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QUIMRAN
and the
HISTORY
of the
BIBLICAL TEXT
We shall examine here the first stages in the history of the transmission of the Old Testament text over a period of approximately 500 years, starting with c. 300 B.C. For the preceding phases in the history of the text woefully little historical evidence is available, and none of it is contemporary. Any account of the development of the text prior to c. 300 B.C., i.e., in the Persian period, not to mention the periods of the Babylonian Exile or of the First Temple, must perforce rely upon conjecture and, at best, upon deductions and analogies derived from later literature and later manuscripts.

The beginning of what may properly be called the history of the Old Testament text roughly coincides with the final phases of the canonisation of the Old Testament books, a subject which has been discussed in the preceding section. During the period under review, the Jewish scribes and sages decided on, and carried out, the minute fixation of the consonantal text of the scriptures in the original Hebrew tongue.
Concurrently, the Old Testament books were translated into other Semitic languages—Aramaic and Syriac—and also into non-Semitic languages—Greek, and subsequently Latin. This intense activity of editing and revising resulted, at the end of this period (first half of the third century A.D.), in the first comprehensive scholarly enterprise, Origen's Hexapla. In its six columns Origen presented a synoptic view of the then current Hebrew text of the Old Testament and its Greek translations: (1) The Hebrew Old Testament in Hebrew letters; (2) this same text transcribed in Greek letters; (3–6) the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint and Theodotion.

The work of the Jewish scribes affected, as we have said, only the Hebrew consonantal text. To the best of our present knowledge, no fully fledged system of recording vowels in Hebrew had yet been invented, with the exception of the use of some consonants as matres lectionis, i.e. as indicators of a few basic long vowel values. The pronunciation of Hebrew words, as it was current in that period, can, however, in some cases be ascertained by means of retroversion from their rendering in translations, and in some instances from their transcription into the vocalised Greek or Latin alphabets.

The absence of vowels meant that many a Hebrew consonant group could be differently pronounced, and from this resulted the fact that a variety of meanings could be attached to one and the same word in the original. When ultimately vowels were introduced into the Hebrew text of the Bible, these pronunciation variants sometimes became the bases of variae lectiones.

The lack of any system of interpunctuation in written Hebrew at that time was another factor which gave rise to different interpretations of many passages. These diverging interpretations may also in the end turn up as variants in versions which are based on fully interpunctuated manuscripts.

The full establishing of these features of the text which are complementary to the basic Hebrew consonantal text, namely the vowel system(s), interpunctuation, and the subdivision of the text into paragraphs (s'därim and päräšōt), was carried out by the various schools of Massoretes, vocalisers and interpunctuators who flourished in the last

---

1 Cf. iv, 14.
quarter of the first millennium A.D. These late aspects of the textual transmission of the Bible do not come within the orbit of our present exposition.¹

II

There is probably no other extant text, ancient or modern, which is witnessed to by so many diverse types of sources, and the history of which is so difficult to elucidate as that of the text of the Old Testament. The task of the scholar who endeavours to trace the antecedents of the text as we know it today is further complicated by the fact that he is concerned with sacred literature, every word of which is considered to be divinely inspired and therefore infallible. However, having been handed down by human agents for more than two millennia, the text of the scriptures suffered from the shortcomings of man. It became faulty to a greater or less degree and even at times distorted. It must therefore be subjected to scholarly critical analysis like any other ancient literary document.

The Old Testament books were handed down, as has been said, not only in their original Hebrew or, in some passages, Aramaic tongue, but also in a variety of translations into Semitic and non-Semitic languages. All these textual traditions, as we know them today, differ from one another. What is more, even the witnesses to one tradition, in the original language or in a translation, often diverge from one another. As a result, the scholar who takes a synoptic view of all the sources at his disposal is confronted with a bewildering plethora of variae lectiones in the extant versions of the Old Testament books.

This fact obviously does not become apparent in the common editions of the Old Testament, in Hebrew or in translation, which are in everyday use. However, it should be borne in mind that the printed editions represent the end of a long chain of textual development and of editorial activities which were aimed at unifying the sacred texts. These late editions can in no way be taken to exhibit faithfully the autographs of the biblical authors. In fact not one single verse of this ancient literature has come to us in an original manuscript, written by a biblical author or by a contemporary of his, or even by a scribe who lived immediately after the time of the author. Even the very earliest manuscripts at our disposal, in Hebrew or in any translation language,

are removed by hundreds of years from the date of origin of the literature recorded in them.

Even a cursory perusal of the sources available immediately reveals that not one tradition and not one manuscript is without fault. Each and every one patently exhibits errors which crept into it during the long period of its transmission, in the oral stage, when written by hand, and even, though to a lesser degree, when handed down in the form of printed books.

It should, however, be stressed that these errors and textual divergences between the versions materially affect the intrinsic message only in relatively few instances. Nevertheless this may occur. Some examples of variants significant from a theological or ideo-historical angle may in fact be found. In most instances the differences are of a linguistic or a grammatical nature, which resulted either from the unpremeditated impact of the linguistic peculiarities of successive generations of copyists, or from their intentional attempts to adjust the wording of scripture to changing concepts of linguistic and stylistic norms.

The above remarks do not, however, absolve us from accounting for the fact that the further back the textual tradition of the Old Testament is followed, i.e. the older the biblical manuscripts perused, and the more ancient the records which come to the knowledge of scholars, the wider is the over-all range of textual divergence between them. The existing variants, therefore, cannot be simply explained as having arisen solely from the cumulative effect of imperfect copying and recopying of the text over many centuries. The very earliest biblical manuscripts known—and in this respect the biblical scrolls from Qumrân—a are of decisive importance—exhibit practically all types of variants found in later witnesses. This fact indicates that variation as such in the textual transmission cannot be laid exclusively at the door of careless scribes, or of sometimes unscrupulous, and sometimes well-meaning, emendators and revisers. One has to consider the possibility, as scholars have indeed done, that individual variants, and also groups or even types of variants, which have been preserved in the ancient versions, both in Hebrew and in translations, may derive from divergent pristine textual traditions. That these divergent traditions are today represented in the extant witnesses only in what amount to haphazard

---

1 See below, pp. 182–7.
remains, can be explained as resulting from the endeavour of later
generations to establish for each version one officially acclaimed
standard text. After the establishment of such an official standard, new
copies would have been based from the very start on the *textus receptus.*
In the course of time, earlier non-standard manuscripts would also
have been emended to conform to it. In the ensuing process of unifica­
tion, which was inspired both by religious-dogmatic and scholarly
motives, divergent texts almost automatically went out of circulation,
or were more or less systematically suppressed. After a given period in
the history of the text, a period which differs from version to version,
all manuscripts of a version can be reduced to a very restricted number
of prototypes. In some instances, as is the case with the Massoretic
and the Samaritan Hebrew texts, all manuscripts conform to one basic
text form. In other words, the later the witnesses which are reviewed,
the more pronounced their conformity, and the fewer their divergences,
both in number and type.

The scholar whose interest lies in tracing the history of the text
cannot rely upon the end products, but must turn for information to
the earliest sources available. In doing so he is faced with an *embarras
de richesse* of variant and often conflicting readings even in the most
ancient witnesses to the text. It now becomes his task not only to
sketch the lines of these developments, but also to attempt the reconsti­
tution of the original wording, or wordings, of the text. He will
sift the available evidence, and discard from the outset obvious faults
and errors. He will try to establish manuscript families, as far as this
is possible. All manuscripts which can be affiliated with each other will
then be considered as one composite witness to a reading found in
them. Any decision with regard to the importance of a reading cannot
be based merely on counting manuscripts. They have to be assessed
and their intrinsic value taken into account. At the apex of this long
and complicated process of collation and critical analysis, the investi­
gator may carefully conclude that with the available evidence no ‘first’
text form can be established. Or else, more optimistically, he may
attempt to reconstitute the presumed pristine texts of each of the major
versions individually. It then still remains to be debated whether these
proto-texts of the extant versions can be reduced to one common
stem, or whether, at least in part, they must be considered to represent
intrinsically independent textual traditions. Even if by retracing the
steps of textual development we may be able to arrive at the *Ur-text* of this version or that, the question still remains open whether we shall ever be able to recover the *ipsissima verba* of a biblical author.

III

In pursuing the chain of development of the Old Testament text, we may discern four distinct main stages in its transmission between its initial inception at a time varying from book to book, and its form in the days of Origen.

The initial stage, that of the not provable but highly probable oral phase of the biblical literature, lies outside the scope of our present investigation, since by its very nature it precedes written documentation. It should, however, be pointed out that originally oral variations may ultimately turn up as textual variants between duplicate texts within the Old Testament. Such instances are found in two versions of one and the same psalm embedded in a book of the Former Prophets and Psalms (e.g. 2 Sam. 22 = Ps. 18), in Chronicles and Psalms (e.g. 1 Chron. 16: 8–36 = Ps. 105: 1–15; 96: 1–13; 106: 1, 47–8), or in the Book of Psalms itself (e.g. Ps. 31: 2–4b = 71: 1–3; 60: 7–14 = 108: 8–14).¹ Again, we meet with two or even three presentations of a piece of biblical literature in parallel passages in the Former and Latter Prophets (2 Kings 18: 13–20: 19 = Isa. 36: 1–38: 22 = 2 Chron. 32: 1–20; 2 Kings 25: 1–22 = Jer. 39: 1–10 = 52: 4–27; 2 Kings 25: 27–30 = Jer. 52: 31–4). To some extent also quotations from an earlier book in a later one may exhibit textual variants. However, in these cases literary licence and a possible tendency towards intentional variation or rephrasing on the part of the writer who is borrowing may lie at the root of the present divergences.

It goes without saying that in using the term oral tradition we do not exclude the transmission of some biblical books or parts of them in manuscript form even at this stage. The question rather is one of the relative preponderance of the two vehicles of transmission of literary material, the oral and the written. For this reason it is completely unwarranted even to attempt, with the means currently available, to delineate what cannot be known—namely the process of transition from the stage of mainly oral tradition to that of preponderantly

¹ On this theme cf. also pp. 185 ff.
written transmission. In all likelihood the process was gradual, with
the weight progressively shifting from the former to the latter. Without
aiming at precision, in view of the foregoing remarks, it may be said
that the period of the Babylonian Exile after the destruction of the
First Temple, i.e. the middle of the sixth century B.C., could be taken
as a rough dividing line. The definite shift of emphasis from oral to
written transmission of the biblical books would thus have become
clearly apparent during the period of the Return, i.e. at the end of the
sixth and in the fifth century B.C., in what, from a wider historical
viewpoint, may be termed the Persian period. These considerations
indicate, as will be further shown, that in attempting an elucidation of
the history of the text we cannot concern ourselves exclusively with
literary issues, but have to look out also for social and political pheno­
mena whose impacts made themselves felt in its development.

The preponderance of written transmission of Old Testament books
after the return from the Exile still does not make this second phase of
development a ready subject for textual study in the strict sense of the
term, since it is not yet represented by manuscript evidence. Any con­
cclusions with regard to the history of text at that time lack a docu­
mentary basis. They are grounded solely on inference from subsequent
phases of development and on theoretical considerations rooted in other
fields of biblical research and transferred from them to the study of the
text. Textual study proper commences in the next stage with the
appearance of accessible manuscripts of Old Testament books.

The third phase begins, according to the present state of our know­
ledge, in the early third century B.C. For several reasons this phase
must be considered the pivot around which any investigation into the
history of the Bible text turns. At this stage, the written transmission
of biblical literature finally and, to all intents and purposes, completely
replaced oral tradition. With this transition went the gradual formal
sanctification of the books which were accepted as scripture, culminat­
ing at the end of this phase, i.e. by the turn of the eras, in the establish­
ment of the complete and closed Old Testament Canon. The very fact
that an attempt was made to compile a definite codex of the sacred lore
of the community shows that those who undertook it sensed that a
period in the history of Israel and of its literature had come to a close,
and that a new era of basically different literary standards and norms
had begun. In instigating the canonisation of those books, they
intended to ensure the faithful preservation of the spiritual heritage of preceding generations. At the same time they purported to draw a definite line between this acknowledged body of written sacred literature and contemporary non-sacred books on the one hand, and on the other hand between it and the emerging new type of rabbinic literature which was to be only orally transmitted. Again, as has been shown in the section on the Canon, we are concerned with a gradual process, of which many aspects still cannot be adequately examined for lack of reliable evidence. Yet it would appear that the progressive demarcation of the books accepted as scripture over against all other writings extant at that period was a prerequisite for the ensuing preoccupation with the exact wording which aimed at guaranteeing an unimpaired textual transmission. No such tendency is apparent in the preceding phase. It seems that only with the emerging concept of a clearly circumscribed canon of inspired literature could there develop this concern for the exact preservation of its wording. We have no reason to suppose that much heed was paid to the text of non-sanctified writings, nor does the traceable textual history of writings of this kind, such as Ecclesiasticus, substantiate such an assumption. Since they had no claim to have been conceived under divine inspiration, variants in their transmitted wordings were regarded as of no consequence.

IV

The internal Jewish trends outlined above were intensified by another set of factors. In the period under review, Israel was drawn into the orbit of hellenistic culture, which heavily influenced contemporary Jewish culture. The resulting contact with the Greek world of letters had a decisive impact on the transmission of the Old Testament. Jewish scribes emulated Greek scribal techniques and terminology, and adopted their insistence on exactitude in handing down written records and literary works.¹

This development occurred at an opportune moment in the history of the Old Testament text, when its translation into other languages was first undertaken. The demand for a translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic probably arose during the Babylonian Exile or immediately after the return of the exiles to Palestine, i.e. in the

Persian period. Aramaic being the lingua franca of the time, it was adopted by many Jews in their intercourse with the non-Jewish world. Being a Semitic language, closely related to Hebrew, it eventually achieved the status of a sister tongue to Hebrew even in the internal life of the Jewish people, especially in the Babylonian Diaspora, but also in Palestine. At first, the translation of the scriptures into Aramaic was most probably sporadic and undirected. It was left to the individual communities to tend to the needs of their members by providing a vehicle which would make the message of the sacred writings understandable also to those whose command of the mother tongue had become insufficient for this purpose. Lacking authorised supervision, the resulting translation often assumed the form of a somewhat free paraphrase of the original, rather than of an accurate rendering into the translator’s language. But even when a word-by-word translation was attempted, divergence from the Hebrew Vorlage was inevitable. Translation from one language into another always produces inaccuracies since there is no exact correspondence between the vocabulary and the syntax of the two, even if they belong to the same language family. Moreover, the probably divergent first renderings of the Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic were based on originals which may well have differed among themselves to a smaller or larger degree, for reasons set out above.

The same considerations apply with additional force to the translation of the Old Testament books into Greek, a non-Semitic language. This translation was required, for reasons similar to those mentioned above, by Jews living within the sphere of hellenistic culture, whether in Ptolemaic Egypt, where the Jewish community of Alexandria was the focal point, or in Palestine. Tradition maintains that in this case official non-Jewish agents also showed interest in rendering the Old Testament into Greek, and instigated a properly supervised scholarly translation. This tradition will be further discussed subsequently. The pseudepigraphic Letter of Aristeas credits King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 B.C.) with having inaugurated the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek by seventy sages. As a result of their concerted effort, the Septuagint, commonly designated LXX, was in the Pentateuch less open to the uncontrolled impact of translators’ idiosyncrasies. It contains indeed fewer deviations from the Hebrew text here than in the renderings of the other books. But it is still open to discussion whether
this reputedly official undertaking is to be considered the first attempt at translating the Old Testament or parts of it into Greek and to have provided the impetus to further ventures of the same kind, or whether it should rather be viewed as an event which crowned a long series of previous diffuse attempts with a standardised version.

The first wave of translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into other languages, Semitic and non-Semitic, perforce resulted in the creation of variants and types of variants in the then extant witnesses to the text. The ensuing embarrassing textual diversity of the versions of the sacred books soon called for the application of the methods of textual analysis and textual criticism to remedy this deficiency. As stated above, the ground for this new approach had been laid by the conjunction of scholarly norms borrowed from the Greeks with the care for the accurate transmission of the inspired literature which had developed within Judaism. This attitude towards the text characterises the fourth period of its history.

\[ V \]

We have already indicated that the fourth phase in the textual history of the Old Testament may be reckoned to extend from the end of the last century B.C. to the beginning of the third century A.D. It is marked by a vigorous process of textual standardisation which affected practically all versions. In order to include within this time-span the activities of Jewish and Samaritan scribes who applied themselves to the stabilisation of the Hebrew text, and of Christian, and to some extent also of Jewish, scribes and scholars who dealt with the Greek Bible, the upper and lower limits have been chosen with some latitude. The dates could be lowered by half a century or so at both ends as far as the Hebrew text is concerned. Also in this phase we have to take into account the impact of socio-political events on the history of the text, especially the emergence of Christianity and the destruction of the Second Temple in A.D. 70. The finalisation of the rift between the Synagogue and the Church which was incomparably more important and decisive than any preceding clash of the main stream of Judaism with deviating movements, and the insistence of both Jews and Christians on basing the cardinal tenets of their conflicting beliefs on the sacred scriptures, necessitated the clear definition of the text on which these claims were grounded. Further, the destruction of the
Second Temple seriously impaired the social cohesion of Jewry which had previously ensured some unity of the text, or at least had prevented its dissolution into innumerable streamlets of textual tradition. The renewed dispersion of Jews over a large geographical area, the disruption of existing socio-religious centres and the creation of new pivotal agencies with the possible resulting diversification of the biblical textual traditions, required counteraction. The propagation of one, universally recognised text form was considered indispensable for ensuring the continuity of the national unity. Rabbinic literature, Hebrew fragments of the Old Testament from after A.D. 70 such as those from Wadi Murabba'at and Massada,¹ and some subsidiary evidence from the ancient versions, witness to the emergence of a Hebrew textus receptus, the prototype of the Massoretic text which was finally established almost a millennium later.

Correspondence between the developments of the Hebrew and non-Hebrew versions terminates somewhere at the end of the first century A.D. By then the division between them is in fact no longer a division along linguistic lines, but reflects the schism between the Synagogue and the Church and their different attitudes to the text. The process of textual unification referred to above affected not only the rabbinic Hebrew Bible and the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch but also seems to be observable in the Jewish Aramaic translations of the Old Testament books, especially in the Targum Onkelos to the Pentateuch. As against this, if we may judge by Origen's enterprise, and by some preceding Greek evidence from Qumrân, Christian scholars were indeed also bent on editing, and probably on stabilising, the various extant Greek translations, but apparently did not attempt to weld them into one solely acceptable textual tradition. This interpretation of the available evidence is borne out by the subsequent fate of the Greek Bible which after Origen's time was also subjected to recurrent revisions which in practice sometimes amount to new translations. This state of affairs brought about the renewed efforts of Jerome some two centuries later to provide the Church with a new Latin version, the Vulgate, based on the then extant form of the hebraica veritas.² The Vulgate was intended to supersede the Old Latin version then in use, itself derived from the Greek and therefore presenting in many cases readings which deviated considerably from the current Hebrew text. True, there is

¹ See below, pp. 182–6. ² See v, 16 in the present volume.
no comparable evidence on hand for the Jewish-Hebrew text in the period under review. At the beginning of the second century manuscript Hebrew evidence comes abruptly to an end, and the text remains unattested for some seven centuries until the appearance of the earliest medieval Hebrew manuscripts. However, the basic similarity between the Hebrew textual traditions at the two extreme points of this time-span, which is not impaired by the persistence of individual variants or even the emergence of new ones, bears out the above statement that after the first century A.D. one single Hebrew text type gained the upper hand and that deviant types practically went out of circulation.

VI

At this point of our investigation we have to turn our attention to the history of biblical textual research as it has developed since the rediscovery of the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch by Pietro della Valle in 1616. The Samaritan text was made available to scholars shortly afterwards when Morinus first printed it in 1632 alongside the other versions in the Paris Polyglot. Its many deviations from the Massoretic text, later estimated at about six thousand, were soon observed. It was further established that approximately one third of these variae lectiones could be traced also in the Septuagint. This concurrence enhanced the doubts which had been raised concerning the veracity of the Massoretic text. It was maintained that, having been revised by the rabbis after the destruction of the Temple, in the first half of the second century A.D., it did not represent the ipsissima verba of the divinely inspired message, but a faulty text, resulting from incuria librariorum or from wilful malicious tampering with it on the part of the Jews. As against this it was claimed that the Septuagint had never been subjected to such interference, and therefore represented the biblical text in its pre-revision stage. If it was not altogether a true image of the pristine form of the divine word, it certainly came closer to it than any other version. The alignment of the Hebrew Samaritan version with the Greek in so many instances seemed to strengthen the position of the defenders of its accuracy. True, the history of the Samaritan community remained to a large extent shrouded in mystery, but its seclusion throughout more than a millennium appeared to imply that its version of the Pentateuch had been safeguarded from the impact of the biased Jewish
revision. It was therefore accepted as a true reflection of the Hebrew Pentateuch as that had been extant before the rabbis exerted their influence on it.

It hardly needs stressing that the discussion at that time, and into the eighteenth century, arose almost exclusively from theological considerations and not from detached scholarly observation. Textual criticism was employed in order to prove the claim that the Greek Bible adopted by the Church was the only true manifestation of the divine message. Accordingly, the Hebrew text of the Synagogue was relegated to an inferior status. The Reformation had, however, instigated a counter movement. Its reliance on the Hebrew text accorded the latter a new place of honour in biblical studies. It was indeed agreed that the Massoretic text exhibited a text form which had been fixed and codified by numerous successive generations of Jewish scribes and sages, and that it bore the imprint of their redactional activities. But, it was argued, this very preoccupation of those early scholars with the accurate preservation of the text, and the uninterrupted supervision of its transmission, had saved it from the corroding impact of insufficiently controlled copying which had been the lot of the other versions. Collations of the available Hebrew manuscripts which were prepared at the end of the eighteenth century by Kennicott and de Rossi, and which superseded all previous endeavours, proved their basic identity. The rich crop of individual variants which were recorded in the apparatus of these works at first sight appeared to disprove the compactness and stability of the Hebrew text. However, closer scrutiny more and more strengthened the conviction that almost all of them can and should be classified as intentional or unintentional secondary scribal alterations. In any case, they could not offset the clear impression that the consonantal text of practically all Massoretic manuscripts showed no deviation of any consequence. All exhibited a tradition which was identical to the smallest minutiae, even in recording anomalous phenomena such as the puncta extraordinaria, and the unconventional spelling or pronunciation of certain words. The lesson to be drawn from Kennicott’s, de Rossi’s and other such collations was summarised at the end of the eighteenth century by E. F. C. Rosen-

1 M. H. Goshen-Gottstein has recently provided us with new insights into the phase of research into the history of the Massoretic text which is briefly discussed here. See his 'Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts', Biblica, XLVIII (1967), 249–77.
mueller as follows: 'This whole range of variants...leads moreover to the simple recognition that all surviving codices are relatively late in relation to the *originals*...they all represent one recension, all stem from one source...'.

It is imperative to underline Rosenmueller's reference to *originals* (in the plural), and his conclusion that all medieval Hebrew manuscripts derive from one single recension, i.e. a revised text source. They are therefore to be regarded as one composite witness. Moreover, they can in no way be viewed, without further analysis, as a faithful reflection of the original Hebrew text. Their collation can only help us to reconstitute or recapture the prototype of the Massoretic recension, not the pristine Hebrew Bible.

This line of argument by which the extant *variae lectiones* in Massoretic manuscripts were shown to be of secondary origin was further elaborated in the early nineteenth century to include also the Samaritan Pentateuch text. In his dissertation *De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine* (1815), W. Gesenius subjected this version for the first time to a proper textual analysis, leaving aside theological considerations. After collecting and categorising the variant readings in the Samaritan, comparing them whenever possible with parallel readings in other non-Massoretic sources, he concluded that in the overwhelming majority of cases these variants resulted from a Samaritan revision of the same basic text exhibited by the Massoretic text, and therefore cannot be considered to present evidence for an original independent text tradition. Even the concurrence of the Samaritan in so many instances with the Septuagint could not affect this conclusion. Gesenius' successors did not materially add to his findings, but only put in sharper relief the dependence of the Samaritan Version on the Massoretic text, and thus further diminished the former's text-critical value. Z. Frankel defined the Samaritan as a faulty recension full of mistakes and scribal redactions, based on the Massoretic text, a view subscribed to by S. Kohn in numerous publications, and summed up by him as follows:

The Samaritan and the Massoretic text are not two divergent copies of one book, but the Samaritan is related to the Massoretic text in the way that a new edition, carefully revised, is related to an older one; it not only improves

---

1 E. F. C. Rosenmueller, *Handbuch der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, 1 (Göttingen, 1797), p. 244; quoted by E. Preuschen, *ZA W*, ix (1889), 303. (Translation by the editors.)

on it in content—though in this instance it is mainly the opposite of improvement—but it is also modernised in regard to language and orthography.\(^1\)

Rosenmueller's well-balanced 'one-recension' theory which, it is to be noted, he had applied to the Massoretic text only, was pushed into the background by the more sweeping 'archetype theory' propounded by P. de Lagarde about a century ago. In Lagarde's formulation all Hebrew manuscripts derived from one single exemplar, not one recension. This hypothetical manuscript admittedly did not faithfully mirror the original text, but patently contained numerous deviations from it which had been faithfully transmitted and preserved in all extant manuscripts: 'The result is that our Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament all go back to one single exemplar, and have even faithfully reproduced as corrections the correcting of its scribal errors and taken over its fortuitous imperfections.'\(^2\) It was tacitly assumed or even expressly conceded, e.g. by J. G. Sommer, that that unique proto-Massoretic manuscript either derived directly from the Temple or else was based upon a copy of the complete Canon which had been kept there before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, although it achieved its final form only somewhat later.\(^3\)

Lagarde widened the scope of his investigation by applying a similar method to the Greek tradition. He argued that all the available Greek manuscripts could be reduced to the three basic local recensions of Origen, Hesiod and Lucian, from which scholars could trace their way back to the original Septuagint. Taken as a whole the Greek tradition represented a textual family which differed from the Massoretic text. Although it must be viewed as an unsatisfactory translation of the original, this tradition can be employed, by way of comparison, to go behind the archetype which underlies the Hebrew manuscripts: 'We could only penetrate behind this archetype of the Massoretic text by conjecture, were it not for the fact that the Greek version of the Old Testament opens up the possibility of making use of at least a poor translation of a manuscript belonging to a different family.'\(^4\)

\(^1\) S. Kohn, 'Samaritikon und Septuaginta', *MGWJ*, xxxviii (1895), 60. (Translation by the editors.)

\(^2\) P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverben* (Leipzig, 1863), p. 2. (Translation by the editors.)


\(^4\) P. de Lagarde, *ibid.* n. 18. (Translation by the editors.)
The various manifestations of the Old Testament text could, according to this theory, be likened to the branches of a tree, all of which had grown from one stem in diverse stages of bifurcation. There remained little doubt that an analysis and comparison of the main versions, chiefly of the Massoretic text and the reconstituted Septuagint buttressed by the Hebrew Samaritan Pentateuch version, would lead scholars to the very Ur-text common to all. The Greek tradition was deemed especially valuable for the purpose of purging the Old Testament of anti-Christian falsifications which allegedly had been introduced into the Massoretic text by the rabbis. This consideration, more theological than textual, fixed the terminus non ante quem of the reputed Jewish Ur-exemplar. It could not precede the emergence of Christianity, indeed not the first centuries A.D., since one had to allow some time for the Jewish–Christian controversy to develop.¹ The final fixation of the proto-Massoretic text was soon connected with the members of the Sanhedrin of Jamnia that flourished in the days of the Emperor Hadrian (first half of the second century A.D.), and especially with Rabbi Aqiba, probably the most prominent rabbi of the early Christian era. In some such formulation Lagarde’s Ur-text theory, which was incorrectly considered an elaboration of Rosenmueller’s ‘one recension’ theory, carried the day. Scholars differed in their opinions as to how the basic Massoretic text had been established—whether a deliberate choice had been made by some official Jewish body (Olshausen), or whether, rather haphazardly, a readily available manuscript had been made the basis of the standard text (Noeldeke).² But they concurred on the basic issue—the presupposed existence of an archetype. The situation was succinctly summarised at the end of the nineteenth century by F. Buhl:

Of the style and manner in which this authorized text was constructed we unfortunately know nothing definitely. This much only is plain, that the very conception of such an authorized form of text implies the existence of a definite standard manuscript, which was pronounced the only allowable one. In so far, the relatively recent but already widespread theory, that all extant manuscripts point back to one single archetype, is decidedly correct.³

¹ For a summary of Lagarde’s views see A. Rahlfs, P. de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk (Göttingen, 1928), pp. 75–82.
Buhl subscribed to the idea that this standard text was officially pro­
claimed, and soon pushed its way
in a remarkably short time wherever the Pharisaic influence extended. On the
other hand, the equally widespread theory that this primitive codex obtained
this position by mere arbitrary choice, or by the manuscripts of the several
books that by chance were at hand being bound together into one standard
Bible, is by no means certain.¹

But he was less sure than Lagarde that we can reach back behind this
archetype by comparing the Hebrew version with the extant Greek.
It is important, he says,
to determine the exact relation between the Massoretic text and the Arche­
typal texts of Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerome. In a remarkable way the
Hebrew manuscripts, which were certainly derived from the most diverse
regions, seem to form a unity over against those translators, because the
variations present in these are only extremely seldom repeated in any one
manuscript. Evidently the rigid stability of form which resulted from the
labours of the Massoretes called into being new standard texts, on which the
manuscripts are directly dependent, which, however, were themselves
collateral with the manuscripts used by those translators.¹

VII

The validity of some of Lagarde’s arguments was questioned already
in his lifetime. Within thirty years after the inception of the Ur-text
theory the onslaught on it from various quarters forced its adherents
to modify their rigid position, and ultimately resulted in the conception
of new rival hypotheses. P. E. Kahle drew attention to Hebrew manu­
scripts from the Cairo Geniza stemming from the end of the first and
the beginning of the second millennium A.D. which exhibited variants
in the secondary phenomena of the Hebrew text (vocalisation, punctua­
tion, etc.). These derived from different Massoretic systems, and seemed
to indicate that the Hebrew tradition was less solidified than Lagarde
had assumed.² But since these manuscripts were much too late, and
their variants did not really affect the consonantal text, their evidence
could not be adduced to disqualify the Ur-text hypothesis.

¹ Buhl, ibid.
² P. Kahle’s work of a lifetime is summarised in his The Cairo Geniza. The Schweich
More decisive were the strictures raised by V. Aptowitzer. His collection of biblical quotations in rabbinic literature, a field which had not been explored at all by earlier scholars, brought to light a wealth of variant Hebrew readings, which were sometimes reflected also in one or another of the versions.\(^1\) In spite of attempts to diminish the value of this evidence, by explaining the variations as arising from quotation by heart, or from intentional alteration of the original on the part of the quoting authors, it stands to reason that it severely undermines the theory of a single Jewish *Ur-text*. It would be hard to explain the persistence of variants in rabbinic literature, even when these occur merely in quotations, if indeed the text of that one manuscript had ousted all others since the days of Rabbi Aqiba.

The very existence of variant quotations in rabbinic writings and in their exegetical comments, particularly in Midrash literature, which mirror a text that deviates from the Massoretic text, dealt a severe blow not only to the *Ur-text* hypothesis, but also to the less rigorous ‘one recension’ theory. Rival theories were now put forward. All of these set out to account for the co-existence of divergent text traditions of the Old Testament in the pre-Christian rabbinic and the early Christian period, in Hebrew as well as in Aramaic, in Greek and possibly also in Latin translations, as are exemplified in: (a) divergent textual traditions exhibited in quotations in rabbinical literature; (b) parallel Aramaic translations of the Pentateuch, which indeed stem from a period later than the one under discussion here, but most probably derive from pre-Origenic prototypes, namely Targum Onkelos which possibly originated in Babylonia, and certainly was redacted there, Pseudo-Jonathan, of Palestinian origin, and a third Aramaic version which until recently had been known only from excerpts, and therefore had been named the Fragment Targum, but now has been proved to represent in fact a fully fledged Jerusalem Aramaic translation;\(^2\) and


(c) the propagation of diverse Greek translations exhibited in an almost codified form in the parallel columns of the Hexapla, and sometimes preserved in the form of variant-quotations from the Old Testament in the Apocrypha, the New Testament and the writings of the early Church Fathers, and also in Jewish hellenistic literature, especially in the works of Flavius Josephus.

The most extreme of the new theories was that of the 'vulgar texts' proposed by Paul Kahle which may be considered the very opposite of Lagarde's Ur-text hypothesis, and with some qualifications also of the 'one recension' theory. As stated, both these hypotheses take for granted that all extant versions of the Old Testament books, and also most of the intra-versional textual variants, can in the last analysis be reduced, at least in theory if not always in practice, to one common text base which was the only acclaimed, or possibly even the only extant, text form of the Old Testament at the beginning of the Christian era. Though differing as to the characterisation of the 'archetype' as a 'recension' or as a single manuscript, neither of these two hypotheses seems to have taken into consideration the antecedents of the presupposed archetype. It would, in fact, appear that in both the respective archetype was believed to have represented the very first text form of the Old Testament books, not preceded by any divergent predecessors. In other words, all present divergences in the extant versions must be considered to have arisen after the archetype had been established and had been officially accepted. The archetype is viewed, as it were, as a riverhead running off into numerous rivulets, all of which, however, can be retraced to the original source.

Now, it may be said that Kahle would be prepared to subscribe to such a description of the issue as far as the latter part of the simile is concerned, namely the diversification of the Old Testament text tradition in the post-Jamnia period. He would also agree that many variants in the diverse versions are of a secondary nature, resulting from intentional or accidental scribal alterations. But on the other hand he would maintain that on the whole the more important witnesses to the Old Testament text, such as the primary Hebrew Massoretic and Samaritan versions, and the basic Greek and Aramaic translations, represent in essence text forms which preceded Lagarde's model-codex or Rosenmueller's arch-recension. The 'vulgar texts' school does not consider the archetype to be the riverhead, but rather the confluence
of preceding varying text traditions. These pristine traditions were unified to a considerable degree by the endeavour of generations of tradents within the Jewish, Samaritan and Christian communities who established the (proto)-Massoretic textus receptus, the Samaritan consolidated version of the Pentateuch and the Septuagint respectively. But they never fully succeeded in completely suppressing older and purer, i.e. non-revised, 'vulgar' texts within their own official tradition, which was determined by linguistic peculiarities and religious dogma, nor could they ever establish one common archetype of the Old Testament books.\footnote{Similar ideas had been already presented in statu nascendi by A. Geiger. See e.g. his remarks on the Samaritan text in: Nachgelassene Schriften, iv (Berlin, 1876), 67.}

It is the great merit of Kahle that he attempted to push the inquiry into the history of the text in all its ramifications beyond the terminus non ante quem which his predecessors had tacitly or explicitly considered as the starting point for their investigations, namely the end of the Second Commonwealth or the beginning of the period after the destruction in A.D. 70. In his understanding of the matter, the then already extant textus receptus of each single version marked the apex of a long chain of development in the course of which divergent text-traditions had been progressively abolished. The creation of the Septuagint as portrayed in the pseudepigraphical Letter of Aristeas, the compact Aramaic Targums, the Massoretic text and the Samaritan Version are the crowning events in a process of textual unification which had been set on foot by the needs of socio-religious organisations: the Synagogue, the Samaritan community and the Church.

Without, to the best of my knowledge, stating so explicitly, Kahle in fact applied to the research into the history of the Old Testament text ideas and principles which concurrently emerged in the study of biblical stylistics and literature. Quite correctly, he considered textual history as a phenomenon of a socio-religious kind and endeavoured to map out its place in actual communal life, i.e. to establish, in Gunkel's terminology, its 'Sitz im Leben'.

It follows that in many instances an ancient variant, or a Bible quotation which differs from the authoritative texts, exhibits a wirkliche Variante, i.e. a true variant which is a remnant of a pristine text-tradition that had escaped the levelling influence of the official redactions. Inter-version variants may have resulted from the fact that the
individual versions finally crystallised at different stages of the textual transmission of the Old Testament. Variant quotations survived predominantly in texts which did not come under the scrutiny of the official revisers. They should be considered sediments of 'vulgar', i.e. popular traditions that had been in use before the introduction of each respective textus receptus.

VIII

It hardly needs stating that by virtue of its being the very antithesis to the Ur-text and the Ur-recension theses, Kahle's theory of 'vulgar texts and textus receptus' was from the outset rejected by the followers of Lagarde and Rosenmueller. But scholars who were inclined to embrace the new idea also called for the correction of some of its constituent elements. They fully recognised a diversity of the textual traditions of the Old Testament as already existing in the very first stages of its manuscriptal transmission—the point on which Kahle had based his arguments—and they accepted his attempt to account for this diversity by trying to retrace the steps of the textual development before the emergence of a standard text. It was nevertheless considered imperative to smooth out some features of his theory which had justifiably evoked criticism. Kahle had brought into clear focus the natural, uncontrolled transmission of the 'vulgar' traditions, thus freeing them from the rigidity of a conception which supposes the Ur-text or the Ur-recension to be scholarly creations. Yet he postulated that very same 'academic' setting for the Masoretic textus receptus. His presentation of the process by which this model text came about suffers from all the misconceptions which led the Ur-text thesis to postulate an abstract scholastic procedure—a procedure for which there is little evidence that it corresponded with socio-historical realities. His assumption that the textus receptus should be viewed as resulting from the concerted efforts of a rabbinic academy, especially that of Jamnia, and that its exclusive status was achieved by what amounts to a wholesale auto-da-fé of all diverging manuscripts, is neither substantiated by any historical evidence nor plausible. The emergence of the textus receptus should be conceived of as a protracted process which culminated in its post factum acclamation in the first or at the latest in the second century A.D., as has been stated previously.
Some of the opposition to the Vulgärtexte theory, when not attributable to dogmatic rather than rational, scholarly motives, probably has its roots in the reluctance of scholars to accept the bewildering ‘disorderliness’ implied by that thesis in place of the much more systematic theory of an Ur-text. But its impact on the issue under review was soon felt. As normally in scholarly discussion and evaluation, some novel intermediate theories were produced which, by way of synthesis, combined salient features of the opposing schools. It may be said that basically, the attempt was made to bring some method into the madness of the uncontrolled vulgar texts, and at the same time little was needed to square Kahle’s textus receptus with Lagarde’s Hebrew Ur-text or Rosenmueller’s Ur-recension, all of which in fact were considered to be mirrored with some deviations in the present Massoretic text.

We shall consider here two propositions which purport to take into account the diversity of the actual textual traditions from the very moment at which they become known to us in manuscript form or in quotations in early post-biblical Jewish and Christian literature, and to avoid at the same time the disturbing diffuseness of the vulgar texts if seen as pristine independent traditions.

Setting out from Kahle’s premises, and probing into the antecedents of the various text forms in which the Old Testament is extant, in Hebrew as well as in translations, and especially in Greek, A. Sperber attempted to reduce all versions in their variations to two basic textual traditions: one is supposedly derived from Judah and is represented most clearly by the Massoretic text; the other stems from Ephraim, and is best recognised in the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch. Both have their offshoots in the major Greek textual families, in manuscripts A and B.¹ The admitted initial dichotomy of the biblical text-tradition, carried back by Sperber’s hypothesis into pre-exilic times, is fundamentally opposed to the ‘one Ur-recension’ and the ‘one Ur-text’ theories. The difference between one textual tradition and two is qualitative, and not merely quantitative. On the other hand Sperber invalidated to a high degree the originality of the ‘vulgar texts’, which Kahle had assumed, by presenting them as derivations from a preceding

¹ Sperber’s criticism of the archetype theory may be found in his Septuagintaprobleme (Stuttgart, 1929). For a presentation of his own views see ‘New Testament and Septuagint’, JBL, lxxix (1940), 193–293.
pristine textual tradition which diverged from the prototype of the present Massoretic text. Sperber further introduced into the discussion the idea of 'local traditions' which figures prominently in the most recent theory, yet to be described, perceiving in the Samaritan not merely the product of a late dissident Jewish group, but rather the best-preserved representative of a North-Israelite (namely Ephraimite) text type, and in the Massoretic text its South-Israelite (Judaean) counterpart.

In the same manner as Kahle had applied, as was suggested, Gunkel's exclusively literary concept of the 'Sitz im Leben' to the sphere of biblical textual history, so Sperber appears to have transferred to the study of the text the notion of a geographical dichotomy of the pentateuchal literature inherent in the sigla J and E which, according to some views, are taken to represent the Judaean–Jahwistic and the Ephraimite–Elohistic traditions respectively. At the same time he abandoned the evaluation of the diverse text types which is concomitant with Kahle's very terminology, 'vulgar texts' versus textus receptus, and repaired to a purely descriptive division of the extant representatives of the text.

S. Liebermann, on the other hand, took up the qualitative differentiation between the witnesses to the text, applying it, however, not to 'textual traditions', but to types of manuscripts which were extant in the crucial period of the last one or two centuries B.C. and the first one or two centuries A.D. His division between manuscripts as 'base' (φαυλότερα), 'popular' (vulgare or κοινότερα) and 'excellent' (ήκριβωμένα) also has some 'local' affiliations, since the first were supposedly unworthy copies found mainly in the hands of uneducated villagers, the second class was widely used in cities for study purposes, even in schools and rabbinic academies, whereas only the third type had binding force and was meticulously transmitted by the learned sages of Jerusalem. It goes without saying that only the latter group can be taken to represent faithfully the pristine text of scripture, whereas the others must be judged inferior, their variants being in the nature of secondary deviations. Here Lieberman, without stating so expressly, obviously presupposes the existence of some basic text of exclusive validity which is best mirrored in the manuscripts.

It is important, again in reference to later theories pertaining to the

---

1 Cf. Hellenism in Jewish Palestine.
history of the text which are yet to be discussed, to put in relief Liebermann's threefold division of biblical manuscripts at the end of the Second Temple period, and the assumption that the three types were anchored and transmitted in different localities. One may also detect in his system a sociological dimension in so far as the above types are affiliated with different strata of Jewish society: illiterate or semi-illiterate country people on the one hand, and 'academicians' on the other hand, with an intermediate, less precisely delineated group including city dwellers of all kinds.

IX

At this stage of our investigation we turn to the presentation of some issues which have caused novel developments in the theories about the history of the text.

It was said above that the third phase in the early history of the text, which coincides approximately with the hellenistic and the early Roman period, i.e. the last three centuries B.C., must be considered crucial for our investigation. The final and complete transition from oral tradition to written transmission, the gradual canonisation of the books which were deemed holy, the emerging processes of translation of the Hebrew Bible into other languages, and the impact of hellenistic literary norms and techniques, make this stage the very centre of our inquiry.

To the above considerations must be added one other factor which looms very large in contemporary research into the issue under review. It necessitates, in fact, a reopening of the discussion on the history of the text, and a re-evaluation of theories which had been formed at the end of the nineteenth and in the first half of the twentieth century. We refer to the collection of manuscripts and fragments from the Judaean Desert, also known by the misnomer 'The Dead Sea Scrolls', which include numerous scrolls and thousands of fragments of biblical books. Since 1947 when the new finds were first reported, an incessant stream of discoveries, so far only published in part, illuminates that phase in the history of the text.

The above documents are of two groups, quite disparate from the standpoint both of chronology and of their sociological provenance. One group hails from Qumrân which is situated some five miles south of Jericho and two miles west of the shores of the Dead Sea. It precedes
the destruction of the Second Temple (A.D. 70)—so important an event for the textual history of the Old Testament—and derives from the dissident Jewish sect of the ‘New Covenant’.¹ The other consists of scattered manuscript finds from the region to the south of Qumrân, Wadi Murabba’at (halfway between Jericho and ‘Ein Gedi), Nahal Ze‘elim and Massada, and exhibits the textual tradition of what has been styled by G. F. Moore ‘normative’ Judaism.

The latter fragments, which date from the Bar-Kochba revolt (middle of the second century A.D.), do not shed much light on our problem because they provide evidence for only some sections of a few Old Testament books, and because they present a text which had already been almost wholly adjusted to the prevailing textus receptus.² These documents therefore do not bear on the phase of textual development at present under review. The biblical manuscripts from Qumrân, on the other hand, some of which are dated by scholars in the third and many in the second and first centuries B.C., have added a new dimension to the criticism of the biblical text and to the study of its history, both in the original Hebrew and in the earliest ancient versions, especially in Greek.³ Some of these manuscripts are quite extensive. Thus in the case of the First Isaiah Scroll (1QIs⁴), we have a virtually complete copy of the biblical book. This, like many other manuscripts from Qumrân, precedes the oldest extant manuscripts of any part of the Old Testament in the Hebrew Massoretic tradition by more than a millennium, and those in Greek or any other translation by several centuries. They are thus of unsurpassed importance for an investigation into the third phase of the history of the text, and into the processes of its transmission.

The new material often helps in elucidating the genesis and the history of individual variants in which one or more of the ancient versions differ from the Massoretic text. They also open up new possibilities for the recovery, or the reconstruction, of the factors which underlie textual variation. The sifting of these cases, their

¹ The reader will find a valuable summary of the literature and the ideology of this group in F. M. Cross, jun., The Ancient Library of Qumrân (revised edition, New York, 1961).
classification, and a statistical assessment of the frequency of their appearance, may make possible the systematic presentation of the processes which can be proved empirically to have been conducive to the emergence of \textit{variae lectiones}. The pertinent information gained from these first-hand sources, because of their scope and their primacy, should enable scholars to improve on previous attempts along these lines.

Prior to the discovery of the Qumrân Scrolls, observations on the skill and the peculiarities of the ancient copyists of the text could be inferred only from the analysis of variants which are found in medieval Hebrew manuscripts, or had to be abstracted from deviating translations in the ancient versions. With the pre-Christian Hebrew Scrolls from Qumrân at our disposal, we are now in a position to verify principles established by inference, and to put them to a practical test. The Scrolls afford us a completely new insight into ancient scribal craft and give us an unparalleled visual impression of the physical appearance of the manuscripts in which the biblical \textit{variae lectiones} arose. We can now observe at close range, so to say \textit{in situ}, scribal techniques of the Second Temple period which left their impression on the text in subsequent stages of its history. We can perceive the conditions which were the breeding ground of the variants that crop up in the extant witnesses to the text of the Old Testament.

There is nothing specifically sectarian in the external appearance of the Qumrân Scrolls, in the scribal customs to which their copyists adhered, or in the majority of the deviant readings found in them. The impression of dissent that goes with the biblical Scrolls from Qumrân derives from the secession of their scribes from normative Judaism, and has no roots in the manuscripts as such. That is to say, it must be attributed to the socio-historical processes which engulfed these Scrolls, but in no way to their textual or manuscript character. Genetically the biblical texts from Qumrân are 'Jewish'. They became 'sectarian' in their subsequent history.

What makes the evidence of the Scrolls especially valuable is the fact that they present not just a horizontal cross-section of one stabilised version, such as is the Massoretic \textit{textus receptus}. Because of their diversity, the kaleidoscope of the textual traditions exhibited in them, their concurrence here with one, here with another of the known versions, or again in other cases their exclusive textual individuality,
the biblical manuscripts found at Qumrân, in their totality, present in a nutshell, as it were, the intricate and variegated problems of the Hebrew text and versions. The concentration of processes which obtain in the history of the text in a comparatively small corpus of manuscripts, small in comparison with the bulk of Hebrew (Massorethic and Samaritan), Aramaic, Syrian, Greek, Latin, etc., manuscripts which have to be sifted, collated and compared in the course of the critical work on the text—a corpus which moreover is relatively homogeneous with respect to time and provenance—make the Qumrân Scrolls an ideal subject for a study of these processes. Although the results gained from an analysis of the Qumrân material cannot be applied without qualification to the wider field of comparative research into the Massorethic text and the versions, we may derive from them certain working hypotheses which have then to be verified by application to the wider problem.

Thus the situation at Qumrân reflects on a basic issue in Old Testament textual research, namely the debated problem of the very establishment of a Hebrew textus receptus. The coexistence of diverse text-types in the numerically, geographically and temporally restricted Covenanters' community, the fact that some or most of the conflicting manuscripts had very probably been copied in the Qumrân scriptorium and that no obvious attempts at the suppression of divergent manuscripts or of individual variants can be discovered in that voluminous literature, proves beyond doubt that the very notion of an exclusive textus receptus had not yet taken root at Qumrân.

We have no reason to doubt that this 'liberal' attitude towards divergent textual traditions of the Old Testament prevailed also in 'normative' Jewish circles of the second and first centuries B.C. According to rabbinic testimony, even the model codices that were kept in the Temple precincts—the 'qārah—not only exhibited divergent readings, but represented conflicting text-types.¹ Phenomenologically speaking, the situation that prevailed in the 'qārah of the Temple may be compared, though with qualifications, with the one that obtained in the scriptorium at Qumrân. The difference consists in the fact that in the end the Temple codices were collated, probably in the first century A.D. and, what is more important, that rabbinic Judaism ultimately

¹ See S. Talmon, 'The Three Scrolls of the Law that were Found in the Temple Court', Textus (Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project), 11 (1962), 14-27.
established a model text and strove to banish deviant manuscripts from circulation. But at this stage the comparability of Jewish 'normative' with Qumrân practice breaks down. The active life-span of the Covenanters' community ends some time in the first century B.C., although sporadic attempts at restoration have repercussions in the first and possibly into the second century A.D. However, even the latest manuscripts from Qumrân which provide evidence of the local history of the text in the crucial period, the last decades before the destruction of the Temple, do not give the slightest indication that even an incipient *textus receptus* emerged there, or that the very notion of a model recension was ever conceived by the Covenanters.

The coexistence of varying text forms of the Old Testament, and the absence of any noticeable attempt at establishing one universally recognised recension of binding force, must have confronted the Qumrân scribes with the problem of what attitude to take towards these conflicting textual traditions, which had not yet been assessed and evaluated. The individual scribe could solve this problem by adhering faithfully to the manuscript which he had chosen, or had been assigned, as the *Vorlage* for his own copy. In a reasonable number of instances he could perpetuate parallel readings which he found in other manuscripts that were at his disposal, by noting them in the margins or between the lines of his own copy, or sometimes by integrating them in his text-base, in which case he would create a double reading.¹ Now these devices, which were a common stock-in-trade of the ancient Bible scribes regardless of their socio-religious affiliations, are mere practical expedients that may work fairly well, up to a certain point, for the individual copyist, but cannot satisfactorily solve the problem of the community's disposition towards divergent, but equally well-documented, readings. In manuscripts which are intended for public use, critical annotations must be kept to a practical minimum. In fact, even these relatively few marginal entries will tend to disappear at subsequent copyings by sheer routine omission, unless they are absorbed into the text proper. Even where authoritative guidance is absent we may find a spontaneous tendency towards the simplification and the stabilisation of the textual traditions of scripture and other hallowed books. This process cannot be expected to culminate in

¹ See S. Talmon, 'Double Readings in the Masoretic Text', *Textus*, 1 (1960), 144-84.
complete unification but it will effectively circumscribe the scope, and reduce the number, of textual types which are allowed a continued existence until, if ever, conscious official redactional activities set in.

The impending gradual disappearance of variant readings, which on objective grounds could not be declared to be intrinsically inferior to those which happened to have taken root in the predominant textual traditions, may well have been viewed with misgivings by those concerned with the preservation of scripture. The practical advantage of acquiring a fairly standardised text-type for communal-cultic purposes was offset by an understandable apprehension for the—to all intents and purposes—irrecoverable loss of valid and venerated textual traditions of the biblical books, which perforce would result from the process outlined above. Contradictory as it may sound, such pro and ante deliberations seem to have produced diverse manuscript and non-manuscript techniques of variant preservation which helped to balance the scale which was tipped in favour of the text-tradition(s) that became increasingly predominant, to the exclusion and practically complete suppression of less favoured variae lectiones.

Here again, a comparison with attitudes and techniques that were current in other communities is in order. In rabbinic circles, the prevalence of such trends of thought may have been responsible for the perceptible latitude in the employment of the text in scholarly discussion which conspicuously contrasts with the unceasing efforts to establish an exclusive textus receptus for public worship and for official text-transmission. Whereas deviant readings were banned from the books which were earmarked for these latter categories, they were readily accepted and used as bases for midrashic exposition. At times it appears that such an officially discarded variant was not employed merely as a convenient peg upon which to hang a midrash that was to hand, but rather that the midrash in question was constructed on a variant that had been barred from the textus receptus, in order to give it a non-manuscript lease of life. This supposition especially applies to the specific type of the 'al tigre' midrash in which an established reading is suspended as it were, and another reading becomes the point of departure for an ensuing midrashic comment, by means of the introductory formula: 'do not read...but rather read...'. A famous case

in point is the 'al tiqre' midrash (Bab. Tal. Berakot 64a) which hinges on reading in Isa. 54: 13 bōnayîk = 'thy builders', instead of bānayîk = 'thy sons' (cf. ṭē[op]o; Targum bānâk), a variant which now has turned up in 1QIs* as an emended reading bōnayîki. Similarly the midrash 'do not read (the flesh of) his arm but (the flesh of) his offspring' (Bab. Tal. Shab. 33a) can be anchored in the different text traditions of Isa. 9: 19. Here the Massoretic text (= 1QIs*) reading: 'they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm' = ḥr(ō)š is abandoned for the variant reading ṣar(ō)ḏ = 'his offspring' which underlies the Aramaic paraphrastic rendering: 'they shall plunder everyone the goods of his neighbour', and Symmachus' τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ. Both readings were apparently conflated in the main stream of the Septuagint tradition: τοῦ βραχίονος τοῦ ἄδελφου αὐτοῦ.

We do not mean that every extant 'al tiqre' midrash can be shown to have arisen from an already identifiable textual variant. This certainly is not the case. Variae lectiones which supposedly triggered off the emergence of many midrashim of this type have been lost for us together with the (suppressed) manuscripts which exhibited them. Moreover, this specific type of midrash progressively degenerated. The 'al tiqre' formula was then often employed even when the midrash in question could not be related to an actually extant reading, though this had originally been by definition a sine qua non requirement. Ultimately it became a mere exegetical Spie lelement.1 Conversely, the introductory formula of a genuine 'al tiqre' midrash was often dropped, so that now the same exposition is sometimes preserved both with and without that formula.

In a majority of cases the textual variations involved are of the simplest and most common types: interchange of graphically similar letters or of auricularly close consonants; haplography or dittography; continuous writing of separate words or division of one word into two; plene or defective spelling (as in the cases adduced above); metathesis; differences of vocalisation, sometimes entailing a change of verb conjugations. Some cases of more complicated textual phenomena do not materially affect the over-all impression.

The ambivalence of the request for a generally recognised standard

1 See I. L. Seeligmann, 'Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese', Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 1. Congress Volume Copenhagen, 1953 (Leiden, 1953), 150-81, and III, 8 in the present volume.
text of scripture, and the concomitant apprehension over the resulting loss of possibly valuable readings, may have produced yet another technique of variant preservation in the early Church. The recording of different text-traditions in the parallel columns of Origen's *Hexapla* was a way out of this dilemma. On the one hand it ensured the continued preservation of probably widely accepted text forms. On the other hand, with the help of a system of critical symbols by which omissions or additions in the Greek in comparison with the Hebrew text could be indicated, the basis for the establishment of an officially acknowledged and critically guaranteed text was created. In this case, as also in the case of the rabbinic 'al tigrê' formula, the critical symbols were subsequently not properly recorded in copies made of or from Origen's work. This may have resulted simply from scribal carelessness. However, in view of our foregoing remarks it is reasonable to surmise that this apparently merely technical deficiency was helped along, so to say, by the postulated disinterestedness of the Church in the centuries after Origen in establishing one exclusive, binding text-tradition of scripture.

We seem to be able to discern three main types of technique intended to counterbalance the impact of standardisation which affected the textual transmission of the Old Testament in all its ramifications in various degrees of intensity and at various stages of its development:

(1) Internal manuscript notation of variant readings, either in the text-base, leading to the emergence of double-readings, or else in the margins, as exhibited, e.g., in the Qumrân Scrolls and probably also in some qerê readings in the Masoretic text.¹

(2) The preservation of variant readings in parallel text-traditions. In its earliest form this technique may be observed in the retention of *variae lectiones* in parallel passages in the Former Prophets and Chronicles, etc., and from it may have been derived the basic idea which underlies Origen's *Hexapla*.

(3) Extra-manuscript preservation of variants in midrashic-homiletic exegesis.

The situation which obtains at Qumrân holds out one more possibility of comparison in respect of another aspect of the history of the text.

¹ See the chapter by B. J. Roberts (vol. 2, pp. 1-10).
In conformity with a basic characteristic of Second Commonwealth Judaism, the Covenanters' religious concepts were Bible-centred. Their original literary creations, such as the War-Scroll, the Hôdayôt, the Sectarian Manual, and the Zadokite Documents, swarm with verbatim Bible quotations, paraphrases and allusions. Their most fundamental beliefs and practices reflect the attempt to recapture, and typologically to re-live, biblical Judaism. This scriptural piety produced the peser technique,\(^1\) so indicative of the Covenanters' system of Bible hermeneutics, by the aid of which biblical history was actualised, and made existentially meaningful. In this unceasing process of quotation, interpretation and adaptation, the text at Qumrân was exposed to a fate which is comparable to that which the hebraica veritas experienced on a wider scale in rabbinic Judaism and in the orbit of Jewish and Christian communities that had recourse to translations of the Hebrew original. The deliberate insertion of textual alterations into scripture for various reasons of style and dogma, the uncontrolled infiltration of haphazard changes due to linguistic peculiarities of copyists or to their characteristic concepts and ideas, which may be observed in the wider transmission of the text, have their counterparts in the 'Qumrân Bible'. The study of these phenomena at Qumrân is again facilitated by the comparative compactness of the material and by the decidedly more pronounced manner in which they are manifest. We thus encounter in the Qumrân writings developments of biblical text-transmission which may be considered prototypes of phenomena that emerge concurrently and subsequently in the text-history of the Old Testament in Jewish and Christian tradition, albeit in less concentrated form, and at different grades of variation.

That the sum total of the biblical documents from Qumrân may be seen to present the issue of the 'Massoretic text and the versions' in miniature, derives further support from one more characteristic of that material. The Qumrân manuscripts exhibit, as already stated, a basic homogeneity with regard to time and provenance. There are no grounds to doubt that these manuscripts were written in Palestine, and that a great majority, if not all, were copied at Qumrân. It may also be considered as established that, with the exception of some odd items, the bulk of the manuscripts in the Qumrân library was copied within a span of not much more than three hundred years, approxi-

\(^1\) On the peser, cf. also pp. 225 ff.
mately from the beginning of the third century B.C. to the middle of the first century A.D. In view of these circumstances, the marked diversity of textual traditions which can be observed in these scrolls presumably derives from the temporal and/or geographical heterogeneity of the Vorlagen from which the Qumrân manuscripts, or some of them, were copied. Thus, in addition to the horizontal cross-section view of the text at Qumrân during the last phases of the Second Commonwealth period, this material also affords a vertical cross-section view of the transmission of the text, which reflects different chronological layers, geographical areas and social strata. These circumstances further enhance the similarity of the problems relating to the text at Qumrân with those appertaining to the wider issue of the relations of the Masoretic text and the versions and, therefore, give rise to new definitions of their historical development.

XI

Before presenting in detail the impact of the Judaean Desert Scrolls on existing theories of the text-history of the Old Testament and their importance for the formation of new theories, it may be useful to summarise the main conclusions which can be drawn from the material published up to the present.

(1) Different books of the Old Testament differ in their textual history and furnish different sets of problems. Restraint should therefore be exercised in subjecting textual processes observed in one book to an analysis which is based on the analogy of issues which obtain in another book. In the last resort, the textual development of almost each individual book must be viewed separately. Thus we can observe in the Hebrew tradition of the Pentateuch at Qumrân the same relative textual compactness, and the same relative sparseness of variant readings, which have already been pointed out in the Septuagint Pentateuch. On the other hand the extant copies of the book of Isaiah, and above all the complete First Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa), present us with a veritable crop of variae lectiones. It has moreover become quite clear that, e.g., the book of Samuel and the book of Jeremiah were current at the time in clearly discernible deviant Hebrew text-traditions. All this goes to show that the text of these and similar books was still in a state of flux. Only a careful synopsis of the results achieved by a detailed analysis
of the individual books may ultimately lead to more general conclusions with regard to the over-all history of the Old Testament text.

2) The Hebrew scrolls from Qumrân prove beyond doubt the actual existence of variant readings in the biblical books of the hellenistic and Roman periods which until their discovery had been beyond the scope of textual research proper. They have added a kaleidoscopic wealth of individual readings for practically all books of the Old Testament, represented in the Qumrân library whether by substantial manuscript finds or sometimes even by only small fragments. Some of these *variae lectiones* are to be found also in:

(a) the textual traditions of the main versions, in Hebrew or in translation;

(b) quotations in post-biblical writings (Apocrypha, early Christian, hellenistic-Jewish and rabbinic literature); and even

(c) medieval Hebrew manuscripts.

In view of the arguments presented earlier, we may assume a genetic relationship between Qumrân variants and identical or similar readings found in the first two sets of the above witnesses which precede the final stabilisation of the Hebrew text. As against this it is probable that the comparatively rare congruence of *variae lectiones* in the third group, i.e. in medieval Hebrew manuscripts or in medieval Jewish commentaries with Qumrân readings, is merely accidental. In most instances the similarity seems to have been caused by the equal but independent impact of the same scribal habits on widely separated sets of manuscripts.

3) All the extant major versions of the Old Testament, as we know them today, are already represented in Qumrân manuscripts, not only in individual readings, but also in the form of prototypes of their textual traditions. This observation applies principally to the Hebrew Massoretic and the Samaritan (Pentateuch) versions, and to the Septuagint. But manifold affinities with the Aramaic Targums, the Syriac Peshîṭa, and in rare cases even with Jerome’s comparatively late Vulgate (end of fourth century A.D.) can also be observed. It is self-evident that this circumstance will weigh heavily in the appreciation of the individual development of these sources and of their common history.
In view of the foregoing presentation of the manuscript finds from Qumrân, it can hardly cause surprise that these discoveries required a reopening of the inquiry into the history of the Old Testament. The resulting scholarly discussion of this issue, and not a mere comparative textual research into the diverse versions, brought about a renewed confrontation of the rival theories of Rosenmüller in Lagarde’s version of it, and of Kahle. On the one hand it was claimed with full justification that the presence of the prototype of the Massoretic text among the Qumrân manuscript finds, e.g. in fragments of the Pentateuch or the Second Isaiah Scroll (1QIs³) and others, proved the existence of an early precursor of the *textus receptus* at a time which considerably preceded the date presupposed by the followers of the *Ur-recension* and the *Ur-text* schools. On the other hand it was argued that the ‘vulgar texts’ theory is fully vindicated by the host of textual variants and also of clearly discernible different textual traditions in the bulk of the Qumrân material. The stalemate that resulted from the pro and contra arguments which could now be buttressed by tangible evidence, unlike the situation which obtained in the stage of the discussion referred to above, again became the point of departure for the conception of a novel theory.

The foundations for a new interpretation of the available material were laid by W. F. Albright.¹ His ideas were soon embraced by a group of predominantly American scholars, and were further developed and succinctly summarised by F. M. Cross:

Any reconstruction of the biblical text before the establishment of the traditional text in the first century A.D. must comprehend this evidence: the plurality of text-types, the limited number of distinct textual families, and the homogeneity of each of these textual families over several centuries of time. We are required by these data...to recognize the existence of local texts which developed in the main centers of Jewish life in the Persian and hellenistic age.²

² F. M. Cross, jun., ‘The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text’, *IEJ*, xvi (1966), 81. The author’s preceding studies of this problem are listed in the notes to that article.
After at first accepting Albright’s terminology, Cross is to be commended for subsequently introducing a significant change of terms into the system advocated by Albright who had referred to ‘local recensions’. Says Cross:

Against Albright, we should argue, however, that the local textual families in question are not properly called ‘recensions’. They are the product of natural growth or development in the process of scribal transmission, not of conscious or controlled textual recension.¹

These considerations are in line with the arguments presented above, and disclose a welcome recognition of the fallacy of the concept of a ‘scholastic-academy recension’, a concept which haunted practically all preceding theories about the history of the text. However, notwithstanding this difference, the ‘local recensions’ theory in its ‘local texts’ variation absorbed some prominent features of its predecessors which it built into its own system, as will be shown. The following quotation summarises the basic concepts of the new school:

Three textual families appear to have developed slowly between the fifth and first centuries B.C., in Palestine, in Egypt, and in a third locality, presumably Babylon. The Palestinian family is characterized by conflation, glosses, synoptic additions and other evidence of intense scribal activity, and can be defined as ‘expansionistic’. The Egyptian text-type is often but not always a full text. In the Pentateuch, for example, it has not suffered the extensive synoptic additions which mark the late Palestinian text, but is not so short or pristine as the third or Babylonian family. The Egyptian and Palestinian families are closely related. Early exemplars of the Palestinian text in the Former Prophets, and pentateuchal texts which reflect an early stage of the Palestinian tradition, so nearly merge with the Egyptian, that we are warranted in describing the Egyptian text-type as a branch of the Old Palestinian family. The Babylonian text-type when extant is a short text. Thus far it is only known in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. In the Pentateuch it is a conservative, often pristine text, which shows relatively little expansion, and a few traces of revision and modernising. In the books of Samuel, on the contrary, it is a poor text, marked by extensive haplography and corruption.²

An analysis of the above quotation discloses the dependence of the ‘local texts’ theory on its predecessors. It may be described as a new synthesis, arrived at by sifting the major contentions of earlier views,

¹ Ibid. note 21.  
² Ibid. p. 86.
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discarding some items and maintaining others, and subsequently welding them into a novel structure. It is interesting to remark that although initially the conceivers of the ‘local recensions/texts’ theory seemed to view themselves as being in line with the basic ideas of the Lagarde–Rosenmueller school, in later presentations of it no reference is made to the Ur-text/Ur-recension theory. The very concept of solidified textual traditions, however, whatever term may be applied to characterise them, is apparently tacitly accepted. Further, the assumption of three ‘local recensions’ or ‘traditions’ is not intrinsically opposed to the ‘one recension/manuscript’ theory. Of the presupposed three textual recensions or families, in fact only one, namely the Palestinian, has some claim to having been presented by the proponents of the ‘three local texts’ school as an independent, fairly clearly circumscribed entity, recognisable by specific textual peculiarities. The so-called ‘Egyptian’ text-type is regarded as derived from the Palestinian, and is presumed to have broken off from it at some time in the early fourth century to begin its independent development. The definition of the third family is not too clear either and its locale can be defined only as being ‘presumably Babylon’. This text also obviously originated in Palestine, but had come into final form in Babylon in the sixth century. It is assumed that it had developed there during the interval between the fifth and the second centuries B.C., was reintroduced into Palestine some time after the Maccabean period, and by the end of the first century A.D. had established itself as the dominant or standard Jewish text.\footnote{Ibid. p. 91.} Without stating it explicitly, the ‘local texts’ theory appears to presuppose the existence of an Ur-text in Palestine at some time before the Babylonian Exile from which the two major types, the Babylonian and the Palestinian, and the latter’s derivative, the Egyptian, emerged at later stages in the post-exilic period. It appears that as a result of the now available material, which is several hundred years older than the material on which scholars of the ‘pre-Qumrân’ generations could base their arguments, the date of the implied Ur-text is also pushed back by some centuries.

In a way, the new theory in its major aspects also resembles Sperber’s parallel-transmission system. Both assume different locales for the emergence of the different traditions: here post-exilic Palestine and Babylon; there pre-exilic North and South Palestine. Again we are
transported into the realm of purely hypothetical statements, arrived at by deductions and reconstructions which lack any material, i.e. manuscript, basis.

The very idea of 'local' texts underlies not only Sperber's 'two traditions' theory, but also the system of 'three manuscript types' elaborated by Lieberman, who had not only already posited a tripartition of the biblical textual tradition, but had also affiliated the diverse manuscript types with different types of localities, though in Palestine. One further point is to be noted, namely that the differentiation in value between a standard/received and a vulgar text, introduced into the discussion by Kahle, had been taken up with significant variations in Lieberman's distinction between 'inferior local school texts', 'Jerusalem vulgar manuscripts', and the 'most exact copies of the temple'. Such a value judgement is now applied again by Cross to characterise his three local families: the Palestinian text is conflate and expansionistic, the Egyptian is presented as a predominantly full text, and the Babylonian, in the main, as a short pristine tradition. The shortcomings of this characterisation become apparent when it is applied in detail to the textual tradition of different biblical books in the families thus distinguished. It then transpires that, as if refusing to submit to the scholar's natural quest for order, in the books of Samuel, for example, the Babylonian, somewhat unexpectedly, 'is a poor text, marked by extensive haplography and corruptions'.

One cannot help suspecting that the proposed tripartition of the Old Testament text tradition into a Palestinian, a Babylonian and an Egyptian family in some way echoes the widely accepted three-pronged transmission of the New Testament text in Palestinian, Antiochian (Syrian) and Egyptian versions. Though in itself such a transfer of theories is certainly permissible and could be constructive, it remains doubtful whether in the present case it can be justified in view of the differing attitudes which the Synagogue and the Church took towards the text transmission of their holy scriptures. It has been pointed out above that whereas the former strove gradually to abolish deviant readings and text-types, the latter, possibly because of its heterogeneous composition, attempted to accommodate the diverse traditions that had emerged in the main daughter churches. An unqualified application of a theory which arises from an investigation into the history of the New Testament text to the history of the Old Testament text perforce
results in a distortion of the issue and in yet-to-be-proved, or unprovable, hypotheses.

Summing up, we may say that in spite of its appeal the 'three local texts' theory cannot really explain satisfactorily the 'plurality of text-types' at the end of the pre-Christian era. It could indeed account for the 'limited number of distinct textual families' extant at that time. But one is inclined to attribute this feature of the text transmission to two factors: (a) historical vicissitudes which caused other textual families to disappear; (b) the necessary socio-religious conditions for the preservation of a text-tradition, namely its acceptance by a sociologically integrated and definable body. It is this latter aspect of the problem which safeguarded the preservation of the (proto-)Massoretic text which ultimately became the standard text of the Synagogue, the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch version which gained authoritative status in the Samaritan community, the Greek Bible that was hallowed by the Church, and the diverse textual traditions saved for us by the Judaean Desert Covenaners in a form from before standardisation. This tradition complex should be viewed as representing the remains of a yet more variegated transmission of the Old Testament books. Contradictory as it may sound, one is almost inclined to say that the question to be answered with regard to the history of the Old Testament text does not arise from the extant 'plurality of text-types' but rather from the disappearance of other and more numerous textual traditions.

These considerations do not necessarily call for an unqualified acceptance of Kahle's theory of a 'textus receptus and vulgar texts' which, as already stated, suffers from the over-emphasis put on presupposed but unsubstantiated conscious, official redaction processes. All we can say is that from the very first stage of manuscript transmission of the Old Testament text the material which is available to us witnesses to a wide variety of textual traditions which seemingly mirror fairly exactly the state of affairs which obtained in the pre-manuscript state of transmission. In other words, the extant evidence imposes on us the conclusion that from the very first stage of its manuscript transmission, the Old Testament text was known in a variety of traditions which differed from each other to a greater or less degree. As a result of undirected, and possibly in part also of controlled, processes of elimination, the majority of these variations
went out of use. The remaining traditions achieved by and by the status of a *textus receptus* within the socio-religious communities which perpetuated them. These standardised texts were preserved for us in the major versions of the Hebrew Bible and its translations.
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1. The renewed activity in textual studies of the Bible has led of necessity to a revival of interest in Hebrew biblical manuscripts. It stands to reason that in the present state of a general re-evaluation

(1) This study bears the imprint of the oral presentations on which it is based. This may explain the unwieldy subtitle which hints at the subjects treated together — the history of the Hebrew Bible text, the Problemgeschichte and the practice in the new edition of the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP). Keeping to the form of the original papers serves also, as usual, as an excuse for the large number of footnotes. Some of the points made here are touched upon in the Introduction to my recent 'Sample Edition' of Isaiah, especially §§ 16-18, 73-77, and should be read in conjunction with it. Slight changes of stress and formulation are intentional. This study is to a large extent a provisional summary of my work on the text of medieval Hebrew MSS, started soon after the first discovery of Qumran Scrolls, but is not meant to submit the detailed evidence on which my view is based; that would mean writing a special volume. Apart from the common abbreviations, the following sigla for my recent publications should be noted: TL = Text and Language in Bible and Qumran (1960); BMU = "Biblical Manuscripts in the United States", Textus 2 (1962); RTBT = "The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text", Biblical and Other Studies, ed. A. Altmann (1963); TPTC = "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism", Textus 3 (1963); ISE = The Book of Isaiah: Sample Edition with Introduction (1965); PSCT = "The Psalms Scroll — A Problem of Canon and Text", Textus 5 (1966). In my work on the text of Hebrew MSS I have been ably assisted by Dr. A. Hurwitz and by Mr. M. Bar-Asher of the HUBP, to whom I should like to express my thanks. The responsibility for the views put forward is solely mine.
we cannot yet fully appreciate the change in our overall picture of the development of the Hebrew Bible text. On the one hand, we have already grown accustomed to the idea that no other type of evidence for the Bible text is known to us for such a length of time as that of Hebrew MSS, and this seems almost too natural to need further comment. On the other hand, attitudes to, and evaluations of, Hebrew MSS which have developed during a period of about two centuries still linger on, and perforce influence our judgment. It is, therefore, a matter of course that we do not, as yet, possess any theory which tries to integrate all the known facts into one historical framework. The present study will deal mainly with the problem of Hebrew 'medieval' (*) MSS as part of an attempt at such a theory. The remarks about earlier periods are thus intended, not as an investigation in its own right, but as a sketch of the background against which medieval manuscripts should be seen and as an outline of the pre-medieval history.

2. Our evidence at present (⁰) suggests a division of the history of Hebrew biblical MSS (⁰) into three major periods, with an evident cleavage between the second period and the third (⁰). Our witnesses from the first two periods are of great importance both for our knowledge of the development of the Bible text and for our understanding of the text itself. In other words: their readings can materially change our understanding of the text (⁰). Although these witnesses have only recently become available to scholarship — and are still partly

(¹) For the term cf. below, § 7.
(⁰) But for the basic problem discussed in PSCT, one might feel more confident that our results with regard to the details of the second period are there to stay. We are too much in the middle of new discoveries to claim finality for the picture we attempt to paint. The borders between the periods may therefore stand in need of future revision, apart from the inevitable borderline cases.
(⁰) This discussion deals only with the periods of MS evidence, not with the earlier transmission of the text.
(⁰) Cf. below, § 6.
(⁰) According to the position set forth in ISE § 3 f., I am not talking in terms of preferability for the reconstruction of the Urtext. Those scholars whose primary aim is such a reconstruction would adopt the formulation that those witnesses can sometimes get us nearer the Urtext.
unpublished — nobody would contest their place⁽¹⁾ in a 'critical' edition of the Bible text⁽²⁾.

3. The first period starts around 300 B.C.E.; to what degree the picture emerging for that period holds true for the preceding 'Persian' period in the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth is anybody's guess⁽³⁾. This period is characterized by a diversity of textual traditions undreamt of two decades ago. It may already be said today that at the stage of examinatio the 'Massoretic Text'⁽⁴⁾, in comparison with these traditions, often yields one out of two or more hyparchetypal variants which for the time being seem irreducible⁽⁵⁾. Whether we shall be able to subdivide these traditions into more or less fixed 'recensions' and whether it is useful to add at this juncture identifying labels according to the habitats of Jewish communities, is a matter

⁽¹⁾ Whether they will occupy pride of place (cf. ISE § 8) obviously depends on future finds.
⁽²⁾ One is almost afraid to use this term. I just refer to an edition of the text with an apparatus adducing the readings from various types of witnesses.
⁽³⁾ Cf. ISE § 6. It is most tempting to push the limits upwards, beyond the earliest fragments from Qumran. But the outcome of past speculation beyond the limits of the evidence should teach us a lesson.
⁽⁴⁾ Especially SPERBER has repeatedly suggested dropping the definite article from 'the Massoretic Text'. Cf., e.g., A. SPERBER, A Grammar of Massoretic Hebrew, 1958, § 36. Cf. below, n. 3, p. 270. It seems inevitable that the different senses in which the term was used have become confused. In the light of our results in this study (cf. especially below, § 24) we might as well keep the article, at least for the purpose of text-critical discussions (as opposed to the problems of the Tiberian textus receptus. Cf. below, n. 6, p. 272, ISE § 74 and RTBT, Ch. VIII. Just now the re-issue of C. D. GINSBURG, Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Bible (New York 1966) has come into my hands. In the 'Prolegomenon' to this edition H. M. ORLINSKY wages war, amongst other things, against all the editors of Bible editions and translations who dared use the term 'massoretic' on their title-page. (The last editor who has committed this 'sin' is, I think, ORLINSKY himself, although his note 34 does not clarify his responsibility). I am not convinced that his pronouncements against 'the massoretic text' (p. ix ff.) have lessened the general confusion. I hope that the present paper will clarify the facts; but I may have to return to an evaluation of ORLINSKY'S statements on another occasion.
⁽⁵⁾ Cf. TL p. 161. The present discussion deals with traditions in Hebrew only.
which needs further discussion (1). This diversity in Hebrew manuscript tradition is paralleled by extra-Hebrew witnesses, and the combined evidence must be taken into consideration. It is this period that offers the greatest challenge to the student of the Bible text (2), who, quite naturally, is mainly interested not in textual dynamics per se but in 'material' insights. In contradistinction to what will be said later (§22), it should be stressed that the types of readings and the textual development which previously could only be illustrated from extra-Hebrew sources, can now be more or less paralleled from Hebrew MSS (3). But it should be stressed no less that such a statement is to be understood typologically. We are in need of many more material finds before the theoretical importance of the insights gained during the past years will be equalled by factual gains in the sphere of variant readings (4).

4. The second period may be said to centre in the first century C.E. (6) and seems to have come to a close in the first half of the second

(1) Cf. ISE, Ch. I, n. 15.
(2) If evidence were needed, the first two apparatuses of ISE may be taken as an illustration.
(3) Differently put, these MSS contain both ever-fresh variations such as caused by the 'law of scribes' (cf. TL, p. 159) and 'real variants' (ibidem, p. xiii). All this is stressed in contradistinction §22 to below.
(4) Cf. n. 5, p. 244, above and §30, below.
(5) I am not sure that our paleographical knowledge is precise enough to fix very narrow limits (cf. PSCT, n. 15). A date in the first century B.C.E. for the beginning of this period seems acceptable, even without pressing too much the argument from halachic activity in the generation of Hillel and the statement of Josephus, Contra Apionem I, 42: τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἵνα παραγωγικόν οὐ τρωγιθήναι τις οὐδὲν οὐκ ἀφέτειν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐμπαθήναι τετάλμηκεν. Even though it is based on Deut 4,2 and meant to impress foreigners, we have no right to discard this explicit testimony. The turn of the era must be presupposed also because of the activity of 'book correctors'. For this problem, which will not be discussed here, cf., e.g. S. Liebermann, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 1950, p. 20 f. See also S. Talmon, Textus 2, p. 14 f. and now M. Beer, Bar Ilan Annual II, 1964, p. 136 f., and the references mentioned there.

Most recently F. M. Cross has put forward strong arguments for an extremely low dating of the final rift between Jews and Samaritans (cf. Harvard Theological Review 59 [1966] 201 f.). I should like to suggest that it may be no coincidence if his date for the final branching off of the Samaritan Pentateuch turns out to be the first century B.C.E. (ib. p. 211). While it would not be unusual that in such a situation of religious tension
century (*). Since our material evidence comes to an abrupt end at that point, it stands to reason that our picture would emerge somewhat less schematic if later evidence were available. But in the light of the Rabbinic activity around 100 C.E., this picture — which in a slightly different shape is of long standing (*) — is probably more or less correct. The first century C.E. (*) is emerging more and more as the decisive phase in the stabilization and growing predominance of what I have termed elsewhere the 'Massoretic type' (*). By the end of the second period that type had become absolutely dominant — deviating details notwithstanding. Again, whereas previous descriptions of the history of the Bible text had to be pieced together without the benefit of Hebrew evidence, the picture which now emerges fits the combined evidence of Hebrew MSS, Versions and Rabbinic literature (*). To put it differently, the ratio between 'real variants' (*) and text diminishes during that period, but the readings can still be
textual differences tend to become part of a general interplay of cause and effect, the final breach may have been one of the factors which resulted in further unification of the 'Jewish' text-tradition. Hence the gradual emergence of that century as the turning point in the history of the Hebrew text and as the beginning of the second period.

(*) For a discussion it may be useful to agree on convenient, if somewhat arbitrary, terms. Chronologically 'pre- and post-Christian' may not be too far off the mark, but the term would be badly chosen. Since we have to reckon with Tannaitic activity as a major influence in the process of standardization (see below, § 31) 'pre-Tannaitic' may, perhaps, be suggested for the first period and 'Tannaitic' for the second.

(2) Cf. the sources mentioned below: n. 2, p. 258; n. 4, p. 263; n. 1, p. 270; and see § 31.

(*) It remains to be seen to what extent a more exact limitation is borne out by the facts. In ISE § 13 the 'period of the Destruction of the Temple' — the last third of the first century and the first third of the second century — has been suggested. But cf. the problems mentioned above, n. 2 (p. 244), and n. 5 (p. 246).

(*) Cf. ISE § 14.

(*) The results of the study of the Peshitta and the Aramaic Versions will have to be integrated, and it is to be hoped that recent activity in these fields will lead to a study of the aspects affecting our problem. The results of my own unpublished attempts in this field corroborate the picture. Cf. ISE, Ch. I, n. 25; cf. ibidem, Ch. IV as regards Rabbinic Literature. See also 'Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta', TL, p. 175 f.

(*) As opposed to variations caused by the 'law of scribes'; cf. above, n. 3, p. 246.
of importance for our understanding of the Bible text (†). To be sure, we must be careful not to press our present evidence for the trend towards a more or less stabilized text or to make ex silentio arguments bear too much weight. But attention should be paid to the fact that from the 'destruction period' (‡) no Bible texts of the 'non-Massoretic type' have so far come to light (§).

5. The end of the first two periods marks the decisive turning point in the history of the Hebrew Bible text. To put it, perhaps, somewhat boldly: the two periods we have tried to describe lead up to the very point which was the reconstructed starting-point of theories about the history of Hebrew biblical manuscripts current until two decades ago. Working back from medieval Hebrew MSS, and connecting the result with what could be inferred from the history of the Bible Versions and Rabbinic Literature, our predecessors were able to reconstruct a point of departure more or less identical with the end of the second period (‖). This identity is neither coincidental nor self-evident, and this question will need some further discussion.

6. The turning-point reached is remarkable for an additional reason. For the first two periods Hebrew and non-Hebrew evidence runs on roughly parallel lines and all the evidence can be fitted into one picture. As from the end of the second period this 'parallelism' is disturbed: the third period of non-Hebrew evidence, down to the days of Jerome (¶), as yet lacks any comparable Hebrew evidence; the third period of Hebrew MSS starts centuries later (§). It is here

(†) Cf. ISE § 13 f. and above, n. 5, p. 245.
(‡) The problem of the Nash Papyrus need not be gone into on this occasion. If 11QPs* should turn out to be datable to this period, this statement may stand in need of revision. Cf. above, n. 2, p. 244.
(§) The much quoted Torah-scrolls with variant readings (from the רַבִּי הַלָּוֵי etc.) are not of the 'non-Massoretic' type. Cf. ISE, Ch. I, n. 26. For the facts cf., e.g., M. H. SEGAL, Mīvo ha-Miqra IV, 1950, p. 880 f.
(‖) For details see below, n. 1, p. 270.
(¶) For our discussion it is immaterial whether any independent use of the Hebrew text by a Christian source later than Jerome can be detected. The anonymous Greek version of Habakkuk III is probably earlier; cf., e.g. GOOD, "The Barberini Greek Version of Habakkuk III", Vetus Testamentum 4 (1954) 29.
(§) The facts can be described by counting the periods differently, e.g., by leaving a blank in the 'Hebrew' column for the period 3rd–9th
that we are most likely to misinterpret what seems to be our evidence. We have just begun to understand that the history of about four decisive centuries — about 300 B.C.E. to 100 C.E. — was telescoped until this generation for lack of evidence. It seems improbable that new evidence of similar impressiveness will ever come forward (1), from the span of about six to seven centuries, until the emergence of the earliest MSS of the 'Massoretic period' (2); but the gap is too large to be made light of. On the other hand, it must be admitted that the state of the text reached at the end of the second period does not require any further intermediary stage for the 'Massoretic' MSS to have developed from (3).

7. We have thus reached the third period (4). The term 'Massoretic' may be used in this connection to indicate that none of the Hebrew biblical MSS known today which were written after ca 150 C.E. antedates the activity of the Massoretes (5); for the moment 'medieval' (6) is an equally acceptable term for that period. In quantity these by far outnumber all other Hebrew MSS, and until our generation this was the only Hebrew evidence. To be sure, these witnesses provide

century, and assigning the medieval Hebrew MSS to period IV. The variants found in the Arabic Version of R. Saadia Gaon hardly go typologically beyond what is found in early medieval Hebrew biblical MSS.

(1) I am on record (Ha'arez 15.1.1965) as having said that I would be more than surprised should we ever come across a find of Hebrew MSS where a whole lot (as opposed to one or two MSS) written after the beginning of the second century would turn out to be of a non-Massoretic type. In other words, it is more than improbable that there will ever be a discovery of a hoard of non-Massoretic type MSS, similar to that of Qumran Cave IV, written in that period.

(2) For the difference of terms cf. ISE § 74.

(3) It should be noted that this is an attempt to differentiate between main stages. For the possible developments after the second period, cf. below, §§ 20, 31.

(4) It may not be without interest to compare the 'periodization' suggested from quite a different point of view by B. KENNICOTT Dissertatio Generalis § 14 f. (Unless otherwise stated, I quote from the augmented reissue by BRUNS, 1783).

(5) I am not aware of any witness certainly datable before the ninth century. Earlier datings are still in need of proof.

(6) In order to avoid terminological difficulties (cf. TL p. 160, ISE § 74), witnesses from the first and second periods are termed here 'pre-medieval'.
an excellent illustration of textual dynamics, and they deepen our knowledge of the development of the Bible text in the technical sense. But ever since these were first studied in larger numbers, about two centuries ago, it was obvious that their contribution to the understanding of the text itself is extremely doubtful (1). We must therefore ask ourselves whether the retention of this type of evidence in the apparatus is due to more than mere habit and inertia. Perhaps in the light of the type of evidence available today, the time has come to disregard the readings of medieval MSS completely and to free the apparatus from meaningless ballast? If it is true that these MSS contribute practically nothing to an attempt to reach back to an earlier textual stage, perhaps the consequences must be drawn? Those who wish to study textual dynamics in their own right or to investigate the changes introduced by medieval scribes will turn to the original collections; other scholars may safely ignore that material. This problem cannot be brushed aside, because it has both theoretical and practical implications. We must, therefore, turn to the history of this question as it took shape in recent generations (2).

8. All views on the text of medieval Hebrew biblical MSS held by scholars in the past and at present are based primarily on the collations published in the end of the eighteenth century by Kennicott and de Rossi (3). In spite of assertions to the contrary (4), and of some material additions in the form of further readings, mainly due to the

(1) For the contrast cf. below § 22. The criteria for judging MSS in the time of Kennicott and in this generation are different, but the judgments are not as unconnected as appears at first sight. If we bear in mind that scholars in those days tended to accept the very identity of readings as proof of relationship, the widespread disappointment even in those days is telling. Cf. below, § 10.

(2) The following paragraphs had to be written in some detail because I have been unable to find a description of the Problemgeschichte which I can regard as absolutely correct and to which the reader could be referred. Much of the material for a full-length study is referred to in the notes to these paragraphs and it is hoped that our discussion will be sufficient within the present framework.

(3) B. KENNICOTT, Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus, 1776-80; J. B. DE ROSSI, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti, 1784-88; J. B. DE ROSSI, Scholia Critica, 1798.

(4) Cf. especially below, § 20.
diligence of Ginsburg (1) nothing typologically new was discovered after their time (2). It is therefore not really surprising that after a relatively short period of violent discussion in the nineteenth century most scholars in our time hold a view substantially identical with what had been stated back in the seventeen-nineties.

9. Kennicott's collations (4) were not undertaken as a purely philological work. They were one of several enterprises (4) resulting from the onslaught of the 'Critica Sacra', and were intended to be of theological significance. Both text-critical and theological positions were at stake ever since the implications of the Sola Scriptura and Theopneustia ideologies had developed to their logical end. The Reformers had placed the Hebrew text on a pedestal and it was this text on which severe doubts had been cast. Whether it was Iudaeorum malitia or incuria librariorum (5) was for many a question of secondary importance. Only the extensive study of Hebrew MSS could give an answer to the issue itself.

10. Against this theological background, the judgments and views expressed by scholars at that time (6) and their strong accusations and

(*) The material adduced by STRACK is hardly worth mentioning in this context. Cf. below, n. 3, p. 266.

(2) Of course, anything printed before the work of KENNICOTT must be regarded as superseded, although not all the variants published in the edition of the Bible by J. H. MICHAELIS (1720) were included by KENNICOTT. Practically all modern studies which use Hebrew variants are based on the collations of KENNICOTT and DE ROSSI.

(8) Unless specification is necessary, KENNICOTT's name alone will be mentioned, because most of the discussion turned on his work and because its arrangement made it more influential, although from the scholarly point of view DE ROSSI's work was more exact. Cf. below: n. 1, p. 252; and n. 2, p. 255. As sigla K–R will be used.

(4) Cf. the editions and collations from MILL until BENGEL and until WETTSTEIN and, in other fields, those of SABATIER and HOLMES-PARSONS. The study of Hebrew MSS had its special aim, but it was part of a larger movement. The term 'Critica Sacra' is used here in its general sense, not as the title of a collection.

(β) The theological overtones remind us that but for the theological implications the work would never have been carried out. Perhaps even our generation is less free from theological predilection than we like to admit. Cf. for the field of N.T. studies the latest Presidential Address to
counter-accusations (*) must be understood. From the point of view of the theory of one fixed immutable Hebrew text the sheer mass of readings was overwhelming (*) and some scholars even felt the need to explain it away (*). Many readings previously known from the Greek seemed all of a sudden paralleled by Hebrew variants (*). These

the SBL of K. W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variations in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966) 1 f. and his statement (p. 5): "The only objective and justification of textual criticism is that its emended text should give access to a clearer insight and a deeper faith." Cf. *TPTC* p. 137. We should also remember the remark of H. S. Nyberg, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 52 (1934) 244 repeated *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, 1935, p. 14 "Diese Geringschaetzung ist nur als Antithese gegen das alte kirchliche Dogma von der Verbalinspiration zu verstehen. Die ganze Psychose kann nur durch nüchterne philologische Betrachtung überwunden werden".

(*) From a perusal of the literature of the second half of the 18th century it seems that various scholars occupied different positions on a 'scale' of attitudes towards the received Hebrew text, and consequently had to defend their position on both sides. Even Kennicott — who certainly was interested in overstating the importance of the readings (cf. also below, n. 4) — started out by turning against denigrations of the Hebrew text; cf. B. Kennicott, *The State of the Printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Considered*, 1753, p. 556 f. J. H. Michaelis turned against Kennicott's claims, but he himself was considered by others to exaggerate the importance of the Hebrew variants (cf. ref. below, n. 4, p. 283). At the other end of the scale we find the extreme position of O. G. Tychsen (cf. n. 3). The rather sloppy work of some of Kennicott's assistants helped to make things easier for his opponents.

(*) Cf. e.g., the evaluation of J. C. Doederlein, *Auserlesene Theologische Bibliothek* II, 7, 1782. p. 483 f.

(*) The most radical attempt was made by O. G. Tychsen, *Tentamen de Variis Codicium*, 1772; *Befreyetes Tentamen*, 1774. Whereas this work is better known for the 'Transkriptionstheorie', taken up in our time by F. X. Wutz, its major aim was to defend the received Hebrew text and to explain the deviations as coming from 'inferior' sources (written by Christians, women, etc.). Cf. also below n. 2, p. 270, and n. 3, p. 275. In any case, his extreme position did some good in making scholars more critical towards the 'Varientenrummel'.

(*) To be sure, many scholars were dimly aware that most of these 'readings' were secondary harmonization, simplificationss, etc. But we must not forget that at least one variation of the נבש / נבש type (cf. below n. 3, p. 281) was discussed on many occasions. I am referring, of course, to the famous נבש problem in Ps 16,10, which was judged to be of the utmost theological importance. Kennicott himself was very out-
variants seemed thus of the greatest importance and their use in any exegetical-critical work was imperative. Textual critics were at liberty to plough through the collations and to dig up what they thought useful for their purpose (1). They have done so ever since (2).

11. On the other hand some scholars were not slow to recognize that very little could be actually gained and that the huge mass of readings consisted mostly of secondary scribal changes, parallelisms, normalizations, harmonizations or free associations (3). In fact, for them the old theory of the one 'Massoretic Text' seemed vindicated de facto, only the picture (4) which had emerged was somewhat more

spoken in his claim and his influence is felt in all the subsequent discussion. Cf. his Dissertatio Generalis, § 49: "Quanquam vero manusciptorum vetustissimi non superant aetatem annorum 800 vel 900, tamen desumti fuerunt hi ex manusciptis qui ipsi antiquiores erant, idque fortasse per quaedam secula: auctoritas vero eorum, dum saepius confirmant versiones antiquas, assurig ad aliquot secula A.C." Cf. also the more sophisticated discussion of DoEDERLEiN, loc. cit., (n. 2, p. 252), p. 523.

(1) The summary of DoEDERLIEIN, loc. cit., II, 9, 1783, p. 675 is quite typical. According to his summary we should be content "dass hie und da eine Lesart verborgen steckt, die der Ausleger sucht und als Rest der alten Recension betrachten kann, dass Untersuchung, Prüfung und Wahl der Materialien, welche hier ausgelegt sind, dazu dienen kann, dass wir in der biblischen Kritik doch einige Schritte vorwärts kommen".

(2) It seems superfluous to voice again objections to the procedure of R. KITTEL's BH. Cf. below n. 5, p. 264. It is somewhat surprising, however, to find out that in our generation a scholar should come forward with an appeal for readings from Hebrew MSS to be used more frequently in everyday exegetical work — an appeal which does not betray much knowledge of the problems involved and illustrated by rather unsuitable examples. See F. S. NORTH Jewish Quarterly Review 47 (1956) 77 f. Cf. below, n. 3, p. 284.

(3) Cf. TL 45 f., 57 f. DoEDERLEIN, loc. cit., 653 f. gives a striking example of how, on closer inspection, practically none of the readings from the apparently deviating MS K 1 stands up to scrutiny. See also below, § 25 f.

(4) In spite of certain differences in stressing details, leading scholars of that time, like DoEDERLEIN, EICHHORN and MICHAELIS came to similar results. Thus, J. G. EICHHORN, Einleitung II, 1781, p. 239 summed up immediately after the first volume of KENNICOTT appeared: "Schreibfehler in Menge und brauchbare Lesarten äusserst wenige" (and this according to the criteria of that generation). This statement remained in EICHHORN’s standard work throughout the editions. Cf. 4th ed. II,
complicated than before. It was thus quite natural that a scholar at that time could sum up his impressions in the form of a 'one-recension theory' which was destined to get mixed up hopelessly, almost a century later, with Lagarde's 'archetype theory'. Rosenmueller, one of the half-forgotten foremost critics of that time was the first to formulate the results of his study of the huge collections in philological terms: "Dieser ganze mit so viel Aufwand von Zeit und Kosten zusammengeführte Variantenwust gibt übrigens das einfache Resultat dass alle noch vorhandenen Codices im Verhältnis zu den Originaten sehr jung sind... dass sie sämtlich zusammen eine Rezension darstellen, aus einer Quelle geflossen sind, und dass folglich aus ihnen für die etwa verdorbenen Stellen des hebräischen Textes wenig oder

p. 700, and ib. p. 707: "die Geschichte des Hebr. Textes lehrt, dass seine Hauptfehler älter sind als alle unsere noch vorhandenen kritischen Hülfs­­mittel..." Cf. MICHAELIS, Oriental. und Exeget. Bibliothek 11 (1876), p. 72 f. esp. p. 95 f., as well as the appendix containing the dispute between him and KENNICOTT.

(*) J. G. ROSENMEUHLER, Handbuch der bibl. Kritik und Exegese I, 1797, p. 244. This publications is not available to me and I cannot verify the exact title and the quotation. I quote after E. PREUSCHEN ZAW 9 (1889) 303. Since PREUSCHEN had pointed to the formulation of 1797, it is not clear why scholars went on quoting ROSENMEUHLER as if his view was formulated in 1834 only. Cf. below n. 3, p. 261, and n. 1, p. 264). (I have not searched for other possible statements of ROSEN­­MEUHLER on the subject. He does not mention it in his preface to the reprint of J. SIMONIS' edition of the Bible [1828]). By the way, there was no real need to rediscover ROSENMEUHLER'S view, since it was quoted in DIESTEL'S standard work in 1869 (loc. cit. [n. 5, p. 251], p. 594, quoted as Handbuch d... Literatur). DIESTEL took the 'one-recension' formulation as representative of the view taken by scholars who summed up KENNICOTT'S work. He does not yet as much as mention LAGARDE! Cf. below, n. 4, p. 263.

(2) The term 'Rezension' in ROSENMEUHLER'S writings has to be understood in the sense in which it was current since it was introduced by J. S. SEMLER (1765) into New Testament studies. For the history of our problem it may not be uninteresting to point out that SEMLER'S term recensiones superseded J. A. BENGEL'S term nationes. The two terms thus foreshadowed the later 'local recension' from K. LACHMANN'S time down to our own (cf. below, n. 2, p. 257 and ISE, Ch. I, n. 15). Cf. now for N.T. studies B. M. METZGER, The Text of the New Testament, 1964, pp. 112 f., 119 f. The term 'Rezension' in those days was not yet understood as implying almost complete 'official' regulation. Hence it is accepted throughout this study and the term 'one-recension' theory is used. But cf. below, § 31.
gar keine Hülfe zu erwarten ist” (*). The ‘one-recension’ theory was the result of a level-headed analysis of the collations of Kennicott (*); it was never seriously challenged or disproved (*), and its substance remains true to this day (*).

(*) This remains the most important criterion; cf. above n. 1, p. 250; n. 1 and n. 4, p. 253. In the words of EICHHORN, loc. cit., II, 706: “Die suesse Hoffnung muss man aufgeben, dass er [the Hebrew text] selbst bei einem moeglichst vollstaendigen kritischen Apparat zu seiner voelligen urspruenglichen Reinigkeit wieder gelangen werde”.

(*) The attitude to the text was shaped by the analysis of KENNICOTT’s collection and in spite of its special features DE ROSSI’s work was never allowed the same influence. Cf. above, n. 3, p. 251. It should be remembered that KENNICOTT did not note variants in vocalization; hence the impression of a unified text was even greater. Cf. below, n. 1, p. 282. Of course, KENNICOTT advanced good reasons for leaving out the vocalization — the amount of work involved, the different types of MSS, etc. — but the omission should also be viewed in the light of the ‘vowel-war’, which had not yet abated at that time. Cf. DOEDERLEIN loc. cit., p. 508, and see the telling remark of MICHAELIS, Orient. etc. Bibliothek, 23, p. 104: “bey allem meinem Unglauben an das Alter der Functe waeren mir diese doch sehr wichtig gewesen”. Cf. TYCHSEN, Tentamen, p. 182 f., and Befreyetes Tentamen, p. 144: “Ein grosser Fehler ist es, dass Hr. D. K. sich nicht um die Vergleichung der Punkten (sic) bekämmert hat. Denn da er durch seine Varianten-Samlung den masoretischen Text zu verbessern zur Absicht hatte, die Punkte aber ein wesentliches Stück desselben ausmachen, so hätte er sie auch vergleichen lassen sollen... Sagt man, dass die Punkte oder die Aussprache eine neuere Erfindung der Juden sind und ein jeder Ausleger das Recht habe sie nach Belieben zu ändern, und dass daher die Consonanten blos authentisch sind, so setz man unausgemachte Sachen als ausgemacht voraus, etc. etc.”.

(*) Statements in the literature to the contrary rest on the misunderstanding discussed below, § 15 f.

(*) I am not concerned here with the felicitousness of this formulation or with the term itself. Cf. below, § 31. Some statements in the literature are worded to convey the impression that the ‘one-recension’ theory was already suggested by SPINOZA. It should be made clear, therefore, that not only is there the difference in the textual theory, indicated by the term ‘Rezension’, but SPINOZA’s statement is simply a paraphrase of the well-known story about ‘the three Scrolls of the Law that were found in the Temple Court’. This can be seen if one cares to check the discussion in Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, end of Ch. 9. The statement itself reads: “... credo scribas paucia admodum exemplaria reperisse, forte non plura quam duo vel tria”. For the story of those scrolls cf. most recently S. TALMON, Textus 2 (1962), p. 14 f.
12. In spite of certain formulations in the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century (1), matters might have rested there, but for Lagarde. Students of the history of a problem have got used to the fact that posterity tends to connect a certain theory with a certain man, regardless of his predecessors. Whatever our feelings about Lagarde as a person, his stature as a master of textual criticism was unrivalled. In spite of his waverings between theology and philology, he did more than anyone else to lay the foundations of textual criticism of the Bible as a philological discipline (2). Together with this went his penchant — his strength or weakness, as one prefers to see it — to formulate very outspoken and extreme theses which tended to acquire an axiomatic character. It was his clear-cut and attractive formulation which became the basis for subsequent discussion of our subject, and earlier formulations were soon erroneously equated with his view. A spurious dilemma began to bedevil all later statements, and a perusal of many studies and handbooks reveals that hardly anyone has managed to state the exact positions ever since (3).

13. The quotation of the famous 'archetype theory', first formulated just over a century ago, is in order (4): "es ergiebt sich also, dass unsere hebräischen handschriften des alten testaments auf ein einziges exemplar zurückgehn, dem sie sogar die korrektur seiner schreibfehler als korrektur treu nachgeahmt und dessen zufällige un-vollkommenheiten sie herübergenommen haben. Über diesen arche-typus des masoretischen textes würden wir nur durch conjectur hin-

---

(1) Cf. below, esp. n. 3, p. 261.
(2) The present writer is probably not the only one who often wonders wistfully whether the place of P. de LAGARDE as a combination of all-round textual critic and Semitist has ever been filled. Precisely because the man and his views were often objectionable (see also below, n. 4, p. 258), his merits should not be belittled. LAGARDE did not reach his goal, and the specialization in the generations since then has carried us further and further away from it. Cf. TL, p. xiv, and my Hebrew and Semitic Languages, 1965, p. 26.
(3) I can only hope that I have got the facts right and that no further misunderstandings will occur; but, unfortunately, misunderstandings copied from book to book are almost ineradicable. Cf. also below n. 6, p. 272.
(4) LAGARDE, Anmerkungen zur greekischen Übersetzung der Prover-bien, 1863, p. 2. I have tried, in general, to reproduce LAGARDE's orthography.
ausgelangen können, wenn uns nicht die griechische version des alten testaments die möglichkeit verschaffte, wenigstens eine schlechte übersetzung eines einer andren familie angehörenden manuscripts zu benutzen". According to this picture, the Hebrew and the Greek texts were likened to two witnesses representing two textual families. The conclusion to be drawn from all the existing Hebrew MSS was thus that they all went back to one archetype, one single manuscript(1).

14. No sooner had this theory been formulated than the misunderstandings began. Lagarde had not bothered to base his view on any analysis of readings in Kennicott and de Rossi. He rested his case at this stage exclusively on what could be regarded as a 'stemmatic proof' based on common characteristics — a type of proof acceptable according to the rules of textual transmission in cases in which texts were developing without outward influence or regulation (2). The

(1) It has not always been emphasized that LAGARDE assumed a parallelism in the development of the Hebrew and the Greek texts, that is, he maintained that in both cases we may attempt to reach back to the respective archetypes. There remained, however, an important difference. The aim for the Greek was the reconstruction of 'hyparchetypes' — the famous 'local recensions' — which would then enable scholars to work their way back to the original Septuagint. For the Hebrew there was no more than that one assumed 'archetype'. For the temptation to put forward similar theories to account for the facts in related fields of textual inquiry, cf. below, n. 1, p. 272, and n. 3, p. 281. For the somewhat belated introduction of such a theory into the study of the Vulgate, especially by H. QUENTIN, and the present state of the issue in that field cf. now R. A. KRAFT, Gnomon 37 (1965) 777 f.

(2) For a long time I have been wondering how the misunderstanding about LAGARDE's 'proof' (see below) could arise, and how most of his contemporaries were apparently unable to take his argument at its face value. The following seems to be a possible explanation: The scholars in the sixties of the last century to whom LAGARDE's formulation was addressed were Semitists and theologians, however thorough their training in classical philology. LAGARDE's way of argument, as well as the very term 'archetype', were taken over from K. LACHMANN. But in 1863 only thirteen years had passed since LACHMANN had finalized his textual theory in the introduction to his edition of Lucretius (1850). The theory and the way of argument were quite novel, and LAGARDE's fellow-Semitists and theologians could not really be expected to appreciate that LAGARDE rested his case exclusively on the slender evidence of 'common mistakes' etc., completely ignoring the whole issue of variant readings which in previous generations had stood in the centre of the argument. One might
common exterior signs, *puncta extraordinaria* and *literae suspensae*, which appeared at the same places in the Hebrew MSS were deemed sufficient proof (*) for the assumption of one common ancestor text. Nothing more was needed to prove the case. This completely theoretical construction was soon to be buttressed by two further pillars (2). First came a late Arabic story about a Scroll of the Law saved from Bittir from which other scrolls were said to have been copied — a story which was taken as historical proof (3), fixing the time of the archetype in the reign of Hadrian. Second — an unbelievable argument which was later on deliberately glossed over by others because of its unpleasant affinities to a certain type of literature — was the ‘theological’ proof, i.e. a certain chronological difference between MT and LXX was alleged to prove the wilful tampering of the Rabbis with the text from anti-Christian motives. Such tampering could only have succeeded, in Lagarde’s contention, because all later manuscripts derived from the selfsame copy. (4). In other words: the arche-

---

(1) *LAGARDE* stressed that he considered his statement in 1863 as proof; see, e.g., *LAGARDE, Symmicta I*, 1877, p. 50; II, 1880, p. 120.

(2) *LAGARDE, Materialien zur Geschichte und Kritik des Pentateuchs I*, 1867, p. xii and the references there.

(3) *Loc. cit.*: “... eine mir damals unbekannte notiz, die als ein historisches zeugniss für jenen damals nur durch combination gefundenen satz gelten darf”.

(4) “... um die mit huelfe der LXX angestellten berechnungen der christen zu widerlegen, nach denen der Messias im Jahre 5500 der welt erschienen war. Solche falschungen (welche die kirchenväter so oft den juden vorwarfen) sind nur denkbar, wenn sie an Einem exemplare vorgenommen werden konnten, aus dem alle übrigen abschriften des textes zu entnehmen waren. Aquila ... hat seine übersetzung offenbar nur angefertigt, damit das im Interesse des grimmigsten christenhasses gedokterte hebräische alte testament ja den aständigen ‘Gebildeten’ nicht unbekannt bliebe....” Can one really do more than add exclamation marks with A. *GEIGER*, *Jüdische Zeitschrift* 7 (1869) 312? This incredible argumentation was quickly disposed of in a masterly study of A. *KUENEN, De Stamboom van den Masoretischen Tekst des O.T.*, 1873 (I have used
type theory had been formulated in 1863 on purely theoretical grounds, and it was bolstered up and given a chronological setting in 1867. It should be emphasized that these and only these points were Lagarde's 'proofs', and the problem of variants was never mentioned. These points were repeated over and over again (1), but no attempt was made by him to answer any of the queries raised (2). If Lagarde was forced to come back to the issue it was only in order to guard his priority rights (3).

mainly the German translation in Budde's edition of Kuenen, Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1894, p. 82 f.). Cf. below, n. 4, p. 263. In the light of the history of this problem it is rather unfortunate that the author of a recent well-known handbook on the Bible text found it necessary to say in this context — I am sure, in ignorance of Lagarde's argument — that in the "movement for fixing an authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible... the name most prominently associated with it is that of Rabbi Aqiba, probably the most renowned Rabbi of the early Christian era, and a notorious anti-Christian". See B. J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, 1951, p. 25.

(1) Cf. Materialien, Symmicta I, loc. cit., and especially his discussion of his priority rights, Symmicta II, 1880, p. 120 f. and Mittheilungen I, 1884, p. 22 f.

(2) Mittheilungen, loc. cit., does not disprove anything. The arguments against Lagarde are summarized below, § 17 f. Cf. also n. 4, p. 263.

(3) Cf. above, n. 1. An elaborate description of the theory in its historical context was given in 1870, reprinted Symmicta I loc. cit.: "Im Jahre 1863 habe ich in den Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien bewiesen (ich betone dies zeitwort), dass alle bisher bekannten Handschriften des jüdischen Kanons aus einem Archetypus stammen. Am nächsten läge es, diesen Archetypus für das Exemplar der Sammler jenes Kanons zu halten, das natürlich officiell war. Auffallen würde dann die stellenweise ausserordentlich grosse Fehlerhaftigkeit des überlieferten Textes. Man könnte zu deren Entschuldigung freilich sagen, dass der unter Esdras amtierende Ausschuss die Widersprüche des Deuteronomikers etwa gegen den Elohisten übersehen hat, also auch wohl Fehler in den Worten nicht bemerkt haben kann... indessen abgesehen von anderen Erwägungen, haben wir ein, allerdings durch die mündliche Überlieferung eines für geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsauffassung absolut unbegabten Volkes hindurchgegangenes, also mit mehr oder weniger unzuverlässigem Stoffe vermengtes ausdrückliches Zeugnis dafür, dass jenes Urexemplar unseres Textes der Zeit Hadrians angehört... glaubhaft erscheint jene Nachricht insofern, als eine in den schweren Zeiten unter Hadrian sich sammelnde Gemeinde von hebräisch gelernten, leicht in der Lage sein konnte, sich mit einem einzigen Exemplare ihrer heiligen Schriften begnügen zu müssen, und als das Ansehen der Männer, welche sich eines solchen Exemplares bedient hatten, unschwer diesem Buche eine grössere bedeu-
15. It is not easy to understand today how a theory built on so insecure a foundation was so warmly welcomed (*). I would go so far as to suggest that the main reason was that very misunderstanding against which Lagarde tried unsuccessfully to guard himself (‡). His contemporaries took it for granted that his theory was only a refinement of the view expressed on the basis of the K–R collations, with slight variations, ever since the days of Rosenmueller — especially in Lagarde's own time by Olshausen. They talked of the theory of Olshausen and Lagarde (†) — and Lagarde's formulation appealed to

tung verschaffte, als sein innerer wert philologischer kritik gegenüber ihm verliehen haben würde... was aber jene überlieferung als in der grundanschauung richtig erweist, ist der umstand, dass unser text des jüdischen kanons mindestens an Einem punkte gegen das christentum gerichtete correcturen enthält, mithin sein archetypus aus der christlichen zeit stammen muss...”.

(*) The first scholar of note who accepted the theory was none other than Th. Noeldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur*, 1868, p. 241. But according to the popular character of that book he did not state expressly that this was Lagarde's view. In scholarly discussion he reiterated his acceptance of the view five and ten years later (see Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1873, p. 445; *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 32 [1878] 591). There is therefore no justification for Lagarde's complaint (*Mittheilungen*, loc. cit., pp. 22; 210) that his theory met with the 'Hohn der Zunft'. Since later literature states that the theory was accepted by J. Wellhausen in the fourth edition (1878, p. 620 f.) of F. Bleek, *Einleitung in das A.T.*, it should be noted that A. H. Kamphausen had already done that in the third edition (1870, p. 733). This is apparently the first textbook which mentions the theory in the name of J. Olshausen next to Lagarde. Kamphausen's formulation shows that he did not appreciate the difference between Lagarde's formulation and the older view: "... besitzen wir denselben wesentlich nur in Einer Recension, d.h. alle unsere Hebr. Handschriften gehen auf ein einziges Exemplar zurück, dass man... zur Musterhandschrift erklärte, und dann mit ganz slavischer Treue abschrieb". Cf. *ib.*, p. 802. But it was probably Wellhausen's acceptance that was decisive. Cf. n. 3, p. 269.

(‡) There is no evidence that scholars tended to welcome the theory because of the allegedly similar state of textual transmission, claimed at that time for the Vedas by M. Mueller. But the parallel was suggested by A. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift* 3 (1864) 78 f. and was taken up in Bleek–Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*.

(†) Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*, described the theory as that of Olshausen and added (p. 621): "Um die weitere Verbreitung dieser sehr plausibeln Hypothese Olshausens's hat sich Lagarde verdient gemacht" and ex-
them because he had added further ‘proofs’ (*). Soon the ‘one recension’ theory and the ‘archetype’ theory had become fused into one. Rosenmüller was quoted as having said more or less the same thing as Lagarde (†) — and it would seem that some scholars who were annoyed by Lagarde’s unsavoury habit of repeatedly starting some ‘priority quarrel’ enjoyed pointing out that in this case it was Lagarde who had forgotten his predecessors (‡). It was a somewhat tragico-

pressly stressed that “LAGARDE überschätzte hier... seine Originalität”. In the same vein, although not so outspoken, were the remarks of NOELDEKE, *Hilgenfeld’s Ztschr.* and *ZDMG, loc. cit.* (n. 1, p. 260). Such remarks forced LAGARDE to stress his priority rights; cf. below, n. 1 f., p. 263.

(1) The widespread acceptance in the eighties of the last century can be seen from various statements in the literature. W. ROBERTSON SMITH, *The O.T. in the Jewish Church*, 1881, p. 70 f., 398 — through whose influence the theory was accepted in England — stated “I know of no attempt to refute the argument”. Slightly different was B. STADE, *ZAW* 4 (1884) 302: “Es ist bekanntlich eine noch nicht alte Erkenntnis, dass der massoretische Texte des A.T. auf eine einzige Handschrift zurückgeht. Und wiewohl die Variantensammlung zu jedem beliebigen Capitel des A.T. diese Annahme für jeden philosophisch Geschulten als notwendig erweisen müsste, vernimmt man zuweilen dagegen noch Widerspruch”. Note that STADE connects the theory with the result of collations of variants. F. BUHL, *Kanon und Text des A.T.*, 1891, p. 259 summed up: “Insofern ist die verhältnissmässig neue, aber schon sehr verbreitete Annahme, dass alle vorhandenen Handschriften auf einen Archetypus zurückweisen, entschieden richtig”.

(2) Since handbooks are mainly responsible for perpetuating the formulations of summaries, I single out the wording of BUHL, *loc. cit.*, p. 261: “Die Abstammung aller Handschriften von einem Archetypus ist behauptet worden von ROSENMEUHL... OLSHAUSEN... LAGARDE... NOELDEKE.” And he adds: “Eine ganz eigentümliche Formulierung hat LAGARDE dieser Hypothese gegeben”. This is a fair example of the way the two theories had become fused and BUHL’s formulation was copied up to our own generation. Cf. R. GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 1937, p. 45. I. L. SEELIGMANN, *Tarbiz* 25 (1956) 118 also fell victim to the statements of his predecessors, in spite of some attempt to differentiate between views. See also below, n. 4, p. 263.

(3) OLSHAUSEN was named as the originator of the theory as soon as discussion started; cf. above, n. 1, p. 260 STADE, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 1), pointed to ROSENMEUHL’s statement in the preface to the Bible edition of 1834, and PREUSCHEN, *ZAW* 9 (1889) 303 rediscovered the statement from 1797 (cf. above, n. 1, p. 254). Finally C. H. CORNILL, *ZAW* 12 (1892) 309 rediscovered the position of J. G. SOMMER, *Biblische Abhandlungen*, 1846, p. 79. ROSENMEUHL had talked about a ‘recension’ but SOMMER was the
mic situation that had developed: scholars had enthusiastically em-
braced Lagarde's formulation, but named his alleged predecessors into
the bargain. Lagarde fought tooth and nail to make it clear that

first to suggest an exact description — of course without using the term
'archetype': "... da alle Handschriften und Ausgaben des hebr. Textes
nicht nur im Allgemeinen einer Recension angehören, sondern ursprünglich
samt und sounder von einem Exemplar der bereits vollendeten Schrift-
sammlung — vielleicht war es ein zu besonderem Ansehen gelangter
Tempelcodex — herstammen...". It should be emphasized that Sommer
was not only the first to formulate the 'archetype' theory but also the
first to differentiate it clearly from the 'one recension'. Cf. below, n. 2,
p. 270. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, 1853, p. 18 wrote in a very similar
vein, without any mention of Sommer. According to him, an official
'recension' — very similar to the later 'massoretic' one — already existed
in early Christian times. Since this 'recension' contains obvious mistakes
which were not corrected, we must assume that it was based on one sin-
gle MS for each part of the Bible, which was often damaged but was
followed "mit sklavischer Treue". The recension itself had probably
been arranged at the end of the first century B.C.E.

Even Lagarde's 'proof' had practically been mentioned already
by Olshausen, two years before the Anmerkungen appeared. In his
Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache, 1861 § 31a Olshausen stated: "Wenn
in einigen Stellen des Alten Testamentes die Finalform eines Buchstaben
in der Mitte des Worts oder umgekehrt die gewöhnliche Form am Ende
gefunden wird, so ist der Grund davon darin zu suchen, dass in dem
Exemplare der heiligen Schriften, welches die diplomatische Grundlage
der heutigen Textesrecension bildete, der Schreiber entweder mit Absicht
oder durch Versagen eine andre Wortabteilung statuirte..." There can
be little doubt that in fact Lagarde only added some refinement in his
formulation of the 'proof' as well as the very term 'archetype' to this
theory. Wellhausen's judgment of the actual contribution of Lagarde
(cf. above, n. 3, p. 260) therefore seems justified.

It remains an unsolved problem whether Lagarde — who was
quick to censure others for ignorance of the literature — was really com-
pletely unaware of his predecessors. As shown above, (n. 1, p. 260),
Kamphausen knew about Olshausen in 1870, but Noecke added
Olshausen's view in 1873 (see n. 3, p. 260) as mentioned to him in a
private talk, and Lagarde maintains (Mitth., I, p. 23) that Olshausen
himself "von mir seiner zeit ausdrücklich befragt, erinnerte sich nicht,
sich über den hier behandelten gegenstand einmal öffentlich geäussert zu
haben". There remains the possibility that Lagarde propounded his
view independently, and once the facts were pointed out to him tried to
defend his priority rights by stressing the slight differences. Olshausen
himself appears to have remained completely quiet and did not claim his
rights, perhaps because of his official position or else because he himself
had omitted to credit Sommer.
his theory was different from any other (1), that he did not accept Olshausen's position, that nobody had ever put forward any of his, Lagarde's, proofs, and that his proofs were different toto caelo (2). Hence it was his theory only — a theory different from their's (3). But he did not succeed (4), and scholars went on talking about 'archetype' and 'recension' as if they were synonyms and quoting Rosenmüller etc. as the first to have put forward Lagarde's theory (5).

(1) For details cf. Symmicta II, 1880, 120 f. and Mitth., loc. cit.

(2) Almost the whole discussion centered around Olshausen's priority. Only in the 'Nachträge', Mitth. I, p. 381, did Lagarde hear of the note about Rosenmüller, to be published that year (1884) in the ZAW, and he identified Rosenmüller's view with that of Olshausen, as opposed to his own. As far as I can see in the literature available to me, Lagarde returned to the issue finally in 1886, in his review of Cornill (Mitth. II, p. 49 f.) On that occasion he mentions for the first time that the question of variant readings may also be of importance for proving the existence of the archetype. Here he seems less confident about the dating of the archetype in the time of Hadrian, and even finds it worth mentioning that the archetype "erheblich über 750 hinauffreicht" (the date is based on a wrong premise in that context and need not concern us here). Cf. below, n. 2, p. 265, and n. 1, p. 270.

(3) Mitth I., p. 24: "Da ich Wert darauf lege, das oben wiederabgedruckte zuerst erkannt zu haben...".

(4) Right at the beginning of the discussion the particular position of Lagarde had been stressed by Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift 7 (1869) 312 f. in his review of Lagarde's Materialien (1867). For Geiger the commonly accepted position of his day was that there was practically one text as from the second century C.E. In other words, he bears witness that the 'one recension' theory was the reigning one. (cf. above n. 1, p. 254): "Im Gegensatze zu diesem wohlbezeugt Resultate stellt Herr Lagarde in dem Vorworte zu den "Materialien" eine Ansicht auf, die wir als eine Probe seltsam launenhafter Kritik nicht vorenthalten wollen..." Thus, Lagarde's first opponent stressed the difference. Lagarde took notice of the review only by some personal sneers (Mitth. I, p. 22). Nor did he ever trouble to refute Kuenen, Stamboom (cf. above, n. 4, p. 258), who was the only one at the time who had attempted to undermine Lagarde's structure by reasoned argument and who had formulated afresh a 'one-recension' formula ("In één woord: al onze codices vormen te zamen één familie"). The most correct assessment of the differences of position given right after Lagarde's death is the summary by E. Koenig, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 1893, p. 88, but he, too, missed a number of points. As for Buhl, cf. above n. 2, p. 261.

(5) Thus, e.g., B. Stade, Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik, 1879 p. 20, mentions Lagarde as having put forward a view about one recen-
16. It seems a reasonable assumption that the lack of differentiation between the two formulations (⁴) had a share in preventing scholars from drawing the necessary consequences for their theoretical positions — and here we return for a moment to the text-critical practice. As long as the Hebrew manuscripts were viewed as belonging to one recension (²), there was at least a theoretical justification for their use in the critical apparatus and for connecting their readings with those of the ancient versions. A ‘recension’ is not watertight (⁴). But an ‘archetype’ is, by definition, only one manuscript. Ex hypothesi the belief in an archetype should have meant that all medieval readings were secondary changes in the transmission and hence could only be used for the reconstruction of that archetype. They could never be simply used side by side with readings from the versions (⁴), and such statements as ‘read with G 4 MSS’ or the like should have been disallowed on theoretical grounds. One might even have envisaged a difference of procedure between ‘exegetical practitioners’ according to their adherence to one theory or the other, with the adherents of the ‘archetype theory’ abstaining from the use of Hebrew MSS.

17. Nothing of the kind happened (⁴). Scholars were quick to accept the ‘archetype theory’ (or what they thought it to be), although they differed in their opinions as to how that archetype had come into

sion (‘eine einzige Recension’). In ZAW 4 (1884) 302 he mentions correctly, ‘eine einzige Handschrift’ — without realizing the difference — and then goes on to equate this with Rosenmüller’s view.

(⁴) In the eighteen eighties ‘Archetypus’ was already a well-established term. But it may be that the term ‘Rezension’ was not longer free any more from ambiguity. Cf. above, n. 2, p. 254; n. 2, p. 257.

(²) That is, until the seventies of the last century, because only by then had Lagarde succeeded in making an issue of the question.

(⁴) Cf. below, § 21 f.

(⁴) I am not concerned at present with the actual correctness of retroversions (cf. TPTC), but with the practice of adducing readings in the apparatus, which ran counter to what theory should have taught. The consequences which should have been drawn from the ‘archetype’ theory seem to me self-evident. Looking for a discussion of such a problem in general literature I found this application of the theory affirmed by H. Kantorowicz, Einführung in die Textkritik, 1921, p. 24. For my suggestion on handling the evidence, cf. also ISE, § 23.

(⁴) Quite typically, R. Kittel, Über die Notwendigkeit und Möglichkeit einer neuen Ausgabe der Hebräischen Bibel, 1902, p. 5, having mentioned the differences of opinion about the ‘archetype’ theory, adds: ‘Für unsern
being (*). In practice nothing changed and Hebrew readings were quoted as before (*). But perhaps the time was too short for the exegetical and text-critical practice to be influenced by the new theory.

Zweck verschlägt der Streit wenig”. It is largely thanks to his Biblia Hebraica that two generations of Bible scholars were reared on this way of looking at the evidence. Cf. also, n. 2, p. 253, and below, n. 2.

(*) Olshausen, Psalmen, p. 18 had assumed a “pharisäische Redaktion” whereas Lagarde tried to pin down the historic situation in which there was literally just one MS left (cf. above, n. 3, p. 259). (Kuenen, Ges. Abhandl., p. 118 turned also against this detail). Noëldéke, Die alttest. Literatur, p. 241 thought that one MS had been chosen more or less by chance, “... dass man ziemlich planlos nach einer Handschrift griff, weit mehr besorgt darum, einen einzigen als einen guten Text zu bekommen”. Cf. also Bleek-Kamphausen, Einleitung, p. 802. A few years later the idea of ‘deliberate suppression’ of other MSS was added to the description (Noëldéke, Zeitschrift f. Wiss. Theol. 1873, p. 444 f. Cf. below, n. 4, p. 288. It was probably because of Noëldéke’s preoccupation with the history of the Qoran that he saw the acceptance of the Hebrew archetype in the light of the action of Othman, in utter disregard of the different historical situations. (This is not intended to deny that the comparison of the histories of Qoran and Bible texts may yield instructive illustrations, if cautiously applied; cf. also Gordis, Tarbiz 27 (1958) 454 f.).

This picture of the Rabbis ruthlessly ordering all other texts to be suppressed (or destroyed) was only too readily accepted as explaining the later actions of the Massoretes, too. Cf. Kahle, Cairo Geniza², 1959, p. 141 f., and my criticism, RTBT, Ch. IV. That picture mainly grew out of the misunderstanding of the institution of ‘Geniza’, which was mentioned in connection with the dearth of MSS again and again, at least since the days of Walton (Prolegomena IV, 8): “Ratio etiam probabilis reddi potest cur non habemus codices Hebraeos... quia scil. post Masorethurum criticam et punctationem ab omnibus receptam Judaeorum magistri omnes codices his non conformes ut profanos et illegitimos damnarunt...”; cf. also H. L. Strack, Prolegomena Critica, 1873, § 6.

For a summary of opinions by the end of the last century as to the choice of the archetype, cf. Buhl, Kanon, p. 259 f. More or less the same opinions were expressed as regards the origin of the recension, a number of scholars claiming that the MSS chosen were actually the best; cp. e.g. the position of Kahle, Masoreten des Ostens, 1913, p. xviii, against Gressmann. For a summary of the Rabbinic sources with regard to the question of the possible ‘archetype’ and the different types of MSS cf. Liebermann, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 1950, p. 20 f.

(*) The first scholar of that generation who seriously attempted to carry out the demand that the exegesis of a book should start off with the use of the ancient witnesses and should be preceded by a systematic
For no sooner had the 'archetype theory' become accepted than the gradual rejection of Lagarde's extreme position started (1). Just as scholars had not really bothered to examine Lagarde's reasoning and his position was accepted under a partly false impression, so they did not bother to disprove Lagarde's proof formally by unmasking the fallacy of his stemmatic argumentation and by rejecting his theory on those grounds. Thirty years after 1863 it began to be realized somehow that the particular history of massoretic MSS made them defy the usual stemmatic procedures — and hence Lagarde's proof was no proof at all (2). But this was not the decisive argument. To be sure, the weight of the work done by those of his younger contemporaries who had worked on Hebrew MSS, especially that of Strack (3), was thrown against Lagarde, although their actual
evaluation of those witnesses was C. H. CORNILL, Ezechiel, 1886 (cf. also the review of LAGARDE, Mitth. II, p. 49 f.) CORNILL accepted LAGARDE's thesis enthusiastically and even tried to strengthen it by reintroducing the problem of variants (cf. n. 2, p. 263, and n. 2, p. 272). But he then went on to quote Hebrew readings without so much as realizing the dilemma. Nor did LAGARDE comment on it in his review.

(1) The reasons given in the literature for the rejection of the 'archetype' theory are many and varied, showing a correlation with the subject each scholar happened to be dealing with; cf. also n. 1, p. 269, and n. 1, p. 274. An interesting example is F. ZIMMERMAN, Jewish Quarterly Review 34 (1944) 459, dealing with the problem of double readings, who claims as first reason for LAGARDE's fall: "In the first place, scholars have noticed that in quite a number of instances the massoretic context contains obvious variants placed side by side." Cf. below, n. 1, p. 285.

(2) During LAGARDE's lifetime KUENEN (cf. above, n. 4, p. 258, and n. 4, p. 263) remained the only one to have written a proper refutation, but also he was not aware of the basic fallacy of LAGARDE's argument based on the puncta extraordinaria, etc. Immediately after LAGARDE's death E. KOENIG, Einleitung etc., 1893, p. 88 f., and H. L. STRACK Einleitung, etc., 1895, p. 172 questioned the validity of that argument, followed by V. APTOWITZER, Das Schriftwort in der Rabbinischen Literatur: Prolegomena, Sitzungsberichte Akad. Wien, Phil.-Hist. Kl. Bd. 153, 1906, p. 5. A remark on the subject from D. H. MUELLER'S classroom, quoted by APTOWITZER, clearly exposes the weakness of LAGARDE's argument. The main issue, however, was the return to the evaluation of variants, and LAGARDE's real argumentation was pushed aside. Cf. esp. below n. 5, p. 275; n. 2, p. 278.

(3) Strack was the only one in the decade before APTOWITZER who repeatedly rejected LAGARDE's formulation even though he did not add further evidence. Cf. preceding note and his paper in Semitic Studies
findings did not really change the overall picture as known from the collections of Kennicott and de Rossi. But nothing of what they said actually countered Lagarde’s basic argument about the puncta extraordinaria, etc. Trying to reconstruct the history of our problem, one is tempted to conclude that since Lagarde’s theory had never really been accepted just on its own merits, but rather as a continuation and logical conclusion from the positions of his predecessors, which were based on the study of variants, it sufficed to point out forcefully that the overall evidence of variants now available precluded the assumption of an archetype. It was first and foremost a return to the evaluation of variant readings which dethroned the Lagardian formulation (*).

18. Once the Lagardian structure had begun to collapse, further attacks were readily interpreted as having dealt it the final blow. Scholars were now only too eager to accept the contention of Aptowitzer (2) that the variants in Rabbinic literature suffice to nullify Lagarde’s formulation (2). Since the type of material on which Aptowitzer based his argument was relatively unknown to most theologians and had hardly been used seriously in the previous discussion of the

---

*in Memory of A. Kohut, 1897, p. 571 — basing his opposition especially on the large number of marginal notes to codices — and Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 1902, p. 28.

(*) Cf. E. KOENIG, loc. cit., C. STEUERNAGEL, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das A.T., 1912, p. 20 f. See the list of B. J. ROBERTS, O.T. Text and Versions, 1951, p. 27. But cf. below, n. 3, p. 283. It must, of course, be remembered that not all the scholars whose views are mentioned in such lists were in a position to express a view based on first-hand study.

(2) loc. cit., p. 3 f.

(2) “Dieses Argument fällt mit dem Nachweis solcher Varianten einfach weg”. It is characteristic of the atmosphere in those days that nobody paused to ask whether the argument based on variations in Rabbinic sources had any necessary bearing on the theory of an archetype assumed for Bible MSS. In any case, I have not seen that anyone suggested this rather obvious counter-argument. All later discussions revolved around the question to what degree one should assume ‘quotation by heart’. (For a similar problem in the study of the Peshitta cf. TL, p. 196 f.) An interesting argument recently put forward from ‘orthodox’ quarters is that because of the strict regulations as to the conditions of writing down Scripture, the Rabbis intentionally refrained from exact quotations. Cf. R. MARSHAK, Bible and Massora (in Hebrew), 1964, p. 47 f. It is not clear how this explanation accounts for the great majority of quotations which agree with MT.
subject (1), its impact was considerable and made many scholars decide finally against the archetype formulation (2). It thus began to become customary for scholars to propagate the view that Lagarde's theory was still basically true, but had to be slightly modified. His position was almost right — with the stress on 'almost'; his formulation was too extreme and should be tuned down; one must allow for more flexibility, etc. (3). It is not without reason that we attempted previously to analyze the development through which the 'one-recension' theory got mixed up with the Lagardian position. Since most scholars around the turn of the century were convinced that Lagarde's predecessors had intended to put forward his theory and that there was only one theory accepted by most leading scholars during the latter half of the nineteenth century, none of Lagarde's opponents was able to state in so many words that the seemingly new, 'almost Lagardian' position was in fact nothing else but a return to the

(1) Even so, it had come up sporadically, especially since the days of KENNICOTT, and STRACK had stressed it in his dissertation. A list of his predecessors is given by APTOWITZER, p. 8.

(2) The statements of KAHLE in his young days show clearly that his anti-Lagardian position was influenced by APTOWITZER. This is foreshadowed in a long footnote, Masoreten des Ostens, 1913, p. XVIII f. and developed in his "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes", 1915 = Opera Minora, 1956, p. 31. APTOWITZER'S work is not even mentioned in Cairo Geniza.

(3) A typical formulation, e.g., STEUERNAGEL, loc. cit., p. 22: "... dass jene These in abgemilderter Form doch ein gewisses Recht hat". Similarly, KAHLE, Opera Minora, p. 33: "Seit ungefähr 100 n. Chr. ist in den offiziellen jüdischen Kreisen unser masoretischer Konsonantentext als textus receptus betrachtet worden — so könnte man vielleicht LAGARDE'S Hypothese modifizieren". The formulation, some decades later, of O. EISSFELDT is not much different, but he allows for more flexibility; cf. Einleitung*, 1956, p. 838: "die... These... ist in dieser Form nicht mehr haltbar..."; cf. 3rd ed., p. 929 f. See below, n. 2, p. 270, and n. 3, p. 283. It should be noted that EISSFELDT also writes as if his view is directly opposed to LAGARDE'S thesis, and the reader is not really made aware that Lagarde's formulation had been rejected by practically all scholars since the beginning of this century. One may compare the slightly varying formulations of J. REIDER, Prolegomena... to Aquila, 1916, p. 81 f.; A. BENTZEN, Introduction to the O.T., I, 1948, p. 51 f.; D. Winton THOMAS in H. H. ROWLEY (ed.), The Old Testament and Modern Study, 1951, p. 244 f. B. J. ROBERTS, loc. cit., p. 25; M. NOTH, Die Welt des A.T., 1953, p. 245, etc. My own formulation in TL, p. xi, reflects the common state of misinformation; the formulation in ISE § 75 is correct, as far as it goes.
view formulated by the father of the ‘one recension’ theory, back in 1797 (1).

19. At no stage, however, did the pendulum swing back towards an even more ‘positive’ evaluation of Hebrew readings, such as was suggested by some scholars in Kennicott’s times. If there was not sufficient proof for assuming an archetype, there was not more than what could be encompassed within one recension (2). To be sure, back in the eighteen-eighties matters had looked different for a short moment, when Hebrew MSS with completely different readings were said to exist. But the forgeries were soon detected (3), and the result of the disappointment may, in a way, have indirectly even strengthened the general opinion that no readings of ‘importance’ could ever be found in genuine MSS.

20. Thus, by the first quarter of this century, practically all specialists were agreed on what amounted in fact to a ‘one recension’ theory (4). The main difference as compared with the position of

(1) It may be added that since scholars have not been aware of the differences of position, the outline of the Problemgeschichte suggested here should be judged only in the light of the primary sources concerned.

(2) This may explain why the issue of studying variants from biblical MSS was practically reopened only in the thirties of this century. Cf. P. Volz, ZAW 54 (1936) 104: “Mir scheint dass die Annahme eines Archetypus daran gehindert hat in der Untersuchung der hebr. Handschriften auf Wert usw. vorwärts zu kommen”. But (p. 106): “Der Ertrag der Variantensammlung ist, wie ich aus eigener eingehender Beobachtung weiss, ganz abgesehen von der Frage des Archetypus, sehr gering”.

(3) As for Firkowitch, cf. my recent remarks in Tarbiz 33 (1964) 149f. It is most unfortunate that J. M. Allegro has attempted to warm up the Shapira affair in a popular book, connecting it afresh with the Qumran discoveries and insinuating gross errors committed by the leading Bible scholars and archeologists in those days. (The Shapira Affair, 1965). Allegro has not adduced a shred of new evidence or so much as attempted to refute the arguments brought forward in recent discussions. Any attempt to clear the Shapira forgeries will first have to get rid of the evidence I submitted in Journal of Jewish Studies 7 (1956) 187 f. See the London Jewish Chronicle, Nov. 12, 1965 and cf. also O. Rabinowicz, “The Shapira Scroll: A Nineteenth-Century Forgery”, JQR 56 (1965) 1 f.

(4) Sometimes a formulation was copied which reminds one of J. G. Sommer’s statement (cf. above n. 3, p. 261), but seems to have been some kind of ‘compromise’. As far as I can see, it occurs first in S. R. Driver, Notes... on... Samuel, 1890, p. xxxvii: “All MSS belong to the same recension, and are descended from the same imperfect archetype.” This was taken over, e.g., by J. Reider, loc. cit. (cf. above, n. 3, p. 268).
Rosenmüller was that it became now usual to quote a date for the recension, mostly by simply relying on the date suggested by Lagarde for the 'archetype', but sometimes by pushing it slightly up or down (1). Apart from minor fluctuations (2), the problem could be regarded as settled, and remained so up to the time of the recent discoveries. In this context one cannot but point out that the work of Kahle and his followers on the vocalization systems dealt, in a way, only an additional blow to the Lagardian theory (3). Statements in the literature

The only one in our generation who built his own thesis on the 'archetype' theory is R. GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 1937, p. 45 f. He believes in one single MS on the margins of which variant readings had been noted. His picture is somewhat like that of NOELDEKE in *ZDMG* 32, p. 591. In private talk he stressed that he did not think of the archetype in the Lagardian sense, that no other MS was in existence at the time, but rather as the MS, out of a larger number, which became the basis for all the later ones. Cf. now his slightly modified exposition in *Tarbiz* 27 (1958) 444 f., where he stresses that the large number of variants in Hebrew MSS need not influence the verdict on the issue of the archetype.

(1) In a way, the suggestion to recognize a 'second period' (cf. above, §4) is little more than an attempt to get into one framework the various dates suggested for the 'archetype' on the basis of ancient Rabbinical and historical literature, since the days of SOMMER and OLSHAUSEN (cf. above, n. 3, p. 261). For the problem of evaluation of Rabbinical sources cf. also the references above, n. 5, p. 246 and in GORDIS's discussion (cf. preceding note and his reply to ALBRIGHT in *JBL* 37 [1938] 330). The connection with the early Christian period has been claimed at least since R. Simon; cf. BÜHL, *Kanon*, p. 261. More scholars accepted the suggested date in the first century C.E. than is usually realized; cf. especially Th. NOELDEKE, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 446 and LAGARDE's slight withdrawal (above n. 2, p. 263).

(2) The formulation of O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung*, p. 833 is typical of a position which assumes a rather considerable degree of fluctuation (cf. above, n. 3, p. 268), probably influenced by KAHEL (see below). But nobody went as far as to suggest a typological differentiation among Hebrew MSS. In the light of § 23 f. below, it should be added that the last one to maintain that against the uniformity of the rest of the recension there are a few MSS which are seriously deviating was SOMMER (cf. above n. 3, p. 261). But from his discussion it would seem that his remark was rather in the nature of claiming Christian etc. origin for deviating MSS, after the fashion of TYCHSEN (cf. above, n. 3, p. 252): "Allerdings gibt es nebenher auch etliche hebräische Codices die einer andern Reihe von Abschreibern, zum Theil sicher Judenchristen, angehören...; aber auch diese Gattung gehört mit den acht jüdischen Codices derselben Recension an".

(3) Cf. e.g., the introduction to R. KITTEL, *Biblia Hebraica*, p. xiii. KAHEL's remarks on problems of textual variants remained incidental
which may create the impression that it was mainly Kahle's work that overthrew the 'archetype' theory are not borne out by the facts (1). Kahle published the first major summary of his views (2) when the anti-Lagardian movement had won the day and he never added new evidence against the 'archetype theory' (3). His main contribution

and he never attempted to study the Geniza material in this respect systematically; cf. BMU, Ch. II. The provocative statement of A. Sperber (cf. above n. 4, p. 245): "There never existed The Massoretic Text and consequently never will be" has little to do with the subject under discussion here. But such statements easily lend themselves to misinterpretation.

(1) Thus, e.g., it is difficult not to understand A. Bentzen, Introduction, I, p. 56, as if it is because of Kahle that "we have to abandon the theory of the archetype". Similarly E. Würtwein, Der Text des A.T., 1963, p. 26. More correctly R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the O.T., 1948, p. 79. Cf. below, n. 3. Precisely because of H. M. Orlinsky's many just strictures against Kahle one would have wished that his description of the position in Journal of the American Oriental Society 61 (1941) p. 84 f. had been more exact, the more so since younger scholars have copied the details on his authority. As far as I can make out, according to Orlinsky, too, it was Kahle who attempted to refute Lagarde. But Lagarde, according to him believed in the 'one-recension' (not the 'archetype'!), whereas Kahle rejects the theory of a one-text tradition. Since the idea of 'one-recension' is right, Orlinsky upholds Lagarde. (''In the second third of the nineteenth century, Rosenmüller, Olshausen and Lagarde, especially the last-named, advanced the view, which is held by practically all competent scholars today, that all preserved MSS of the Hebrew text of the O.T. go back to the one recension which came to domination in the first-second century A.D. at the latest. In this I concur'.) I can only add that I wonder whether Orlinsky would have identified his position with that of Lagarde, had he been aware of the exact facts. As his words stand, they are part of a total position for Lagarde against Kahle, as regards both the Hebrew and the Greek textual traditions. Furthermore, in spite of the strong words of Orlinsky against Gordis (cf. JAOS 60 [1940] 30 f.), both these pupils of M. L. Margolis happen to be the only ones who maintained, around 1940, that Lagarde was right. Since I tend to assume at least a partial misunderstanding, I agree with Roberts, JJS 1 (1949) 147 that the apparently considerable differences between the positions of Kahle and Orlinsky are exaggerated.

(2) Published in 1915; cf. above n. 2, p. 268.

(3) The few variants from MSS with Palestinian vocalization published in Masoreten des Westens II, 1930, p. 22 f. did not change the picture at all. Cf. below, n. 3, p. 272. I should think it fair to state that Kahle's main point was that in the light of the different systems of traditions of vocalization, "es scheint dass erst die exakte Arbeit die die
was an argument *ex analogia* (*) from his own theory about the work of the Massoretes (*). It was thus no specific evidence (*), but rather the overall weight of Kahle's position, which made some scholars adopt a view in favour of a certain textual fluctuation even after the second century C.E. (*) It would, therefore, be correct to sum up that Kahle's (*) writings made it finally clear that Lagarde's formulation was erroneous and that Kahle went further than his predecessors in assuming fluctuations within the 'one recension' (*). On the theo-

Punktation des Konsonantentextes erforderte, einen wirklich einheitlichen Konsonantentext — in Palästina wie in Babylonien — durchsetzte” (*Opera Minora*, p. 32). Perhaps one may say that whereas Kahle's predecessors had rejected Lagarde's formula, but had thought of the 'one-recension' as being almost of an archetypal nature, Kahle saw larger divergences within the recension which became unified through later gradual convergence. Cf. below, n. 2, p. 273. This may explain why some authors of handbooks credited Kahle with overthrowing Lagarde's thesis (cf. above, n. 1, p. 271). It should be stressed that what Kahle put forward was a somewhat refined view, but not based on any new and relevant evidence. In a way, he refined the picture drawn by his anti-Lagardian predecessors, just as Lagarde had done with the statements of Olshausen, etc.

(*) Cf. especially *Opera Minora*, p. 26. It cannot be shown here in detail how the argument *ex analogia* played a large part in Kahle's theories in general. Cf. also RTBT, n. 42, and TL, p. 176.

(*) This did not prevent him mixing up facts about the text and about vocalization, and claiming that Cornill in his comparisons of the Petrograd Codex of 916 with the printed text “in all the details of punctuation of such a long and difficult text he was able to find only about a dozen slight variations” (cf. *Cairo Geniza*, p. 63). Because of the interest of Cornill's position for the history of our subject (cf. above, n. 2, p. 263; n. 2, p. 265) I cannot but note that Kahle got the facts wrong.

(*) Roberts, *JJS* 1 (1949) 152 sums up, rightly, that the variants collected by Kahle have little bearing on textual questions. Cf. above, n. 3, p. 271.

(*) Even some of those who favoured Kahle's modification of the theory felt he pressed his point too much, Cf. Roberts, *loc. cit.*

(*) For Kahle's lack of interest in Tiberian Geniza material cf. BMU p. 35 ff. See above, n. 3, p. 270.

(*) Kahle's opening sentences on the two senses in which 'textus receptus' is used (*Opera Minora*, p. 26) can be wholeheartedly endorsed. His summary (ib., p. 33) is in line with what had been said by his predecessors. Roberts, *O.T. Text*, went even beyond Kahle when he stated that 'the theory collapses when it is argued that the archetype belongs to the second century A.D., or some such early date. The MSS on which
retical side, the victory of the 'one recension' theory — regardless of the terms or words used — was thus well established by the end of the first third of this century, and it has remained victorious throughout the second third. What seemed to Kahle and his opponents a major clash between their positions was no more than a minor difference of views which did not really affect the basic common theory (1). It was a difference as regards the degree of internal unity that scholars were ready to allow the recension at ca 150 C.E., with Kahle opting for the picture of a broader basis and a partial later ironing-out of variations (2).

21. In the context of our present study it should be stressed that at no point of the discussion did the theoretical position have any repercussion on the everyday practice of the use of Hebrew variants by 'practitioners' of textual criticism. Hebrew variants were continued to be quoted as before, and their use was not felt to constitute any problem (3). On the other hand, the end of the first third (4) of

it is based belong in the main to the twelfth century A.D. and later" (p. 24) and "... until final emergence of the standard archetype text of the ben Asher Massoretes, which received official status by the decree of Maimonides in the twelfth century A.D." (p. 29). Bearing in mind the history of the term 'archetype', this is either an unfortunate use of the term or a mistaken presentation. My objections to ROBERTS' formulation on another occasion (cf. RTBT, n. 126; see also above, n. 4, p. 258) have been attacked by him in Journal of Theological Studies 15 (1964) 253 ff. (but see ib., p. 331). I shall try to reduce differences of opinions between us to a minimum in a future paper.

(1) Cf. also above, n. 1, p. 271. Possibly some writers tended to overstress the differences between positions precisely because there are too few facts.

(2) In a way, the differences and possible combinations between the 'family-tree theory' and the 'wave theory' in linguistic theory may be compared.

(3) Cf. above, § 16. Of course, had anyone been asked about the theoretical basis, he might have answered that since the 'archetype' formulation had been rejected, there was no bar to using Hebrew variants. It should be noted that the scholars who took part in the theoretical discussion or wrote the handbooks were usually not those who carried out the actual text-critical work. Cf. below, n. 7, p. 274.

(4) Cf. below, § 23. HEMPEL was the first scholar who approached the problem methodically, and was aware of the necessary connection between the Lagardian theory and text-critical practice. His study in
this century marks a renewed interest in the old problem of the 'value' of those variants and their sources (*). This problem was to appear in a new perspective about the middle of the century (2). It has been mentioned above (3) that the K-R readings have remained the basis for any view expressed on the subject of Hebrew variants and that none of the additional material published since has altered the overall picture (4). Therefore, any judgment expressed in our generation is, by necessity, hardly more than a restatement of the opinions put forward in the second half of the eighteenth century, whether pro or con (5). Our main advantage over our predecessors lies, therefore, in our ability to view medieval Hebrew MSS against the background of pre-medieval ones (6), and to attempt to create some interaction between theoretical insights and text-critical-exegetical practice (7).

22. The results of our investigations force upon us the conclusion that pre-medieval Hebrew biblical MSS are typologically different from medieval ones. Only now that different types of readings can be adduced from pre-medieval MSS can it be fully appreciated that what sets medieval MSS apart is the fact that they contain practically exclusively variations of the types which can arise again and again.
through scribal activity (*). Among tens of thousands of readings from medieval witnesses which were checked in this connection it was hard to find even a handful which were not immediately explicable as having arisen through harmonization, simplification, etc. To be sure, all these occur in Hebrew MSS from the first two periods and can be amply adduced from the Versions. But there they exist side by side with ‘real variants’ (*). It is precisely the existence of ‘real variants’ that has made the pre-medieval MSS a new challenge to textual criticism (*); it is their absence that marks medieval MSS (*). This is the reason why scholars have been disappointed ever since Kennicott’s collections became known and why the study of medieval Hebrew MSS was previously said to be little more than an illustration of textual dynamics (*). On the other hand, it is the considerable number of variants, formally common to medieval Hebrew MSS and pre-medieval sources, which we tend to attribute to the ever active and repeated force of the ‘law of scribes’ that creates the illusion (*) of a genetic connection between medieval MSS on the one hand and pre-medieval ones and the Versions on the other. It is that apparent formal identity which has caused scholars ever since Kennicott’s time to state that, in spite of the generally disappointing results, there are some readings of ‘value’ in medieval MSS, which


(2) For the term cf. TL, p. XIII. The existence of borderline cases, here as elsewhere, does not invalidate the differentiation.

(8) Cf. now also Talmon, Textus 4 (1964) 95 f.

(*) This may, perhaps, be put differently: were we to put medieval and pre-medieval MSS together indiscriminately and have them sorted out according to types of variations, the new typological arrangement would turn out to be identical with the chronological one. Cf. ISE, § 17.

(*) As a corollary; because of this, any attempt at ordering all medieval witnesses into families according to stemmatic principles is doomed to failure, just like Lagarde’s attempt to assume a Hebrew archetype according to Lachmann’s principles. It may be truly said that the Massoretic activity made the usual criteria inapplicable. Cf. § 17 and n. 2, p. 278. — Cf. also ISE, §§ 17, 76. This is not to deny, of course, that individual MSS can be shown to be connected. Cf. already the discussion of Doederlein, Auserlesene... Bibliothek II, 9, 1783, p. 650 f.

(*) Cf. below, § 25 f. The connection would cease to be an illusion only after a specific relationship is proved.
‘confirm’ (or are confirmed by) the readings of the versions, and those readings have taken their place in the apparatuses next to the retroversions.

23. Having restated the argument against the assumption of genetic relationship between medieval and pre-medieval witnesses as seen from our newly-gained vantage ground (1), we may turn back and look at the attempts during the past fifty years at studying medieval MSS (2). It may be useful to distinguish between two main lines of inquiry: the attempt to detect MSS which deviate in their whole textual structure from the standard text (2) to such a degree that their deviations may be said to point towards extra-massoretic connections, so that these specially selected MSS may serve as the basis for the apparatus of medieval MSS (4), and the attempt to select from all

(1) Cf. above, n. 2, p. 274. In the past years I have repeatedly come back to the investigation of the problem, hoping that more positive results could be gained. The following paragraphs have been written after a fresh analysis of the material adduced in the various studies.


(3) For this purpose it makes practically no difference whether we take as ‘standard’ the text of van der Hooght used by Kennicott, the Venice Biblia Rabbinica, or the Aleppo Codex or use some statistical mean. Cf. n. 3, p. 278.

(4) This, again, is a restatement of observations such as Doederlein, Auserlesene... Bibliothek II, 9, 1783, p. 641 f.: “Kennikot [!] hingegen sammlet, ohne den Versuch... seine gefundenen Lesarten zu vergleichen oder das Gewicht seiner Handschriften abzuwagen”. Cf. below, n. 1, p. 278. The first to restate this clearly is Hempel (ZAW 48 [1930] 195): “es ist unzulässig, ohne Prüfung des Characters der betreffenden Handschrift eine innermasoretische Abweichung kritisch zu verwerten oder auch nur mitzuverwerten” Cf. below, n. 1, p. 279. This is echoed more weakly by Volz, ZAW 54 (1936) 100 f. Since “Die Jesahah-Rolle und das
the medieval readings taken together those that formally agree with readings in pre-medieval sources so that genetic relations are allegedly proved (*).

24. The analysis of all the studies which pursue the first line of inquiry (*) has yielded an unequivocal result: among all the MSS and fragments known so far there is not even one the deviations of which can be significantly connected with any non-Massoretic tradition (*). We possess no medieval manuscript (*) which, on the strength of its readings, may be termed 'valuable' or be worthy of our attention more than any other. Having attempted to come to an 'evaluation' of MSS (4) in order to fulfil the demand that MSS should not be counted

Problem der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften” (1954) I have tried to argue that the problems of the textual character of the apparently deviating MSS as a whole and of the typology of changes must be investigated before any further step in this field can be made.

(*) The second line of approach is basically the one usual in KENNICOTT's times, whereas the first one is methodologically novel — in spite of the fact that the most deviating MSS were, of course, noticed by KENNICOTT, BRUNS, etc. I need not add that I use the term 'structure' in this context as against 'atomistic' comparisons of readings; cf. TL, index. Since I am not well enough acquainted with the procedures in N.T. studies, I can only register that also in N.T. textual criticism the evaluation of readings as part of a textual structure is mentioned as a novel approach; cf. K. W. CLARK, JBL 85 (1966) 16.

(*) This includes the published studies by HEMPEL, GESE and myself as well as the work carried out at the HUBP. Völz did not really pursue this line, and BLANK only touched upon the problem by the way. Nevertheless, his study serves to point out — much against his own intentions — that the MSS wrongly attributed by KÄHLER to BEN-NAFTALI (cf. RTBT, Ch. VI) do not stand apart from the textual side. For the problem of publishing all the details on which this summary is based; cf. above, n. 1, p. 243.

(*) My attempts to 'salvage' even one single MS onto which others could be pegged have proved abortive. Cf. ISE, § 77.

(*) Caution bids us say that none has survived, but I doubt very much whether there was ever any such MS. A chapter explaining the rarity of medieval Hebrew codices has been included in many studies since the days of WALTON; cf., e.g., STRACK, Prolegomena Critica, 1873, § 6. See also DE ROSSI, Scholia Critica, 1798, § 15 (“unde antiquissimorum codicum hebr. summa raritas”).

(*) Our tabulations are based both on quantity and on typology.
but weighed (1), we are finally driven to admit that the history of the transmission of Hebrew medieval MSS is such that this famous rule is inapplicable (2). There exists no MS which deserves special attention in the sense that it 'weighs' more; there are only MSS with smaller or larger numbers of readings (3). But as one starts to investigate them, they melt into nothing (4), and the huge mass of variations does not finally yield a single variant which is significantly, decisively and undoubtedly connected with a pre-medieval tradition.

(1) The weakness of 'counting' readings was stressed two centuries ago, especially by those scholars who strongly opposed KENNICOTT's work; cf. O. G. Tychsen, Tentamen, 1772, p. 134 f. Befreyetes Tentamen, 1774, p. 150 f. See also H. L. Strack, Sem. Stud... Kohut, p. 561 and above n. 4, p. 276.

(2) This is, in fact, also the result of H. Geese, ZAW 69, p. 66. Having written against the undiscriminating use of medieval MSS (cf. TL, p. xf.; ISE, § 18), I am forced to admit that I now doubt even more whether after the 'discrimination' there remains anything to use. This is, again, the outcome of the history of medieval MSS under the influence of Masoretic activity, and again these MSS defy the application of the text-critical rules of the game. Cf. above, § 17, and n. 5, p. 275.

(3) For the standard, cf. above, n. 3, p. 276. It is with grave misgivings that I approach the conclusion that statements made in KENNICOTT's times to the effect that we possess only MSS with more or less scribal mistakes and that finally the textus receptus is our only yardstick, are not really so far off the mark, although they seem to carry us back to 'Buxtorfian fundamentalism'. Cf. above nn. 3 f., p. 253. Now, that we can check the ninth and tenth century model codices, such a statement does not look as preposterous as it did when the attack on the textus receptus was in full swing. Again, I suspect that in the deprecation of the textus receptus there was also a good deal of carry over from N.T. studies. Cf. the somewhat similar remark in RTBT, § 44, and my cautionary note below, n. 3, p. 289. Were I not afraid of overstating my case, I would consider a very provocative formulation, i.e., that in our case the textus receptus functions practically like the 'archetype' and that we might disregard the MSS by way of eliminatio codicum descriptorum. This sounds, of course, like a reductio ad absurdum of the Lachmannian method. Cf. below, n. 3, p. 283.

(4) Cf. now the result of Geese (above, n. 2) which should be seen in the light of HEMPEL, ZAW 1930, p. 193; 1934, p. 273, i.e., that those MSS which seem to stand out at first sight turn out to have the greatest number of obvious mistakes. HEMPEL's result with regard to K 69 in Deuteronomy, which only at first sight seems to have affinities with the Samaritan text, is borne out by our investigations of Genesis and Exodus.
25. In order to enable others to judge for themselves, a full new collation (1) of the MSS (2) which seemed most 'promising' is being published in the HUBP edition — considerably fuller than the collation published by Kennicott, not least because the vocalization and the differences of hands have been noted. From the thousands of readings checked from K 30 93 96 150 (3), it is difficult to 'salvage' a handful which might be possibly more than the result of harmonization etc. etc. — certainly a far cry from the claim of special value. Thus we get as the yield from Isaiah (4):

| MT | תבורה שלים וה泚ים שניה | K96 |
| MT | תכלת וכספה ויראת | K30 (5) + |
| MT | נמות נבריה לאמפי | K96 (?) |

(1) Cf. for this issue, H. S. Nyberg, ZAW 52 (1934) 244 and see above, n. 4, p. 276.

(2) As against the more extreme suggestion TL, p. xi, four MSS were finally included. As long as we find it necessary to adopt this system, the details of the MSS to be chosen may vary from book to book. Cf. below, § 30 and n. 4, p. 283.

(3) The general character of these MSS had been noticed by Kennicott, Bruns, Doederlein, etc. It is interesting to remember that K93 was once said to be a MS written by a Gentile and that on the strength of the judgment of H. Opitz, K150 was thought to represent the 'true' MT until Kennicott, Diss. General., 1780, p. 83. After prolonged examinations of K96 and 150 I now doubt — against TL, p. xi — whether K150 is really the more noteworthy of the two. But the initial impression (TL, p. 56), that K96 150 should be studied in the first place, has been confirmed.

(4) The present list includes those places where an explanation of the reading from context, parallel, etc. does not obviously suggest itself, without limiting the examples to cases where similar extra-Hebrew readings exist. It thus specifically excludes cases such as were mentioned as illustrative of the 'law of scribes' (cf. above, n. 1, p. 275), but may include what is actually a scribal mistake. On rechecking the collation of K-R others may, of course, find, an instance to add or to omit.

(5) Details as to second hands, lack of vocalization, etc., are not taken into consideration on this occasion.
From the whole book of Isaiah one can quote only one variant which makes one really prick up one’s ears:

18.4 – MT

This reading occurs in about a dozen other MSS as well as LXX, Pesh, Vulg.; and while the graphic similarities are such that the variant could have arisen again independently in medieval MSS, the case remains remarkable (4).

26. It may be of some interest to mention in this connection some provisional results of our study of Geniza fragments (6). First and foremost: leaving aside the mass of ‘pseudo-readings’ which are connected with different methods of vocalization (8), the overall picture of the text in Geniza fragments is completely identical with that of the codices collated for K-R etc. The Geniza has not turned out to have been in any way a repository for aberrant texts which were, (4) This case should probably be omitted, both because of the idiomatic character and because of the letters of DOIS.

(6) LXX: δ ἐκοψε ἔκτην ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ, δ ἐφύτευσε κύριος... is no more than an interesting parallel to the same train of thought.

(8) Cf. ISE app. ad. loc. This is the only case which may remain from K150. But this one too should probably be weeded out; cf. Is 46,13.

(6) This is the only instance in the entire book which fulfils the conditions which would make it a candidate for the ‘extramassoretic trickle’ (cf. below, § 29). The question of its ‘value’ per se is outside the scope of this discussion.

(6) The hopes expressed in TL, p. xi had already been damped in BMU, Ch. II.

(6) It is hoped that we shall be able, before long, to publish a study exemplifying the various types of vocalized texts using Tiberian vowel graphemes.
allegedly, condemned to oblivion. Since earlier studies of Geniza material were not concerned with the problem of variant readings and no systematic inquiry had been carried out, there was some hope that Geniza fragments might help in clarifying our ideas about the 'Massoretic recension'. This hope must be given up, although we may always run into a fragment which at first sight seems to contain a large number of readings (1). Though not all the Geniza fragments are known to us as yet (2), the following readings from Isaiah, culled from a few hundred fragments of this book checked so far, may illustrate our point. Leaving aside variants of Divine names and of the types 

[^1]: (1) The large number of Geniza fragments has helped to enlarge the sum total of MSS, partly or fully preserved, and has thus given us an even broader basis for statements on medieval MSS. Quite often a reading quoted as unique by K–R can now be adduced from a Geniza fragment too. The fragments from 'Listeners' Codices' (BMU, p. 39 f.) have not turned out to change the picture. Inversions of textual portions in a very few fragments need further investigation.

[^2]: (2) This summary is based, of course, on the study of fragments from the entire Bible. Altogether several thousand fragments have been studied.

[^3]: (3) Cf. above, n. 4, p. 252.

[^4]: (4) The following are examples of some of the types.

[^5]: (5) F = Fragments. A system has yet to be devised for quoting the fragments. In the present context the exact shelfmark is given only where the fragment as a whole is of interest.

Thus (4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Geniza Fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22,12    | MT | ליקרהו ולחר השג
|          | F  | הלזרת          |
| 37,26    | MT | הלשנ למסת לא哪家好 שלשה ס.Promise מת קים
|          | F  | לmaint               |
| 42,3     | MT | לאמש ופי ממסת
|          | F  | ממסת ופי          |
| 47,5     | MT | שבמ דמש וباء מתש
|          | F  | om.               |
| 52,10    | MT | התש ומ בו יִהלת
|          | F  | יִהלת |
These instances can be multiplied manifold; they are paralleled by thousands of ‘readings’ in K–R and amount to nothing. The same is true for variations in vocalization which indicate a different sense (1). Thus, e.g.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
18,6 & - \text{MT} \\
& יִתְבּוּ הָדֶרֶךְ \\
F & יִתְבּוּהַ
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
19,22 & - \text{MT} \\
& וְנָחַת ... בְּכֵלָה רָפוּאָה \\
F & בְּכֵלָה רָפוּאָה
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
52,6 & - \text{MT} \\
& לְכֵן יִתְעָשֶׂמֶשׁ \\
F & יִתְעָשֶׂמֶשׁ
\end{array}
\]

Only one fragment is interesting in this respect, i.e., T-S A 10,5, because it has a considerable number of changes, among them in

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
52,12 & - \text{MT} \\
& הָלְפַשְׂעִים יִפְגִּיטִי \\
F & הָלְפַשְׂעִים
\end{array}
\]

Among the simplifications an outstanding instance, hitherto unattested, is

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
19,4 & - \text{MT} \\
& יָמְרָה אֲלֵיהֶם \\
F & יָמְרָה
\end{array}
\]

We are thus left with the one and only instance of a remarkable variant in the Geniza fragments, and it need hardly be added that this is again בָּהַמ instead of בָּהַמ in 18,4.

27. For those books of the Bible which have already been checked (4) the results gained for Isaiah are paralleled, and there is no reason to assume that further investigations of MSS and fragments from

(1) These cannot be paralleled, of course, from K and only rarely from R. Cf. above, n. 2, p. 255.

(2) LXX: καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη In KENNICOTT’S generation such a reading would have been hailed as being of significance.

(3) I cannot help remarking that this reading would have fitted perfectly into 1QIsa.

(4) At the time of writing, complete or exploratory studies have been carried out on the Law and the Prophets. First results of an investigation of books from the Hagiographa indicate that the picture may be different
other books are going to enable us to uphold the notion of a ‘valuable’ medieval MS (1). Thus the provisional result for Jeremiah is that only two variants from the above named MSS are possibly worthy of note:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{27,22} & \quad \text{MT} & \quad \text{בֶּבַל} \text{ חיָּם} \\
& \quad \text{K96} & \quad \text{וּבַל} \\
\text{48,2} & \quad \text{MT} & \quad \text{חָשֹּׁב} \text{ עלָה} \text{ רַעָה} \\
& \quad \text{K150} & \quad \text{מֻחָלְמָה} + (\textit{2})
\end{align*}
\]

There can be no doubt that our evidence fully upholds the ‘one recension’ (2) theory. But the existence of MSS like K 30, 93 96 150 (\textit{4}) to a very slight degree only. Today it seems that the expression ‘weak link’ used ISE, § 18 is an exaggeration, born out of caution. What remains in medieval MSS to make us suspect a reading as genetically connected with pre-medieval sources is next to nil. I am afraid that with the disappearance of the ‘weak link’ our view is fully validated and practical consequences will have to be drawn before long.

(1) While studying the so-called ‘Psalms Scroll’ (11QPs\textit{a}) it seemed at first sight as if readings from medieval MSS are uniquely paralleled by the scroll. What finally remained was

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ps 119,2} & \quad \text{MT} & \quad \text{בָּכַל} \text{ לֵב} \text{ הָרֶשׁוֹת} \\
11QPs\textit{a} & \quad \text{K245} & \quad \text{הַעַ} \textit{(3)}
\end{align*}
\]

For the problem of readings in that scroll cf. PSCT.

(\textit{2}) Some other MSS read תִּלְתִּיסָה instead of הָרֶשׁוֹת. No reading in Jeremiah approaches the ‘quality’ of מַעֲבָדִית quoted above pp. 280, 282 from Isa 18,\textit{4}.

(\textit{3}) According to the criteria applied here, the study of the variants — far from overthrowing the Lagardian thesis — comes almost near upholding it. Cf. above, § 17; n. 3, p. 268; n. 3, p. 278. It is rather for theoretical considerations that one is bound to limit LAGARDE’s formulation to being only ‘almost right’. I would go so far as to suggest that those studies during the past thirty-five years which have attempted to approach the problem by applying what amounts to structural criteria lead \textit{de facto} to this ‘almost right’ formulation — of course not in the way LAGARDE had pictured the process nor on the strength of his arguments. From a different point of view cf. the summary of HEMPEL, ZAW 1930, p. 95: “Mit ungeheurer Zähigkeit hat die Judenschaft der Zeit nach den staatlichen Katastrophen einen Text durchgesetzt, so dass nur geringe Spuren der einstigen Differenziertheit dem Schicksal der Ausmerzung entgangen sind. Das ist das Richtige an der These LAGARDE’s”.

(\textit{4}) The numbers may change, of course, from book to book. Cf. above, n. 2, p. 279 and below, n. 3, p. 287.
still remains a problem which forces us to tread cautiously. At least as long as we remain in the dark as to the state of MSS between the second and the ninth centuries, more than one explanation may be suggested (!). But no explanation which assumes the existence of what is in substance a greater diversity than can be encompassed within 'one recension' is acceptable.

28. The second line of inquiry (!) — the study and selection of readings as such, regardless of their source — could be hardly expected to yield results different from those suggested by Kennicott and his contemporaries. If every formal agreement between a reading in a Hebrew medieval MS and a pre-medieval source can be valued as indicative of a genetic connection (!), the result can be impressive, indeed. If that procedure is accepted, not only can the 'archetype'

(!) The possible influence of the type of codex — vulgar, private official, etc. — on the text has been suggested repeatedly. Cf., e.g., Tychsen, Befrøvetes Tentamen, p. 159; Strack, Prolegomena, 33; BMU, Ch. II. As regards the textual basis — as opposed to vocalization, etc. — no such differentiation emerges from the evidence at our disposal, although 'Listeners' Codices' were usually written with less care. It should be remembered that the four MSS quoted by us do not differ outwardly in any way from hundreds of other 'Massora'- or 'Study'-codices (according to the classification in BMU, loc. cit.). No evidence could be found for the existence of a vulgar sub-recension suggested by Hempel, ZAW, 1934, p. 254. In any case, during the last decade we have learned to be very hesitant in talking of 'vulgar' MSS. Cf. already TL, p. 67.

(!) It may be more than coincidence that this line of approach was developed in dissertations written under the guidance of H. S. Gehman. From the written material it does not seem that the approach taught by Gehman is a conscious theoretical renunciation of method, influenced by attitudes like the 'Critique Rationelle' in N.T. research. The remarks of W. H. Brownlee (cf. above, n. 2, p. 276) can be hardly termed a contribution to our discussion.

(!) Wevers, loc. cit., p. 75, maintains expressly "that the Hebrew variants have perpetuated pre-Massoretic traditions which were the basis for certain readings in G and the later Greek recensions". For Beling the comparison with the versions is sufficient proof "that these Hebrew variants from the Massoretic text in I Samuel are actually pre-Massoretic". North (cf. above, n. 2, p. 253) goes so far as to accept any Hebrew variant for his exegetical needs, without any corroboration from the versions, provided it meets the following conditions: it is contextually not less difficult than the received text, it seems not to be attributable to scribal error and it is explicable.
theory be disproved (1), but even the 'one recension' theory can be made to look questionable. We have as yet only one objective way to declare out of court the evidence gained by such indiscriminate hunting for readings (2): Our newly gained insight into the typological limitation of readings in medieval MSS as opposed to pre-medieval witnesses (3). But even if we admit this yardstick and accept the conclusion that all medieval MSS must be dealt with as one family, representing one recension or even 'almost' one archetype, there remain those very few instances (4) which make one wonder whether the 'one-recension' central current did not allow the occasional drop to trickle in from the side. It must, however, be stressed that while this remains a possibility, we have not yet encountered even one instance where the assumption of a genetic relationship between a MS from the Massoretic period (5) and a pre-medieval source differing significantly from the received text is an absolute necessity (6).

29. This position may be formulated in a slightly different fashion in order to ensure fairness to possible opponents. Almost all our evidence from medieval MSS would be explicable as a secondary

(1) WEVER’S dissertation was the first attempt to use the apparent identity of readings in Hebrew MSS with the Greek for disproving the ‘archetype’ theory. ARMSTRONG in his dissertation sets out to investigate also the truth in the thesis of O. H. BOSTROM, Alternative Readings in the Hebrew Book of Samuel, 1918. The main point of BOSTROM’S thesis had also been taken up by ZIMMERMANN (cf. above, n. 1, p. 266) and by WEVERS, JBL 65 (1946) 307 f. The whole issue has lately been studied extensively by S. TALMON.

(2) For me, personally, the issue is settled. The problem remains how to prove the case ‘objectively’.

(3) Cf. above, § 22.

(4) If we adopt the system of indiscriminate use of all MSS, the number of readings which are apparently connected in a significant way with pre-medieval witnesses is somewhat larger than in our example above, § 25, but incomparably smaller than suggested in the dissertation of WEVERS, etc. The material in ISE, Apparatus III may be used for illustrating the question.

(5) For the definition, see ISE, § 74e.

(6) It may be useful to remember that, of course, not all the apparently identical readings in a version, on the one hand, and Hebrew MSS from the first or second period, on the other hand, should be rated as genetically connected, the more so since the ‘law of scribes’ never ceased to be operative. Cf. above, § 22, and already TL, p. 67 f.
development from a common archetype (*) and practically all of it as belonging to one ‘recension’. Were it not for the disturbing ‘almost’, the whole chapter on medieval MSS could be regarded as closed and our apparatus be freed from them once and for all. But since scholars, especially during the first half of this century, were justly forced to the conclusion that our witnesses cannot be reduced to one archetype, we cannot be absolutely sure that a few extra-Massoretic variants did not trickle into the central current even after the recensional decisions or standardizations were carried out in the first and/or second centuries C.E. Once this possibility is not absolutely ruled out in theory — though of no consequence in practice — the door is thrown open for those who wish to maintain that we possess no sure yardstick to decide, whether in a given case we can unreservedly deny that formal identity between readings may be interpreted as genetic relationship. It lies in the nature of the subject that the case against genetic relationship is based on the analysis of the evidence as a whole and that those who wish to ignore the typological proof mentioned above may use that apparent excuse in order to go on declaring as ‘valuable’ any reading from Kennicott, etc. they fancy. I can do no more than hope that this attempt at pointing out that a tiny remnant of doubt cannot be overcome will not be misused, and that scholars will accept the position advocated here: that the possibility of infiltration of extra-Massoretical variants into the Massoretical ‘central current’ is so negligible that for all practical purposes it may be disregarded, and that medieval Hebrew MSS are therefore without practical value for any attempt to reach back into the early history of the Bible text (*).

30. Yet another point must be mentioned to which insufficient attention has been paid. Since no one in this century has independently worked through the evidence from medieval MSS for the whole

(*) For the present argument ‘archetype’ may be understood in the sense of a master model codex, the tradition of which served as a basis for correcting other MSS.

(2) Anyone who wishes to base a reconstruction of the Bible text on Hebrew medieval variants must offer specific proof for his procedure. But since it is inevitable that a considerable time will elapse before the view outlined here is more widely accepted, fellow students would justifiably find fault with an edition that completely ignores the Hebrew evidence and thus does not serve scholars of different persuasions and demands. Cf. above, § 7 and below, n. 1, p. 290.
Bible, it is inevitable that scholars tend to take the results gained in
the analysis of one book as indicative of the state in the entire Bible (¹).
In other fields of inquiry into the Bible text it has become customary
in recent years to sound a note of caution and to stress the demand
that each book, or group of books, of the Bible ought to be investigat­
gated in its own right and that the results gained for one book are not
necessarily valid for all the books of the Bible as a whole (²). In our
views of the growth of the Hebrew 'Massoretic Text', as gained from the
analysis of both medieval and pre-medieval MSS, there is nothing that
induces us to assume that the fate of all the books was absolutely
identical (³). On the other hand, we have as yet no reason to assume
slightly different histories for different books, apart from the obvious
slight differences of 'spread' of readings connected with the liturgic
position of the books (⁴). However, the analysis of readings such as in
the Book of Kings may at least justify the mentioning of the possi­
bility that different results may be obtained for different books (or
parts) (⁵) of the Bible and that, accordingly, we may have to reckon
with different 'breadths' of the 'central current' and different strengths
of the 'trickle' from the side. But whatever the possible slight dif­
fferences in detail — the main conclusion remains.

31. Our inquiry has thus brought us back to the point of departure
at the end of what we have termed the second period in the history
of Hebrew MSS, i.e., around 100 C.E. While future evidence may show

(¹) For the MS basis for our statements, cf. above n. 2, p. 281, and
n. 4, p. 282.
(²) Cf. ISE, § 10.
(³) For the difference of MSS as regards various books cf. above
n. 2, p. 279; n. 4, p. 283. Thus, e.g., for Kings K70 seems to stand out
and for 1 Sam also K 89 174 187 have to be considered. Among these
is K 89, the alleged age of which has given rise to discussions. But this
MS does not stand out at all in Isaiah.
(⁴) There exists as yet no comprehensive study of the relationship
between the 'spread' of variants and the liturgical use of the individual
book of the Bible. The relatively stronger standardization of the text
of the Peshitta in the Pentateuch is a case in point. Cf. also TL, p. 175.
In any case, the state in medieval Hebrew MSS is only one aspect of a
larger question. On the other hand, Samuel and Kings offer specific prob­
lems because of the parallel texts.
(⁵) Wevers is cautious enough to add that his results may hold true
only as regards the Book of Kings.
that the 'recension' was rather broader than we tend to assume now, and that the end of the second period must be pushed beyond the second century C.E. (¹), the analysis of Hebrew medieval MSS allows us at present to identify *grosso modo* the textual tradition of these MSS with that of the 'central current' tradition of *ca* 100 C.E. (²). However, as regards the choice of terms, the term 'recension' has acquired a sense slightly different from that understood in the generation of Rosenmüller. It is thus open to discussion because of the connotation of official interference (³). Since in the past whatever meagre evidence for 'official' approval and disapproval has been blown up into a picture of imposing the 'official' text of the Rabbis by force and consigning all rival texts to extermination (⁴), it may be more cautious to talk about the 'central current' tradition (⁵). On the other hand, the type of halachic discussion pursued by the Rabbis in the first century C.E. presupposes one more or less binding text. I prefer, therefore, the picture of a 'main current' tradition, constantly narrowing down (⁶) until its predominance ('central current') in the first century C.E. was a matter of course. The text used by the Tannaites for halachic discussions was, so to speak, the 'ideal' core of this tradition, with other texts, acceptable just as well to a broader public, differing from it only slightly. The 'official' text was thus part and parcel of a somewhat broader current of textual tradition and served at the same time as a

(¹) This possibility is mentioned here in order to stress that the view outlined here allows for marginal changes of facts which may be caused by future surprises. Cf. above, § 6.

(²) No further intermediary state is theoretically necessary (cf. above, § 6), but a certain breadth of the tradition with some further standardizing remains a possibility, though not on the exaggerated lines suggested by KAHLÉ.

(³) Cf. *ISE*, Ch. I, nn. 12, 15. The idea of official pressure appears in various descriptions under various guises. Cf., on the one hand, the statements mentioned above, n. 1, p. 265 and, on the other hand, e.g. VOLZ, *Studien zum Text des Jeremia*, 1920, p. xiv, who talks about the 'amtliche Arbeitsplan der Synagogue'. See also *ZAW* 54 (1936) 104 f. My resistance to previous exaggerations should not be interpreted as denying any 'officiality' altogether. Cf. *RTBT*, § 26.

(⁴) Cf. above, n. 1, p. 265, and *RTBT*, § 23 f.

(⁵) I am ready to accept any better term, if it helps to express the issue more clearly.

(⁶) Possibly with differences as regards different books; Cf. above, § 30.
centre for further standardization and unification. For binding halachic or liturgic purposes there was thus, in fact, one model text; that text became the 'ideal' centre of the tradition out of which it had grown, together with which it continued to exist, and which it re-influenced to the point of creating the illusion of there having been 'almost' an archetype.

32. I trust that the preceding discussion has shown how the investigation of the problem connected with the arrangement of the apparatus of the HUBP edition has led us to suggest a theory which accounts for the facts known so far, and how the theory has become inter-

(1) See above, n. 5 f., p. 246. For the view of R. Gordon, which takes into consideration the textual problem with regard to Rabbinic discussion, cf. above, n. 4, p. 269. Cf. also the views of S. Talmon, Textus 2 (1962) 14 f.; 4 (1964) 126 f. The Rabbinic discussion is such as presupposes one text, and the textual questions mentioned in it concern mostly plene and defective spellings. On the other hand, the analysis of readings in medieval MSS according to types shows quite clearly that the fluctuation was strongest in matters of copulative waw, prepositions, etc., as opposed to 'meaning-words', and with regard to the former full unification within the recension was probably never achieved. Hence the difficulty of dealing with these elements in the apparatus; cf. TL, p. 59 (which today I would formulate somewhat differently).

(2) To put it differently. Precisely because the differences had already become minimal, the texts could co-exist, until the few 'extra-central current' variants were finally swallowed up in the MSS or practically drowned in the mass of new secondary variants.

(8) Talking about Lagarde and Kahle above, n. 1, p. 257, and n. 1, p. 272) I have remarked on the tendency of scholars to advance the same type of explanation repeatedly for different sets of problems. Kahle's way of solving the problems in various fields of biblical textual studies by a 'pluralistic' theory is an outstanding example; cf. TL, p. 66 f. The main doubt in the correctness of my views remains that I, likewise, try to understand the development of the consonantal textus receptus on lines similar to those of my view on the development of a textus receptus of vocalization and accentuation, as outlined in RTBT. But if no mistakes as to the facts can be pointed out against my theory, I am ready to take the blame that I repeat myself in rejecting the imputation of highhanded arbitrariness of which, in turn, both the Tannaites and the Masoretes have been accused, unless specific and unequivocal proof is offered. If we have to allow for Lagarde's and Kahle's personal equations to have influenced their theories, I might as well let myself be influenced by my own. Cf. TPTC, n. 18. For a kindred discussion in N.T. textual criticism cf. now K. W. Clark, JBL 85 (1966) 5.
connected with the practice of constructing the apparatus of medieval MSS. The time is not yet ripe and the last remaining queries not yet fully disposed of. Hence an edition of this type cannot altogether dispense with the quotation of readings from medieval MSS (1). The practical solution — a separate apparatus exhibiting both full collations from MSS which appear to be of special interest and all the readings which may conceivably be judged by some scholars to be of value (2) — remains a compromise which, in practice, may not justify all the efforts bestowed on it. (3). I hope this discussion may turn out to be a modest contribution towards the clarification of our views on the history of the Bible text as a whole, and especially on Hebrew MSS — both on the level of suggesting a theory of textual development, and on the practical level of allotting a place to Hebrew MSS within the framework of the new edition of the Bible.

(1) In writing a text-critical study or commentary, unconnected with the HUBP edition, I would not hesitate leaving out those witnesses altogether. Cf. above, n. 2, p. 286.

(2) The separation of the medieval evidence in an apparatus of its own is for me a matter of principle. As for the size, it may be noted that Apparatus III in ISE gives the fullest selection to be published since the selection of J. C. Doederlein and J. H. Meisner, edited right after the publication of de Rossi's collations. Cf. ISE, §§ 16, 77.

(3) It has been our endeavour not to evade the problems posed on the theoretical level, even if the practical gain for the understanding of the Bible text is next to nil.
FÜR DEN biblischen Textkritiker ist die vollständige Isaias-Rolle
(1QIs*; in diesem Beitrag einfach mit "Qu" bezeichnet) der wert­
vollste Fund von Qumran; denn sie enthält eine Textform, die von dem
masoretischen Text ("M") in zahlreichen Varianten abweicht (im Gegen­
satz zur unvollständigen zweiten Isaias-Rolle, die M ganz nahe steht).
In vielen Abhandlungen ist der Textcharakter von Qu untersucht worden;
es seien hier die folgenden genannt (die Zahl in eckigen Klammern
bezeichnet die Nummer, unter der die Aufsätze in der von Chr. Burchard
zusammengestellten Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer,
Berlin 1957, stehen).
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Gelegentlich sind meine Arbeiten zur Is.- und Ier.-LXX zitiert:


Bei diesen textkritischen Untersuchungen von Qu mussten die Forscher auf Varianten stossen, die sich mit LXX-Lesarten berührten, und sie beurteilen. Dies ist auch bisweilen geschehen, aber gewöhnlich nur in kurzen Hinweisen und einfacher Aufführung der in Frage kommenden Stellen. Gottstein hat in seinem Beitrag über die Beziehung von Qu zu Pesch. Targ. auch jedesmal die LXX genannt, wenn sie mit Qu Pesch. Targ. gegen M zusammenging (es sind aber verschiedene fehlerhafte Angaben über die LXX gemacht).

Am ausführlichsten hat sich Orlinsky mit unserer Frage befasst und an zwei Einzelbeispielen ausführlich nachzuweisen versucht, dass die LXX-Lesarten nicht dazu berechtigen, die in Qu vorliegende Lesart auch in der Vorlage der LXX anzunehmen (siehe unter VIII zu 32 6 und 42 25). Orlinsky ist bekanntlich ein fanatischer Liebhaber von M und ebenso ein entschiedener Gegner von Qu: "MT has been transmitted unusually carefully, SM (=Qu), on the other hand, is an extraordinarily carelessly written text" *JNES*, 11 (1952), 155. Es ist Orlinsky zuzustimmen, wenn er davor warnt, bei Varianten, die in Qu und LXX über­einstimmen, auf die gleiche hebr. Vorlage zu schliessen, aber es ist doch etwas zu spitz formuliert, wenn er schreibt: "a more patient and sober study of DSI (=Qu) and G would have shown how reckless and baseless the idea of associating DSI with G’s Hebrew Vorlage really was" *JJS*, 2 (1950/51), 152. Im Verlauf dieser Untersuchungen wird gezeigt werden, dass LXX zwar in ihrer Vorlage oftmals wie M gelesen hat, dass sie aber auch die Lesart von Qu gekannt und benutzt hat.


Nur ein "subjektives Moment" kann man nicht umgehen, weil es in der "fallibilitas humana" seine Wurzel hat. Ein jeder, der Varianten notiert, weiss, wie gross hier das Versagen ist; so sagt Gottstein, *Bibl.*, 34 (1953), 212: "Man glaube aber nicht,
Eine besondere Schwierigkeit für unsere Studie liegt darin, dass (1) an manchen Stellen die LXX ganz anders liest als M (und Qu), so dass eine andere Vorlage angenommen werden muss, und dass (2) sehr oft frei wiedergegeben wird, so dass bei zwei verschiedenen Vokabeln in M und Qu nicht gesagt werden kann, welche LXX in ihrer Vorlage las. Einige Beispiele sollen genannt werden. Zu (1) sei 21 loa und 37 27c genannt. Infolge der völlig abweichenden Wiedergabe in LXX kann nicht gesagt werden, dass LXX die in Qu überlieferte Variante 21 io ma oder 37 27c unp ηΐΒΝΠ gelesen hat. Es wird so sein, dass LXX weder Qu noch M vor sich hatte, sondern einen anderen Text. Zu (2) mögen folgende Stellen zitiert werden:

13 10 (το φως οὐ) δόσουσι M; ἀιρετικό ζ. Qu.
13 16 (καὶ τὰς γυναικὰς αὐτῶν) ἔξουσιν] ἐξουσίαν M; ἀποκαλύπτει Qere Qu.
26 12 (εἰρήνην) δοῦσ (Ἱμων) τῇ σήμα M; ἀκοῦσε Qu.
48 21 (ὑδώρ . . .) ἐξάλειψι M; ἀκοὐβ Qu.

An allen Stellen lässt die freie Wiedergabe der LXX keinen Schluss auf die Vorlage zu. LXX kann sowohl M als auch Qu gelesen haben.

Deshalb bietet auch 47 13 die LXX-Wiedergabe οἱ ἀστρολόγοι keine Handhabe, um das Hapaxlegomenon des M ἀπεραντόλαθη als "entbehrlich" zu bezeichnen. Auch οἱ ἀστρολόγοι ist Hapaxlegomenon der LXX und dass hiermit das Rohmaterial erschöpft sei, und es wird noch so mancher 'Zusätze' bedürfen, bis alle Varianten definitiv verzeichnet sind." Dies ist jedoch wieder zu pessimistisch. Wenn die Sammlung der Varianten richtig gehandhabt worden wäre, dann hätte dies auf den ersten Hieb hin "definitiv" geschehen können. Deshalb seien hier drei Regeln genannt: (1) Man darf sich nicht mit einer Kollation begnügen, sondern muss eine zweite, ja sogar eine dritte machen, (2) man muss die Kollation immer zu zweien machen, weil man viel leichter die Varianten übersieht als überhört, (3) man muss die Kollationen langsam, ohne jede Hast, machen.

Die Sammlung der Varianten soll geordnet (konkordanzmässig) vorgelegt werden. Gewiss ist es notwendig, die Varianten nach Kapitel und Vers geordnet vorzulegen, wenn sie im Apparat der BH aufgenommen werden sollen. Wenn sie jedoch in einem Sonderheft erscheinen, dann ist eine geordnete Zusammenstellung (wie es bei den "Orthographika" der Göttinger Sept.-Ausgabe in der Einleitung geschieht) erforderlich. So bleibt es dem Benutzer erspart, noch einmal die Arbeit zu leisten, die der Sammler bereits gemacht hat. Bei dieser Darbietung der Varianten werden auch Versehen leichter ausgeschaltet. Zwei Beispiele seien genannt: (1) οἱ ἀστρολόγοι Qu, so (mit 1, bedeutet sam für die LXX, siehe unter VII), fehlt bei Eissfeldt, nachgetragen von Hempel, ZAW, 64 (1953), 64 und ZDMG, 101 (1951), 140, und Gottstein, Bibl., 34 (1953), 215: 7 1 (von Hempel übersehen); 7 5; 7 9, aber 7 4 fehlt das 1, und 8 6 ist eine Lücke im Ms. (2) ῥυόμεθα so mit 1, nicht mit τ, wie fehlerhaft die Ausgabe von Burrows hat: 14 7 (von Gottstein übersehen) und sonst überall, ausser 43 14; vielleicht mag diese Lesart (= M) andeuten, dass an dieser schwierigen Stelle nicht das Wort "Jubel" vorliegt. Somit wäre zu notieren: (1) οἱ ἀστρολόγοι ὦ ὄρασις θεοῦ θεοῦ 7 1, 5, 9; ἀλήθεια 7 4; 8 6 lacuna. (2) ῥυόμεθα 14 7; 44 23; 48 20; 49 13; 54 1; 55 12; 55 10; 51 11; 43 14 6 lacuna (cf. M).
im Anschluss an das folgende \(\text{oi \ ὁρῶντες τοὺς ἀστέρας} = \text{M Qu gewählt. Der Übersetzer hat höchst wahrscheinlich bereits die Lesart von M vor sich gehabt, die nicht anzutasten ist; dagegen ist Qu sekundär (gegen Nötscher, VT, 1 [1951], 299).}

II

Das Plus, das LXX Qu gegenüber M bezeugen, ist unbedeutend. Es betrifft zunächst (1) die Einfügung von Partikeln, die verhältnismässig häufig ist, und dann (2) die Einfügung einzelner Wörter und Wendungen, die selten ist.\(^3\)

(1) Sehr oft ist die Konjunktion von LXX (καί) und von Qu (1 copulativum) bezeugt, die in M fehlt.

\(\text{καί LXX =} \text{1 Qu] om. M.}\)

\begin{align*}
1 3; 1 8; 2 4; 3 7; 3 9; 3 19; 3 20; 3 21; 3 22; 5 6; 7 4; 13 8; 16 10; 16 41; 17 8; 17 14; (1\text{ auch }"20\text{ MSS}"); 30 19; 30 23; 31 5; 32 13; 34 2; 34 10; 34 16; 36 15; 38 5; 39 6; 40 17; 41 2; 41 3 (2\text{mal}); 42 7; 42 21; 43 17; 44 11; 44 16 (1\text{ auch }"42\text{ MSS}"); 44 19; 45 14; 45 16; 45 23; 46 3; 46 6; 47 11 (2\text{mal}); 48 13; 48 16; 48 18; 48 20; 49 9; 52 5; 52 9; 52 13; 52 15; 53 4; 53 5; 53 11; 55 13; 56 6; 57 4; 57 13; 58 8; 58 9; 60 7; 60 13; 60 18; 61 8; 62 4; 65 20; 66 8 (1\text{ auch }"Var Ka") : 68\text{ Fälle.}\n\end{align*}

\(\text{oūδε LXX =} \text{αὐδι Qu] αὐδ M.}\)

\begin{align*}
5 27; 13 18; 26 14; 35 9; 38 13 (2°); 40 28; 57 11; 64 4 (3): 8\text{ Fälle.}\n\end{align*}

\(\text{δέ LXX =} \text{1 Qu] om. M.}\)

\begin{align*}
26 11; 55 13 (1\text{ auch }"mlt\text{ HSS Q")}; 64 8 (7): 3\text{ Fälle.}\n\end{align*}

\(^3\) Es werden die gleichen Sigel und Abkürzungen wie in der Göttinger LXX-Ausgabe verwendet: S, A-Q, \(O\) (=B-V; hexaplarische Rezension), \(L\) (lukianische Rezension), \(C\) (Catenen-Gruppe), oI oII, \(l I l I I, c I c II\) (hexaplarische, lukianische, Catenen-Untergruppen). Bei starker Verteilung sind nur die Hauptzeugen genannt; wenn wenige Zeugen eine Lesart überliefern, dann sind alle Hss. aufgeführt.
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\[ \gamma \dot{a} \rho \text{ LXX} = \text{i Qu] om. M.} \]

2 11; 9 21 init. (19 fin. M); 41 29: 3 Fälle.

\[ \text{άλλα LXX} = \text{i Qu] om. M.} \]

7 17: 1 Fall.

Im ganzen sind es also 83 Fälle, wo LXX Qu die Konjunktion \( \text{et} \) bezeugen, während sie in M fehlt. Damit ist aber nicht gesagt, dass die LXX-Vorlage an allen Stellen auch \( \text{i} \) gehabt hat; manchmal mag der griech. Übersetzer sie aus eigenem beigefügt haben.

Hierher gehören auch 43 19 \( \text{ά νυν: cf. ἀνυν Qu] om. ά M und } \) 46 2 \( \text{oί oύ (δυνησονταί: cf. μὴν Qu] om. oί Bo Cypr.= M.} \)

An den genannten Stellen ist \( \text{και} \) einhellig bezeugt. Es lassen sich auch Stellen anführen, wo die Bezeugung von \( \text{και} \) geteilt ist, wo also nur einige Rezensionen, Textgruppen, Unzialen, Minuskeln und Väterzitate \( \text{και} \) überliefern, das als \( \text{i} \) auch in Qu steht.

1 18  \( \text{καθαροί γένεσθε=M]} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 93 130 ClemRom. Or. \( \text{ιατ=Qu.} \)

9 12 (11)  \( \text{έπι τούτων} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 538 Syr=Qu.

10 4  \( \text{έπι τούτων} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) C 403–613 Syr=Qu.

15 2  \( \text{πάντες} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) I I 449–770 Cyr.=Qu.

40 26  \( \text{oδέν} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) Syh=Qu.

41 2  \( \text{έκάλεσεν άνθην} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 309=Qu.

41 25  \( \text{κληθήσονται} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) L = Qu.

42 1  \( \text{κρίσιν} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) Bo=Qu et Matth 12 18.

42 11  \( \text{έπαύλειω} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) ai Iust.=Qu.

43 3  \( \text{έποίησα} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) Syr=Qu; pr. \( \text{oδου} \) 46 538 Sa.

45 21  \( \text{oύκ έστιν} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 233 534=Qu.

46 2  \( \text{oύκ} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 88 L=Qu.

46 13  \( \text{τώ Ισραήλ} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) Eus. Hi.=Qu.

52 2  \( \text{κάθισον} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) L c I I = Qu.

57 2  \( \text{εσται} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 106 88 147–233 Cypr.=Qu.

59 13  \( \text{έλαλήσαμεν} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) 88=Qu.

60 11  \( \text{oύ} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) L=Qu.

61 6  \( \text{λειτουργοί} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) A–86–106 449–770 538 Bo=Qu.

63 10  \( \text{άντόσ} \) pr. \( \text{και} \) S* A C=Qu “50 MSS.”

An keiner einzigen Stelle kann mit Sicherheit gesagt werden, dass die genannten Zeugen in der hebr. Vorlage \( \text{i} \) gelesen haben, weil sie nicht nach ihr ausgerichtet sind, ausgenommen 42 11 (Iust.). Es könnte der Fall sein bei \( \text{L}; \) aber auch für Lukian ist der Stil, nicht der hebr. Text entscheidend. Nur an der zuletzt genannten Stelle (63 10) ist sehr wahrscheinlich \( \text{και} \) ursprünglich.
In den beiden Zusätzen 34 10 und 43 23 ist καί nicht einheitlich bezeugt:

34 10 ✱ καί (hab. Sc o II L = QU; om. V = M) ouk εστιν ... 
43 23 ο ν δ ε (Sc A cII = QU; ouk V oI II L C = M) ἐδουλευσας ...

Oft steht der Artikel in LXX Qu, während er in M fehlt.

8 9; 23 8; 44 23; 52 10 τ ἦς γῆς = QU] om. τ ἦς M.
8 22; 45 9 τ ἦ ν γῆν.
9 19 (18); 24 20 ἦ γῆ.
14 12; 63 15 ἐκ τ οῦ οὐρανοῦ.
14 16 ὁ παροξύνων.
19 6 ο ἑ ποιμαίοι.
23 7 ἦ ὃβρις.
32 11 τ ἁ σ ὁσφαίας.
34 3 τ ἁ ὅρη.
41 18 τ ἦ ν ἐρήμων.
45 10 ὁ λέγων.
52 14 ἀπὸ τ ὃ ν ἀνθρώπων.

Während an den genannten Stellen der Artikel einhellig überliefert ist, findet er sich an den folgenden Stellen nur in einigen Zeugen.

1 2 γη = M] pr γ 147–36 410 534 538 613 = QU.
14 16 σείων = M] pr. o 88 L C = QU.
66 2 τρέμοντα] pr. τον lI 544 = QU.

Noch unsicherer als bei der Konjunktion τ lässt die Setzung des Artikels in der LXX einen Schluss zu, dass er bereits in der hebr. Vorlage gestanden habe und dass somit die LXX-Vorlage und Qu in der Setzung des Artikels übereingestimmt hätten. Man kann deutlich beobachten, dass oft der Artikel sekundär ohne Rücksicht auf die Vorlage aus stilistischen Gründen eingefügt worden ist. Auch die Einfügung von τ in Qu ist sekundär; deutlich zeigt dies 33 9 τ γη = QU] om. τ M Qu*.

Auch parallele oder benachbarte Stellen erweisen, dass die Setzung bzw. Unterlassung des Artikels in LXX keinen Schluss auf die Vorlage ziehen lässt:

23 8 ἀρχοντες τ ἦς γῆς = QU] om. τ ἦς M; vgl. 23 9 παῦ ἐνδοκέ απὶ τ ἦς (> M Qu) γης.
63 15 ἐκ τ οῦ οὐρανοῦ = QU] om. τοῦ M parallel ἐκ τ οῦ (> M Qu) οἶκον.

4 Siehe meine Beiträge zur Ier.-Sept., S. 114–169. Vierter Beitrag: Der Artikel in der Ier.-LXX.
Dies gilt besonders für den Is.-Übersetzer, der bekanntlich seine Vorlage frei wiedergibt.

Pronomina sind selten von LXX Qu gegenüber M bezeugt.

Pronomen separatum.

65 3  α ὑ τ ο i = Qu > M.
36 11 καὶ εἴπει π ῥ ὁ s α ὑ τ ὅ ν = Qu om. πρὸς αὐτόν M.
48 17 ἐ n ὲ ἡ πορεύσῃ ἐ n α ὑ τ ἡ = Qu om. ἐ n ἡ ἡ et ἐ n a ὑ τ ἡ M.
66 21 λήμψωμαι ἐ μο i S A (ἐμαυτω)-Q C = Qu om. ἐ μο i O L = M.

Suffixum nominale.

1 31 ἡ ἵσχύς a ὑ τ ὄ ν et aî ἐγγάζαι a ὑ τ ὄ ν = Qu om. a ὑ τ ὄ ν (bis) M.
26 18 σωτηρίας σ ὁ ν = Qu om. σ ὁ ν M (im Text habe ich οὐκ für σοῡ geschrieben).
53 12 διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας a ὑ τ ὄ ν ν = Qu om. a ὑ τ ὄ ν ν M.
40 21 ἵσχύος = M] + αὐτόν 87* Sa = Qu.

Suffixum verbale.

44 13 ἔστησεν αὐτό = Qu om. αὐτό M.
49 7 ὁ ὤσάμενος σε = Qu om. σε M.
65 1 τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν = Qu om. ἐμὲ M.

Präpositionen.

34 12 ε ἵς ἀπώλειαν: cf. Qu ἰσχυρὸ] om. ε ἵς M.
55 9 ὦ ἵς ἀπέχει = Qu om. ὦ ἵς M.
62 5 ὦ ἵς συνοικῶν = Qu om. ὦ ἵς M.
64 10 (ὁ) ὦ ἵς έρημος = Qu om. ὦ ἵς M.
66 3 ὦ ἵς ὁ ἀποκτέννων = Qu om. ὦ ἵς M.

4 9 14 (13) ἐ v μιὰ ἡμέρᾳ = Qu om. ἐ v M.
37 38 ἐ v τῶ ὦ ὁ ὁ κω = Qu om. ἐ v M.
43 23 ἐ v ταῖς δυνασίας σου = Qu om. ἐ v M.
6 10 καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ: cf. ὑλοβολή Qu] om. ἦλλοβολή M.
57 15 ἐ v ἀγάλαι 2°: cf. ἐκβασία Qu] ἐκβασία M.

5 31 1 ε ἵς ἄγνυπτον = Qu om. ε ἵς M.
45 18 ε ἵς κενὸν = Qu om. ε ἵς M.
49 4 καὶ ε ἵς οὐθέν = Qu om. ε ἵς M.
18 e ὁ λαοῦ = Qu (parallel ἀπὸ ὁ λαοῦ = Qu M) om. e ὁ M, vgl. Hempel, ZDMG, 101 (1951), 167: "das hochgewachsene Volk wird nicht als Gabe dargebracht, sondern stiftet selbst Gaben."

29 ἀπὸ οἴνου = Qu] om. ἀπὸ Μ; es geht voraus ἀπὸ (> Qu Μ) σικέρα.

Sonstige Partikeln.

7 ὅταν γάρ = Qu] om. γάρ M.

48 ὅτι ἀδετῶν = Qu] om. ὅτι M.

58 τοῦ μὴ ποιεῖν = Qu] om. μὴ M.

38 οὔδε οἵ ἀποδηλώντες = Qu] om. οὔδε M.

54 ἐπὶ σοῦ ἔτι = Qu] om. ἔτι M.

62 ἀλλ' ἦ S = A–Q C = ἢ Λει κ ο] om. ἦ S* O L = M.


(2) Bedeutsam sind die folgenden Wörter und Wendungen, die in LXX Qu stehen, dagegen in M fehlen.

37 καὶ ἄκούσας ἀ π ἐ σ τ ῶ ρ ἐ ψ ε = Qu] om. ἀ π ἐ σ τ ῶ ρ ἐ ψ ε M; vgl. unter X “Dubletten.”

36 ἐ οὶ Βαβυλώνα η ἔ = Qu] om. η ἔ M.

51 τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε καὶ ἐν τῶ ν π α σ reactstrap = Qu] om. π α σ reactstrap M.

56 ὄ βασιλεύς = Qu.

36 τῶν ἀνδρώπων τῶν] + κα θη η μ ε ν ω ν A cI II = Qu; + ἐ στη-κοτων V–Qmπ–οI II L C.

36 ὁ βασιλεύ[ις] + α σ ν ρ ω ν 26 407 538 Sa = Qu.
An den Stellen 49; 51; 53; 60 haben LXX Qu das Ursprüngliche erhalten; deshalb ist ihre Lesart als Text anzunehmen und zu übersetzen, siehe meinen Isaias-Kommentar der "Echter-Bibel" III (Würzburg, 1958) zu den einzelnen Stellen. Die übrigen Stellen sind in exegetischer Hinsicht nicht so wichtig; hier scheinen sekundäre Erweiterungen vorzuliegen, die M nicht kennt. Zu 56 ist zu bemerken, dass nicht "innergriechisch" (so Gottstein, Bibl., 35 [1954], 63) ist, sondern LXX in ihrer Vorlage gelesen hat (BH retrovertiert und setzt aber mit Recht ein Fragezeichen hinzu); auch sonst hat andere hebr. Äquivalente. An den beiden letzten Stellen, wo die Bezeigung der mit Qu übereinstimmenden griech. Lesart geteilt ist, braucht nicht die hebr. Lesart in der LXX-Vorlage angenommen zu werden.

III

Die Stellen, an denen LXX Qu ein Minus gegenüber M haben, sind nicht so zahlreich wie die, welche ein Plus bezeugen. Auch hier kann man unterscheiden: Auslassung (1) von Partikeln und (2) von einzelnen Wörtern.

(1) om. kal LXX Qu hab. M. 1 24; 6 1; 8 11; 13 22; 14 13; 17 8 (2mal); 30 23; 33 9; 37 20; 44 7; 45 11; 46 4; 46 13; 48 5; 48 7; 50 2; 51 16; 51 22; 56 3; 58 2; 64 4 (3); 64 6 (3); 65 7.

Dies sind 24 Fälle (beim Plus 83). Dies zeigt, dass LXX Qu gegenüber M sekundär sind; denn die asyndetische Verbindung ist ursprünglich.

An einigen Stellen lassen nur einige Zeugen kal bzw. δé aus:

43 8 kal ὑπόθαλμοι = M] om. kal 22–93 = Qu.
43 10 kal ἐπιλείπτομαι = M] om. kal 393 = Qu.
49 21 τοῦτος δέ = M ἡλικία] om. δέ 534 Tert. = Qu.
54 16 ἐγώ δέ = M ἡμίκον] om. δέ 88–oIII III 49* Bo = Qu.

Das Fehlen von kal besagt nicht, dass die genannten Zeugen nach einer hebr. Vorlage ausgerichtet worden wären, die wie Qu 1 nicht hatte.

An nur 3 Stellen fehlt der Artikel in LXX Qu, während er in M steht: 11 5; 64 8 (7); 66 22.

Siehe Beiträge zur Ier.-Sept., S. 35. Vgl. auch 57 2 δ σ τα λ ἐν ἐλπίδι νωτια.
Auch hier hat der Übersetzer nur frei wiedergegeben, wenn er den Artikel nicht setzt.

**Pronomina (Suffixa)** fehlen selten.

11 15 πνεύματι = Qu] + eius M.
13 9 καὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτωλοὺς = Qu] + eius M.
21 14 ἄρτοις = Qu] + eius M.
26 8 ἡλπίσαμεν = Qu] + te M.
42 3 οὐ σβέσει = Qu] + eam M.
45 11 ὁ ποιήσας = Qu] + eum M.
46 6 ἐποιήσαν = Qu] + eum M.
48 15 ἐκάλεσα = Qu] + eum M.
63 11 ὁ ἀναβιβάσας = Qu "pc MSS"] + eos = M.
5 27 κοπιάσουσιν = Qu] + in eo M.

**Sonstige Partikeln**

44 20 Ψευδός = Qu] pr. καὶ M (δότι 1° 2° von LXX eingefügt).
52 6 τὸ δυναμὸ μου = Qu] + ※ δια τουτο V C = M et oi γ'.
60 20 δύσεται = Qu] + ※ ετι = M et oi λ'.

(2) Einzelne Wörter fehlen manchmal in LXX Qu, während sie in M stehen. Das “Füllwort” esse fehlt 2mal, omnis 4mal.

3 24 κονιορτός = Qu] + erit M.
7 23 ἐκεῖνῃ = Qu] + ※ εσται L C = M et π'.

11 9 τὸ δρός = Qu] pr. omne M = σ' εν παντὶ τω ορεί.
14 18 ἐκουμηνήσαν = Qu] pr. omnes illi M.
21 16 ἡ δόξα = Qu] pr. omnis M.
56 6 om. πάντας Sa = Qu] hab. πάντας rel. = M.

Die Zufügung in M ist wohl sekundär.

An folgenden Stellen fehlen die genannten (manchmal in O L C vorhandenen) Wörter in LXX Qu.

26 3 fin. = Qu] + ελπιδι O L = M.
26 5 καταβαλεῖσ = Qu] + humiliabit eam M.
26 6 πατήσουσιν αὐτὰς = Qu] + pes M.
36 11 ἰωάχ = Qu] + ※ προς τον ραψακην V L C = M.
62 10 πορεύεσθε = Qu] + ※ πορεύεσθε Q mn- oI 403 Eus. = M.

Überall wird M den Vorzug gegenüber LXX Qu haben.
An einigen Stellen fehlen die genannten Wörter nur in einigen Zeugen der LXX und in Qu.

Die Auslassungen, die Qu LXX gegenüber M haben, sind der Zahl und dem Umfang nach unbedeutend, besonders dann, wenn man sich vor Augen hält, wie oftmals LXX ein Minus gegenüber M Qu hat, das dann Origenes gewöhnlich sub asterisco aufgefüllt hat. Nur zwei Stellen können genannt werden, wo LXX Qu im Minus gegenüber M übereinstimmen, und von ihnen kommt eigentlich nur die erste in Frage, nämlich 40 7–8, die bereits Kahle, ThLZ, 74 (1949), 93, besprochen hat: "Wir sehen, dass der Text der Rolle genau der hebräischen Vorlage der LXX entspricht." An der zweiten Stelle 55 1 fehlen in Qu infolge Homoioteleuton die drei Verba natp, dagegen in LXX nur die beiden letzten, die von V L P C Κ και πορευεσθε και αγορασατε aus δ' ergänzt worden sind. Hier wird LXX den ursprünglichen Text bezeugen, vgl. BH.

IV

In der Wortfolge stimmen LXX Qu gegenüber M an nur wenigen Stellen überein.

Somit ist die Wortfolge nur selten geändert. Dies ist umso auffallender, als LXX sehr oft gegen M umstellt und ebenso Qu (siehe die Stellen bei Eissfeldt "invers"). Wenn hier LXX mit Qu zusammengeht, so ist damit nicht gesagt, dass bereits in der Vorlage der LXX die Umstellung vorhanden gewesen sein muss. Nur 60 7 haben LXX Qu die ursprüngliche Wortfolge bewahrt, siehe BH und die Kommentare.
Sehr zahlreich sind die grammatisch-syntaktischen Varianten, die LXX Qu gegen M bezeugen.

(1) Numerus.

1 18 ὡς φοινικόν = Qu “4 MSS”] plur. M (parallel ὡς κόκκινον = Qu M).
14 11 τὸ κατακάλυμμά σου = Qu “66 MSS”] plur. M.
15 2 ἐπὶ πάσης κεφαλῆς = Qu plur. M.
43 23 τῆς ὀλοκαρπώσεως σου = Qu] plur. M.
63 15 ἡ ἱσχύς σου = Qu] plur. M.

26 6 πραέων = Qu] sing. M (neben ταπεινῶν = Qu M).
32 7 ταπεινῶν = Qu] sing. M (parallel ταπεινῶν = Qu M).
53 9 τοὺς πλουσίους = Qu*] sing. Qu M (parallel τοὺς πονηροὺς = Qu M).

37 19 und 60 21 ἕργα (χειρῶν).
41 2 κατὰ πόδας αὐτοῦ.
47 7 τὰ ἔσχατα.
57 10 ταῖς πολυνοσίαις σου.
58 3 τὰς ψυχὰς ἰμῶν.
59 5 ἀσπίδων.
64 6 (8) διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἰμῶν.

43 6 ἀπ’ ἄκρων: cf. Qu] απ’ ἄκρων S ol J TyC. = M.
66 19 σημεῖα S* A–Q* = Qu] σημείων S* O–Q* L C = M.

36 12 πρὸς ὄμας = Qu] sing. M (ad le).
56 5 αὐτοὶς 2° = Qu et α’σ’δ’] sing. M (ei).

9 21 (20) φάγεται = Qu] plur. M; “le ms. fait commencer le verset 20 par ἦλθει comme la Sept.” Barthélemy, RB, 57 (1950), 541.
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12 4 καὶ ἑρεῖς = Qu (wie 12 i καὶ ἑρεῖς = Qu M)] plur. M (et dicitis).

16 4 ἀπώλετο = Qu] plur. M (Subjekt ὁ ἄρχων ὁ καταπατῶν = Qu M; BH "l ὁσσον").

33 23 ἀρεῖ = Qu] plur. M.


42 11 εὐφράνηθητι = Qu] plur. Syh = M.

62 2 καὶ καλέσει σε = M] et vocabunt Tyc. = Qu.


5 3 οἱ ἐνουκούντες = Qu] sing. M (LXX übersetzt das kollektive ὕσσω mit dem Plural, wie auch sonst, vgl. nur 12 6a LXX plur. gegen Qu M sing.).


7 1 ἡδυνήσασαν = Qu et M LXX IV Reg 16 s] sing. M (vielleicht ist der Plur. ursprünglich, vgl. BH).


14 32 ἀποκριθήσονται = Qu] sing. M (LXX hat als Subjekt βασιλεῖ ἀνίπτομε, Qu M scheint verderbt zu sein, vgl. BH).

16 10 εὐφράνηθησονται = Qu] sing. M (neben παρῆσονων gegen Qu M sing.; LXX übersetzt frei, da sie die Vorlage nicht versteht).

21 9 συνετρίβησαν = Qu] sing. M (LXX ändert die Satzkonstruktion und nimmt ἀγαλματα, χειροποῖητα als Subjekt).

23 2 διαπερῶντες = Qu] sing. M (Subjekt οἱ ἐνουκούντες = Qu M, und metαβάλοι X Qu M sing.).

30 20 ἐγγίσωσόι σοι = Qu] sing. M (Subjekt οἱ πλανῶντες σε = Qu M).


Das Zeichen X besagt, dass in den genannten Zeugen entgegengesetzte Lesarten stehen, steht also dem Gleichheitszeichen = gegenüber.
36 7 λέγετε = Qu et M IV Reg 18 22] sing. M et LXX IV Reg (die Rede folgt im Plural: πεποίηθαμεν = Qu M).
41 25 ἐρχέσθωσαν = Qu] sing. M (Subjekt ἄρχοντες = Qu M).
51 3 εὐρήσουσιν = Qu] sing. M Niphal (in LXX aktive Form).
56 6 τοὺς φυλασσομένους = Qu] sing. M (LXX hat überall Pluralformen in diesem Vers = Qu M).
57 20 κυνωνισθήσονται = Qu (Subjekt οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι).
58 5 καλέστε = Qu] vocabis Cypr. Spec. = M.
6 3 ἐκκεκραγον S A-Q L C (87c) = Qu] ekekragen B 87* = M.
45 24 ἡξουσί S c A-Q = Qu "21 MSS Seb"] ἡξει S* O L C = M.

(2) Tempus.

2 11 καὶ ταπεινωθῆσεται = Qu] perf. M (parallel καὶ υψωθῆσεται X Qu M).
5 5 ἁφελῶ = Qu] infin. abs. M (parallel καθελῶ X Qu M).
5 12 ἐμβλέποντι = Qu] fut. M (parallel κατανοοῦσί = Qu M).
8 2 μάρτυρας . . . ποίησον = Qu (vgl. die Imperative 8 1 Λὰβε und γράψον = Qu M).
14 24 ἐσται = Qu] perf. M (parallel μενεῖ = Qu M).
17 13 καὶ ἀποσκορακεῖ = Qu] perf. M (es folgt διώξεται X Qu M).
26 19 ἐγερθήσονται . . . καὶ εὔφρανθήσονται = Qu et οἱ λ'; α' δ'] imperat. M (es geht voraus ἀναστήσονται = Qu M; nach BH sind die Futurformen zu lesen).
27 6 καὶ ἔξανθησει = Qu] perf. M (neben βλαστήσῃ = Qu M)
28 16 (Ἰδοῦ ἐγώ) ἐμβαλῶ (besser ἐμβάλλω) = ἔστω Qu] perf. M (nach ἔστω steht gewöhnlich das Partizip; deshalb fordert BH ἐστί).
29 11, 12 (2°) καὶ ἐρεῖ = Qu] perf. M (das Futur ist in LXX stilistisch gefordert, vgl. καὶ ἐρεῖ 1° v. 12 X ἔρει Qu M).
33 10 λέγει = Qu] ἔρει M (LXX λέγει im Anschluss an die häufige Formel λέγει κύριος).
41 7 ἐρεῖ = Qu] part. M (ἔρει stilistisch notwendig, vgl. καὶ ἐρεῖ 41 6 fin.).
καὶ ἔδωκα = Qu] imperf. M ἐπιτύχω (es geht voraus καὶ ἔμισαν; BH fordert mit Qu die Punktierung ˝κ˝).
καὶ πορεύσονται = Qu] perf. M (parallel ἀείχυνθῆσονται καὶ ἐντραπῆσονται × Qu M).
καὶ (>Qu) συναχῆσονται . . . καὶ ἀκούσονται = Qu] imperat. M
άγαπῶν σε: cf. ἐρωτάσι Qu] perf. M.
ἀνοίγει 2° = Qu] imperf. M (bei ἀνοίγει 1° auch Qu wie M imperf.).
πῆξον: cf. ὁ Qu] imperf. plur. M ἤ (πῆξον = ἤ Qu BH; in v. z nur Imperative).
καὶ ἐκλέξονται = Qu] perf. M (parallel φυλάζονται = Qu M).
πεποίησαν . . . τίκτουσι = Qu] infin. abs. M (auch die beiden anderen absoluten Infinitive sind mit λαλοῦσι und κύουσι übersetzt).
καὶ αἰνέσουσι = Qu] perf. M (neben φάγονται und πίνονται = Qu M).
οὐκ ἔγνω = Qu] imperf. M (parallel οὐκ ἔγνω = Qu M).
καὶ ἔστην = Qu] imperf. M (vgl. BH).

(3) Wechsel der Person.
καλέσεις = M] -σει S 311–46 = Qu.
δῷσθε = Qu] videbunt (oculi tui) M.
ἡνοίζα -Cas 564 239 410 534 Sa = Qu; apertum est M (siehe unter VIII).
τοῦ λαοῦ μοὶ u v = M] του λαου αυτοῦ Syr = Qu.
χειρών πολύ v τ ο u = Qu] χ. μ o u II lII-233 Tht. = M.
ὁ πλάσας με = M] o πλ. σε 534 Sa = Qu.
(ὁ παρακαλῶν) se = Qu] πιέ M.
ἀναβιβάσει σε . . . ψωμεῖσε = Qu] et sustollam te . . . et cibabo te M.

(4) Genus.
καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ = Qu] πρὶ M.
ἐν ταῖς πλατείαισι αὐτὸ σ = Qu] εν ταις πλ. α u τ o u M.
Zahlenmässig sind es somit viele Stellen, wo LXX und Qu gegen M übereinstimmen. Aber bei diesen grammatikalisch-syntaktischen Varianten muss man sehr vorsichtig sein, wenn man auch sagen will, dass LXX überall so wie Qu in ihrer Vorlage gelesen hat. An den meisten Stellen forderte der griechische Stil, nicht die hebräische Vorlage, die mit Q übereinstimmende Wiedergabe.

VI

In der Vokalisierung (Punktation) treffen LXX und Qu manchmal zusammen.

5 28 ὁς στερεά πέτρα = Καί χρόνιον Qu [Επάθος M].
14 32 βασιλεία = ἡ παλαιά Qu [Βασιλεία M].
15 3 περιχώσασθε = Καὶ εὐχαρίστησε Qu [Προσέξασθε M].
21 7 ἀναβάτην 1° 2° und 21 9 ἀναβάτης = Καὶ ὧν Qu [Θυρίων Μ].
27 1 ἰσχύουσα = ἀρχὴ Qu [Βίβλος Μ].
34 13 αἰλή = ἀφέσις Qu [Αἰλίνα Μ].
40 10 μετὰ λαχεῖον = λαθος Qu, vgl. Hempel, ZAW, 61 (1945/48), 282] λαθός M.
40 26 καὶ ἐν κράτει (ähnlich a’ θ’ καὶ κράτους) = Καὶ ἐν κράτει Qu [Αἰμιλία M].
41 26 ἀληθῆ = καὶ ζητήσε Sh Qu [Αἰμιλία Μ].
49 17 οἰκοδομηθήσει (ähnlich a’ θ’ οἰκοδομηθήσεις se) = Καὶ οἰκοδομηθήσει Qu [Αἴγινον M = σ’ οι οὐσί οὐ].
53 3 καὶ εἰδὼς = ἡ τιμὴ Qu [Καὶ εἰδὼς Μ].
53 12 καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας (besser ἀνομίας) αὐτῶν = λέγεται οἱ ἀμαρτίες Qu [Αἴγινοι Μ].
54 11 καὶ τὰ θεμελία σου = τὰ σκέπασθε Qu [Καὶ τὰ θεμελία Μ].
55 10 εἰς βρῶσιν = ἐν θρήσκει Qu [Εἰς βρῶσιν Μ].
57 15 ἐν ἀγίοις 2° = ἐν θρήσκει Qu [Ἐν θρήσκει Μ].
66 2 καὶ (+τον lI 544 = Qu, siehe unter II) τρέμουσα = ἀρχὴ Qu [Καὶ τρέμουσα Μ].
66 12 τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν = ἀνθρώποι Qu [Τὰ παιδία ἀνθρώποι Μ].


Bei den übrigen Stellen kann man geteilten Meinung sein, ob die Punktation des M oder die Lesart der LXX Qu den Vorzug verdient.

19 Σόδομα: cf. Qu, ebenso an allen Stellen.
19 Γομора: cf. Qu, ebenso an allen Stellen.
71 (vios) Ρουμελίου: cf. Qu, ebenso 7 5; 7 9; 8 6; aber 7 4 (LXX aliter) steht in Qu, also ohne η, siehe Anm. 2.
15 5 Σηγηρω: cf. Qu, ebenso.
21 13 Δεδαν V 544 Bo Hi. (δαδαν S A Q C): cf. M, ο' σ' δωδανυμ = L Qu.
36 3 Σομνας: cf. Qu, ebenso 36 11, 22; 37 2.


In M haben viele Eigennamen die langen altertümlichen Endungen ιΠ'-, während in Qu die kurzen Endungen τη'- stehen. Auch in der LXX sind durchweg die Eigennamen in der Art von Qu geschrieben, vgl. Ἰσαίας, Εζεκίας, Οζ'ς usw. Auch hier kann LXX wie M in ihrer Vorlage gelesen haben; aber ebenso war ihr die Form in Qu bekannt.


Doppeltes ο liest Qu 23 1, das auch LXX voraussetzt Κιτιέων (κιτιέων S A B C; χετειαμ 239–306m), und 23 12 Κιτιέις, wo auch M Ketib heißt (M Qere aber Ketib). Auch 23 1 ist nach LXX Qu zu lesen.

Die zuletzt genannten Stellen zeigen, dass keine Konsequenz vorhanden ist. Dies ist auch allgemein in Bezug auf die Transkription der Eigennamen zu beobachten. In Qu stehen noch viele andere Eigennamen mit dem o-Laut, der aber in LXX keine Aufnahme gefunden hat, z. B. 20 1 Ταναδαν (δαναν Q= M) Χρον η Qu.
VIII

Buchstaben-Vertauschung

1 | 18 6 kai kataleípsi: cf. Qu, M; vgl. Loewinger, 
   VT, 4 (1954), 81.
1 | 21 2 oi πρέσβεις = ζωρίς Qu, M.
22 | 24 ἐνδόξος = κόρη Qu (vid.) = θέσεις M.
33 | 13 γυνώσωνται = ζωρίς Qu, M.
37 | 13 Σεπφαρ(ε)υμ A L ci = μιμητικά Qu seppharom μ O-Qmä:
   cf. sepphar.

52 5 kai ὠλοθύπητε: cf. ὀλοθυπήτε Qu, M.
1 | 16 9 τὰ δένδρα σου: cf. ἄρα Qu, M; BH: "ἀρχάγγελος"
5 | 9 (18) διὰ θυμὸν = θυμὸν Qu, ἀνάμ 
46 6 εκ μαρσιππίου = μαρσιππίου M en marssippio 534 Bo
   = 'bac Qu.
15 9 Ρεμμων = διήθων V Eus.; διῆθω 87–91; διήθων 309–490 =
   τιρίν Qu; διήθων B et ο γ’ διήθων = ίμιο Qu, M.
65 14 εν εὕφροσύνη = μιμή Qu, M.
14 17 eis (ος 88 93 87* 566 Cyr.1em) oυθέν: cf. ἀπεστάσει Qu, M.
14 44 ως (ωσεί) ἀνά μέσον = οπίς Qu "10 MSS"] = 
   οπίς M.
28 21 εν τῇ φάραγγι = θεμέλιον Qu, M.
23 10 ἐργάζονται = οὐριον Qu, M.
29 23 ως Δαυὶ = ραβίν Qu, M, vgl. Loewinger, VT, 4
   (1954), 82.
14 14 ὁ ἐπιστουβασθής: cf. ἐπιστούμεν Qu, M.
51 9 πλατος (im hexaplar. Zusatz) =
   μαρθών Qu, M.
56 10 ἐνπτυμαζόμενοι = μιμή Q, Μ; p l MSS” οὐθέν Qu.
42 25 ὁργηθὲν (ὑπακού αὐτοῦ) = 
   μαρθών Qu, M.
48 8 ἡνοιξας 564 239 410 534 Sa = μαρθών Qu, Miaoia rel.;
   μαρτών M; siehe oben unter V (3).
63 11 ό ἀναβασίας = μιμή Qu, M. "pc MSS"
9 4 (3); 66 6 Ἀδαμαῖ = χρωμ Qu, M.
35 9 εὐρεθῇ = ἀντὶ Qu, M.
64 9 (8) εν καρφὶ = 
   μιμή Qu, M.
28 22 kai ὑμεῖς = μιμή, vgl. Loewinger, VT, 4
   (1954), 82; cf. 
   ἀναθέτη τον Qu, M.
12 31 8 οἰκ. = μιμή Qu, M. "Köv"
12 49 5 πρὸς αὐτῷ = μιμή Qu, M. "9 MSS Q"] M.
2 2 (καὶ ἥξουσιν) επι αὐτό ὑπὲ 
   μιμή Qu et ἀπὸ LXX Mich 4 1] 
   ἔστω M etc.
17 8 (πεποίθοτες ὄσον) επὶ ὑπὲ Qu, M.
22 5 (πλανῶταί) ἐπὶ (τὰ δρη) ὑπὲ Qu, M.
36 7 Ἐπὶ (κύριον ... πεποίθαμεν) ὑπὲ Qu, M.
22 15 (Πορευοῦ ... ) πρὸς (Σομμαν) ὑπὲ Qu, M.
29 12 (καὶ δοθήσεται ... ) εἰς χέιρας (ἀνθρώπων) ὑπὲ Qu, M.
BH empfiehlt die Lesart von Qu LXX an folgenden Stellen: 40 17; 44 4; 23 10; 14 4; 42 25; 63 11; 49 5; von den genannten Stellen schwächt sie ihre Empfehlung durch "frt" oder "prb" ab: 23 10; 42 25; 63 11. Wenn hier LXX Qu zusammengehen, so ist nicht immer damit erwiesen, dass der Übersetzer auch so in seiner Vorlage gelesen hat. Dies gilt besonders für die Präpositionen ὑπό und ἐν; sie sind teilweise durch das Verbum bedingt, so ώτι 17 8 36 7 durch πεποιθεῖαι, ebenso εἰς 29 12 durch διδοίναι (im vorausgehenden Vers 11 ist die gleiche Wendung frei mit dem Dativ δῶσιν αὐτῷ άνδρόπως wiedergegeben; deshalb ist die Notiz in BH "1 c G ἡ" hinfällig) und vor allem 65 6, 7 durch die Wendung ἀποδίδομαι εἰς τὸν κόλπον, die auch Ps 78 (79) 12 und 1er 39 (32) 18 vorkommt.

48 8 ist vielleicht ἄνοιξα ursprünglich: s ist infolge Dittographie ausgefallen, es folgt σου.


IX

Am bedeutsamsten sind solche lexikalische Varianten, die ein anderes Wort bezeugen, weil sie für die Exegese entscheidend sind.

10 32 θήν δυνατέρα = Qu Qere ἡβ M.
16 9 τὰ δέντρα σου, siehe bereits unter VIII.
23 10 ἐργαζόμενοι, siehe bereits unter VIII.
36 11 τῶν ἀνθρώπων = Qu ἄνθρωπος M = populi Vulg.
39 1 καὶ ἀνέστη = Qu ἔθους M = et convaluissest Vulg.
41 5 άμα = Qu ιηθεῖρ M = obstupuerunt Vulg.
41 20 καὶ ἐννοηθώσι = Qu ς] ἔρισε: cf. et recogitent Vulg.] Qu* M.
44 20 διναται ἐξελεύδθαι: cf. Qu ἐνυγκλιτι M.
45 2 καὶ δρῆ = Qu ζητεῖρας ιηθεῖρας M: cf. gloriosos terrae Vulg.
49 24 αδίκως: cf. Qu μύρις: cf. a robusto Vulg.] ζητεῖ M.
50 2 ξηραπανθῆτωσι = Qu ζητεῖρας M = computrescent Vulg.
50 6 ἀπέστρεψα = Qu ἄνεστι ἡβ M.
Verschiedene Stellen sind eigens zu besprechen. An den beiden Stellen 41 20 und 50 6 hat LXX wohl die Lesart des M vor sich gehabt und frei übersetzt; es ist aber möglich, dass die Lesart von Qu in der Vorlage stand entweder als Textlesart oder als Randnote. 41 20 ist zum Verb um das Nomen zu ergänzen, vgl.

41 22 επιστήσομεν τὸν νοῦν.
47 7 ἐνόστασα...ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.
57 1 ἐκδέχεται τῇ καρδίᾳ.
57 11 οὐδὲ ἐλαβὲς μὲ εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐδὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου (οὐδὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου ist Dublette, siehe Untersuchungen zur Is.-Sept., S. 77). Es ist deshalb mit ἐννοηδῶσι richtig wiedergegeben, wie die benachbarten Wörter verlangen. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass die Lesart von Qu als "mater versionis" bereits der LXX vorlag.

50 6 liegt in M die häufige Wendung vor "das Angesicht verbergen," von den Menschen als Subjekt nur 4mal (Exod 3 6; Isa 50 6; 53 3; 59 2), von Gott jedoch 27mal (namentlich in den Psalmen) ausgesagt. Überall übersetzt die LXX mit ἀπόστρεφειν τὸ πρόσωπον Exod 3 6; Deut (3mal); Pss (14mal); 1er 40 (33) 5; Ezek (3mal); auch Isa 8 17; 53 3; 54 8; 57 17; 59 2; 64 7 (6), also 6mal. Nur Iob 13 24 ist "warum verbirgst Du Dein Angesicht" frei mit διὰ τί ἀπεστρέφειν τὸ πρόσωπον.

Es ist auffallend, dass nur 50 6 in Qu steht, das wie eine Retroversion des griech. ἀπέστρεψα aussieht, aber sicher keine ist. Es ist auch nicht anzunehmen, dass in der Vorlage der LXX die Lesart von Qu gestanden habe. Aber es ist deutlich zu sehen, dass die LXX-
Übersetzer eine gemeinsame Tradition kennen, die ihre Heimat nicht in Alexandrien, sondern in Palästina hat. Es mag so gewesen sein, dass für die Übersetzer gewisse "Richtlinien" ausgearbeitet worden sind, die Angaben über die Bedeutung und Wiedergabe verschiedener Wörter und Wendungen enthielten. Sie mögen zunächst an den Rand der Handschriften geschrieben sein (unsere Handschrift von Qumran enthält keine Randnoten, wohl aber die hebr. Sirach-Handschriften); vielleicht waren sie auch in getrennten "Wörterverzeichnissen" vorhanden. Man kann diese Lesarten als "lectiones auxiliares" oder besser (im Anschluss an die "matres lectionis") als "matres versionis" bezeichnen (siehe oben die "matres transcriptionis"). Sie sind dann gelegentlich vom Rand oder von der separaten Liste in den Text geraten (wie an unserer Stelle).


39 1 ist ebenfalls nicht sicher zu sagen, dass LXX wie Qu in der Vorlage gelesen hat. Aber wiederum ist dem Is.-Übersetzer die Qu-Lesart bekannt gewesen; dies zeigt die Parallelstelle 38 9 καὶ ἀνέστη = ἦν M Qu (von hier kam ἦν nach 39 1), ferner 26 19, wo ebenfalls ἦν mit ἀνιστάσει wiedergegeben ist: ἀνιστάσει ἁτί σον τα οἱ νεκροὶ.

Auch bei 44 20 kann nicht entschieden werden, ob LXX wie Qu in der Vorlage gehabt hat. Es ist eher wahrscheinlich, dass sie wie M gelesen hat und dass ihr die Lesart ἡς als "mater versionis" (aus 16 12, siehe unten) ebenfalls zur Verfügung stand. Bei der Verwendung des Verbums διδονεσσαὶ bestehen drei Möglichkeiten:
1. Die Vorlage hat zwei Verba (dies ist der gewöhnliche Fall), z. B.
7  1 καὶ οὖκ ἡ δύνασθαι πολυρρήσαι αὐτὴν = M Qu.
36 14 οὐ δυνῆσονται ὅσασθαι ὑμᾶς = M Qu.

2. Die Vorlage hat nur das Hauptverbum; der Übersetzer übernimmt als Hilfsverbum δύνασθαι, z. B.
11  9 οὐδὲ μὴ δ ὅ ὑ ν ὁ ὀ τ ἄ ι (> M Qu) ἀπολέσαι.
20  6 οὐκ ἦ δ ὅ ὅ ν ὁ ὄ η τ ὀ (> M Qu) σωθῆναι.
36  9 καὶ πῶς δ ὅ ὅ ν ὁ σ ὃ ὀ (> M Qu) ἀποστρέψαι.
36 19 μὴ ἐ δ ὅ ὅ ν ὁ τ ὀ (> M Qu) ὅσασθαι.

3. Die Vorlage hat nur ἐπι im absoluten Sinn “vermögen,” “imstande sein”; diesen absoluten Charakter hat der Übersetzer verkannt und musste so ein sinnentsprechendes Verbum beifügen, z. B.
16 12 καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξελέσθαι αὐτὸν (ἐξελέσθαι αὐτὸν sub + ; om. M).
29 11 οὐ δύναμαι ἀναγγώναι (ἀναγγώναι sub + ; om. M).


Χ

Die bis jetzt genannten Stellen zeigen, dass Qu von M abweichende, gewöhnlich sekundäre Lesarten kennt, die auch LXX als “matres versionis” benützte. Da kann es leicht vorkommen, dass Dubletten eindringen; es ist aber auffallend, dass nur wenige Stellen genannt werden können, wo “Dubletten” in Qu bew. LXX vorliegen.

37  9 καὶ ἄκοισας ἀπεστρέψε = Qu ὑπεστρέψον M; ὑπεστρέψε IV Reg. 19 9.


40 19 ἐποίησε; cf. Qu ἐποίησε M.

Der in Qu vorliegende Text ist unklar. Hempel, ZAW, 61 (1945/48), 284, meint, dass “τοις ὑπεστρέψε 19, wohl unter dem Einfluss des neben
häufigen "mksam" stehe. Jedoch ist in einer Nomen als Objekt von ntpy i zu sehen. Sowohl Qu als LXX kannten die Lesart ntpy i. Der griech. Übersetzer benutzte sie als "mater lectionis" und gab deshalb ntpy i mit eποίησσε wieder. Der Schreiber von Qu wollte die alte ursprüngliche Lesart nicht unter den Tisch fallen lassen und schrieb "und er machte ein Gussbild." Jedoch passt die Satzkonstruktion nicht gut; man erwartet ὑπὲρ ntpy i ἰθῆ.

41 11 πάντες 2°: cf. Qu ὁ ουσι M.
Man könnte ἄλλον άνθρωπο M, als einfache Hinzufügung betrachten, die der Schreiber aus eigenem beigab; aber πάντες 2° der LXX zeigt, dass ἄλλον bereits vorlag (beeinflusst von πάντες 1° v. 11a). ἄλλον ist sekundär, siehe G. Fohrer, VT, 5 (1955), 249.

65 2 ἀπειδοήντα καὶ ἀντικένοντα (so ist nach dem Photo zu lesen, nicht χάρις, wie Burrows abdruckt) Qu; χάρις M.
Wahrscheinlich hat LXX in ihrer Vorlage bereits die beiden Lesarten von M und Qu χάρις gelesen. Dann hätten wir in der LXX eine Dublette, die allerdings ihr Doppelgesicht verloren hat, da die Wendung "widerspenstig und abtrünnig" an vielen Stellen vorkommt und ursprünglich ist, siehe meine Untersuchungen zur Is.-Sept., S. 78. An unserer Stelle ist nur ein Verbum und zwar das des M echt.

XI


6 11 κύριε ὁ θεός Qu, ἀτροχ M.
7 14 κύριος ὁ θεός Qu, ἀτροχ M, ebenso 9 8 (§); 21 18.
28 2 κυρίου ὁ θεός Qu "mtt MSS Edd," ἀτροχ M.
3 18 κύριος ὁ θεός Qu "mtt MSS" ἀτροχ Qu; ἀτροχ M, ebenso 8 7.
Ein Überblick über die genannten Stellen lässt keine klare Linie sehen. Der griech. Übersetzer hatte ja bereits die Schwierigkeit, κύριος mit einem entsprechenden Wort wiederzugeben, nachdem κύριος für MN festgelegt war. So ist 49 14 zweimal κύριος für 'ΠΝ und 'πκ verwendet. Das bekannteste Beispiel ist Ps 109 (110) 1 (Εἰς τὸν κύριον τοῦ μου) MN. Deshalb kann auch nicht gesagt werden, ob LXX wie Qu mit 'πκ in ihrer Vorlage 6 11; 7 14; 9 S (7); 21 5; 28 2; 3 18 gelesen hat. Dagegen hat sicher LXX wie Qu nur einen Gottesnamen (M zwei) an folgenden Stellen: 28 18; 28 22; 30 15; 49 22; 50 5; 52 4; 61 1; 65 13, ferner 38 11. Wahrscheinlich hat hier LXX mit Qu das Ursprüngliche bewahrt. Dagegen stehen aber wieder Stellen, wo LXX mit M nur einen Gott-
Auch in Qu zwei stehen, so 37 20; 49 7; 25 9; 54 6. Schliesslich hat LXX nur ein ein Gottesnamen, während in Qu M zwei stehen, so 50 5; 61 11.

Ergebnis. Eine stattliche Anzahl von Varianten konnte notiert werden, die in LXX Qu gegen M ubereinstimmen. Diese Übereinstimmung besagt aber nicht, dass überall die Vorlage der LXX die gleiche hebr. Lesart wie Qu hatte. Es ist deutlich zu erkennen, dass Qu gerade in vielen Fällen, wo sie mit LXX übereinstimmt, sekundäre, erleichternde Lesarten gegenüber M bezeugt.

DSIa AS A WITNESS TO ANCIENT EXEGESIS
OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH *)

BY

S. TALMON

In the very first attempt to clarify systematically the readings deviating from the MT which were discovered in DSIa, Millar Burrows defined the textual relationship between the scroll and MT as follows: “Differing notably in orthography and somewhat in morphology it agrees with the Masoretic text to a remarkable degree in wording. Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition. There are minor omissions, but nothing comparable with those found in the Septuagint of some of the books of the Old Testament. Words repeated in the MT are sometimes not repeated in our manuscript: e.g. vi 2 שֶׁת הָכִּי; vi 3 כְּרָחֵשׁ (repeated once); viii 9 הָכִּי; xxxviii 11 הִפְנֵיהֶנִי; lvii 19 שֶׂלָה; lxii 10 נָעֲרִי. Such omissions may have been made deliberately by a scribe who did not have the modern scholar's concern for meter” 1).

This definition expresses rather a high estimate of DSIa as a witness to the text of the Book of Isaiah. It was followed by similar statements voiced by other scholars who set out to prove the antiquity and the authenticity of the MT by drawing attention to the basic resemblance between its textual tradition and that of DSIa.

This basic identity between MT, which is preserved to us only in comparatively late manuscripts none of them from before the ninth century A.D., and DSIa which beyond any doubt stems from the pre-Christian era, surely implies that the scribe of DSIa must be considered a fairly reliable workman who took great care to transmit somewhat mechanically, but faithfully the intricacies of a textual tradition held holy in his community. Just as did the scribes who handed down the MT he sometimes copied passages in his manuscript which were faulty and no doubt, without sense even to him.

As against this remarkable basic concurrence of DSIa with MT

*) A paper read at the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem in May 1961. The original text is printed here with slight alterations and with some notes appended.
the former differs from the latter textually in a good number of instances, as is well known. Now, these deviations from MT are often quoted by the same scholars to prove the scribe’s laxity and the unreliability of the text of DSIA.

It appears to us that this two-edged reasoning comes dangerously near to juggling of evidence. There can be no two measures by which to judge and evaluate this ancient manuscript. It is methodically unsound to give credit to DSIA where its tradition coincides with that of MT, while condemning it as unworthy of trust whenever it goes its own way, unless its direct dependence on MT or on its proto-type has been conclusively proved. It is in this respect that, wittingly or unwittingly, scholars have failed by taking recourse to an unproven conjecture as if it were an established fact: MT is applied as a yardstick to measure the textual tradition of DSIA, with the tacit assumption that Isaiah’s prophecies were handed down in one single formulation which moreover was preserved most faithfully in the Massoretic Text. But actually this question, whether all versions of the Bible were derived from one ancestor or whether we have to assume a manifold textual tradition in the latter half of the Second Temple Period, or even in the very first stage of literary biblical composition, has constituted the bone of contention between two schools of textual scholars since the beginning of the twentieth century. Instead of judging DSIA by the axioms of an Urtext theory, we should use the new finds from the Judaean Desert as a test for this theory. By stating matters in this manner we are widening the scope of a mere investigation into the impact of DSIA on the study of the Book of Isaiah. This will call for further comments at a later stage.

Before proceeding we have to consider some additional factors. In spite of the alleged general textual integrity of DSIA it cannot be denied that in many instances the scroll is demonstrably faulty. By processes which sometimes can be reconstructed to a reasonable degree of certainty errors of various types were incorporated in the text of the scroll. Again, in some cases we can observe in the scroll attempts at improving imaginary or real misreadings which the scribe or the copyist found in his Vorlage and which often remained unchanged in the MT. These errors were assembled and roughly categorised already by Burrows in the article mentioned previously. They drew the special attention of Y. Kutscher 2) and H. M. Orlinsky 3) who, more than others, became convinced of the inferiority of DSIA as against the MT.
It must be conceded that erroneous readings due to failings of the copyists are more numerous in the scroll than in the MT. The same holds true for the number of attempts at correcting obviously faulty readings. But it should be stressed, on the other hand, that this process of textual revision is far from being complete. Many cases of a crux interpretum in the Hebrew Isaiah were left to stand unchanged in DSIa as they are in MT. Statistically speaking we may say that only a minority of difficult passages in the book were smoothed over in DSIa while the great majority were transmitted in their unsatisfactory wording. This state of matters does not allow a clear-cut decision, whether in those instances in which the scroll presents a better reading than MT this is due to a secondary attempt at improvement or whether the scroll preserved here sometimes an original straightforward text. The maxim that the lectio difficilior should usually be given preference over a parallel smooth reading is a valid safeguard against hasty textual emendation. But it should not be considered an invariable rule by which to decide the relative value of variants.

From the foregoing discussion arises a rather multicoloured picture of DSIa as a witness to the text of the book of Isaiah. Even should the scroll ultimately be judged to be inferior to the MT this does not rule out the possibility that in many individual instances it has preserved readings superior in sense to those of MT, and textually more original than their parallels in MT. In order to form a balanced opinion of DSIa and the characteristics of its scribe the discussion should take its departure from an evaluation of the scroll by itself without setting MT as a standard for comparison. A reading of the scroll should first of all be judged by itself in order that we may decide whether it has any intrinsic value. At the second stage of such an investigation DSIa should be compared with other extra-Massoretic versions, with the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and to a lesser degree with the Targum, which probably perpetuate other independent textual traditions. Only after that a comparison with the MT is called for.

This comparison will often result in a deadlock, both versions presenting equally acceptable readings. Again in other instances we may arrive at the conclusion that both parallel readings cannot be considered original, but were derived from a common ancestor which sometimes can still be restored conjecturally.

Finally we should submit all the variant readings of a given passage to a synoptic analysis. This synopsis will often reveal a striking
resemblance, even an identity, of DSIa with one or more of the extra-Massoretic versions. These textual concurrences are of great value, since they point to an ancient Jewish tradition current in Israel in the latter half of the Second Temple period.

II

The diversity of textual tradition which can yet be observed in our sources makes it sufficiently clear that at some stage or other in the history of the book of Isaiah different avenues were leading to its interpretation.

Our modern concept of the prophet's words is decisively influenced by the system of vowels and syntactical symbols, the ta'amim, with which the Massoretes endowed the biblical text during the ninth and tenth century A.D. This system embodies exegetical reflections which undoubtedly are deeply rooted in Jewish tradition. Still, they convey only one possible approach to the Bible. DSIa presents to us a text devoid of the Massoretic aids to its explanation. But it is free, on the other hand, from those explanatory symbols which transmit a historically dated interpretation of the Holy Writ, an interpretation that constituted the tradition of only one, however important, sector of the Jewish people.

Here the exegetical importance of DSIa becomes apparent. It is witness to a phase in Jewish interpretation of the book of Isaiah independent from that embodied in the Massoretic text. Furthermore, it often provides us with an excellent tool for a novel approach to the interpretation of Isaiah's prophecies. If we succeed to read the text of the scroll without unconsciously providing it with the vowel signs and text-divisions to which we became accustomed we sometimes will arrive at a new interpretation of a given passage which assumedly was in the mind of its scribe even where its consonantal text does not differ from that preserved in MT.

We shall now adduce some examples by which to put these theoretical considerations to the test of practical application. Starting from instances in which only a difference in pointing of a single word is assumed to constitute the variant, we shall then deal with cases of identical consonantal texts which were divided syntactically in different ways.

1. Different vocalization of single words.

We shall first adduce an example in which the scroll has a most
probably faulty pointing of a crucial word. However it is important to show that this same pointing is mirrored partly in the translations of the Sept., the Pesh. and the Targ.

a) Is. xix 10. MT:

G: καὶ ἔσονται οἱ διαζώμενοι αὕτα ἐν ὀδύνῃ καὶ πάντες οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸν ζύθον λυπηθήσονται καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσιν

DSIa: 

The RV translates the verse under review thus: “And her pillars shall be broken in pieces, all they that work for hire shall be grieved in soul”. Here as in G’s rendering ἀνεμί is tacitly equated with διαζώμενοι, probably on the basis of Job xxx 25: "was not my soul grieved for the needy”. The root ἀνεμί is a hap. leg. This may have been conducive to the substitution of Χ for Η, both in MT and DSIa. T however seems to have thought of Όναμ — pond.

But we are mainly concerned with two other words in the verse. In translating “her pillars” the RV obviously connected ῥήρω with ῥυπόπτω, from which also ῥηθήσεται — “base, foundation” is derived. ῥηθήσεται was taken as just a variant pronunciation of ῥηθήσομαι — “wages”.

The ancient versions, however ascribed these words a quite different meaning. G’s οἱ διαζώμενοι, which is preserved only in some mss. but is nevertheless considered original, takes ῥηθήσεται as a technical term which rather fits the context. The same verb translates in Judg. xvi 14 the Hebrew root הָעַש. It has been suggested that the Hebrew הָעַש is of Egyptian origin and that it carries the meaning of “weaver, ropemaker”.

The main Greek tradition renders ἡθήσεται rather loosely ἔργαζόμενοι. T’s ἡθήσεται definitely connects ἡθήσεται with ἀνεμί, to drink. Now it appears that DSI’s reading ἡθήσεται points to the same concept. ἡθήσεται alongside ἀνεμί is employed by both MT and DSIa in Is. xxii 13: ἀνεμί ἡθήσεται, ἀνεμί ἡθήσεται... ἂν εἴ μὴ ὁρίζω. Hence DSIa concurs with T in the interpretation of the first half of the verse under review.

This leads to the assumption that DSIa’s reading differed from that of MT also in the second half of the verse, though their consonantal texts are identical. Here G’s translation contains the clue. ζύθον was rendered by G — ζύθον, i.e., beer, the Hebrew word ob-
viously being read — שָרֶר. We suggest that this was also the reading of the scroll and that accordingly its text is to be translated: “And her drunkards (lit. drinkers) shall be downcast (depressed), all makers of beer (shall be) grieved in soul”.

The argument advanced here goes to show that in the verse under discussion DSIa presents an ancient attempt of Jewish exegesis, one part of which is also reflected in the Targum while another part underlies the Greek translation. As already stated we think that in this case DSIa represents a misinterpretation of scripture. In the following example however we feel strongly that DSIa contributes to a better understanding of the biblical text.

b) Is. xxvi 9. MT:

\[ \text{כִּי בַּכְּשָׁר מַמָּשִׁים לָאָרְץ חֲדָרִים יְשֻׁבֶּה} \]

T: ...

G: \( \text{διότι φῶς τὴν προστάγματα σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς} \)

This is a case of an assumed variant which ordinarily would not attract the attention of a reader of the scroll since its consonantal text is identical with that of MT (excepting the plene writing of שִׁבֹּר, which is written defective in MT). The difference seems to lie in the second word which in MT is obviously taken as a particle and is pointed כָּשָׁר. The RV consequently translates the passage in a rather forced manner: “...for when thy judgements are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness”.

The ancient translators had before them essentially the same text as is preserved in MT. But they could not make head or tail of it. T inserted a verb — כָּשָׁר, which completes nicely the relative clause introduced by כָּשָׁר, but is patently secondary 6). G turned the particle into a noun — φῶς, reading, intentionally or unintentionally, כָּשָׁר for כָּשָׁר. It appears that this is a step in the right direction. A noun seems to be required after the comparative “כ”. Retaining the consonants of MT — כָּשָׁר, we propose to point the word כָּשָׁר or כָּשָׁר, and to translate the phrase—“for as happiness (sweetness) are your statutes to the (dwellers of the) earth, the inhabitants of the world learned justice”. Thus is restored the parallelism of the verse which is now in full accord with the other sentences in the passage Is. xxvi 6-10.

The idea, that God’s precepts (מַמָּשִׁים) produce happiness or sweetness (בּוֹךְ) for their observers, recurs in Is. xxx 18: “...for the
Lord is a God of righteousness (מַשֵּׁש), happy (אֵרֵי) are all they that wait for him”. And again in Is. lvi 2: “Happy (אֵרֵי) the man that doeth this... that keepeth the Sabbath from profaning it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil”. We may further compare Ps. cvi 3: אֵרֵי שָׁמַיִם מַשֵּׁשׁ שָׁמֵשׁוֹ זֶרֶקְהָ בְּכָל עָתָּה — “Happy are they that observe the laws (and) he that doeth righteousness at all times”. Here we have the same combination of אֵרֵי - מַשֵּׁשׁ - זֶרֶקְהָ that supposedly is to be found also in the verse under review—Is. xxvi 9.

Our argument may be strengthened by a further consideration. We assumed that the restored noun אֵרֵי carries the sense of “happiness” or “sweetness” and that this sensation is bound up with the notion of justice and righteousness. Now is it mere coincidence that as against this injustice is compared to bitterness? We venture to propose that Is. xxvi 9 is the very antithesis of the verse Am. v 7: יְהַבַּשׁ בְּלוּחַ מַשֵּׁשׁ זֶרֶקְהָ אֲלָמָּה גְּדוֹלָה, “Ye who turn justice to bitterwood and cast down righteousness to the earth”, are bound to come to grief. The incompatibility of God’s intentions and man’s acts is forcefully brought out in these mutually opposed scriptures by the employment in both of them of the salient words מַשֵּׁש - זֶרֶקְהָ - הַלְעַנֶּה, modified by the antithetic concepts of אֵרֵי and אֵרֵי, אֵרֵי.

We wish to emphasize that the reading of Is. xxvi 9 that was proposed here adheres to the consonantal text as transmitted both in MT and DSIA. However, availing ourselves of the flexibility inherent in the unpointed text of DSIA we achieved two results:

a) We were able to restore the hitherto only presupposed noun אֵרֵי from which may have been derived also the word מַשֵּׁש in Gen. xxx 13. We may expect to find some further instances in the MT in which this noun was erroneously taken as the relative pronoun and was pointed אֵרֵי.
b) We could interpret satisfactorily the verse under review and to place it into proper relationship with other scriptures which express similar ideas.

2. Erroneous pointing coupled with the additional interchange of two very similar letters, yod and waw, seems to have resulted in the following variant:

a) Is. xix 9. MT:

b) Is. xix 9. DSIA:

The substitution of yod for waw in אֵרֵי is just another
case of the alternate employment of the perfect and the imperfect and does not affect the sense of the verse. However, the interchange of מזֵר and מזֵר is of a different nature. Let it be stated that the reading of MT is supported by T’s translation מֶטְסָר = nets, which points to a derivation of מזֵר from מזֵר — hole. Also G render מזֵר as a noun בֵּסָר, deriving it probably from מזֵר (Esth. i 6; viii 15). The weavers of that material (אֲרֵיִם מזֵר) would be put to shame (אֵלָכְשׁוֹ וַתִּמְסֹר) like the flax workers mentioned in the first part of the verse. This is roughly the rendering of the RV too: “moreover they that work in combed flax, and they that weave white cloth, shall be ashamed”. The weavers of the Pesh. is inconclusive since its meaning cannot be ascertained.

As against these DSI’s reading מזֵר must obviously be explained as a perfect form (3. pers. pl.) of the verb מזֵר and should probably be pronounced הָּדֵר (or הָּדֵר — if pausal forms were employed in DSIa). This reading was already proposed tentatively by some commentators (cp. BH), prior to the discovery of DSIa. The second member of the verse thus contains a verb parallel to בּוֹשׁ in the first member: “Ashamed shall be they that work in combed flax and weavers (of flax) shall wax pale”.

b) The same parallelism of מזֵר-בּוֹשׁ recurs in Is. xxix 22: בּוֹשׁ תַּחַת יבּוֹשׁ יטַקָּב לא יבּוֹשׁ תַּחַת מזֵר “Jacob shall not now be ashamed, neither shall his face now wax pale”.

It could be argued that the scroll’s reading in this verse should be viewed as an attempt of explaining away the hap.leg. מזֵר of MT. By employing the rule of lectio difficilior the MT should then be given priority over DSIa. But we shall immediately see that this rule cuts both ways. If it were to be applied categorically it would for example prove the superiority of DSIa over the MT in the following instance:

c) Is. xi 6. MT:

DSIa:

Instead of the noun מַרְיָא, fatling, in the MT, DSIa has a verb in the perf. form — מַרְיָא, which like מַרְיָא is derived from the same stem מַרְיָא with elision of the aleph. Again this reading had already been restored conjecturally before the discovery of the scroll. Now, the noun מַרְיָא is found several times in the O.T. (II Sam. vi 13; I Kings i 9, 19, 25; Is. i 11; xi 6 etc.), but there is not one single instance of
the verb מַרְכָּב being used. Therefore it is DSIa that in this case has preserved the more difficult reading.

The same division of MT and DSIa can be observed also in the translations. T’s מַרְכָּב mirrors MT’s מַרְכָּב. On the other hand the rendering of Pesh. — וְיִרְשְׁנָה “they will graze”, concurs with DSIa’s — מַרְכָּב. G surprisingly has conflated both interpretations, translating: כְּלָלְכָּרִים וְיִתְוְרָה וְיִלְיָה וְיִבָּשָׂכֵרָה וְיִסְדֹּף.

The reading of DSIa is stylistically better suited than that of MT. The verse thus contains four syntactically complete parts (a-b; a-c) each with its own predicate.

This stylistic superiority of DSIa over MT deserves serious consideration. But of even more importance is the exegetical and textual concord of DSIa, Pesh. and of one Greek tradition. There are no adequate reasons to explain this as due to the same trend of emendation independently conceived in a Hebrew, a Greek and the Syriac tradition. Similarly no direct interdependence between these three witnesses to the text of the Bible can be established. It therefore appears that their combined evidence points to an ancient source from which all three were derived. This, admittedly hypothetic source represented an exegetical tradition, based on a text varying from that of MT, which must have been firmly established in Jewish circles in the period of the Second Temple.

3. Different pointing coupled with an interchange of non-similar letters.

Is. xiv 11. MT:

DSIa:

The translation of MT: “Thy pomp is brought down to hell (and) the noise of thy viols” shows that we are confronted here with a parallelism in which the words מַרְכָּב are tacitly applied also to the second apocopated member. מַרְכָּב can be taken with some imagination as a parallel to מַרְכָּב. But DSIa’s reading מַרְכָּב — thy corpse, can by no means be combined with מַרְכָּב. The scribe obviously read the word as מַרְכָּב, conceiving it as a parallel to מַרְכָּב. Though “he killed your corpse” sounds somewhat unusual, this exegetical tradition is witnessed for also by the rendering of Sym.: θανάτωθη το πτώμα σου. A reference to death is contained also in Theodotion’s translation who apparently reads the noun πτώμα instead of the verb
The *atnach* under מְסַכָּר indicates that in MT the second stichos opens with the word מְסַכָּר. The second half of this verse is admittedly difficult. The apparent noun מְסַכָּר is usually derived from מִסְכָּר — distress, but is registered in the most recent dictionary of the Bible (KOEHLER) as “unexplained”. The RV took it as a verb from the stem מִסְכָּר, and translated accordingly: “Lord, in trouble have they visited thee, they poured out a prayer when thy chastening was upon them”. The first half of this translation corresponds roughly to the ancient versions. But instead of interpreting מְסַכָּר in the second half as “chastening—affliction”, G and T take it as a reference to God’s commandments — G: מֹשֵׁר מְסַכָּר. T: מֹשֵׁר מְסַכָּר. This is the sense which the word מְסַכָּר usually carries in the Bible (e.g. Jer. xvii 23; xxxii 33; Zeph. iii 27; Pr. viii 33; xii 1 etc.), and this is obviously also the meaning of the plural מְסַכָּר of DSIa.

Against MT and the versions which take מְסַכָּר as a noun (G: מְסַכָּר, read: מִסְכָּר; T: מִסְכָּר), DSIa has here a verb: מְסַכָּר. It seems that this is paralleled by מְסַכָּר, which in DSIa is probably a contraction of מְסַכָּר. That מְסַכָּר was understood as a verb by the writer of the scroll may be deduced also from his reading מְסַכָּר — thy precepts, a noun parallel to מְסַכָּר in the second stichos, instead of the verb מְסַכָּר in MT. The noun מְסַכָּר is frequently used in the Psalms and is, so to speak, the catchword of Ps. cxix, where it is paralleled by מְסַכָּר, מְסַכָּר, etc.

All this results in a different verse division in DSIa, and in a perfect parallelism of members: 2: בּוֹדַר מְסַכָּר, מְסַכָּר. We suggest the following translation: “Lord, in distress they call out your precepts, they whisper your commandments unto themselves”.

We are fully aware that the few examples which were analysed here
can only indicate the line of approach to the scroll of Isaiah which was advocated. A full investigation will result in proper appraisal of the scroll as a witness to ancient Jewish exegesis and of its writer as an exegete of no mean achievements. In conclusion we wish to state that the exegetical tradition underlying the scroll is reflected not only in ancient translations, as we set out to prove in this paper, but also in Talmudic and Midrashic literature. But this problem should be dealt with separately.

6) We tend to assume that this translation is moulded upon the pattern of the similar expression in Is. xlii 4: יד יושב בַּאֲרֵךְ מְשָפֵת, where T translates: יד יושב בַּאֲרֵךְ מְשָפֵת. Cf. J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, 1934, p. 65.
7) Prof. G. R. Driver has kindly drawn our attention to some of his notes in which he dealt with the root יָרֵא and its occurrences in the O.T. S. *JT'st* 38, pp. 37, 43; *BiOr* 1, pp. 234-35; *AJSL* 52, p. 160. To the instances of the noun יָרֵא suggested by him we would add provisionally Is. xlii 4.
Pendant la répression du mouvement insurrectionnel de Ben Kosebah — si nous en croyons la mise en scène du « Dialogue » — Justin se plaignait auprès du juif Tryphon de l’attitude du rabbinit contemporain à l’égard de la vénérable version des Septante. Non seulement ils avaient l’audace de soutenir que l’interprétation donnée par leurs soixante-dix anciens réunis chez le roi d’Égypte Ptolémée n’était pas exacte en tous points (1), mais ils allaient jusqu’à prétendre donner eux-mêmes leur propre interprétation de l’Écriture (2), osant ainsi dénaturer ce vénérable héritage (3) et remplacer l’exégèse messianique traditionnelle des prophéties par des interprétations misérables, « qui se traînent à ras de terre » (4). Justin affirme sans ambages que c’est pour ôter une arme essentielle à la propagande chrétienne que les rabbins ont falsifié ainsi les prophéties en en retranchant maints passages qui laissaient entrevoir trop nettement la figure de Jésus-Christ (5).

Ne se bornant pas à ces accusations globales, Justin prétend nous donner en plusieurs cas, face à face, des exemples de l’interprétation traditionnelle des LXX et de celle du rabbinit contemporain (6). Il accepte même à contre-cœur la situation faite ainsi à la controverse chrétienne antijuïdaïque et s’efforce de n’argumenter qu’à partir de textes acceptés par ses adversaires (7). En plusieurs cas, il nous prévient incidemment qu’il les cite sous la forme où les lisaient ceux-ci (8).

Si l’on pouvait faire toute confiance à Justin, nous aurions donc en lui un témoin précieux d’une phase très importante de l’histoire du

(1) LXXVIII, 7; LXXI, 1; LXXXIV, 3 (divisions et texte selon l’éd. d’Archambault, Textes et Documents, Picard, Paris, 1909).
(2) LXXI, 1.
(3) LXXXIV, 3.
(4) CXII, 4.
(5) LXXVIII, 8; LXXI, 2; LXXII, 3; CXX, 5.
(6) CXX, 4; CXXIV, 2 et 3; CXXXVII, 3.
(7) LXXI, 2.
(8) CXXIV, 4; CXXXVII, 3.
texte grec de l'Ancien Testament. Ses innombrables citations souvent très longues, tirées de livres bibliques fort divers, nous auraient conservé le texte grec courant dans les milieux juifs orthodoxes du début du Second siècle. Mais certaines considérations ont empêché la critique contemporaine de se laisser entrainer par cet espoir. Même ceux qui ne nient pas, à la suite de Preuschen et de Schäder, l'authenticité du « Dialogue » sont forcés d'y reconnaître une bonne part de fiction et de repousser sa composition dans la seconde moitié du siècle. Aussi envisage-t-on volontiers le texte biblique très original attesté par Justin comme une recension personnelle de la LXX à partir des premières grandes traductions juives du Second siècle et spécialement de celle d'Aquila. Il importe enfin de faire remarquer que nous ne connaissons l'œuvre de Justin que par un unique ms. du xive siècle, et que la forme de ses citations bibliques a pu être sérieusement affectée par son passage à travers cette longue et étroite filière. Il semblait donc, jusqu'à une date toute récente, que le plus prudent fût de souscrire à ces lignes déçues et décevantes par lesquelles Rahlfs concluait une étude du texte biblique de Justin : « Für den LXX-Forscher ist unser Resultat insofern lehrreich als es wieder einmal zeigt wie vorsichtig man bei der Verwertung von Kirchenväter-Zitaten sein muss. » (1).

Mais au cours de la seconde quinzaine d'août 1952, les infatigables bédouins Ta'amré ont découvert dans une nouvelle grotte du désert de Juda d'importants fragments d'un rouleau de parchemin qui y avait été déposé lors de la révolte de Ben Kosebah (2). Ces fragments ont été acquis par le Musée Archéologique Palestinien, avec l'assentiment de Mr. Harding, Directeur des Antiquités de Jordanie, et nous sommes autorisés à en faire une première présentation aux lecteurs de la Revue Biblique. Il s'agit d'un texte grec des Petits Prophètes dont les parties conservées appartiennent à Michée, Jonas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonie et Zacharie. Comme on pourra s'en rendre compte par la planche ci-jointe (pl. I), la très belle onciale de notre ms. se situe au mieux vers la fin du 1er siècle après J.-C. (3), ce qui concorde avec le fait que

(1) ZNW., 1921, p. 198.
(2) C'est ce qu'indique de façon suffisamment certaine l'écriture des petits fragments de papyrus hébréo-araméens trouvés dans la même grotte ainsi que les monnaies et documents datés trouvés en deux autres grottes proches.
(3) Des apices inférieurs vigoureusement lancés vers la droite constituent la caractéristique la plus frappante de cette onciale au caractère très ferme. Ni l'alpaca ni le mu ne présentent les signes de fléchissement qui apparaissent au début du second siècle. Le centre de gravité de l'écriture n'est ni surélevé ni surbaissé. Les apices obliques supérieurs qui apparaissent parfois dans le delta, l'alpaca et le lambda ne manifestent aucune tendance à s'incurver.
le ms. était déjà très usagé lorsqu'il fut abandonné. L'abondance de textes découverts cette année ne nous permet pas d'aborder tout de suite la publication intégrale de ces nouveaux fragments bibliques, aussi me bornerai-je pour cette fois à situer cette nouvelle recension du texte grec dans son contexte littéraire et historique.

Voici tout d'abord un passage qui recouvre partiellement une importante citation faite par Justin au ch. cix du « Dialogue » : il s'agit de M"icée iv, 3-7.

Il suffit de comparer ce texte à celui de la citation de Justin pour constater qu'il lui est substantiellement identique. Voici les seules variantes qui les distinguent : v. 3 : ανθαρη/αρη Just.; v. 4 : καθισεται, Just.; ibid. : εστιν/εσται (1) Just.; ibid. : το στόμα/στόμα Just.; v. 5 : θεων/θεων Just. Aucune de ces variantes, on le voit, n'excède ce que l'on est en droit d'attendre des abâtardissements d'une tradition manuscrite aussi longue et étroite que l'est celle du texte de Justin.

La dimension des lettres est régulière, bien calibrée. Toutes ces caractéristiques s'accordent au mieux avec la Seconde moitié du Premier siècle; date qu'aucune particularité de détail ne vient contredire, bien qu'il soit difficile de trouver des parallèles parfaitement typiques.

(1) En cx, 4, Justin reprenant ce passage lit εστιν comme notre ms.
Les points où notre texte concorde avec celui de Justin contre les LXX sont beaucoup plus nombreux et typiques (1) : v. 3 : συνκοψουσι/κατακοψουσι LXX; ibid. : μαχαιρας/ρομφαιας LXX; ibid. : τας ζιβυνας/τα δορατα LXX; ibid. : ου μη/ουκετι μη (1er) LXX; ibid. ου μη...ετι/ουκετι μη (2e) LXX; v. 4 : ανηρ/εκαστος LXX; ibid. : των δυναμων/παντοκρατωρος LXX; v. 6 : ην εκακωσα/ους απωσαμην LXX; ν. 7 : θησω/θησομαι LXX; ibid. : επ’αυτων εν τω ορει/επ’αυτούς εν ορει LXX; ibid. : εως του αιωνος/εως εις τον αιώνα LXX.

Notons de plus que les lacunes du ms. sont beaucoup plus aisément remplies avec le texte de Justin qu’avec celui des LXX. Mais les concordances formelles qui viennent d’être relevées paraissent suffisamment démonstratives : en argumentant contre Tryphon, Justin citait Michée selon notre texte.

Je n’ai relevé dans le « Dialogue » qu’un autre passage très bref où ses citations des Petits Prophètes recoupent encore une fois nos fragments : il s’agit de Zac. ii, 12 où tous deux sont d’accord pour lire ἐκλέγεται contre αἴρετιεϊ de la LXX. Remarquons enfin, pour éviter une méprise, que le texte que donnent nos fragments pour Mic. v, 2 est très différent de celui que cite Justin. Cela tient seulement à ce que ce dernier ne cite pas directement Michée, mais en réalité reproduit la citation libre qu’en fait l’évangile de S. Matthieu.

Que nous ayons ainsi retrouvé dans une grotte de la Seconde Révolte le texte des Petits Prophètes cité par Justin, cela nous amène déjà à une première conclusion : c’est que Justin cite un texte juif réel, en vogue au moment où il situe son dialogue avec Tryphon. Nous n’avons donc pas affaire, comme on pouvait le craindre, à une mixture tardive et arbitraire : il n’invente rien. Seuls ses copistes peuvent être rendus responsables de quelques modifications facilitantes ou assimilantes. De là nous pouvons inférer que les autres citations de Justin, et elles sont aussi amples que variées, représentent très vraisemblablement, dans ce qu’elles ont d’original, une recension rabbinique de la Septante qui avait cours entre 70 et 135.

Il est en effet assez aisé de prouver, sur la base des fragments qui nous en sont parvenus, premièrement que notre texte n’est qu’une recension de la Septante, et deuxièmement que cette recension est l’œuvre de lettrés juifs.

Que notre texte ne soit pas une version originale mais une recension, un simple exemple suffira à le prouver en permettant de saisir sur le

(1) Pour l’établissement du texte de la LXX, je me base sur l’édition de J. Ziegler (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943).
Le texte hébreu de notre recenseur supprime le waw final par haplographie.

Voici deux versets d’Habacuc. On pourrait trouver nombre d’autres passages typiques dans nos fragments. Le seul privilège de ces deux versets est de ne pas avoir été rendus trop lacunaires par la dent des rats :

_Hb._ II, 7 : οὐχὶ ἔξαλη· ἦν ἀναστήσονται διάκυντες σε καὶ ἐγνή·[ψουσ] ὁι ἀλέυοντες σε καὶ ἔση εἰς διαφραγμάτας σωτ[οίς].


Il suffit de comparer ces deux versets au texte de la LXX et à l’hébreu pour se rendre compte que toutes les modifications (en caractères gras) du texte grec traditionnel s’expliquent par un souci de le modeler plus exactement sur l’hébreu.

Il convient cependant d’ajouter qu’à côté de centaines de variantes de ce type, on en trouve aussi un certain nombre où notre texte semble s’éloigner à la fois de la LXX et du T.M. Cela peut vouloir dire alors que le texte hébreu sur lequel le recenseur s’est basé différait du nôtre. Ainsi en Hab. I, 17 où εκκενωσει μαχαφάν αὐτοῦ (qui remplace αμφίβαλει το αμφίβληστρον αὐτοῦ de la LXX) suppose qu’il lisait avec le Pesher d’Habacuc de Qumrân יבנ au lieu de הָנָּן du T. M. Peut-être faut-il faire entrer dans la même catégorie la substitution de αρτος à μερς en Hab. I, 16. Notre recenseur aurait lu dans son texte hébreu probablement abâtardi מיר au lieu de פִּי, modification que paraît supposer aussi le targum de Jonathan.

Lorsqu’il quitte la base de la LXX pour essayer de rendre par ses propres moyens le texte hébreu, il se montre souvent fort inconsciente. Il lui arrive de faire preuve d’un littéralisme extrême qui viole la syntaxe grecque : ainsi lorsqu’il ajoute επ’ αὐτο en Hab. II, 18 (cf. supra) ou bien lorsqu’il laisse au nominatif sans aucun lien syntactique des substantifs dont il a supprimé, par fidélité à l’hébreu, la préposition introductive : ainsi en Hab. II, 6 : οὐχὶ ταῦτα πάντα παραβολήν καὶ πρόβλημα δδήγησει αὐτοῦ. Ailleurs au contraire il traduit de façon assez large. C’est ainsi que הַחַם est traduit εξεκενωσας en Hab. III, 13, ou ψωπ : περισσχ[ε]ν en Jon. II, 6, ou encore קִזִּי : στερεον en Hab. I, 16.

Je ne puis, dans les limites de cette simple présentation, m’attarder à étudier une à une chaque option de notre réviseur anonyme. Notons plutôt une conclusion intéressante qui semble se dégager du fait qu’il

(1) Le texte hébreu de notre recenseur supprime le waw final par haplographie.
ait pris pour base la LXX au lieu de se lancer dans une traduction entièrement personnelle. Il est difficile de ne pas voir là un hommage tacite rendu à la très grande diffusion dont jouissait alors, jusqu’en Palestine, citadelle du Judaïsme orthodoxe, la grande traduction alexandrine. Cela correspond bien à la situation suggérée par Justin et me paraît s’opposer à l’hypothèse d’une diffusion essentiellement chrétienne de la LXX (1). Partout l’Église naissante a dû trouver entre les mains de la Diaspora juive de langue grecque un texte grec essentiellement identique à celui dont l’autorité traditionnelle s’appuyait sur le récit merveilleux que nous rapporte la lettre d’Aristée. Je ne nie évidemment pas que la tradition de ce texte ait pu se nuancer de façon caractéristique en tel ou tel grand centre juif; mais il semble bien que dès le Ier siècle il avait évincé tous les autres targums grecs locaux, s’il y en eut jamais de vraiment consistants.

Essayons d’établir maintenant que cette recension est bien, comme le prétend Justin, l’œuvre de lettrés juifs.

Le fait que le rouleau dont proviennent nos fragments ait été en possession de réfugiés de la Seconde Révolte est déjà un indice, d’autant plus que, dans ce nouvel ensemble de grottes, on a trouvé des fragments hébreux de la Thôrah et des Psaumes ainsi qu’un phylactère parfaitement orthodoxe (avec suppression du Décalogue en signe de raidissement anti-chrétien). Mais ce sont plutôt des arguments de critique interne qui nous apporteront, je pense, une preuve suffisante.

Précisons tout d’abord que, dans ce qui nous a été conservé de son œuvre, le recenseur ne peut être accusé d’avoir agi en polémiste gau­chissant les textes. Il a seulement fait de son mieux pour rendre la LXX plus fidèle à l’hébreu qu’il avait sous les yeux. Ce n’est donc pas à des indices doctrinaux que nous reconnaîtrons une main juive. Mais le fait décisif est que Aquila, le grand champion de l’orthodoxie rabbinique, a pris pour base notre recension. Pour établir cela, envisageons les vingt-huit cas ou notre recension diffère de la LXX et où, par ailleurs, la leçon d’Aquila nous a été conservée (2):

L : Mic. 1, 4 σαλευθησεται; 11, 7 εισι καλοι; ib. πεπορευνται;
R : ]σον[; ]θυναν; ]ενου;
A : τακησονται; αγαθυνουσι; πορευομενου;

(2) Sigles : L = LXX; R = Recension récemment découverte; A = Aquila.
Comme on le voit, Aquila présente des contacts plus ou moins nets avec notre texte en Mic. 1, 4; 11, 7 a et b; iv, 5; v, 3; Jon. iii, 10; Nah. iii, 8, 9, et 14; Hab. i, 8 et 10 b; ii, 3 a, 4 a et b, 17 et 19; iii, 10 et 14 a, c'est-à-dire 18 fois sur 28. Les témoignages de Jon. iii, 10; Nah. iii, 8; Hab. ii, 3 a et iii, 14 a paraissent particulièrement formels (1). Il semble bien que ce contact ne puisse s'expliquer que par

(1) On notera encore un point de contact entre Aquila et notre recension : l'écriture du tétragramme en lettres « phéniciennes ». A propos d'un petit fragment de Psaumes sur parchemin provenant du Fayyûm et publié par Wessely en 1910 comme faisant partie de la
Une ancienne recension de la LXX des Petits Prophètes.

Hali. ι, 14 - 11, 5 et η, Κι-κο-κε.

Planche I.
une dépendance d’Aquila à l’égard de notre recension. En effet les
inconséquences du recenseur anonyme suggèrent qu’il ne s’agit que
d’une ébauche dont l’œuvre d’Aquila présente l’aboutissement achevé.
Si l’on voulait au contraire voir dans notre texte une recension tardive
partiellement inspirée d’Aquila, il faudrait expliquer premièrement
comment ce texte peut se trouver déjà très usagé dans une grotte de
la Seconde Révolte, deuxièmement comment il a pu acquérir au cours
du Second siècle une assez notable diffusion dans les communautés
juives de la Diaspora (cf. infra) alors qu’il est beaucoup moins fidèle
t à l’hébreu que la recension d’Aquila supposée existante, et enfin
troisièmement pourquoi au siècle suivant Origène ne le connaît plus
comme une version en circulation, mais témoigne par contre de la
grande vogue d’Aquila.

L’existence de cette première recension juive nous oblige donc à
envisager l’œuvre d’Aquila sous un jour un peu différent : il s’agit
d’une surrecension et non d’une traduction originale. Aquila eut le
mérite d’étendre à toute la Bible sous une forme infiniment plus sys-
tématique un effort de recension qui s’était déjà fait jour dans le
judaïsme palestinien avant la Seconde Révolte, très vraisemblable-
ment en liaison avec la réforme intégriste et unificatrice qui suivit 70.
Mais certaines initiatives que l’on considérerait jusqu’ici comme des
originalités d’Aquila doivent être restituées au premier recenseur,
asé par exemple les créations de mots du genre de ποταμωθησονται
reconnu par Rahlf dans la citation que fait Justin de Mic. iv, 1.

Symmaque lui aussi manifeste une connaissance directe de notre
recension. Il suffit pour s’en persuader d’envisager plusieurs cas où
il reproduit, souvent sans changements, certaines de ses leçons carac-
téristiques alors qu’Aquila avait éprouvé le besoin de les éliminer.
Ainsi en Mic. v, 7 il a χορτον (cf. χο[ ]; en Hab. i, 10 a ειμπααιεται
(cf. ]παιει ); en Hab. ii, 3 b στραγχευσηται (cf. στραγ [ ]; en Hab. ii,
15 ασχημοσυνη (cf. ]υνη ); en Hab. iii, 14 b πτωχον κρυφαιως (cf.
πτωχον κρυφη). A ces cas s’en ajoutent dix autres où la leçon d’Aquila
ne nous est pas connue mais où celle de Symmaque trahit une dépen-
dance très probable à l’égard de notre recension :

L : Mic. ii, 8 εξεδειραν; v, 4 ακρων; y. 6 τον Ασσουρ; Jon. ii, 5 εξ;
R : εξεδυσ[ ; περατων; την γην Ασσουρ; εξ εναντιας;
S : εξεδυσατε; περατων; terram Assur; απεναντι;
En règle générale, Symmaque présente moins d’indépendance qu’Aquila par rapport à notre recension. Lorsqu’il s’en éloigne, c’est pour des motifs littéraires plutôt que littéraux. Quant à Théodotion, on ne trouve mentionnées que très rarement des leçons caractéristiques de lui pour les passages qui nous intéressent. Cependant, à propos de Soph. 1, 4 que nous avons mentionné au sujet d’Aquila, il est le seul à avoir conservé la transcription χωμαρειμ de notre recension (Symmaque Βεβηλων). Mais la meilleure façon d’étudier son comportement par rapport à notre texte est de comparer sa recension de Daniel à la longue citation que Justin fait de Dan. vii, 9-28 au ch. xxxi du « Dialogue ». Si nous supposons, ce qui est très probable, que Justin témoigne ici encore pour notre recension, nous ne manquerons pas d’être frappés par le fait que Théodotion ne manifeste, ici du moins, aucune connaissance directe de la LXX non-recensée, mais semble avoir pris pour base notre texte. Tout comme Aquila et Symmaque il ne serait donc qu’un surrecenseur et leur base commune serait cette vieille recension palestienne de la fin du 1er siècle. Une telle conclusion suppose, sans doute, que l’on puisse attester par d’autres indices que notre recension a joui, en son temps, d’une diffusion et d’une autorité appréciables.

Si l’on ne veut pas se laisser convaincre par Justin qui se met en scène à Éphèse utilisant notre recension comme un texte reçu par les Juifs du lieu, il nous est loisible de consulter les versions coptes qui nous attesteront qu’elle fut considérée jusqu’en Égypte comme un exact témoin de la « veritas hebraica ». W. Grossouw a prouvé en effet que les très nombreuses assimilations à l’hébreu qui caractérisent le Dodécaprophéton copte (surtout sous sa forme achmimique) ne peuvent s’expliquer adéquatement ni par un recours direct au texte hébraïque, ni par une utilisation constante de l’une ou l’autre des
trois grandes versions du Second siècle (1). Si l'on veut établir que c'est de notre recension que les versions coptes tirent tous leurs hébraïsmes, il faut pouvoir prouver qu'aucun de ces hébraïsmes n'est absent de notre recension. J'estime que cette preuve peut être faite. Pour aujourd'hui je me bornerai à relever un certain nombre de coïncidences particulièrement typiques en me servant de l'apparat critique de Grossouw (2). On se rendra compte aisémen que notre recension est le seul témoin grec aujourd'hui connu qui groupe toutes ces leçons (3) :

_Mic._ iv, 6 ην εκα[κωσα (cf. Grossouw p. 45 n. 3).
   v, 6 εν παρα[ξιφισιν
   v, 7a χο[ρτον
_Jon._ ii, 6 η ελος περιεσχεν την κεφαλην μου
   iv, 1 η[θυ]μησεν
_Nah._ iii, 7a αποτη[δησεται
_Hab._ i, 9b του προσωπου αυτων καυσον
   i, 17 εκκεν]ωσει μαχαιραν αυτου
   ii, 3d ενφανησει [...],αφευσεται (cf. Gr. p. 68 n. 3)
   ii, 14d θαλασσ[...
   ii, 15d ασχημοσ]υνην
   iii, 13b κεφ]αλη εξ οίκου ασεβ[...
   iii, 13e εξεκανωσας θεμελίους
_Soph._ ii, 10 επι λαον κυριου

Mais ce n’est pas seulement en Égypte, patrie de la LXX, que notre recension a pris pied. Nous pouvons peut-être suivre sa trace jusqu’en Grèce (ce qui rendrait toute la vraisemblance désirable à l’attestation par Justin de sa présence à Éphèse). On sait en effet, par le témoignage d’Origène lui-même (4), que ce fut « à Nicopolis près d’Actium » que la Quinta fut découverte. Or les quatre seules variantes connues de la

(2) Op. cit., pp. 18-97. Lorsque Gr. a plusieurs notes critiques sur un même verset, je les distingue par a, b, c...
(3) Notons que l’hypothèse d’une dépendance des versions coptes à l’égard de notre recension est confirmée par la chronologie. On admet en effet généralement que l’origine des versions coptes est à chercher au cours du IIe siècle. Or c’est justement à cette époque que se situe la plus large diffusion de la recension palestinienne. Reste à préciser si le milieu copte où se fit la traduction des Petits Prophètes était déjà purement et simplement chrétien ou s’il ne gardait pas encore quelque attache au judaïsme.
(4) Voir la discussion des textes d’Origène et d’Eusèbe dans The Cairo Geniza de P. Kahle, pp. 161 sqq.
Quinta qui recoupent le contenu de nos fragments leur sont substantiellement identiques :

Q : *Mic.* v, 5 principes hominum; *ib.* en παραξειφυσιν
R : αρχοντας ανθρωπων; en παρα[

Q : *Hab.* ii, 15 ignominias eorum; iii, 13 evacuasti fundamentum
R : ασχημοσυνην αυτων; εξεκενωσας θεμελιους

Q : usque ad collum sela.
R : εως τραχη[γ]ου σελε.

Les très légères variantes qui, dans les deux derniers exemples, distinguent le texte de nos fragments de la Quinta telle qu'elle est citée par Jérôme n'excèdent pas les divergences que l'on est en droit d'attendre à l'intérieur de la tradition manuscrite d'un même texte. Si l'on veut encore un argument convergent pour l'identification de notre recension avec la Quinta d'Origène (1), on remarquera que, selon les statistiques de Grossouw (2), les hébraismes des versions coptes concordent douze fois de façon indubitable avec des leçons de la Quinta et ne s'y opposent jamais formellement, alors qu'il leur arrive de contredire quatre fois Théodotion, onze fois Aquila et onze fois Symmaque.

Je ne voudrais pas grossir l'importance de cette recension juive de la fin du Premier siècle. Il ne s'agit, répétons-le, que d'une première tentative encore tâtonnante et pleine d'illogismes, certainement limitée à quelques livres de la Bible. Il n'est pas étonnant que les grandes recensions du Second siècle l'aient entièrement éclipsée et qu'au début du siècle suivant Origène ait dû déjà, comme nous aujourd'hui, la « redécouvrir ». Elle joua cependant en son temps un rôle appréciable : celui d'amorcer l'œuvre de révision de la LXX qui allait être la grande tâche des générations qui suivirent. Le travail de l'ancêtre anonyme d'Aquila et d'Origène mérite donc une publication que nous espérons pouvoir aborder sans trop tarder. De cette publication nous pouvons attendre un triple témoignage : premièrement sur l'état du texte de base de la LXX, deuxièmement sur l'état du texte hébreu utilisé par le recenseur, troisièmement sur l'exacte originalité de chacun des trois

(1) Je parle ici de la Quinta telle qu'elle est citée par Jérôme et je laisse de côté la question délicate des citations attribuées à la Quinta par le second glossateur marginal du *codex Barberini*... qui mériterait une étude spéciale.

grands recenseurs du Second siècle. Ce témoignage se trouvera encore élargi si on accepte la quadruple identification que nous proposons aujourd'hui : premièrement avec le texte cité par Justin, deuxièmement avec la base commune d'Aquila, Symmaque et Théodotion, troisièmement avec la source des hébraïsmes des versions coptes, et quatrièmement avec la Quinta d'Origène. Tant que le texte n'est pas édité il ne peut s'agir que de suggestions. Elles appelleront certainement telles ou telles nuances notables, mais j'espère qu'elles pourront servir au moins d'hypothèses de recherche.

Jérusalem, 19 septembre 1952.

D. Barthélemy, O. P.

Appendice :

Une des parties les mieux conservées de notre recension portant sur les deux premiers chapitres d'Habacuc pour lesquels nous nous trouvons posséder deux textes hébraïques assez différents : celui du Pésher de Qumrân (Q pH) et celui de la Bible massorétique (T. M.), voici un très bref appareil critique où j'ai seulement relevé les appuis donnés par la Septante originale (LXX) et sa recension palestinienne (Rec), lorsque leurs témoignages respectifs les départagent nettement, aux deux formes susdites du texte hébraïque. Nombre de cas plus complexes demanderaient toute une discussion. Dans cet aperçu provisoire, je les ai délibérément omis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.M.</th>
<th>QpH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יבאי</td>
<td>om.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>העלו</td>
<td>LXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הרבר</td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורא</td>
<td>LXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יהומך</td>
<td>LXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>úלך</td>
<td>LXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יושלבת</td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רמה</td>
<td>LXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

En six cas sur huit nous trouvons donc la recension palestinienne aux côtés du T. M. tandis que la LXX originale témoignait pour le texte de Qumrân. Cela semble indiquer que la date de 70 ap. J.-C. marque une étape importante dans le processus de recension du texte hébreu, ce que confirme pleinement une comparaison des textes bibliques de la Seconde Révolte avec ceux de Qumrân.
NEW LIGHT ON EARLY RECENSIONS OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

W. F. Albright

The publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, though still in an early stage, has now reached a point where we can begin to discuss recensional problems in the early Hebrew text of many books of the Bible. In this brief article I wish to point out certain directions along which future research will have to move; it is thus programmatic and lays no claim to being anything but a pioneer attempt. Now that the chronology of the principal types of script used in the Qumran scrolls and fragments is pretty well established, thanks especially to the recent work of Frank M. Cross,
refining and extending the results of John C. Trever, the writer, and especially of S. A. Birnbaum, we can attack the recensional problems with more confidence.

Recognition of the existence of early Hebrew recensions is not new. Though there has never hitherto been any clear evidence for different recensions in the extant Hebrew and Samaritan manuscripts, the text of some of the Greek books differs so widely from the Massoretic Hebrew tradition that divergent Hebrew recensions must be assumed. Thus H. M. Orlinsky wrote in his analysis of the present state of Septuagintal studies, published nearly fifteen years ago: "Of course there was at one time more than one text-tradition of the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew manuscripts used by the several Septuagint translators of the various books in the Old Testament differ at times not in minor details alone, but, as is the case in such books as Jeremiah, Job, Esther, recensionally from the masoretic text-tradition. But these text-traditions have long perished . . . ."

The greatest textual surprise of the Qumran finds has probably been the fact that most of the scrolls and fragments present a consonantal text which is virtually indistinguishable from the text of corresponding passages in our Massoretic Bible. The new material carries Hebrew examples of the proto-Massoretic text back into the second century B.C., and there are many Qumran manuscripts, long and short, of this type from the last century and a half of the Second Temple, as well as Murabba'at texts of Massoretic type from the late first and early second centuries A.D. The complete Isaiah Scroll (1QIs), now in Israel, is written in a text which belongs to the proto-Massoretic type, though

---

1 See especially his splendid paper in Jour. Bib. Lit., LXXIV (1955), pp. 147-165; I have no suggestions for revision of his chronology.
3 See most recently Bulletin, No. 115 (1949), pp. 10-19, in which I referred to most of the material I had been gathering since 1937 for a new study of the palaeography of the Nash Papyrus. It is interesting to note that my original preference for the first half of the period to which I had assigned this papyrus (placed in 1937 somewhere between cir. 150 and 50 B.C., but in no case later than the accession of Herod the Great in 37 B.C.) is now shown by Cross to be better than my 1949 date in the second half of this period.
4 See especially his monograph, The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography (Bulletin, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14, 1952), and his great work, The Hebrew Scripts (London, 1955—), now in its second fascicle (for a notice of the first see Bulletin, No. 139, p. 24).
5 A beginning along this line was made by the late A. T. Olmstead in his papers in Am. Jour. Sem. Lang., XXX (1913), pp. 1-35, and XXXI (1915), pp. 160-214, with considerable acumen but with very questionable method; against his views see J. A. Montgomery's commentary on Kings (ICC, 1951), pp. 251 f., and my comments in Jour. Bib. Lit., LXXI (1952), p. 256. The trouble with Olmstead's treatment is that he assumed a series of late revisions of the Hebrew, as well as of the Greek text even after the original LXX translation. The Jeroboam story of LXX he considered to go back to a Hebrew original antedating our MT.
7 This point has been emphasized by the scholars working on the Scrolls; cf. n. 15 below.
it has a much fuller vocalization with the aid of waw and yodh and does have a few very useful variants, as well as a great many careless readings.

Only a little less surprising than the new evidence for the great age of the consonantal tradition on which the Masoretic text depends, is the discovery of portions of Exodus, Deuteronomy, and especially of Samuel in recensions which are much closer to the LXX than they are to MT, though they usually differ from both and sometimes exhibit a text which is obviously older than either. The earliest so far found fragments of this type seem to go back into the late third century B.C. and are in any case pre-Maccabean. The new texts of Samuel, especially 4QSam which represents portions of the text of at least two-thirds of the chapters in I and II Samuel, show that Wellhausen and Driver were entirely wrong in considering the LXX translation as so free as often to be a paraphrase of its Hebrew prototype; actually its fidelity to the Hebrew prototype is much greater than has often been assumed. We now know that in the fragments so far described from the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets (Joshua-Judges-Samuel-Kings) the Greek translators were almost slavish in their literalism (though they seldom pushed it to the point of absurdity, as later done by Aquila). When we find sections preserved in the LXX (i.e., in the Egyptian recension of Codex B and its congeners) that are missing in MT, as well as completely different forms of names, we may thus be reasonably certain that they are not inner Greek additions or corruptions, but go back to an older Hebrew recension which differed from MT.

Returning to our proto-Massoretic texts from Qumran, we can now revert to the position shared by tradition and by scholars of the Wellhausen and related schools of criticism, that many of the older books of our Hebrew Bible were edited in approximately their present form in Babylonia and were then brought back to Palestine by the returning exiles during the late sixth and the fifth centuries B.C. This point of view, once taken for granted by most conservatives and liberals alike, has been rejected by many recent students, but is strongly supported by archaeological evidence. We now have most striking confirmatory evidence from the first Qumran Isaiah Scroll, referred to above. In this text we have a number of correct vocalizations of Assyro-Babylonian words and names: Sar'usur (SR'WSR) for MT Sar'éser and LXX

8 See Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York, 1955), pp. 303-314. However, Burrows's extremely judicious selection by no means exhausts the list of important variants in this scroll, which I have studied repeatedly with my students.
12 For the evidence supporting the completeness of the devastation of Judah in the early sixth century and the historicity of the Exile and Restoration see most recently the references in Albright, The Bible after Twenty Years of Archaeology (1932-1952), reprinted by the Biblical Colloquium (Pittsburgh, 1955), Notes, p. 3.
Sarasar; turtân (TWRTN) for MT tartân and LXX Tanathan, etc.; 'Urarat ('WRRT) for MT 'Ararât and Greek Ararath. There are many similar correct occurrences of the vowel-letter W for u, o in 1QIs, including a considerable number which are not in Beegle's excellent paper, but these correct vocalizations of Assyro-Babylonian words are particularly striking. In a text handed down in Babylonia such precise tradition is not at all surprising, since we know from the work of O. Neugebauer and A. J. Sachs that cuneiform scribes were still active in the latter part of the first century A.D. In the West it would be very unlikely a priori, and the LXX transcriptions from the second (or even late third) century B.C. prove that there was no such fixed tradition.

I have maintained for several years that the prototype of the first Isaiah Scroll came from Babylonia, probably in the second half of the second century B.C. There is supporting evidence, into which we have no room to go here. 1QIs is thus an offshoot of the proto-Massoretic text-tradition in Babylonia, which it may have developed further for several centuries after the ancestral Hebrew text was taken by the returning exiles to Palestine; this would help to explain some divergences from MT, as well as the generally inferior character of the text when compared with the proto-Massoretic of the second Isaiah Scroll (1QIs), etc., which is virtually identical with MT.

Returning now to the Egyptian recension of the LXX, we note that there is much evidence of pre-Septuagintal Egyptian influence on the text of several books. I formerly thought that this evidence of Egyptian influence on the LXX pointed to the translators themselves, in the third century B.C. However, in a period of such strong Greek influence on the Egyptian Jews, many of whom had been brought to Egypt by the Lagides as captives or had recently come as traders, it is scarcely likely that the Jews would have treated the Hebrew consonantal text with such freedom merely to exhibit their knowledge of native Egyptian. Moreover, we are in a position to demonstrate from the Qumran fragments so far published that the translators were extremely careful not to depart from the Hebrew text that lay before them. We are, therefore, compelled

14 Suffice it to say here that this evidence is partly derived from Essene beliefs and practices, such as the strong Mazdayasian and specifically Zervanite dualism (to which attention has been drawn particularly by K. G. Kuhn, A. Dupont-Sommer, and Henri Michaud), and the emphasis placed on lustration by water (as still in Mandeanism) as well as upon quasi-science (according to Josephus). There are also historical arguments pointing to a movement from Babylonia in the second century B.C. (cf. my Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible (1932), p. 143, and my observations in The Biblical Period (in Louis Finkelstein, The Jews, 1949), p. 6.
to reckon with the probability that the translators dealt piously with a text which had been handed down for generations in Egypt itself. We can probably fix the time at which the Egyptian recensions of the Pentateuch and Samuel-Kings were edited about the fifth century B.C. (presumably not before the sixth century or after the fourth in any book).

I shall limit myself to a few examples. The Egyptian name of Joseph appears as $\text{SPNTP'}\text{NH}$ which, as long ago pointed out by Spiegelberg, stands for an Egyptian $\text{Dd-p$\ddot{z}$-ntr-\text{iw}.f^-\text{n$h}$, pronounced in the early first millennium approximately $\text{Chepn$\ddot{u}$tef$\ddot{a}$n$h}$,\(^{17}\) This name belongs to a type which was in common use about the tenth century B.C. However, the Greek equivalent in Gen. 41: 45 is $\text{Psontomphanech}$ for a Late Egyptian $\text{Psontenupa$\ddot{a}$n$h}$, "The Creator (or Sustainer) of Life,"\(^{18}\) obviously substituted for a somewhat different consonantal form which had become unintelligible by the Achaemenian period (even assuming that MT had been transmitted correctly to Egypt). The new form of the word made such excellent sense as an appellation of Joseph that we can be quite certain that the editor of the Egyptian recension or a precursor knew Egyptian very well and considered it important to show that he did. There is even more striking evidence in Genesis. We may expect the correct equivalents Heliopolis and Heroönpolis for On and Pithom,\(^{19}\) respectively, but it is much more remarkable to find Heb. $\text{G$\ddot{o}$s$\ddot{e}$n}$, "Goshen," replaced by "Arabian Gesem" in two passages (Gen. 45: 10 and 46: 34). A year ago Dr. Isaac Rabinowitz pointed out to the Society of Biblical Literature that the peculiar Greek form $\text{Gesem}$ for $\text{G$\ddot{o}$s$\ddot{e}$n}$ evidently goes back to the famous Arabian king Geshem, Nehemiah's foe, mentioned on silver bowls found at or near Tell el-Maskhutah, ancient Pithom-Heroönpolis.\(^{20}\) Since Geshem's rule extended from the eastern Delta of Egypt to the frontier of Judaea on the northeast and at least as far as Dedan (el-'Ulâ) in the south,\(^{21}\) he was a very important chieftain who must have made a name for himself in the half-century immediately preceding the restoration of Egyptian independence under Amyrtaeus (cir. 400 B.C.). Rabinowitz is undoubtedly right in explaining $\text{Gesem Arabias}$ for Heb. $\text{G$\ddot{o}$s$\ddot{e}$n}$ as a reminiscence of the Arabian prince Geshem. This makes it difficult to date the editing of the Egyptian recension of Genesis before about 400 (Geshem presumably reigned between 450 and 420 B.C.) or after the beginning of the Greek period (330 B.C.). A very interesting example of the difference between the Egyptian and Babylonian recensions of Genesis is the fact that the former substitutes "land of the Chaldaeans" for "Ur of the Chaldaeans" in the story of Abram. As suggested by the Book of Jubilees (probably from the first quarter of the second century B.C.) the original Hebrew text included the words rendered "Ur in the land of the Chaldaeans" ($'R\ B\cdot\RS\ H\cdot\K$\$\ddot{s}$\DYM$), which the Babylonian Jewish scribes (who knew Ur very well) corrupted by haplography to $'R\ H\cdot\K$\$\ddot{s}$\DYM$, "Ur of the Chaldaeans," while the Egyptian Jews (who knew nothing of Ur) corrupted the original text, by the alter-

\(^{17}\) This explanation we owe to Spiegelberg, Zeits. f. ägypt. Spr., XXVII, pp. 41 f.; XXX, pp. 50 ff.; for names of the same formation see the long list in H. Ranke, Die ägyptischen Personennamen, pp. 409-412, who attributes them to the outgoing New Kingdom (specifically to the XXth Dynasty), and especially to the XXIst Dynasty and the following period.

\(^{18}\) For this explanation see Jour. Bib. Lit., XXXVII (1918), p. 132, where I was wrong in regarding the LXX form as original.

\(^{19}\) In Gen. 46: 28 f., we have a very remarkable substitution in the Egyptian recension of LXX (fortunately B is extant here). Where MT twice offers $\text{G$\ddot{o}$s$\ddot{e}$n}$, "to Goshen," the LXX has "by way of Heroönpolis," which the derived Coptic correctly rendered by "Pithom"; where MT has $\text{'ar$\ddot{g}$h}$ G$\ddot{o}$s$\ddot{e}$n, the LXX substitutes "to the land of Ramesses" (just as both versions offer in Gen. 47: 11). The mention of Pithom and Ramesses evidently goes back to the Hebrew prototype of LXX.


\(^{21}\) For our previous knowledge of Geshem and the extent of his power see especially my discussion in the Alt Festschrift (Geschichte und Altes Testament, 1953), pp. 4 ff.
native haplography, to 'RS H-K$DYM, "land of the Chaldaeans." One might adduce other illustrations, but we have no space.

In Kings we have two very interesting forms of an Egyptian personal name which reflect quite different Egyptian originals. I Kings 11:19 f. mentions the name of an Egyptian queen of the late XXIst Dynasty, about the second quarter of the tenth century B.C. as Tahpenès (THPNYS); this the Greek reproduces as Thekmina, which obviously reflects an entirely different Egyptian name, since there is no indication of inner Greek corruption. While the MT form of the name does look suspiciously like THPNYS, Greek Daphne in the northeastern Delta, there is no reason to doubt that the name has been correctly transmitted. If so, it may stand for an Egyptian *T$h-n. t-pi (or pr)-ns, "She Whom the King (or Palace) Protects," to be pronounced something like *Tahepinse, or *Tahepinse with dissimilation of the first n. However, the name may be corrupt, and there are many long names from the XXIst and XXIIInd Dynasties which begin and end with the same consonants. Thekmina, on the other hand, seems rather transparent; I should identify it provisionally with an Egyptian *T$l-k$-t-(n. t)-mn, "The Female Attendant (or the like) of Min," which would be pronounced something like *Tekemin. In Late Egyptian we have a name with the same meaning and form in T$l-hn. t-(n. t)-mn, "The Concubine of Min." Min, the god of Koptos, was renowned for his role as an ithyphallic producer of life. The pejorative sense which could be attributed to ($k$) (translated by German scholars as "Dirne") can scarcely have been overlooked by the editors of the Hebrew prototype of the Greek Kings.

It must be emphasized strongly that the Egyptian editions of different biblical books may have quite different recensional backgrounds, and that we know far too little to be dogmatic. I should be inclined to consider the Egyptian Pentateuch as essentially of Babylonian origin, i.e., it generally reflects the text which had probably been established in Babylonia during the sixth century B.C. This text was brought back to Judah and may have become canonical under Ezra's influence in the late fifth century. There are, of course, other possibilities. Some of the sharp deviations which we find, for instance, in Deut. 32, especially in verse 43 where the Greek has eight cola as against four in MT and six in the Qumran fragment recently published by Mgr. Skehan, warn us

---

22 On this see my observations in the Bertholet Festschrift (1950), pp. 13 f., with references to the literature.

23 For names of this formation see H. Ranke, loc. cit., p. 365: 24 f., both from the XXIst Dynasty, and for the substitution of a word for "the king" or "house of the king (pr-nsw)" see ibid., p. 355: 23, again from the XXIst Dynasty.

24 The original Egyptian name may have begun with the feminine article, $l, and have ended with (n. t)-ist, "of Isis," like various names from the same general period cited by Ranke, but this explanation seems less likely.


26 There are quite a number of names formed with the word $k$-$t, $k$-$l, kry, which is treated by Erman-Grapow, Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache, V, p. 101; it may go back to the classical Egyptian word $k$-$l, "vulva" (cf. Heb. raham) and it is always feminine in personal names, whether it has the feminine ending or not. From the XIXth and XXth Dynasty come names like T$l-x$-$t, etc. (Ranke, loc. cit., p. 370: 21, 371: 5-6, 8, 11, 14-15) and much later names like T$l-kr-hb or T$l-kr-Dhvy (ibid., p. 371: 12 f.), "The Concubine of Thoth." Note that the vocalization of the word for "Dirne" seems to have been originally ku'e, kuya and would have become approximately ke in later times. Observe further that the attribution of a name with such definitely pejorative connotation (for the Jews) to the sister-in-law of the Edomite rebel would be on a par with the statement in the Egyptian recension of the King that Jeroboam's mother was a harlot.

27 I should propose the following tentative original Hebrew form of the Egyptian
not to underestimate the possibility that the Egyptian Hebrew prototype had been influenced by Palestinian MS readings handed down independently of the Babylonian text-tradition. The complex situation in the earliest fragments of Samuel from Qumran, with which Frank M. Cross is dealing, suggests a basic form of text antedating sixth-century Babylonian copies. Such MSS as 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} reflect a text which antedates both the Hebrew prototype of the LXX and the proto-Massoretic text, and may thus preserve textual elements going directly back to the original Deuteronomistic Samuel, compiled toward the end of the seventh century B.C. We must patiently await the results of Cross's work before jumping at conclusions.

Other biblical books must eventually be restudied in the light of this program; we may mention particularly the Egyptian Isaiah, which perhaps separated recensionally from the proto-Massoretic text as late as the third century B.C., and Jeremiah, which presumably circulated in Egypt as early as the sixth century—thus perhaps accounting for the drastic divergences in content and order between LXX and MT. All such suggestions must await detailed study of the thousands of unpublished fragments from Qumran IV.

recension, on the basis of MT and the new fragment (a word which departs from the Greek translation is marked by an asterisk):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egyptian Recension</th>
<th>Hebrew Parallel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harnînû sämayim 'immô</td>
<td>we-hištahavû lô benê 'Elôhîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnînû gôyîm 'et le'ummô</td>
<td>we-hîthaszeqû lô ( ) mal'akô 'El</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kî dam *ahâdaw yiqqôm</td>
<td>we-nâqâm yâšîb le-sârâw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-le-mekanne'ôw yešâlîm</td>
<td>we-kipper ( ) 'admat 'ammô</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words which are preserved in MT are not italicized but left in Roman type. The new fragment has the first, third, and fourth bicolon substantially as given above, though with two verbal and one morphemic difference. The parallelism in the Egyptian recension is much better than in MT, so there can be little doubt that this text is very ancient. In such cases, where we may have to do with orally transmitted texts, it is dangerous to speak of relative originality of recensions. However, my own impression is that the Egyptian recension, after a few minor corrections on the basis of the other two recensions, presents a satisfactory archaic text.

28 See above, note 10.

29 We have not discussed the extremely interesting publication by Mgr. Skehan of a recension of Exodus which conforms closely to the Samaritan text and is actually written in proto-Samaritan script (resembling the latest preëxilic cursive, but not directly derived from it). My long-standing opinion that both the Samaritan and proto-Samaritan scripts are archaizing rather than archaic is shared by S. Yeivin and now by Cross: cf. my remarks in *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940), pp. 286, 336, and BULLETIN, No. 115, p. 14; Yeivin, BULLETIN, No. 118, pp. 28-30; Cross, *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LXXIV, p. 147, n. 1. I doubt whether any of the fragments in proto-Samaritan script antedate the last century B.C. The recension differs only slightly from MT, and it obviously springs from the proto-Massoretic of Qumran.
THE OLDEST MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN
FRANK M. CROSS, JR.
McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DISCOVERY in 1952 of some three hundred fragmentary manuscripts in Cave 4, Qumran, all dating before the First Jewish Revolt, as well as the discovery of documents of the first and second centuries A. D. in the region of Wadi Murabba'at, some with date formulae, have made possible new advances in the study of early Jewish paleography.¹ Were this find of material not sufficient, Qumran has provided a series of ostraca (partly unpublished) in controlled archeological contexts,² and Cave 4 itself, like the caves of Murabba'at, has produced associated materials in other scripts, notably Greek, yielding confirmation of the results of Jewish paleography on independent paleographic grounds.

The overwhelming lot of new documents does not materially alter conclusions of previous specialists in Hebrew and Aramaic epigraphy. As early as 1937, the main lines of the development of the script from the

¹ For the sake of clarity, we distinguish here between the “Jewish” script and the older (common) Aramaic script of the 4th–3rd centuries B. C. from which it derives, just as in the case of Nabatean and Palmyrene. It is used, of course, to write Hebrew and Aramaic. Over against it is the resurgent Paleo-Hebrew script of the Maccabean era, descended from Israelite times, but at Qumran archaizing, and roughly contemporary with the Maccabean “Jewish” hand. The present paper does not attempt to deal with the Paleo-Hebrew script; new evidence is in hand, however, which provides a solution in principle.

² For example, the practice alphabet from Level I (before 31 B. C.) published by De Vaux, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân,” RB, LXI (1954), Pl. Xa; cf. p. 229. While the forms are crudely made, it is clear in a number of cases how the scribe means to make his letter. Beth is corrected; note, however, that in both forms the lower (baseline) horizontal stroke is made from right to left continuous with the vertical; contrary to the cursive, and to the later formal hand, the base does not break through the vertical to the right. The left arm of gimel is high and horizontal; daleth is fairly narrow and long. Teth (note flat bottom), mem (broad and short to the point of distortion), ‘ayn, pe, and shin (note curved left arms on all specimens) are all characteristically developed forms. Zayn has no tendency to bulge to the right at the top; samekh is closed, but perhaps too crudely made to be useful; the leg of qoph is moderately long; the left leg of ‘aleph is lengthened, and inclining towards a vertical rather than a horizontal or crescent stance as in the preceding two stages of the script; the cross-bar of beth is lowered. In short, we have a mixture of developed and undeveloped letters characteristic of that stage of the script known as “transition to Herodian,” according to typology, here confirmed in an archeological context.
fifth century to the time of the First Revolt had become sufficiently clear to permit W. F. Albright's definitive redating of the Nash Papyrus. It is possible now, however, to clarify a number of obscurities, and to refine the limits within which a given typical script may be dated.

Two crucial tasks of the paleography of our period can be accomplished now with greater precision. The first, and most important, is a detailed description of the parallel courses of evolution of the bookhand (formal script) on the one hand, and the cursive on the other. The organization of a typological series with scores of exemplars of the formal script, both from MSS and inscriptions, is now in progress; this paper deals with the earliest and most problematical section of the series. Similarly, the cursive series can be set up, though with fewer specimens. From Qumran, MSS exhibiting both hands stand side by side from the second century B.C. until the First Revolt. Documents from Murabba'at and associated finds continue the series in the first and second centuries A.D. The cursive hand is rare in biblical scrolls, as might be expected, though frequent in sectarian, and especially Aramaic documents.

A second task is the study of the separation of the related scripts, Jewish, Palmyrene, and Nabatean, from the parent Aramaic script. This effort is aided by new materials in both Palmyrene and Nabatean as well as by the early biblical documents in Jewish script from Qumran, the

3 "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus," JBL, LVI (1937), 145–76 (hereafter abbreviated AN). Cf. "On the Date of the Scrolls from 'Ain Feshkha and the Nash Papyrus," BASOR, No. 115 (Oct., 1949), pp. 10–19. Albright's original Nash article remains the classical organization of the field of Aramaic and Jewish paleography. Despite the vast increases in epigraphic data, not to mention the finds in the Wilderness of Judah, his date in the Maccabean Period remains undisturbed. Indeed, his original preference for a date in the second half of the second century needs scant revision. All characteristic letters of Nash are earlier in form than 1QIsa*. 'Aleph has a short, curved left arm (aside from early, looped, cursive forms); beth is still small and curved; the later form with a rectangular lower right corner has not yet developed; especially significant, daleth is long and narrow; yodh is a three-stroke form; mem is far more narrow, especially at the top, in both medial and final forms; pe is rounded at the top and bottom; resh is extremely narrow; gaph has a very short leg. Birnbaum was the first to relate correctly Nash and 1QIsa* ("The Dates of the Cave Scrolls," BASOR, No. 115 [Oct., 1949], pp. 20–22). His relative chronology is superb; his absolute chronology appears to be a bit too high. Trever's arguments to date 1QIsa* earlier than Nash (J. C. Trever, "A Paleographic Study of the Jerusalem Scrolls," BASOR, No. 113 [Feb., 1949], p. 19) are based chiefly on Isaiah's non-use of modified forms of final letters, an idiosyncrasy of the MS, irrelevant to dating. As a matter of fact, we can now show (see below) that the late third century featured a more developed use of final letters than later periods. The cursive forms of Nash: looped aleph, he, and looped taw, in particular, are mixed with formal types. But these cursive forms must be dated in the cursive series, not in that of the bookhand. In the former they stand quite early. A date in the early Maccabean period, ca. 150 B.C., or even slightly earlier, seems best.
latter mostly unpublished as yet. As a matter of fact, exemplars of the early Jewish bookhand and cursive from Qumran span precisely the period of divergence of the Palmyrene and Nabatean hands. This combination of materials enables us to apply more checks from outside in the effort to achieve an absolute chronology for the typological series of Jewish hands in the early period; of course an absolute chronology from the late first century B.C. to the second century A.D. is already closely fixed by datable epigraphs and dated documents of several kinds.

I

THE ARAMAIC SCRIPT OF THE FOURTH CENTURY B.C.
AND ITS THIRD CENTURY DERIVATIVES

The Aramaic chancellery script of the Persian Empire was in use from Asia Minor in the northwest, to North Arabia and Egypt to the south, and to Afghanistan eastward. To judge from inscriptional evidence, it remained homogeneous, at least in its essential characteristics, over this broad area until the fall of the Persian power. Studies of the development of Jewish scripts must begin with the cursive hands of the late fifth and fourth century B.C., the immediate (extant) ancestor of the Jewish bookhand, as well as cursive scripts from Egypt from the early third century, the immediate ancestor of the Jewish cursive hand.

Our chief exemplars of the fourth-century script, aside from lapidary inscriptions which are not directly useful, are from Egypt, published by

---

4 The key to Fig. 1 is as follows:

*Line 1.* An advanced cursive from Elephantine, dating to ca. 419 B.C. From Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus, usw.* (Leipzig, 1911), Pap. 18, Pls. 17–20. The asterisk notes final forms; the siglum *a* form from Sachau, Pap. 20. Pl. 23.

*Line 2.* The Aramaic cursive of the first half of the fourth century B.C. From N. Aimé-Giron, *Textes araméens d'Egypte* (Cairo, 1931), Pl. X, Pap. 87. Cf. also Ostracon 4 bis, Pl. I; and Pap. 86 bis (393–381 B.C.), 88, 89. The siglum *d* designates a letter taken from Pap. 88.


*Line 4.* The Aramaic cursive of the early third century (ca. 275 B.C.). From M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik III*, Tafel II. The letter bearing the siglum *a* is taken from an ostracon of similar date, *ibid.*, Tafel III.


All forms are traced from enlarged photographs.
Aimé-Giron in 1931, and Papyrus Luparensis. The Aimé-Giron papyri date from the first half of the century, and show only the slightest development from the late cursive script of Elephantine. The Papyrus Luparensis must be dated ca. 350 B.C. Distinctions between broad and narrow strokes within letters are still preserved in the fourth century, though the tendency towards a "monotonous" stroke, to gain sway in the third-century cursive, has already begun. The development of medial letters commences in the late fifth-century cursives. The long downstrokes below the (theoretical) baseline all begin to bend to the left in what may be called "semi-ligatures." So-called "final" letters, actually the older forms preserved where the tendency towards creating "semi-ligatures" is not so strong, are used in late fifth-century and early fourth-century cursives, though not systematically. Medial and final kaph, medial and final pe, medial (and possibly final) sade, as well as medial and final nun are becoming clearly distinguished. Mem in the medial position frequently exhibits a curving left diagonal stroke, as opposed to the older (and "final") straight diagonal. "Medial" lamedh, i.e., with a narrow hooked base, is clearly distinguished first in the fourth century.

The extreme difference in the length of various letters below the ceiling line characteristic of the fifth century persists, with kaph, mem, nun (medial as well as final), pe (medial and final), sade (normally), and taw extending far beneath a theoretical baseline. 'Aleph in the fourth century is developed beyond fifth-century forms as follows: the left leg is no longer a short, nearly horizontal straight line; it has become a crescent-shaped stroke which usually cuts the diagonal at the base on the lower side, as well as protruding in a high, curved point on the upper left of the diagonal. Beth is still gently rounded at the bottom right as it curves to the horizontal. Daleth is long and narrow, as in the fifth century, while resh is still narrower, but shorter. He (see also Fig. 3) is still made in classical fashion, with the horizontal arm drawn from right to left. In the fourth century, there is a notable tendency for the cross-bar of heth to bulge upwards following the right vertical downstroke; the cross-bar comes down again for a partial loop to the left vertical downstroke. Teth is long, pointed at the base, with a high left arm, little developed from earlier forms. Yodh is made with a triple
 figura 1
אָרֵב 8 וְרָחָא גָזָה 6 6ו, לֶאֱוִי רֵעֵי כְּפֹרֵי וַה 38 1 ה

אָבָב אַחֲרֵי אַחֲרֵי הָיוֹת 6 6ו בְּבַר לֵא יִסְבּרִית והָלֹהַיָּים כַּפָּרֶשֶׁת

אָלֶג 6 וְרָחָא הָיוֹת 6 6ו בַּעֲלֵי הָלֹהַיָּים לֵא"ן וְלֵא אָרוֹב וַה 38 1 ה

Figure 4
movement; down, then to the left, then curving up and down strongly again to the right. Medial nun is very long still, and preserves often a curve to the right at the top. Samekh in the fourth century loses its characteristic, complicated head; the letter now resembles a double hook, the second, rounded and large, emerging from the center of the first. The lower stroke curls more tightly to the left than in the fifth century. ‘Ayn remains small and high; a slight tendency for the right stroke to break through at the base may be noted. Shin reveals no curved strokes as yet, and is small. Taw remains very large with a short right stroke.9

The scripts of the third century B.C. from Egypt must all be dated not later than the first half of the third century, and preferably in the first decades of that century.10 The forms are only slightly advanced over those of the early fourth century, and very slightly beyond those of the Sachau ostracon (n. 9). Historical circumstances, namely the rapid decline of Aramaic for business or public purposes in Egypt in favor of Greek, support such a conclusion, confirming the palaeographic evidence.

The development of medial forms is now approaching its zenith.11 The long down-strokes of medial forms of kaph, samekh, pe, sade are more tightly bent to the left. So also with lamedh whose base is hooked more

9 The late fourth century is represented by a single ostracoon, published by Sachau (Tafel 62:2). It has been associated in the past with the ostraca and papyri of the early third century but is clearly more archaic in script. Beth retains its curved lower stroke; the left leg of gimel is very long, with no tendency to “kick up” towards the horizontal; he is classical, not that of the third-century cursive. Kaph is longer than third-century forms. Medial and final mem are little distinguished, and the left diagonal is straight; neither of these characteristics is necessarily a criterion of antiquity, however, since they persist in the cursive into the second century. Lamedh is archaic, not developed beyond early fourth-century forms (see below); medial nun is especially archaic, being scarcely bent to the left at the base, and is longer than some cursive fifth-century forms, much less later third-century types. Yodh is intermediate: its two stroke form, normally like a small, late gimel, is the forerunner of the cursive “inverted-V-shaped” yodh. The sade has its right arm curled upward and back to the left like mid-fourth-century types (Fig. 2, line 1). Shin is relatively large. In fact, the chief element revealing development towards third-century cursive scripts is the increased uniformity in size of letters. Taw has a very short right leg, and is less developed than those of Pap. 18. To this palaeographical evidence it may be added that the ostracoon has no Greek names in some sixteen lines of text, unlike the other name-lists of the early third century, where Greek names fairly swarm.

10 Cf. AN, pp. 154–55.

11 Actually, this took place in the bookhand, not in the cursive script to which the third century documents from Egypt belong, as we shall see below. The tendency towards creation of ligatures or semi-ligatures ceased earlier in the cursive script than in the formal hand, with an attendant trend towards standardization of forms most strongly seen in Palmyrene. Here, except in the case of nun, all distinctions between medial and final forms were obliterated.
sharply; its vertical stance, anticipated in the fourth century, is regular; the first evidence of final ‘lamedh now appears.\(^1\)

The homogeneity of pen stroke, already noted in the late fourth-century script, is more obvious in the third. ‘Aleph is larger. The right downstroke of beth is vertical, and the letter base tends to sweep farther left in cursive (\textit{sensu stricto}) fashion.\(^2\) The left arm of gimel is rising with the concurrent tendency to lower its point of departure from the right downstroke. Daleth and resh are broadening. He is regularly made in what is to become the style of the later cursive (see Fig. 3), a major departure from earlier scripts. Teth is not yet \textit{squarish} at the bottom, but is opening up, its cross-bar failing usually to cut into the vertical left. Samekh is radically changed, the left hook of the fourth-century form giving way to a vertical or, in extreme cursive forms, a long diagonal stroke. The right leg of taw is rapidly lengthening.

\section*{II}
\textbf{THE EARLIEST JEWISH SCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN}\(^*\)

Two MSS in particular are clear exemplars of the most archaic Jewish hand at Qumran. These are 4QSam\(^b\) (I Samuel), herein published, and an unpublished MS of Jeremiah, 4QJer\(^a\). Two aspects of the typology of the script are apparent at a glance. The extraordinary differentiation in size of letters in length, characteristic of the Aramaic hand of the fifth and fourth centuries, and largely absent already from the cursive of the third century, is here retained, especially in 4QSam\(^b\). Secondly, the

\(^{12}\) See below in the early Jewish bookhand, especially 4QJer\(^a\).

\(^{13}\) Cf. 4QEccles, and Palmyrene.

\(^{14}\) A key to Fig. 2 follows. All scripts are traced from photographs with the exception of the Bnê Hêzîr inscription. Its forms were traced from a photograph of a new squeeze made by the writer, and checked by direct photographs. Sigla: ¹, the letter is broken off at the top; ² final pe is not used.

Line 1. An Aramaic script of the mid-fourth century. From the Louvre Papyrus, \textit{CIS (Pars Secunda)} I:1, Tab. XVII, Nos. 146 A, B.

Line 2. 4QSam\(^b\) (see Fig. 6).

Line 3. 4QJer\(^a\) (unpublished).

Line 4. A cursive hand from ca. 150–125 B. C.: 4QXII\(^b\) (Minor Prophets).

Line 5. The Bnê Hêzîr inscription from the end of the first century B. C.

Line 6. 4QDeut\(^a\) (unpublished) from ca. A. D. 50.

Not included in the chart, but presumed in comparative discussions, are 1QI\textit{sa}\(^a\) (ca. 125–100 B. C.), and the Nash Papyrus (ca. 175–150 B. C.). Convenient and accurate typological charts of these scripts may be found in Birnbaum’s studies, \textit{BASOR}, No. 115, p. 21, or \textit{The Qumrân (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography (BASOR, Suppl. Studies, Nos. 13–14 [New Haven, 1952])}, pp. 33, 41. The best photographs of Nash are those of Trever, “The Problem of Dating the Dead Sea Scrolls,” \textit{The Smithsonian Report [1953]}, pp. 425–35, Pl. 17; note also his photographic tables of the script of 1QI\textit{sa}\(^a\), \textit{ibid.}, Pl. 8.
calligraphic technique, varying wide and narrow strokes of the pen according to fixed canons, is here preserved. Actually, the cursive of the third century has largely lost this finesse and, as we have seen, has become monotonous in stroke. Moreover, as we shall see, a number of letters retain characteristics of the classical script of the late Persian period, already lost in the third-century cursives. On the other hand, a few letters are more developed than early third-century cursives, so that there is no question of dating our MSS in the late fourth century B.C. Rather, it now becomes clear that the formal Jewish bookhand derives from a formal tradition of the early third century, as yet unknown from cursive third-century ostraca and papyri. The existence of this formal script, projected to fill the gap in our extant third-century material, is further confirmed by the typology of the cursive scripts which develop directly from the third-century Aramaic cursive. Two exemplars are given here: line 4 of Fig. 2 (4QXIIa) and line 2 of Fig. 4 (4QEccles, see below). This cursive cannot be treated in detail here, save as it bears directly on problems of dating the bookhand.\footnote{The divergence of the bookhand and the cursive is illustrated in Fig. 3. Here below is a key to the figure.}

3. An Aramaic cursive of the early third century B.C. From Lidzbarski, *op. cit.*, Tafel II.
6. An ossuary cursive of the first century A.D. Cf. Bagatti and Milik, “Nuovi Scavi al ‘Dominus Flevit,’” *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus IV* (1953–54), p. 262, Fig. 11; Savignac, *RB*, XXXIV (1925), Pl. X:2; R. Dussaud, “Comptes d’ouvriers d’une entreprise funéraire juive,” *Syria*, IV (1923), 241–49, Fig. 1; etc.

8. From 4QSanb (end of the third century B.C.).
10. From 4QEx (unpublished; ca. 150–125 B.C.).
12. From 4QNumbersb (unpublished; Herodian).
centuries. Of course, forms are mixed in certain documents: the Nash Papyrus, for example, which is none the less dominantly in the tradition of the bookhand. By the first two centuries A.D., the two are so widely separated that an intermediate chancellery hand emerges. The development of cursive \textit{he} is shown in Fig. 3. Several other characteristic cursive forms may be noted. 'Aleph develops two forms: the looped 'aleph which later invades Nabatean, and, in Jewish, the "caret" form, open to the right, which is derived from forms that omitted the left short leg. Beth, by the second century, reverses the direction in which the lower horizontal is penned, a development taking place only in the second half of the first century B.C. in the bookhand. The cursive form develops into the "figure 2" beth of the first century A.D. and later. Hieth early takes on the "N-form." Samekh develops from third-century forms in the cursive, being made often without lifting the pen, looping slightly at top left, and tending to close at the baseline to form a triangular shape. The form invades both Nabatean and the Jewish bookhand towards the end of the second century B.C. 'Ayn, in the cursive, enlarges and rounds before the right stroke breaks very deeply through; in the bookhand, on the contrary, the right arm cuts through early, forming an angular "y-form," which is very small and high. Later 'ayn, in the cursive, is made without lifting the pen. Medial and final mem are never strongly distinguished in the cursive; in any case, a single form develops, made with a continuous motion beginning with the lower end of the left diagonal, omitting the broad tick at top left. Finally, it must be said that

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{figure3}
\caption{Figure 3}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{16} See Milik, "Une lettre de Siméon bar Kokheba," \textit{RB}, LX (1953), 276, n. 1.
the general characteristics of the cursive are, in the early period, its broadening, shortening, increasingly uniform letters, and later its tendency to simplify to single-letter forms which could be made without lifting the pen. Ligatures become characteristic of the cursive only quite late.

We return to the early Jewish bookhand with special reference to the MSS of Samuel and Jeremiah. 'Aleph in 4QSamb is very small compared with that of 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}, or even of third-century cursive. Its left leg is crescent-shaped, breaking through at the bottom, precisely as in fourth-century types, our only clear witness to the form. Of course, from such forms develop the semi-looped leg of Nabatean and Palmyrene 'alephs, as well as the looped, or half-looped Nash forms. Typologically, the 'aleph of 4QSamb is prior to any known Jewish hand, or any forms extant after the fourth century. This applies to its size, the calligraphic technique (shared with Jer\textsuperscript{a}), as well as the treatment of the left leg, the chief typological clue in the case of 'aleph throughout its late history. Beth is small, rounded at bottom right, though the downstroke is moving to the vertical. In Jer\textsuperscript{a}, it has become vertical or even bulges slightly to the right. In neither case has it approached the larger, square-cornered Isa\textsuperscript{a} beth. The top is short with sharp ticks, unlike the broader, cursive forms with a rounded right shoulder. The "square-cornered" long baseline has not yet begun to develop. This latter form is the mother to early cursive beths (by 125 B.C.) which draw the base from left to right. It may be noted that both Nabatean and Palmyrene exhibit the "square-cornered" beth, or "proto-cursive" form. Gimel, both in Sam\textsuperscript{b} and Jer\textsuperscript{a}, has developed beyond the fifth-century forms, but is far more archaic.
than Isa\textsuperscript{a}, or even earlier second-century forms (4QEccles, 4QXII\textsuperscript{a}, and unpublished MSS). Third-century forms are closest. The right leg is a straight diagonal, not bowed as later (e. g., Isa\textsuperscript{a}). The left leg, the more significant paleographically, is normally very long, beginning high on the right leg, if not virtually at the top. It has begun to “kick up” slightly. Daleth again finds its nearest parallels in the long, narrow forms of the fourth century, though Nash is comparable, as well as certain third-century forms.\textsuperscript{17} The broad, angular cross-bar of Isa\textsuperscript{a} is far in the future. The long, right downstroke is vertical, and shows no tendency to shift counter-clockwise to a slightly diagonal stance characteristic of the cursive, especially 4QEccles and Palmyrene. He is made in classical, formal style. Its top horizontal is thickened heavily; the right vertical is still inclined diagonally and sharply pointed at the top. In Sam\textsuperscript{b} the tendency to move the left vertical towards the left end of the horizontal top has now begun; however, the leg is still diagonal. Jer\textsuperscript{a} is more archaic, without the tendency to shift the left leg. They both stand intermediate between the fourth-century scripts and the second-century bookhand. Waw is strongly bent at the top; the true “head,” or hooked top, is not yet developed (Isa\textsuperscript{a} and later). Zayn is not particularly useful for paleography as long as it remains a simple, vertical stroke. However, it is to be noted that the sharply-pointed top, survival of the technique of the fifth-fourth century, is found in Jer\textsuperscript{a} (no zayn appears in Sam\textsuperscript{b}). As early as Isa\textsuperscript{a}, zayn tends to bend and thicken slightly at the top. Heth in Sam\textsuperscript{b} sometimes bulges at the center of the cross-bar (see the discussion of fourth-third century forms), a tendency eventuating in “N-shaped” heth. 4QEccles and Isa\textsuperscript{a} are intermediate, with the cross-bar slanting often up to the left downstroke. On the other hand, some forms, especially those of Jer\textsuperscript{a} are indistinguishable from fifth-century cursive. Note that the left leg often bends left at the bottom, and tapers to a point in archaic style. Teth is narrow, tall, with a long left arm, and rounded or pointed bottom. The cross-stroke cuts the left arm. It is undifferentiated from fifth-fourth century forms. In the second century the cross-bar curls, and, especially in the cursive, the left arm shortens. In the first century b. c (earlier in the cursive) the broad flat bottom with rectangular verticals appears. Yodh in 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} is made with three

\textsuperscript{17} See Fig. 5 which is a drawing of an ostracon from Samaria reading, “(belonging) to Judah,” from ca. 200 b. c. The long, narrow daleth is now certain and characteristic. Formerly it was read ꝫ, “(belonging) to Yahweh.” See E. L. Sukenik, “Potsherds from Samaria, Inscribed with the Divine Name,” PEFQS, 1936, pp. 34–37. Cf. PEQ, 1937, pp. 140 ff. It may now be said with confidence that no coins, ostraca, or stamps bearing the divine name are extant from the post-exilic period. Sukenik himself corrected most erroneous readings, “Paralipomena Palaestinensia,” JPOS, XIV (1934), 178–84. See most recently, Vincent, “Les épigraphes judéo-araméennes postéxiliques,” RB, LVI (1949), 275–94, who holds to older views.
motions as in third-century forms and earlier, as well as in Nabatean and Nash. The yodh of Jer\textsuperscript{a} appears sometimes to be an early form of two-movement yodh, nearly an inverted, curved “V.” It appears only rarely in fourth and third-century materials, but is regular in the early Jewish cursive of the second century. It is also found in the earliest Nabatean inscription (see below), as well as in Palmyrene. By the end of the second century (Isa\textsuperscript{a}), it is standard. Medial kaph is very long and narrow, especially in Jer\textsuperscript{a}. The downstroke is nearly on the vertical, showing advance from the fifth and early fourth-century forms which slant. The downstroke bends in leftward in the middle, a rudimentary “figure-three” form.\textsuperscript{18} The base of medial kaph is still a curving, short flourish to the left, reminiscent of its cursive origin in the fifth century, and identical with that of the third century. There is no hint yet of the long, sloping bottom stroke, bent from the vertical downstroke at a virtual right angle (second-century cursive, Isa\textsuperscript{a}, and later). Final kaph is identical with fourth and third-century forms, having a narrow top, and very long vertical downstroke. Lamedh in Jer\textsuperscript{a} always distinguishes an archaic final form with a long horizontal stroke, almost imperceptibly hooked. Sam\textsuperscript{b} also uses final lamedh but not systematically. Medial lamedh is characteristically short, its hook downward thin, short, and uncurved. Final lamedh appears elsewhere certainly only in the early third century.\textsuperscript{19} It traces its origin to the fourth century. The final mem of Sam\textsuperscript{b} is extraordinarily archaic. There is nothing like it after the fifth-fourth centuries. The third-century forms are neither as long nor as narrow, but belong to the cursive tradition preserved in 4QXII\textsuperscript{a}. The form in Jer\textsuperscript{a} is less archaic, tending to vertical downstrokes, and with a long base-stroke to the left, anticipating the “closed” forms of Eccles, Nash, Isa\textsuperscript{a}, and later. Medial mem in Sam\textsuperscript{b} is also more archaic than Jer\textsuperscript{a}, though both are narrow and very long below the baseline. Contrary to earlier and later cursive mem, the left diagonal does not cut the top-stroke. This left diagonal is still very long, but bends leftward. The closest parallels are fourth century (Fig. 2, line 1). Nun is very large and long, and sometimes bends right at the top in archaic fashion; however, this latter feature survives in even later scripts. Both final and medial nun are identical with fourth and third-century types. In the early second century, medial nun is radically shortened, beginning in the cursive.

Samekh is extremely valuable paleographically in this period, since it is in the course of rapid change. The samekh of both Sam\textsuperscript{b} and Jer\textsuperscript{a} is very archaic. Note the “hooked head” (not looped in Sam\textsuperscript{b}). The only parallels are in late fifth-century cursive and in the fourth century. The

\textsuperscript{18} See AN, pp. 166–67.

\textsuperscript{19} See above, n. 12.
cursive of the third century develops a new tradition out of which emerges the samekh of 4QEccles, Palmyrene, and later scripts. 'Ayn has been briefly touched on in connection with discussion of the Jewish cursive above. It is small and high, but, unlike the early cursive hands, has “broken through” at the bottom. We must presume that the form developed in the bookhand sometime between the early fourth century and the late third century. At this point third-century cursives are of little aid, since they develop in a different tradition (cf. samekh). Medial pe is gently rounded at both the top and bottom as in the fourth-third centuries. The later pointed top and rectangular base develop first in the second century cursives, and enter the bookhand as early as 1QIsaα. Unfortunately, sade is missing in Samβ. In Jerα both the medial forms and the final forms are archaic. Count The closest parallel to the form of Jerα is the sade of the mid-fourth century. Indeed, nowhere else do we find an example of the tightly curled right arm of sade.

The chief element of typological interest in the case of qoph is its tail. It shortens in the fourth century, and begins to lengthen again in the cursives and formal scripts of the early second century. In Samβ and especially in Jerα it is at its shortest phase. The “open” head of qoph (Samβ) is also indicative of relative antiquity (in this period!). Resh in Jerα, and especially Samβ has an extremely narrow head. This is the case in fourth century scripts. The cursive of the third century, and the early Jewish cursives (Eccles, XIΙα) already have a broadening form. Shin in the archaic period is made with a broad left diagonal, and two straight diagonals to its right. The form persists until a tendency to curve the right-most diagonal develops in the second century (Eccles, Isaα, as well as unpublished bookhands earlier than Isaα). Samβ and Jerα belong with the archaic scripts both in style of stroke and in form. Still later (first century B.C.), both right diagonals bend back. Taw in Samβ is extraordinarily large, with a short right leg. Its closest parallels are in Papyrus 18 (419 B.C.)!, and Papyrus Luparensis; however, the third-century forms are quite similar, except in calligraphic technique. In Jerα, the right leg is lengthened (cf. Palmyrene), but taw is still very large. Beginning in the third century, the relative size of taw is steadily reduced to conform with that of other letters.

The result of our analysis is to show that 4QSamb, especially, but also Jerα, belongs to the tradition of the Persian chancellery script of the fourth century B.C. both in its technique of penning letters, and in the size of letters: their length below the ceiling line and their narrowness. Certain letters, 'aleph (Samβ), daleth, he, teth, final mem (Samβ), samekh,

It is not impossible that the Nabatean sade develops from such a form, rather than from the common fifth-century sade.
sade (appears only in Jer<sup>a</sup>),<sup>21</sup> and resh have their closest parallels with fourth-century forms. Another series, waw, heth, yodh, nun (medial and final), qoph, shin, and taw have equally good parallels in the fourth and third centuries. Beth, gimel, kaph (medial), lamedh (medial and final), pe (medial and final) are more developed than fourth-century types, and stand closest to early third-century letters. Two letters, 'ayn (Sam<sup>b</sup> and Jer<sup>a</sup>) and medial mem (Sam<sup>b</sup>), have no precise parallels. Medial mem (Sam<sup>b</sup>) is a development of forms like those of Papyrus Luparensis, bypassed in extant third-century documents. The mem of Jer<sup>a</sup> (medial and final) also has no real parallels, but is developed from the types in Sam<sup>b</sup>. 'Ayn shares early characteristics with fourth-century forms but possesses late characteristics not found in the early third century.

It is evident from this data that the archaic Jewish bookhand belongs to a formal tradition which parallels the extant cursives of the third century B.C., and that this formal tradition has evolved very slowly after the end of the Persian Empire. This is to be expected, of course, with the disuse of Aramaic for official purposes during the period of Hellenization. The Jewish bookhand, in all probability used chiefly to preserve sacred documents, is, therefore, quite naturally conservative. But before proceeding to an attempt to date these MSS, evidence for checking our conclusions from Nabatean and Palmyrene must be examined.

**III**

**THE SISTER SCRIPTS: PALMYRENE AND NABATEAN**<sup>22</sup>

By analysis of the earliest Palmyrene and Nabatean inscriptions, we can project backward, and determine fairly accurately the stage of the Aramaic script at the time each broke off to begin its independent evolu-

---

<sup>21</sup> Both samekh and sade are more formal than their fourth-century counterparts, but show evolution; they are classified here, however, since third-century forms are far more developed.

<sup>22</sup> See Fig. 4. A key to the chart follows:


tion. This information can be most useful if we can then solve two problems: (1) the points at which the prototypic Nabatean and Palmyrene scripts fit into the typological sequence of the scripts with which we have been working, and (2) the probable "absolute" date when Nabatean and Palmyrene branched off from their parent scripts. 23

The earliest Nabatean inscription which can be dated certainly is the Ašlāḥ Inscription of ca. 90 B.C. 24 An older inscription found at Khalasah belongs to the cursive tradition of the third century, rather than to the tradition out of which the Nabatean lapidary branched, and therefore need not be considered. 25

The ductus of Nabatean preserves the narrow, long, and irregularly-sized letters of the formal tradition. Indeed, contrary to the trend towards uniformity ("squareness") in script operating in the second and first-century B.C. Jewish scripts, Nabatean develops and exaggerates this element of the old Aramaic hand. 26 The Ašlāḥ script has only begun this secondary development; the relative size of its letters is close to that of Sam b. As a matter of fact, the Ašlāḥ script shares many characteristics of the earliest Jewish bookhands: daeleth and resh are narrow with small heads; ḫeth shares the domed cross-bar with Sam b (as well as older scripts and Palmyrene); ḧeth has the long left arm; yodh is a development of the "three-movement" formal yodh; medial mem is very narrow and

Mesnil du Buisson (Inventaire des Inscriptions Palmyréniennes de Doura-Europos [Paris, 1939]), dated 33 B.C. The line drawings are traced from unpublished photographs of Abbé J. Starcky. The writer is in debt to Abbé Starcky, not only for permission to draw on unpublished material, but also for counsel in matters of Palmyrene epigraphy, a field in which he is unsurpassed. The present group of inscriptions is announced in Actes du XXI Congrès international des Orientalistes, Paris, 23–31 juillet, 1948 (Impr. Nat., 1949), p. 111. They will be published by Starcky together with a study of early Palmyrene and Nabatean paleography in the forthcoming volume dedicated to Levi della Vida.

23 Albright (AN, pp. 163–71) deals at length with the early evolution of these two scripts, solving most of the basic problems. Much of the material he treats needs not be rehearsed here.

24 For literature on this inscription, and those discussed below, see n. 22.

25 The Khalasah Inscription has been assigned by Cowley (Palestine Exploration Fund Annual [1914–15], p. 146, Fig. 59) and Albright (AN, p. 165) tentatively to Ḥaretat II at the end of the second century B.C. If this script is at all accurately traced, however, it is scarcely developed beyond third-century forms. Note 'aleph, mem, and especially 'ayn and taw (with a short right leg). All forms are broad, and daeleth, ḫeth, yodh, mem, and 'ayn clearly are in the cursive tradition. A date in the reign of Ḥaretat I (contemporary of Antiochus IV) is not excluded paleographically. On the date of the archaic El-'Ulä texts, and of the much disputed Rabbel inscription, see Albright's discussions, AN, pp. 164–67, especially n. 57 and p. 167; and "Dedan," Geschichte und Altes Testament (Alt Festschrift; Tübingen, 1953), p. 7, n. 2.

long (the left diagonal has shortened, however); nun is long; ‘ayn is small, high, and tends towards the “y” form; shin is archaic; taw has a short right leg and is nearly identical with Samb. A number of letters appear, however, never to have evolved through the stage represented by the earliest Jewish hands, but to have diverged from a script of a later period. 'Aleph, both in Aṣlaḥ and later, derives from an 'aleph with a semi-looped left leg.27 Beth, with its rectangular right-lower corner, is late, though it may be derived by parallel evolution. He is especially advanced; it derives from the formal hand, however. Saḍe is problematical; it may well be a survival of the form otherwise unknown later than the fifth and early fourth centuries; it may be a development of the “curled” form represented by Jera. Samekh, when it appears in Nabatean (unfortunately it is not found in Aṣlaḥ), is very late; its form has invaded the formal script from the cursive.28

Thus we may conclude that Nabatean, like the early Jewish bookhand, testifies to the existence of a formal Aramaic hand, ultimately derived from a chancellery hand of the late Persian Empire, paralleling the vulgar hand of the third century B.C. The point of divergence from this tradition appears to be later in Nabatean than in the earliest Jewish bookhands extant, notably 4QSamb. Unfortunately we know little of the early history of the Nabateans from the time of Antigonus’ raids against them in 312 B.C., until their dealings with Jason and the Maccabees in the days of Antiochus IV. It is clear, however, that they were exercising considerable autonomy in the days of Ḥaretat I, though their great expansion begins in the days of Ḥaretat II and ‘Obodat I at the end of the second century B.C. and the beginning of the first century B.C. In this latter period the script begins a period of rapid evolution towards the classical Nabatean lapidary style. The writer is inclined to believe, however, that the Nabatean script became more or less independent in its development not later than the second quarter of the second century, when effective Seleucid and Ptolemaic control of outlying provinces came to an end. It is precisely in the second half of the second century, with the decline of Hellenistic organization in Syria and Egypt, that the Jewish state and Nabatean Arabia are freed to go their own ways. In each case there is nationalistic expansion and resurgent Orientalism. In Judea, the Paleo-Hebrew script is resurrected in Maccabean times, and the Jewish bookhand begins a period of very rapid evolution culminating in the classical Herodian character. Historical circumstances as well as

27 See the 'aleph of the Rabbel inscription (used medially and in final positions), Cantineau, op. cit., p. 2; the looped form of the Ḥawrān inscriptions from the first century B.C. (published by De Vogüé, *Inscriptions sémitique* [Paris, 1868], Pl. 13:1 equals CIS II, 162), and Nash.
28 E.g., see Rabbel, l. 4.
paleographical evidence suggest that the Nabatean script followed a similar pattern of development.

Palmyrene, by the middle of the first century B.C. when our series of inscriptions begins,\textsuperscript{29} has already achieved a strongly individual style. Nevertheless, Palmyrene gives clear-cut evidence of descending from an Aramaic semi-cursive of the first half of the second century, being independent from ca. 150 B.C.\textsuperscript{30}

The script of 4QEccles, though influenced by formal elements of the Jewish bookhand, is very close to the prototypic script of Palmyra.\textsuperscript{31} Both scripts exhibit enlarged, especially broadened forms of letters: 'aleph, beth, daleth, resh, mem, and 'ayn. Palmyrene is also characterized by the later (cursive) style in he, yodh, samekh, 'ayn, sade, and perhaps qoph. Note the following typological traits: 'aleph has the semi-looped left leg; beth is large, with an angular base at the right, and long baseline; the stance of daleth is tipped forward (cf. 4QEccles); heth has the domed cross-bar, and tends to spread its verticals at the base; samekh is fairly archaic, but belongs with 4QEccles and the third-century style, not to earlier bookhand styles; pe is rounded at the top still, but flattened at the bottom, with a long baseline; qoph has a tail; the right leg of taw has lengthened. It is possible that a few of these late traits derive from an independent evolution which by coincidence pursues a similar path to that of the Jewish cursives; but not all of them. They are evidence that the prototype of the Palmyrene script must be dated later than the earliest Jewish scripts, not far from the period of the Ecclesiastes hand.

On historical grounds, the divergence of Palmyrene from its parent script is expected in precisely this period. Like Judea and Nabatea, Palmyra became increasingly independent with the breakdown of Seleucid power following the reign of Antiochus IV. It is extremely doubtful if any form of sustained control of Palmyra from Antioch was ever established again after the fall of Seleucia (141 B.C.).

\textsuperscript{29} See n. 22 (to Fig. 3, line 3).

\textsuperscript{30} Albright in 1937 (\textit{AN}, pp. 168–71), on the basis of Palmyrene texts beginning in 9 B.C. and the third century Egyptian documents, was able to date the divergence of Palmyrene from its cursive prototype between 250 and 100 B.C. The addition of older Palmyrene texts, and especially the discovery of the series of cursive texts from Qumran (4QEccles, 4QXII*, etc.) permits further narrowing of limits.

\textsuperscript{31} As remarked above, the non-use of final forms in Palmyrene is a secondary cursive development, and must be discounted in comparisons with Jewish hands, especially those under formal influence.
IV

THE DATING OF THE Earliest Scripts from Qumran

As we have seen, the relative chronology of Hebrew and Aramaic documents from Qumran in the Jewish script is easily worked out, thanks to the abundance of new data. Absolute dating of the documents poses a more complicated problem, especially in the earlier periods.

At the end of the type-series the paleographer is on sure ground. The dated documents of the first and second centuries A.D. from Murabba'at fix an absolute terminus ad quem for the Qumran script types. This is confirmed by archeological data from Qumran, as well as by the long series of Jewish funerary inscriptions from Herodian times.3

Similarly, scripts of the first century B.C. can be given absolute dates with some confidence since they stand close in typological sequence to the Herodian materials. Moreover, a terminus ad quem at the end of the first century B.C. is fixed from outside by the inscription of the Beņê Hezîr,33 and controls include the Qumran alphabet mentioned above (before 31 B.C.).34

As for the earliest materials, the dating of formal Jewish scripts which fall between the documents of the fourth century, the terminus a quo for the earliest Jewish bookhand (4QSamb), and the first-century B.C. scripts, is still based primarily on typological sequence. While we can establish their age relative to other members of the series, an absolute dating is made difficult since we cannot presume that the speed of evolution of a script remains constant. The earliest Jewish cursives, which have their terminus a quo in the Aramaic vulgar scripts of the early third century, are of some aid. The formal and cursive are in

33 Most useful are the Helena Inscription (CIS II, 156), from ca. A.D. 50–60, the dipinto published by Sukenik, Tarbîj, VI (1935), 190–96, Pl. III, which closely follows the bookhand of the mid-first century A.D., the Uzziah Plaque (Sukenik, Tarbîj, II [1929], 288 ff.) from ca. A.D. 50. There is no let up in the discoveries of ossuary inscriptions which now constitute an extensive corpus, virtually all of which belong to the Herodian era (30 B.C. to A.D. 70). Since 1953, thirty to forty Hebrew-Aramaic inscriptions from Dominus Flevit have been published. At least one other major find has been made within the last two years (unpublished).

34 In the past the Gezer Boundary inscriptions have been dated on archeological grounds to the first century B.C. Cf. Macalister, The Excavation of Gezer (London, 1912), I, 37–40; III, Pls. X, XI; Lidzbarski, Handb. d. nords. Epigraphik, Taf. 43:3; and AN, p. 162. The date is not secure, however, and it may be necessary to lower it as observed by Albright (private communication). A date near the time of the First Revolt is not unreasonable. In any case the inscriptions are not suitable for use as controls in absolute dating.
tension, the cursive, especially, influencing the bookhand. Further assistance comes from the related scripts, Nabatean and Palmyrene. It must be admitted that the attempt to date the divergence of the latter scripts from their parent scripts in part leans on the evidence of Jewish paleography. Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of four typological series, each fixed absolutely in the first century B.C. at the lower end of the series, makes possible judgments which cannot be far wrong in terms of absolute dating. Our conclusions in the preceding section have been that Nabatean and Palmyrene stemmed from prototypic scripts which cannot be dated later than the first half of the second century B.C. If this is true, then the first half of the second century is an absolute terminus ad quem for the archaic Jewish bookhands which are clearly older than the Nabatean or Palmyrene parent scripts.

In the case of 4QSam\textsuperscript{b}, we have thus established its extreme range from the late fourth century to the first half of the second century B.C. Actually, we must allow time for evolution on either side of its script. There is, moreover, a probability that the course of change of the script in the Greek period was relatively slow. Finally, by relating the script to the cursive of the third century which precedes it, and to the Jewish cursive which follows it, we can safely narrow this range to the last half of the third century, and possibly as late as the first quarter of the second century B.C. A date for 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} in the last quarter of the third century B.C. seems suitably conservative. The Jer\textsuperscript{a} script is in the same horizon, \textit{ca.} 200 B.C., or slightly later.

In conclusion to the paleographic section of this paper, we wish to outline a set of periods in the early Jewish bookhand based on preliminary studies of the biblical scrolls from Qumran. This framework attempts to conform to both the typological and historical evidence. While the organization is tentative, requiring exhaustive analysis, I believe three periods are defined adequately:

1. Archaic, \textit{ca.} 200–150 B.C.
2. Hasmonean, \textit{ca.} 150–30 B.C.
3. Herodian, \textit{ca.} 30 B.C. to A.D. 70.

This analysis is confirmed partly by indirect evidence from Qumran, though it was first drawn up on the basis of paleographic schemata alone. The vast majority of the MSS from Qumran fall into Periods 2\textsuperscript{35} and 3, especially the latter half of Period 2, and the latter part of Period 3, precisely the periods when activity at Khirbet Qumran was at its height.\textsuperscript{36} Manuscripts from the Archaic Period are exceedingly rare and

\textsuperscript{35} Significantly, the earliest sectarian MSS fall into Period 2.

\textsuperscript{36} The history of occupation of Khirbet Qumran is given preliminary discussion in De Vaux's report, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân," \textit{RB}, LXI (1954), 231–36.
fragmentary; they may be master scrolls brought into the community at its foundation.

V

A MANUSCRIPT OF SAMUEL IN AN ARCHAIC JEWISH BOOKHAND FROM QUMRAN: 4QSam

To illustrate the earliest Jewish scripts from Qumran, we have chosen to publish 4QSam, probably the oldest of the series. The MS is extremely fragmentary and poorly preserved. It consists of seven fragments containing: Fragment 1, I Sam 16 1–11; Fragment 2, I Sam 19 10–17; Fragment 3, I Sam 21 3–7; Fragment 4, I Sam 21 8–10; Fragments 5–7 (continuous), I Sam 23 9–17. The leather is grey where decomposition has not darkened it. Originally, margin and lineation guides had been impressed lightly into the relatively soft leather. The script is delicate; the lines of script are regular, and unusually long. The number of characters per line averages between 71 and 72; variation in length is no more than five characters in either direction (66–77) over all columns preserved, even less in individual columns.

It will be noted that this is the first of the published Qumran MSS whose orthography seems to be systematically more “defective” than the consonantal Masoretic Text (hereafter MT). While the evidence is skimpy, nevertheless it is significant that within our six fragments there are four cases of words using fewer matres lectionis than MT. In no single case are more matres lectionis used than in MT! Moreover, the text of MT in these sections is relatively defective throughout. We have argued elsewhere that the fullest use of matres lectionis was achieved in the Maccabean Era. Whereas we cannot argue too strenuously on the basis of this evidence, it tends to confirm other arguments, and, in turn, to corroborate the pre-Maccabean date of the scroll.

The textual position of the MS stands close to the Vorlage of the Old Greek; it is an earlier exemplar of the textual type discovered in 4QSam. For reasons of space, a number of technical details, especially measurements, are not given here, but will be recorded in the general publication.

38 Frg. 1, l. 5 (I Sam 16 6), סע for MT נסע; l. 6 (16 7), יוס for MT יוס; Frg. 2, l. 3 (19 12), לומ for MT לומ; Frg. 4, l. 3 (21 10), רמא for MT רמא. There are, as is expected, a number of Kenn. MSS supporting each of the “defective” 4Q readings in three of the cases. No MS preserves the reading לומ.


40 Cross, “A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint,” BASOR, No. 132 (1953), pp. 15–26. (Note the following corrections in the reconstruction, p. 26: Col. I, l. 10, for ynymh, read ynymh; Col. II, l. 4, for bpr, read bpr; Col. II, l. 15, following [sw]ml, add jdbryl.) Still a third unpublished MS of Samuel, 4QSam, represents a similar textual type.
Commentary to Fragment 1:

L. 1 (vs. 1). Calculation of the line length makes the reconstruction of l. 1 beginning [י[ideshow] fairly certain. No other final kaph (or other letter with a long tail) is near enough to fit the count.

L. 2 (vs. 2). Against the MT ויה, 4Q reads י[page] with LXX (לְבָצֵי). Cf. Syriac (S), ʾsḥod.

L. 4 (vs. 4+). 4Q adds וידר with LXX, וּבָצֵי. Unfortunately, calculations of space do not help us determine 4Q’s reading in this verse below where LXX reads שְמַה וְיוָ (so?) רָשָׁת (kai ἐνόπλῳ καὶ ἐμοὶ σύμπερον), clearly superior to MT וְיוָ וְזָמַה זָמַה as first demonstrated by Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis (Göttingen, 1871), ad loc.

L. 5 (vs. 5). 4Q, mult. MSS Kenn. read בֵּבֵא for MT וְזָמַה (see n. 38).

L. 6 (vs. 7). 4Q mult. MSS read וְזָמַה for MT וְזָמַה (see n. 38). 4Q reads וְזָמַה for MT וְזָמַה; cf. MT, vs. 1.

4Q must be reconstructed to read [כְּלָא בֵּבֵא רָשָׁת (יבט זָרָה) וְזָמַה וְזָמַה etc. (LXX, οὐκ ἐνόπλῳ καὶ ἐμοὶ σύμπερον, ὡς ὡς ὡς θεὸς). MT וְזָמַה וְזָמַה is impossible as it stands, as is generally recognized.41 However, this is not the point. The fuller text must be read in 4Q to fill out the line. If we follow the LXX, the line is calculated at 72 characters, precisely the mean; if the awkward MT is followed, the line is 61 characters, impossibly short, or in any case, far shorter than the shortest line elsewhere in the fragments. The phrase וְזָמַה וְזָמַה appears to have fallen out by haplography due to homoioarcton.

L. 8 (vss. 10, 11). As in MT, a paragraph break stood between [בֵּבֵא] and [רָשָׁת], to judge from a reconstruction of the line.

41 The sigla to the transcription of the text are as follows: * above a letter equals very uncertain reading; † above a letter, probable reading. The abbreviations in general follow Kittel, ed., Biblia Hebraica.

**Fragment 2, I Sam 19 10-17**

1. fragment [ ]
2. fragment [ ]
3. fragment [ ]
4. fragment [ ]
5. fragment [ ]
6. fragment [ ]

**Commentary to Fragment 2:**

L. 2 (vs. 10). There is enough room for the introduction of υἱὸς in the line before ἀνωτέρω with the Greek, καὶ ἔγενετο ἐν τῇ νυκτί ἐκείνῃ, clearly the original reading (Wellhausen). However, were it omitted, the line would not be excessively short. Hence we cannot argue from space factors in 4Q to the reading.

L. 3 (vs. 12). 4Q reads Ἰὼν for MT ρωσσι (cf. n. 38).

L. 4 (vs. 13). Before νόμος, the leather is badly split and distorted by shrinkage. Some traces of letters are preserved on the border twisted down from the split; they hardly conform to read δομός or any part thereof. But the traces are too indistinct to permit more than speculation as to the actual reading.

L. 5 (vs. 15). The LXXB text omits ἀνωτέρω δέαρα, a transparent haplography by homoiolarkton (ἀκ...ακ), in the Vorlage of the Greek. LXXLuc, MT, Vulgate (V), S, stand together with the full text. Calculation of the spatial requirements in 1. 5 makes certain that 4Q follows the full (and superior) reading.

**Fragments 3 and 4, I Sam 21 3-10**

1. fragment [ ]
2. fragment [ ]
3. fragment [ ]
4. fragment [ ]
5. fragment [ ]
6. fragment [ ]
7. fragment [ ]
8. fragment [ ]

43 The lineation can be reconstructed accurately on the basis of Fragment 4 which is continuous, and reveals the end of lines.
Commentary to Fragments 3 and 4:

L. 1 (vs. 3). The reconstruction of the lines requires that the tail of a letter seen on the fragment belong to kaph: אֱלֹהָי.

L. 3 (vs. 5+). The reading here is most interesting. Note first the supralinear addition of קד (Καί) by a corrector. Presumably it is to be placed before הָכָנַת with MT and Greek MSS in the Hexaplaric tradition (LXX b). LXX Bluc. and S omit with 4Q*. The addition in 4Q preserves a reading closely related to the Old Greek reflected in the following variants: LXX b kal φάγεται; LXX H Luc. et al. kal φάγονται; Syro-hexaplar (apud Barhebraeus), Eus. kal φάγετε. Without the phrase, the conditional sentence stands awkwardly without an apodosis; the protasis cannot be construed gracefully with the preceding. 4Q (LXX) is superior in all respects: “If the young men have kept themselves from women, then ye may eat of it.” MT arises from haplography and cannot be defended on the principle of lectio difficilior.

L. 4 (vs. 6). LXX adds νεώτερον (eis odoν) after βασανίζεται. Without the addition, 4Q is rather too short; but we cannot be certain here.

4Q, LXX (παντα) read βασανίζεται against MT βασανίζεται. Perhaps this is preferable, βασανίζεται arising secondarily in anticipation of βασανίζεται below. We then read “Certainly we have been segregated from women, as in the past; whenever I have taken a journey, all the young men have been consecrated even if it was a secular journey; how much more so when today, etc.” Thenius, Die Bücher Samuelis (2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1864), p. 99; Driver, op. cit., pp. 174–75.

L. 5 (vs. 7). The uncertainty of readings in the first half of l. 5 makes reconstruction difficult. It seems clear, however, that the conflate reading of LXX b ‘ἀριστερον τοις ἀριστον τῆς προθέσεως, (א/ב ו/ג) cannot possibly be fitted into the line. There is evidence in the several recensions of LXX (though scanty in each: CLS 44 doa 2 Eth.) for the omission of the Old Greek; however, the Greek tradition is still too long. It seems likely that 4Q here agrees with MT against LXX.

4QSamb correctly reads ἀρτος instead of the ungrammatical reading of MT ἄρτος (by attraction to the preceding ἄρτος).

L. 8 (vs. 10 [Fragment 4]). 4Q reads ἀριστερά “behind an ephod,” for MT ἀριστερά ἄρτος.45 However, here 4Q and MT, S and V stand together with a reading surely more original than the omission of the Old Greek.

44 I. e., MSS so designated in the Cambridge Larger Septuagint (The Old Testament in Greek, eds. Brooke, McLean, Thackeray [London, 1927], II:1).
45 Cf. n. 38 for the orthography: רַצָּה.
Commentary on Fragments 5, 6, and 7:

L. 1 (vs. 9). The confusion in the order of the phrase corresponding to MT is considerable in the Greek: LXX\(^B\) οὗ παρασιωτᾶ Σαούλ περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν κακίαν; LXX\(^Luc\) ὅτι Σαούλ περὶ αὐτοῦ γίνεται καὶ οὐ (omit ο) παρασιωτᾶ ὁ Σαούλ περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν κακίαν (clearly conflate, the latter reading equals LXX\(^B\)). There is no way to recover the original 4Q reading. The erasure and insertion of supralinear by a different (though early) hand alters the text into line with the "Masoretic" order. The letters erased are too faint, unfortunately, to be recovered.

L. 2 (vs. 10). The addition of (i.e., Χριόν Χριῶν) and of διὰ Χριῶν (1°) is highly likely in 4Q, with LXX. The line is below minimum length without the additions, and slightly below average length with both additions.

L. 3 (vs. 11). The entire phrase in MT is certainly absent from 4Q. Some twenty characters are involved. Without
the phrase (see below), the line count is 67 characters, only slightly under the general mean for all the fragments (71/72). Moreover, the Old Greek omitted the entire phrase. Finally, since Wellhausen, it has been commonly held that the phrase in MT is a dittograph from vs.12, where it is repeated and obviously belongs. On the other hand, we need with the omission of the phrase to add νῦν with LXX $^{BLuc}$ (καὶ νῦν). Without it, the line count is 63 (below minimum); with it the line is a suitable 67 characters. In short, the reading of 4Q is supported in part by the LXX$^B$, and wholly by critical restoration of the passage by textual scholars.

For MT ינשה ימיו, 4Q reads [ך]. The reading of the LXX ἀπαγγείλων τῷ δούλῳ σου supports 4Q against MT. Our translator in these books regularly indicates נ by δ (rarely ה) in all such passages. In very rare exceptions such as this, we must suppose a different underlying text.

L. 4 (vss. 11–12). In vss. 11b–12a (=MT), LXX has suffered haplography due to homoiarkton: καὶ εἶπεν κύριος [καταβῆσται ... καὶ εἶπεν κύριος] ἀποκλεισθῆσεται. 4Q here presents the fuller, uncorrupted text. Thus in vs. 11, where MT has suffered dittography and subsequent further corruption, 4Q stands with the Old Greek in preserving the original reading; also, where LXX has suffered haplography, 4Q with MT preserves the original reading!

L. 5 (vs. 13). It is necessary, from clear traces of two lamedhs at the bottom of Frag. 5 to reconstruct in the first line of Frag. 6 [now confirmed by new fragments, see n. 46] ויהי לישנ ולמל thus following the reading of LXX $^{Luc}$, Eth. against MT, LXX$^B$!

L. 6 (vs. 14). 4Q reads [ה] with LXX (κύριος) against MT ימלך.

L. 8 (vs. 16). 4Q reads [הו] with LXX (ἐν κυρίῳ) against MT במל.

For convenience, a reconstruction of Fragments 5–7 follows:

LXX$^B$ reads εἰ ἀποκλεισθῆσεται καὶ νῦν εἰ καταβῆσται etc. However, εἰ ἀποκλεισθῆσεται is clearly displaced here as demonstrated by Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 128. See below on its omission in LXX$^B$, vs. 12. S omits the whole of vs. 11 in a haplography which, however, presumes the developed Masoretic tradition.

Budde, The Books of Samuel (SBOT, VIII [Leipzig, 1894]), p. 70 states that יְנֶה is “unquestionably genuine” on the basis of the LXX alone, and its idiomatic use before questions in Hebrew, comparing II Sam 9 11. Our argument from requirements of space certifies this position.

We have not dealt in detail with the readings of place-names in vss. 14, 15 of LXX. There is extensive conflation of transliterated and translated forms of the names leading to some subsequent corruption. Critical restoration of the Old Greek makes clear that LXX and MT do not diverge significantly here, or in any case, not in such fashion as to permit check by calculation of gaps in 4QSam$^b$.

Obviously, a reconstruction cannot claim accuracy in matters of orthography,
I Sam 23 9-17

(9) ... and David knew that Saul was plotting evil against him; then said David to Abiathar the priest, “Bring here the Ephod of Yahweh.” (10) Then David said, “O Yahweh, God of Israel, thy servant has heard definitely that Saul seeks to come to Keilah, to wreck the city on my account. (11) But now! will Saul come down as thy servant has heard? O Yahweh, God of Israel, tell thy servant.” And Yahweh said, “He will come down.” (12) Then David said, “Will the citizens of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul?” And Yahweh said, “They will deliver.” (13) So arose David and his men, about four hundred men, and they departed from Keilah, and they went about wherever they could. When it was told to Saul that David had escaped from Keilah, he gave up his raid. (14) Then David settled in the wilderness, in its fastnesses; and he remained in the hill-country of the Wilderness of Ziph. And Saul sought him constantly, but Yahweh did not give him into his hand. (15) Now David saw that Saul had come to seek his life, while he was in the Wilderness of Ziph at Horesh. (16) Then Jonathan, Saul’s son, arose and went to David at Horesh; and he gave him courage through Yahweh. (17) Then he said to him, “Do not fear . . . .”

A brief summary of the textual position of 4QSam⁷ may be given as follows:

(1) Readings actually on the leather fragment. In eight cases, one of which is questionable, 4QSam⁷ agrees with LXX against MT; in two cases (one of which is not precisely in agreement), 4Q agrees with MT against LXX.

(2) Readings based on spatial requirements in reconstruction. In five cases, two of which are doubtful, 4Q agrees with LXX against MT. In two cases, 4Q agrees with MT against LXX.

or in cases where minor variants existing among MT, LXX and 4Q are not reflected in a derangement of line lengths. In all major cases of divergence, however, we are on fairly sure ground. [For the convenience of readers, a translation of the text has been prepared by the editor. D. N. F.]
(3) Corrections. In two cases, one doubtful, 4Q has been corrected from a reading in line with the LXX to a reading in line with the MT. These are not counted in the totals, either as agreement with LXX or with MT.

Our totals, including three doubtful cases, are as follows: 4Q agrees with LXX against MT thirteen times; 4Q agrees with MT against LXX four times.

Such statistics do not indicate really the full value of this archaic text. Its affinities with the tradition to which the Vorlage of the Old Greek belongs is most important, and cannot be neglected in developing new methods and evaluations in future critical studies of the text of Samuel. Nevertheless, the most extraordinary characteristic of the text of 4QSam b is the high proportion of original readings which it preserves, whether it be in agreement with the Greek, or in agreement with MT, or against both in its several unique readings.
The publication in January, 1953, of fragments of an unknown recension of the Greek Bible gave the first unambiguous warnings of a revolution to come in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Earlier the publication of the great Isaiah scroll of Qumrân, Cave I (1Q Isa\textsuperscript{a}), and later of the second fragmentary roll of Isaiah (1Q Isa\textsuperscript{b}), created noise and excitement, but none of the major text-critical schools was forced to shift significant ground. Champions of the \textit{Hebraica veritas} who had increasingly dominated the field, especially in Europe, noted the close affinities of the scrolls with the traditional text. The failure of 1Q Is\textsuperscript{a} to produce a significant number of superior readings despite its antiquity embarrassed lingering survivors of the great critical tradition of the nineteenth century, and delighted biblical exegetes and historians who wished to ply their trade without entering the miasmal precincts of text-critical labors. Despite some attention paid to its occasional affinities with the Old Greek, most scholars, whether prompted by traditionalist prejudgment or sheer inertia,
were pleased to label the text vulgar or even sectarian, avoiding thereby a serious reexamination of their text-critical theories.

The recension published by Barthélémy proved to be an extraordinary document. It is a revision of the Old Greek text, revised on the basis of a forerunner of the traditional Hebrew text extant in Palestine toward the middle of the first century of the Christian era. The Recension itself dates probably from the second half of the first century. It should be noted, however, that the Vorlage of the Greek text is by no means identical with the surviving textus receptus, but may be called Proto-Massoretic, since it differs even more decidedly with the Old Palestinian Hebrew text. In the Minor Prophets, the recension of Barthélémy has been identified with the text used by Origen in the seventh column of the Hexapla, so-called Quinta. That it had wide circulation is suggested by the evidence that it was available to Origen in at least two editions, and survives in the quotations of Justin Martyr's Dialogue and elsewhere. More important, Barthélémy has been able to establish that his recension was the common base of later recensions of the Greek Bible, above all Aquila.

Barthélemy's most significant contribution, perhaps, is the identification of this Greek recension outside the Minor Prophets elsewhere in the Greek Bible. Building on the basis of H. St. John Thackeray's analysis of the Greek style of the Books of Reigns, i.e., Samuel and Kings, he has been able to demonstrate that the sections of Samuel and Kings assigned by Thackeray to "Proto-Theodotion" actually are identical in style with the Recension. The sections in question are 2 Samuel 11:2–1 Kgs. 2:11 (Thackeray's βγ) and 1 Kgs. 22–2 Kgs. 25 (γδ). Thus it

4 The Greek scripts and Palaeo-Hebrew inserts in “R” (i.e., the Recension of Barthélemy) point to a date about the middle of the first century of our era, or, perhaps better, the second half of the century. See DA, pp. 167f., and C. H. Roberts apud P. Kahle, “Problems of the Septuagint,” Studia Patristica, ed. Aland and Cross, I (1957), 332.
6 See DA, pp. 228–45 for discussion of other relations of the Recension; Cf. D. Katz, op. cit. (note 5), 345–53.
7 DA, pp. 246–70.
8 The Septuagint and Jewish Worship [Schweich Lectures 1920] (London, 1921).
became clear that the Old Greek or Septuagint in these sections has been replaced by the later recension. Other books and sections of the received Greek Bible may belong to this recensional group, appropriately labeled by Barthélémy the Groupe καίγε. Ruth and Lamentations are good candidates. Daniel, traditionally assigned to Theodotion, and correctly recognized by a number of scholars as "Proto-Theodotion," seems clearly to belong to the καίγε Recension. Other Theodotionic materials show clear affinities with the Recension and belong at least to the same family.

The καίγε Recension is of decisive bearing on the debate over Septuagint origins. It brings a qualified victory to the Lagarde school, despite Paul Kahle’s protestations to the contrary. There is no doubt that this Greek text was an early Jewish attempt to revise the standard Septuagint into conformity with a Proto-Massoretic Hebrew text, just as Aquila represents a sequent attempt to revise this revision in the direction of the official Rabbinic or Massoretic text which had been established by his day. We see, then, a series of attempts to bring the Greek Bible into conformity with a changing Hebrew textual tradition. On the

---

9 DA, pp. 33-47; pp. 91-143.
10 The case of Judges is not established by Barthélémy, and insufficient data is presented for Canticles, et al. Much labor is needed to test most of the suggested instances of the καίγε Recension. In the case of the Book of Reigns, Barthélémy’s careful study, the data presented below, as well as a dissertation of my student Father D. Shenkel, which goes well beyond Barthélémy in dealing with the recensions in 1 and 2 Kings, put the identification beyond doubt.
11 E.g., the additions to Old Greek Job, the "Theodotionic" material in Psalms, including "Quinta," etc. Cf. Barthélémy, DA, pp. 41-47. On the "Proto-Theodotionic" text of Daniel, see J. A. Montgomery, The Book of Daniel [ICC] (Edinburgh, 1927), pp. 46-50; J. Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco [Göttingen Septuaginta] (Göttingen, 1954), p. 28, n. 1 and pp. 61f. Barthélémy’s thesis that the καίγε Recension is to be identified with Theodotion must remain sub judice. The evidence to equate Theodotion with Jonathan ben Uzziel is highly speculative, and little is actually solved by reassigning the designation "Theodotion." In Samuel-Kings we must still deal, as Barthélémy recognizes, with two "Palestinian recensions" (at least), in the Minor Prophets with both the Sixth Column and Quinta, with Theodotion in the Pentateuch, and so on. Until the character of "late" Theodotion is fully analyzed, perhaps it is better to retain more traditional designations, "Proto-Theodotion" and "Theodotion," rather than shifting with Barthélémy to what may be termed "Theodotion" and "Post-Theodotion."
13 Cf. ALQ², p. 174 and n.19.
one hand these data firmly support evidence, already overwhelm-
ingly clear, that an *Urtext* exists behind the Christian recensions
of the Septuagint. On the other hand it also vindicates those who
had argued that the special readings of Justin were early, and
lends the support of analogy to those who claimed that the "Luci-
anic" readings of Josephus' biblical quotations were early.¹⁴

Later in the same year that the first fragments of the Bar-
thélemy text were published, the writer published pieces of a He-
brew manuscript of Samuel from Cave IV, Qumrán (4QSamᵃ).¹⁵
Later purchases added a very large number of fragments to the
manuscript, and now it is probably the most important as well
as the most extensively preserved of some one hundred biblical
manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrán. The text was of a type
markedly distinct from the traditional Hebrew text of Samuel,
but closely related to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint.
There could be no confusion. A text having integrity though
widely at variance with the *textus receptus* had come to hand.
This text was the herald of a series of non-Massoretic texts,
some from Cave IV which have had only preliminary publication,
some like the Deuteronomy manuscript from Cave V (5Q¹)
which have been fully published.¹⁶

In 1954 Monsignor Skehan published a fragment of the "Song
of Moses" which followed the Septuagint text against a defective
Massoretic tradition.¹⁷

In 1955 appeared the writer's study of a third-century B.C.
manuscript of Samuel (4QSamᵇ). The character of one group of
its fragments was summarized as follows:

4Q agrees with LXX against MT thirteen times; 4Q agrees with

¹⁴ Paul Kahle is thus justified in his fulminations against Rahlf's treatment
of the Proto-Lucianic problem. It is ironical, however, that Kahle himself then
argued (1947) that the biblical quotations from the historical books in Josephus
had later been brought into conformity with the Lucianic text by Christian scribes!
¹⁵ F. M. Cross, "A New Qumrán Biblical Fragment Related to the Original
Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (Dec., 1953), 15–26; cf. cor-
rections of misprints in F. M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrán," JBL
74 (1955), 165, n.40.
¹⁶ M. Baillet, J. T. Milik et R. de Vaux, Les "petites grottes" de Qumrán, DJD
¹⁷ P. W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumrán,"
MT against LXX four times. Such statistics do not indicate the full value of this archaic text. Its affinities with the tradition to which the Vorlage of the Old Greek belongs is most important, and cannot be neglected in developing new methods and evaluations in future critical studies of the text of Samuel. Nevertheless, the most extraordinary characteristic of the text of 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} is the high proportion of the original readings which it preserves, whether it be in agreement with the Greek, or in agreement with the MT, or against both in its several unique readings.\textsuperscript{18}

In the same year, in fact in the same issue of the Journal of Biblical Literature,\textsuperscript{19} Monsignor Skehan published parts of an Exodus manuscript written in a late Palaeo-Hebrew script, probably of the second century B.C. The character of the text is Samaritan, or rather that Palestinian type of text selected by the Samaritan community and surviving alone in it. It may be designated Proto-Samaritan to distinguish it from the specifically Samaritan text-type which underwent further recension.

Thanks to new data from Qumrân and elsewhere, we can correct a false assumption which has long plagued textual study of the Samaritan recension, namely, the view that the text stems from a Samaritan rupture of the fifth or fourth century B.C. As early as 1941, W. F. Albright had recognized that the script of the Samaritan Bible branched off from the Palaeo-Hebrew script not earlier than the first century B.C.\textsuperscript{20} The study of the Palaeo-Hebrew script of Qumrân, of the Palaeo-Hebrew script found on an unpublished sealing of a Samaritan governor of the mid-fourth century B.C. as well as on coins and stamps of the fourth to the second century B.C., wholly support this dating. Similarly orthographic evidence, evidence from language, and indeed the character of the text itself confirm it.\textsuperscript{21}

In 1958, the writer published his first attempt to deal in a systematic if provisional way with the variety of textual types

\textsuperscript{18} F. M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," JBL 74 (1955), 147-72.
\textsuperscript{19} P. W. Skehan, "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumrân," JBL 74 (1955), 182-87.
\textsuperscript{20} From the Stone Age to Christianity (Baltimore, 1941, 1946\textsuperscript{\textdegree}), p. 336, n.12.
found among the biblical manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrân.²² It had become clear that at Qumrân we had penetrated to an era when local texts prevailed, and, so far as the Qumrân community was concerned, before the promulgation of an authoritative recension. The evidence for textual families for the time being is restricted largely to the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets, and the Book of Jeremiah. Study has been directed first of all to those books whose texts are dramatic in their variety, and whose Greek versions are relatively trustworthy. Isaiah's textual variations between the Hebrew and Greek are narrow in range, and, unhappily, the Septuagint is notoriously paraphrastic.²³ The Minor Prophets exhibit slightly more variety, and ample material is available for their analysis, but full attention has not been directed upon their exemplars from Cave IV, Qumrân, and the same is so by and large for the Hagiographa. The Psalter is an exception, and while its text at Qumrân is close to that of the textus receptus, the Scroll of Psalms from Cave XI shortly to be published will be of considerable interest.²⁴ If the so-called 11Q Ps⁴ is indeed a Psalter, despite its bizarre order and noncanonical compositions, mostly of the Hellenistic era, then we must argue that one Psalms collection closed at the end of the Persian period (the canonical collection), and that another remained open well into the Greek period (11Q), but was rejected by the Rabbis. This is not to mention the extensive fragments of Psalms manuscripts from Cave IV, to be published shortly by P. W. Skehan.

In the Pentateuch three types of text are present. Some texts, especially that of Genesis, are closely allied with the textus re-


ceptus; others reflect close relations with the Samaritan, or properly, with the Palestinian text; a third group is closely affiliated with a text of the type which underlies the Septuagint. A text of Numbers (4Q Num\textsuperscript{b}) shows unusual characteristics. It regularly follows Samaritan readings, including the long additions from Deuteronomy introduced into the text of Numbers in Proto-Samaritan tradition. On the other hand, when the Masoretic and Samaritan texts agree against the pre-Hexaplaric Greek text (i.e., the Septuagint), this text of Numbers usually agrees with the Old Greek, and it almost never sides with MT against both the Samaritan and Septuagint. It is evidently an early type of Palestinian text which somehow survived.

The Samuel manuscripts from Cave IV are all at wide variance with Massoretic tradition, all with ties to the tradition used in the Septuagint translation. For reasons to be discussed below, we believe them all to belong to the Palestinian textual tradition. In the case of Jeremiah, one manuscript of three from Cave IV follows the short tradition familiar from the Septuagint. Two represent the type of the traditional text.

1. THE RABBINIC RECENSION OF THE BIBLE.

With the publication of the biblical documents from Murabba\textsuperscript{at} in 1961, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Isaiah, and above all, the great Hebrew Minor Prophets scroll, there can no longer be any reason to doubt that by the beginning of the second century A.D. an authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible had been promul-

\textsuperscript{25} Some readings from an Exodus scroll (4Q Ex\textsuperscript{b}) together with a photograph of a fragment from it are published in ALQ\textsuperscript{2}, p. 184, n.31; see also the Plate opposite p. 141.

\textsuperscript{26} On 4Q Num\textsuperscript{b}, see already ALQ\textsuperscript{4}, p. 186 and n.36.

\textsuperscript{27} Against the text’s having arisen by a simple crossing of MSS of Palestinian and Egyptian types stands the evidence of occasional agreement with LXX minuses and occasional omission of LXX plusses, as well as a sprinkling of so-called Proto-Lucianic readings (i.e., 4Q Num-(\textsuperscript{b}) \textsuperscript{L} vs. MT-(\textsuperscript{b}) \textsuperscript{BAO}).

\textsuperscript{28} A sample of the text of the shorter recension is published in ALQ\textsuperscript{5}, p. 187, n.38 (4Q Jer\textsuperscript{b}). One of my students, Mr. J. G. Janzen, has shown in a forthcoming Harvard dissertation that a large portion of the plusses of MT in Jeremiah stem from expansionist tendencies of the type familiar for example in the Samaritan Pentateuch. On the contrary, the short text represented at Qumrân and in the Septuagint is exceedingly well preserved.

gated, the archetype of the Massoretic manuscripts of the Middle Ages. The entire text of the Minor Prophets scroll reveals only five or six real variants, neglecting minor orthographic variation, interchange of \( l \) and \( l \), and the like. The astonishing fact is that even the minor textual variants which mark the text of Aquila, the Targum, and the Vulgate are largely absent, and it is clear that these versions preserve some genuine survivals of readings which predate the official recension, since in each case older materials were used alongside the newer standard text. Medieval variants 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. In effect we have found at Murabba‘ât texts which testify to an archetypal recension as the ancestor of all Medieval Hebrew biblical manuscripts. The character of textual variation in Qumrân texts, where manuscripts belong to different textual families, differs toto caelo from the variation exhibited in the biblical texts of Murabba‘ât stemming from the circles of Bar Kokhba.

Thanks to the existence at Qumrân of a variety of textual traditions as well as to the evidence of the Greek recensions, we are able to describe somewhat the process by which the official text came into existence. The establishment of the official text followed a pattern unusual in the textual history of ancient documents. Unlike the recensional activity in Alexandria which produced an elegant if artificial and eclectic text of Homer, and quite unlike

---


31 Compare the writer’s remarks in ALQ², p. 170, n.13.


the recensional activity which produced the Hexaplaric recension of the Septuagint or the conflate textus receptus of the New Testament, the Rabbinic scholars and scribes proceeded neither by wholesale revision and emendation nor by eclectic or conflating recensional procedures. They selected a single local textual tradition, which may be called the Proto-Massoretic text, a text which had been in existence in rough homogeneity for some time. Evidence for this text-type appears in our sources for the Pentateuch first at Qumrân. In Samuel and Kings it first influences the Septuagint text in the second of the major Jewish recensions, the καίγε or Proto-Theodotionic Recension, made about the middle of the first century A.D. It must be noted, however, that the Proto-Massoretic tradition at Qumrân and underlying the καίγε Recension of Samuel-Kings is not identical with the official text now known from the era between the two Jewish Revolts, and from Aquila. Some recensional activity was involved. A single orthographic tradition, in part archaizing to pre- or non-Maccabaean spelling practices, was systematically imposed. Remarkably, the old Palestinian Palaeo-Hebrew script, as well as the Palestinian text-type preserved in it, was rejected. This rejection cannot be termed anti-Samaritan. The Palaeo-Hebrew script was the national Hebrew script of the Maccabees and was at home among the Essenes of Qumrân. It was the script nostalgically revived in both Jewish revolts against Rome. For a reason we shall expound later, the Rabbis chose a textual tradition of a specific kind never found in pure type in Palaeo-Hebrew, and hence, reluctantly, we suspect, chose the Late Herodian book-hand as the official character. This hand, already an archaizing character in the era of Bar Kokhba, was preserved through many centuries with remarkably slight evolutionary change.

As we have remarked, the Rabbinic text is normally short, not conflate or expansionist in the Pentateuch and Samuel. To be sure, there are secondary expansions in the Pentateuch, but by and large it is a superb, disciplined text. On the contrary, the text of Samuel is remarkably defective, and its shortness is the result of a long history of losses by haplography, the commonest error by far in a text which has not undergone systematic recensional activity, or which has not become mixed by infection from a
different textual tradition. Some indisputable evidence can be marshalled of revision and suppression of dramatically corrupt readings in the case of Samuel. At all events, the Rabbinic recension stands in clear contrast to the full texts of the Palestinian and Old Greek traditions. The Proto-Massoretic text of the Pentateuch never passed through the centuries of reworking, revision, and expansion which characterized the development of the Proto-Samaritan tradition; it stood aloof from both this circle of tradition and that of the fuller Egyptian text. In the case of Samuel, it is difficult to understand the selection of the Proto-Massoretic tradition in view of the excellence of the Old Palestinian text-type, available at least at Qumrân.

We shall be speaking later of the local origin of the textus receptus and shall argue that its tradition, at least for the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, is the local text of Babylon which emerged in the fourth to second centuries B.C. Anticipating some of the conclusions of the following sections, however, we wish to deal now with the difficult problem of the occasion and date of the promulgation or, if one prefers, the fixing of the official text.

A terminus ad quem of c. A.D.100 is well established by the manuscripts taken into the desert by the remnants of Bar Kokhba's forces. A terminus a quo is more difficult to fix. Rabbinic reflections of the recensional activity are late, and must be controlled by external data. There exists at Qumrân no evidence whatever of true recensional activity. Earlier, scholars pointed to the late Isaiah Scroll (1Q Isa) as evidence of a gradual trend toward the Massoretic text. There is no justification whatever for such a view. A text of Deuteronomy from Cave V dating to the early second century B.C. was systematically corrected in the Early Herodian period by a manuscript of Septuagintal type, so that every correction carried the text away from the Proto-Massoretic tradition. In general, the date of a roll from Cave IV, Qumrân, tells us nothing of what we may expect of its textual character. These data would naturally lead one to propose that the main thrust of recensional activity on

34 See for example, ALQ, p. 191, n.45.
34a Cf. the studies listed in n.33, to which should be added S. Talmor, JJS 2 (1951), 149 f.
35 5Q1, DJD III, 169-71; Pl. xxxvi.
the part of the Rabbis must date from between the Jewish Rev­
volts, or in any case no earlier than the era of Hillel, at the be­
ginning of the first century A.D. Unfortunately, we cannot be
sure that members of the Essene community, whether living in
the desert or in the villages, were not sealed off from contact
with Pharisaic Judaism after about 140 B.C.36 Before this time,
when the Essenes and Pharisees merge back into the Ḥasidic
movement, there can be no question of their texts being aloof
from putative recensional activity. The separation of the non-
Massoretic Samaritan text in the same era points in the same
direction.

On *a priori* grounds, we should expect the publication of an
official text, and thereby the establishment of the distinction be­
tween official and *koina* traditions, to have taken place in one
of three critical periods. One era would be the late Maccabaean
Age, when expulsions from Parthia and a Zionist revival brought
floods of Jews from Babylon, Syria, and Egypt back to Jeru­
salem, and when, owing to the wholesale destruction of biblical
texts in the Epiphanian persecution, scribal activity must have
been stimulated. Thus, by the beginning of Hasmonaean times,
we should suppose (1) that different local texts had immigrated
to Judah, no doubt causing such confusion as we find reflected
in the library of Qumrân, and (2) that scribal activity was
urgent, both because of rival textual traditions and the great
loss of Palestinian texts. A second era would be that of the in­
terval between the Jewish Revolts, when both Hebrew and Greek
evidence affirms that the official text was regnant. A third period
would be that of the great schools of Hillel and Shammai. By
Hillel’s time, the theological and hermeneutic principles requir­
ing a stable text had come into being.37 Moreover, Hillel’s Baby­
lonian origins could provide a reason for the unexpected Rab­
binic rejection of the Palestinian in favor of the Babylonian
text as the basis of the recension.

The first era must be rejected, and the likelihood is that,

---

36 For the writer’s detailed arguments for this date, see ALQ2, pp. 109–60, and
the literature cited therein. To this should now be added R. de Vaux, L’archéologie
37 Cf. Kutscher, op. cit., esp. p. 472; Barthélemy, DA, pp. 3–21; and the judi­
cious statements of S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, pp. 47–68.
while first recensional activities may have begun as early as Hillel, effective promulgation of the official text and the demise of rival texts date to the era between the Revolts, in the days of Aqiba. This is the easiest way to deal with the evidence from Qumrân. More impressive, we know that late apocryphal and pseudopepigraphical works stemming from Jewish circles in Palestine still exhibit a variety of biblical texts in works composed as late as the first century A.D. The New Testament reflects a variety of Hebrew and Greek biblical traditions. The καιγέ Recension, based on a Proto-Massoretic text, gives evidence on the one hand that in the mid-first century the Old Palestinian text had been displaced in some Jewish circles. On the other hand, it shows equally that the official or Massoretic text had not yet come into being, or at least was not used in the Pharisaic school that produced the recension. Finally, as we shall be able to show in the next section, the Proto-Lucianic revision of the Septuagint of Samuel, a recension of the Septuagint revised to conform with a Palestinian text of the second or first century B.C., was still used by Josephus in his Antiquities, first composed about A.D. 93–94.

2. Proto-Lucian in Samuel and the Text of Samuel Used by the Chronicler and Josephus.

In studying the text of 4Q Sam⁴, I have been forced to note a series of readings in which the Hebrew of 4Q Sam⁴ reflects the so-called Lucianic recension preserved in the Greek minuscules boc₂e₂, and the Itala. In other words, 4Q Sam⁴ stands with LXX⁸ against MT and LXX⁸. These are proper Proto-Lucianic readings in a Hebrew text of the first century B.C., four centuries before the Syrian Father to whom the recension is attributed. In 1 Sam. 1–2 Sam. 11:1, the text of 4Q Sam⁴ (and 4Q Sam⁵) follows closely the readings of the family LXX⁸, especially when LXX⁸ and LXX⁸ agree against MT. There are also a sprinkling of indisputable Proto-Lucianic readings when 4Q Sam stands with LXX⁸ against MT and LXX⁸, and even a rare instance when 4Q Sam and Josephus stand together against all other traditions. A few illustrations follow:

1. 4Q Sam⁴: 1 Sam. 5:9
Θεόν ἀντὶ Β | αὐτὴ B | πρὸς γεθὸν b' | πρὸς γεθθαιον boc₂e₂
History of the Biblical Text [293]

2. 4Q Sam²: 1 Sam. 5:10

τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ bοcₑₑ₂

3. 4Q Samᵇ: 1 Sam. 23:13

ἐκ τῶν σωόλ ἀπηγγέλη τοῖς διασεσωσται ὧν ἡ bοcₑₑ₂

4. 4Q Samᵃ: 1 Sam. 28:1

απὸ τῶν αἰμάτων Αβφηρ ἡ bοcₑₑ₂

Moreover, in sections where Chronicles overlaps with Samuel in this section 1 Sam. 1–2 Sam. 11:1, the text of Chronicles normally agrees with 4Q and LXXBL against MT.

On the contrary, in 2 Sam. 11:2–2 Sam. 24:25, the relation of 4Q Samᵃ with LXXB changes wholly. Now 4Q Samᵃ normally stands with LXXL, the Lucianic recension, against LXXB, and LXXB normally reflects a Proto-Massoretic tradition. We have seen above that Thackeray and most recently Barthélemy have argued that this section of Samuel is not the Old Greek, but the καίγε or Proto-Theodotionic recension. The evidence of the Samuel manuscripts confirms this conclusion beyond dispute. Further, Josephus and the text of Chronicles also continue to side with 4Q Samᵃ and the Proto-Lucianic text.

³⁷ᵃ On this text, see the analysis of S. Talmon, Textus I (1960), 167, 152.

³⁸ That is, in 1 Sam. 31; 2 Sam. 5:1, 6–25; 6:1–23; 7–8; 10; 11:1.

³⁹ On the Proto-Lucianic character of the sixth column of the Hexapla, see below, n.44.
Some illustrations may be found already published in my Ancient Library of Qumrân. More follow below:

1. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 12:15
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה | κυρίος B | o bgoc\(_2\)e\(_2\)

2. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 12:16
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה B | και ηὐλισθη έν σακκω | MN cgnuvb\(_2\) | etc.

3. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 13:3
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה B | ωνάδαμ B | ωνάδαβ GΩ | ωνάδαν boe\(_2\)
   - ωνάθης Jos. vii, 178. Cf. 2 Sam. 21:21 = 1 Chr. 20:7.

4. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 24:17
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה B | o ποιμην εκακοποησα GOL. Cf. o ποιμην Jos. vii, 328.

5. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 24:16+
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה B | ωνάδαμ B | ωνάδαβ GΩ | ωνάδαν boe\(_2\)
   - ωνάθης I Chr.; cf. Jos. vii, 327.

6. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 24:18
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה B | και ειπεν αντω B | και ειπεν abovc\(_2\)e\(_2\)

7. **4Q Sam**: 2 Sam. 24:20
   - ויהוּ דְּרָפְשָׁה B | εοροννας de του σιτου αλων Jos. vii, 330.

The agreement between the text of Chronicles and 4Q Sam\(_a\) is most significant. It makes clear now that the text of the Deuteronomistic history used by the Chronicler toward 400 B.C. was by no means identical with the received text. Yet it is equally clear that the Chronicler used the Old Palestinian text current in Jerusalem in his day. That in 1 Sam. 1–2 Sam. 11:1 the Chronicler used a text very closely related to that of 4Q Sam\(_a\) and LXX\(_B\) and in 2 Sam. 11:2–24:25 a text closely related to 4Q

---

\(^{40}\) ALQ\(^2\), pp. 188–89, n.40a. Samples are chosen arbitrarily from a passage at the beginning and a passage at the end of the section.

\(^{41}\) Among other things it means that we can control better the Chronicler's treatment of his sources. The usual picture painted of the Chronicler violently or willfully distorting Samuel and Kings to suit his fancy must be radically revised.
Sam\(^a\) and LXX\(^1\), but not to LXX\(^B\), yields further evidence for the Old Palestinian substratum in the Lucianic recension.

Perhaps we can now proceed to sketch a general theory of the development of the Hebrew text-types and the Greek recensions of Samuel. There is evidence that the Septuagint of Samuel and Kings was translated from an Egyptian Hebrew text that separated from the Old Palestinian textual tradition no later than the fourth century B.C.\(^42\) This text differed sharply from the textus receptus, and while more closely allied to Palestinian texts from Qumrân, nevertheless is distinct from them. This Old Greek text was revised no later than the first century B.C. toward a Hebrew text we can trace in Palestine in the Chronicler and in the three manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrân. The Greek form is extant in quotations in Josephus, in the substratum of the Lucianic Recension preserved in the Greek minuscules boc\(_2\)e\(_2\), and, surprisingly enough, in the sixth column of Origen's Hexapla to 2 Sam. 11:2-1 Kgs 2:11. Adam Mez first noted that the sixth column in the Hexapla, normally Theodotion, was directly related to the Greek biblical text used by Josephus, and to the Lucianic recension.\(^43\) To Barthélemy must go the credit, however, for fully demonstrating the importance of this material, of freeing the sixth column here of its Theodotionic label, and of dealing systematically with its relations to the family boc\(_2\)e\(_2\). Barthélemy concludes that the column contains the lost Septuagint of this section of Samuel-Kings. Here he errs, not being aware of the new evidence relating to the Proto-Lucianic recension. In fact the column preserves the Proto-Lucianic recension in relatively pure form. The Old Greek is lost in this section as in 2 Kgs (Thackeray's \(\gamma\delta\)).\(^44\) The first stage, then, in the history of the

\(\text{\textsuperscript{42}}\) See W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recension of the Hebrew Bible," pp. 27-33; ALO, pp. 189cf.


\(\text{\textsuperscript{44}}\) See Barthélemy, DA, pp. 126-36. The following points should be stressed about \(\theta\), i.e., the sixth column in the section \(\beta\gamma\) of Reigns: (1) the readings follow the Lucian text closely, but occasionally are superior to the witnesses boc\(_2\)e\(_2\); (2) the readings are very often against MT; and (3) the readings often give translations of terms where LXX\(^B\) transliterates!

In addition to the new Qumrân evidence, supporting the identification of the Proto-Lucianic recension, we should observe that elsewhere in Samuel there are Greek materials difficult to explain by Barthélemy's hypothesis. For example, in
Greek recensions was the Proto-Lucian recension of the second or first century B.C., revised to conform to a Palestinian Hebrew text.

The second stage is represented by the καίγε recension made about the middle of the first century A.D. The Palestinian tradition underlying the Proto-Lucianic Greek was jettisoned, replaced by the Proto-Massoretic text as the Hebrew base.

The final stage is found in the late Greek recensions of the second century A.D., notably Symmachus, and Aquila, who undertook the further revision of the καίγε text, bringing it into conformity with the official Rabbinic text of Samuel.

Similarly we can schematize the history of the Hebrew textual families. The text of Samuel as it developed from a fifth century archetype split into three branches. (1) The Old Septuagint witnesses to an Egyptian local text. (2) 4Q Sam in its several manuscripts, as well as the Chronicler and Josephus, give witness to a Palestinian tradition at home in Palestine in the fourth century B.C. (Chronicles), the third century B.C. (4Q Sam^b), the first century B.C. (4Q Sam^a, the Hebrew text underlying the Proto-Lucianic Recension), and the first century A.D. (Josephus' text). (3) The Proto-Massoretic text is known only from the καίγε Greek Recension of the first century A.D. in Samuel. With Egypt and Palestine preempted by local text-types,

---

Barthélemy's readiness to discard the Lucianic recension, sensu stricto, is puzzling. He recognizes that L in boc^a and in θ of the βγ section go back to a non-Massoretic Hebrew tradition, closely related to the Old Greek. But these data do not require or even support his radical solution.

It may be observed in passing that Barthélemy's selective treatment of Jerome's testimonies to Lucian leaves much to be desired, and that he omits mention of the relatively early and important witness of Pseudo-Athanasius. Compare the judicious recent treatment of these testimonies to Lucian by B. Metzger, Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism (Leiden, 1963), pp. 3–7. Cf. also S. Jellicoe, "The Hesychian Recension Reconsidered," JBL 82 (1963), 409–18.

In short, I do not perceive any ground for doubting the existence of a "late" Lucianic recension, and, in any case, the evidence for an early or Proto-Lucianic recension, the substratum of the text of Antioch, remains unaffected.
there is no escaping the conclusion, I believe, that the Proto-
Massoretic text goes back to a local text preserved in Babylon
in the fourth-second centuries B.C., reintroduced into Jerusalem
in the Hasmonaean or Herodian period.

4. A Theory of Local Texts

The evidence marshalled to support a theory of local texts of
Samuel can be applied to other recensionally diverse texts from
Qumrân, especially to the Pentateuch. In the Pentateuch in the
Proto-Samaritan text of Qumrân and in the later Samaritan re-
cension sensu stricto, we find, I believe, a text which developed
in Palestine in the fifth-second centuries B.C. Its text is marked
by "scholarly" reworking; parallel texts were inserted, grammar
and orthography brought up to date, explanatory expansions and
glosses intruded. As Kahle observed long ago, it is a text which
was the work of centuries of growth, not systematic recension.45
It appears at Qumrân both in Palaeo-Hebrew script, certainly
a Palestinian trait, and in the Jewish character. The Samaritan
texts have strong relations with the Egyptian Vorlage of the
Septuagint, and certain texts of Cave IV, notably the 4Q Num4
manuscript, though of Samaritan type, have very strong Egyp-
tian affiliations. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this
text-type is Palestinian and, like Samuel, closely allied to the
Egyptian local text utilized by the translators of the Septuagint
in the third century B.C. The oldest witness to the existence of
this Palestinian text is to be found in the passages of 1 Chronicles
1–9, which quote from the Pentateuch. Gillis Gerleman has
shown that these passages in Chronicles "show greater resem-
bance to the Samaritan Pentateuch than to the Massoretic."46

This leaves the Proto-Massoretic text once again without
provenience in Palestine or Egypt, and presumably we must look
again to Babylon as the locale for its preservation and emer-
gence as a distinct, if conservative, textual type. It reflects little

45 P. Kahle, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchte-
xtes," Theologische Studien und Kritiken 88 (1915), 399–439 (now republished in Opera

46 Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament (Lund, 1948), pp. 9–12. As will be
evident below, I cannot accept his explanation of the reasons for this phenomenon.
of the active scribal endeavor which shaped the other recensions, especially the Palestinian. Since it would not have been preserved in Palaeo-Hebrew, perhaps we find here cause for the rejection of the national script for the official text.

It is necessary to take up, finally, some of the objections raised against a theory of local texts. Some scholars, not always those with conservative axes to grind, argue that the manuscripts underlying the official recension must have come ultimately from the Temple library, and hence would be "Palestinian" texts. Further, it is argued that different texts might arise in one locality, and one must therefore distinguish between exact or official texts of the Temple, etc., and vulgar texts.

To the first argument we may readily answer that the manuscripts used in the official recension may well have come from the Temple. The question is when. Obviously various texts had come to Qumrân, to the Temple, into scribes' hands in the era immediately preceding the textual crisis which is the normal precondition for recensional labors. It does not follow at all that the text-type in question derived originally from Palestine because exemplars of the textual tradition finally came to rest in a Palestinian library.

The distinction "official versus vulgar" must be abandoned, however, as anachronistic. Official and vulgar texts do exist, but after official definition, that is, precisely after the promulgation of an official text. To use the term "vulgar" of the Proto-Samaritan recension, because of its reworking and revision, is not wholly unreasonable, though it obviously was not considered a vulgar text in the Samaritan or Qumrân community, nor was it deemed vulgar, I dare say, by the Chronicler. But our evaluation on scientific grounds of the text-critical worth of a text is not identical with the mode of judgment applied by the ancients, and it would be absurd to apply the designation vulgar to the old Samuel manuscript, to the manuscript used to revise the Septuagint to produce the Palestinian Greek Recension (Proto-Lucian) — in brief, to manuscripts equal to or superior to the textus receptus of Samuel. Or to put it most strongly, I challenge anyone to give a sensible reason for labeling the short, superb text of Jeremiah from Qumrân and underlying the Septuagint
a vulgar text.\textsuperscript{47} No, the term \textit{vulgar} must be applied to a text denigrated in favor of an official text, whether this be the Rab­binic Bible or Homeric texts, or else it comes to mean merely “non-traditional,” or even “unfamiliar.”

We must object brusquely also to the notion that textual tra­ditions, each having a known character, of limited number, and each quite distinct from the other, can exist side by side in the same community or locality for centuries. Certainly it runs coun­ter to analogies drawn from other fields of textual criticism. In the classical field, in Septuagint criticism, in the study of the his­tory of the old Latin Bible and the Greek New Testament, schol­ars have come to recognize that critical or recensional activity regularly follows an era of local textual development.

It must be remembered that recensionally distinct texts are fragile creations; one text, coming in contact with another, im­mediately dissolves into a mixed text. One set of corrections and centuries of development are destroyed in a twinkling. We may observe that there are few mixed texts at Qumrān, and the Proto­Massorethic text reveals no evidence of mixing in the Torah and Former Prophets. The development of the traditional texts of the Pentateuch and Samuel cannot have taken place in Palestine. Too many centuries were required in their making, and the small community had insufficient space to furnish isolation for two radically distinct texts to mature over a period of centuries in pristine innocence of one another.

\textsuperscript{47} For this analysis of the short recension of Jeremiah I am greatly indebted to my student Mr. Gerald Janzen.
THE MASSORETIC TEXT AND THE QUMRAN SCROLLS:
A STUDY IN ORTHOGRAPHY

DAVID NOEL FREEDMAN

I

Some years ago, Frank M. Cross and I made a systematic study of the orthography of representative inscriptions in the different North-West Semitic dialects. These could be dated by epigraphic and other means to the period between the 10th and 6th centuries B.C.E., and thus provided a pattern for comparison with Hebrew inscriptions of the same period. The object of the investigation was to determine the basic principles governing orthographic practice and to trace the course of development and refinement in alphabetic spelling of these dialects and of Hebrew in particular. One result of the study was the establishment of a relative chronology, and with the help of related disciplines, especially that of palaeography, an absolute chronology could also be fixed within limits. Thus it was possible not only to determine the general pattern of orthographic development, and to distinguish its principal phases, but also to date these approximately. Our conclusions may be summarized as follows:

1. The Phoenician phase of consonantal orthography, down to the end of the 10th century B.C.E. This was a purely consonantal spelling, without indication of vowel sounds at all, and is the oldest form of alphabetic writing. It is characteristic of the Proto-Canaanite inscriptions found at Sinai and in Palestine. Ugaritic spelling, with different aleph signs to indicate various vowels accompanying the aleph, is a special phenomenon arising from the peculiar linguistic situation at Ugarit, and has no echoes in later alphabetic spelling. Phoenician inscriptions, from the earliest to the latest times are written in typically consonantal orthography: in fact they define the nature and details of the system. The earliest Hebrew inscriptions (e.g., the Gezer calendar) exhibit the same characteristics, and clearly belong to this pattern of spelling.

2. The Aramaic phase, from the 9th century, involving the use of matres lectionis to represent certain vowel sounds. Two further subdivisions can be distinguished:

1. F. M. Cross, Jr., and D. N. Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography (New Haven, 1952).
a) The introduction of the vowel letters, *he*, *waw*, and *yodh* to represent long vowels in the final position: *i.e.*, *he* for *â*, *ê*, *ô*, *waw* for *ü*, and *yodh* for *i*. We find this pattern in Aramaic inscriptions from the 9th century on, in the Mesha' Inscription (also 9th century), and in Hebrew inscriptive material from this period (chiefly 8th century on). In short there was a clear shift in Hebrew spelling practice, which may be dated to the 9th century.

b) The gradual introduction of vowel letters, *waw* and *yodh*, in the medial position, to represent *û* and *i*. The first examples are found in Aramaic inscriptions from the late 8th century (*e.g.*, *Assur* spelled with *waw* for *û*), and now also in Hebrew from approximately the same period, the end of the 8th century (in the so-called Shebna inscription, with the word 'ărûr, using *waw* for the *û* vowel). Such usage, however, remains rare and sporadic in Hebrew until the end of the pre-Exilic period. Thus there are only a few examples in the whole of the Lachish correspondence.

II

While some questions could not be decided because of lack of evidence, and others remain obscure, the general pattern, established by inductive analysis from hundreds of examples, has not been seriously undermined by critics, but has been confirmed by subsequent discoveries. On the assumption that some parts at least of the Old Testament were originally written down in the pre-Exilic period, an effort was made to test the usefulness of our studies in early Hebrew orthography for the investigation of the biblical text. For this purpose a series of studies were made of some of the poems, which on other grounds might be regarded as among the oldest compositions in the O.T. Professor W. F. Albright pioneered with his important paper on the Oracles of Balaam\(^2\), followed by studies on Habakkuk \(\text{iii}\); Psalm lxviii\(^4\), and most recently, Deut. xxxii.\(^5\) Cross and I, continuing a long Johns Hopkins concern with this early poetry, as attested by the articles of Albright and before him of Paul Haupt, have published papers on Deuteronomy xxxii\(^6\); Psalm xviii=2 Samuel xxii\(^7\), and Exodus xv\(^8\), and have others as yet unpublished. It is our considered judgment that these papers have generally vindicated the applic-

ation of orthographic analysis to selected biblical passages. That they have proved useful in text-criticism and in the clarification of difficult passages can hardly be denied. Used circumspectly they may be helpful in fixing an original date of written composition. Thus, if any of these poems were written down in the age of David and Solomon, we would expect them to have been written in the prevailing orthographic style, i.e., Phoenician consonantal orthography. While the present Hebrew text of the O.T. naturally reflects much later spelling techniques, the presence of examples of archaic spelling ("mistakes" from the point of view of later practice, but quite correct according to earlier usage) would be evidence in support of such an hypothesis. We would not wish to press the case beyond this point, since the evidence is limited, and the conclusions depend to some degree on the presuppositions adopted and the method employed in interpreting the data.

The orthographic approach has proved useful not only in identifying the features of the earliest Hebrew spelling, but also in distinguishing orthographically the dialects of northern and southern Palestine (i.e. Israelite and Judahite). A basic difference lies in the pronunciation and spelling of the proto-Semitic diphthongs aw and ay, which were contracted in the North to ô and ë respectively while they were preserved uncontracted in the South. Israelite followed Phoenician and Ugaritic in this respect, while Judahite agrees with Aramaic and Arabic. The difference in pronunciation is reflected in the spelling: thus in the North the words for "house" and "death" would be written bt and mt (pronounced bêt and môt), while in the South they would be written bvt and mwt (pronounced bayt and mawt). Comparison of Psalm xviii and 2 Samuel xxii indicated the existence of two recensions of this poem, one written in the standard Judahite spelling characteristic of MT in general, the other in northern orthography. While there has been considerable contamination of the text in the course of transmission, sufficient evidence for the "contracted" orthography survives in the 2 Samuel recension to support substantially the "northern" hypothesis. A further possibility in this direction may be mentioned. The date and provenience of the Book of Job have occasioned much debate among scholars, and it cannot be said that any hypothesis has won general approval as yet. Recently the proposal has been advanced that the book is a product of the northern diaspora, i.e. that it comes from the community of Israelites exiled from Palestine after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.E. A number of arguments have been adduced in support of this view, but quite apart from these, a provisional examination of the orthography of the Book

of Job shows a surprisingly high incidence of peculiar and even unique spellings which are characteristically northern in character. That is, they reflect contraction of the diphthongs *aw* and *ay* in spelling (and presumably therefore in pronunciation), e.g., the particle *dadh* is repeatedly spelled *d* instead of normal Judahite and biblical *wd*. The survival in the book of numerous spellings of this sort can hardly be accidental, and may point to a “northern” recension of the Book of Job.

III

In an important sense, however, these studies have been preliminary. The main problem from the beginning has been to determine the place of the MT as a whole (and not simply isolated passages and archaic survivals) in the history of Hebrew orthography, *i.e.*, in what phase of the evolution of Hebrew spelling does the distinctive and characteristic orthography of the MT belong? While the MT is by no means homogeneous, and there is considerable variation not only between the main divisions (*e.g.*, the orthography of the Torah is more conservative than that of the Kethubim, particularly Chronicles) and from book to book, but also on the same page or even in the same verse, there is nevertheless a discernible pattern in the use of *matres lectionis*, though this has not been clearly analysed or described scientifically. One reason for this is the superimposition of Massoretic vocalization on Massoretic spelling in the ordinary printed text of the O.T. For the purpose of clarity in the discussion which follows, let us make the following distinction between spelling and vocalization: by “spelling” we mean the Hebrew letters used to indicate the consonants and certain vowels, *i.e.* the unpointed text. This is sometimes called the consonantal text, but the term is misleading, since some of the letters represent vowels and not consonants. By “Massoretic vocalization” we mean the full system of vowel indication introduced in the latter half of the 1st millennium C.E., which, while combining with the system of vowel letters, nevertheless superseded and distorted the earlier pattern. There is ample evidence to show that the two systems diverge at many points and reflect different periods in the evolution of Hebrew phonology. Thus the vocalization, while preserving older traditions, is nevertheless considerably later than the pronunciation implied in the spelling of the MT.

A cursory examination of MT shows that its spelling does not fit into any phase of pre-Exilic spelling, which even in the latest materials shows only sporadic use of internal *matres lectionis*. On the contrary, MT exhibits consist-

11. Job i, 18, ii, 3, 9, viii, 12, 21.
ent use of internal *matres lectionis* for \( \ddot{u} \) and \( i \) and the contracted diphthongs \( aw \) and \( ay \) (\( \delta \) and \( \epsilon \) respectively). The representation of \( \delta \) varies considerably (*i.e.*, sometimes the *waw* is used, sometimes not), while \( \ddot{a} \) and \( \ddot{e} \) are not represented by vowel letters. There is no indication of short vowels.

If Massoretic spelling was clearly post-Exilic—and since the written composition or compilation of any complete book or part of the Old Testament could hardly be attributed to an earlier date, this was only to be expected—it was not at all clear where in the post-Exilic period the orthography of the Massoretic Text properly fits. The *terminus ad quem* was fixed by the adoption of the Massoretic Text with its particular orthography as the official Bible of the Jewish community toward the end of the 1st century C.E. This view has been fully confirmed by the manuscript discoveries in the Murabba'at caves: the biblical MSS, which date from the Second Revolt, *i.e.* before 135 C.E., are Massoretic both in text and spelling. The origins of Massoretic spelling and its emergence as a definable system must be placed much earlier, of course. The discoveries at Qumran in addition to the previously known Nash Papyrus (and to a lesser extent the evidence of Jewish coins of the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.E.) have enabled us to trace a specifically Massoretic type of spelling back to the latter part of the 2nd century B.C.E., or roughly 100 B.C.E.

For the *terminus a quo* there was in the first place the Exile. In view of critical theories concerning the compilation of the principal parts of the O.T., and in particular of the Torah and Former Prophets, it seemed reasonable to date the emergence of a canonical text to the century after the Exile. When we take into consideration the considerable divergences between the latest pre-Exilic orthography and Massoretic spelling, the 5th century would appear to be the earliest possible occasion for the appearance of Massoretic spelling, while the 4th would be a more reasonable supposition. On general considerations therefore, the emergence of Massoretic spelling could be narrowed to the period between the 5th-4th and the 2nd centuries B.C.E., since by the latter date distinctively Massoretic spelling appears in biblical MSS alongside other more elaborate spelling systems. Greater precision in narrowing the limits could hardly be undertaken because of the deplorable lack of Hebrew inscriptive evidence for the period in question. We are dependent chiefly on seals and stamps, with personal and place names¹², and these add little to our knowledge of the orthographic practice of the period.

---

¹². Of these, the well-known *yahûd* stamps and the five-letter Jerusalem insignia (*yrslm*) may be mentioned. The *yahûd* stamps are sometimes spelled with the *waw* for \( \ddot{u} \), sometimes without: the former reflects current practice in the 4th (or possibly late 5th) century, while the latter spelling attests the survival of an even older practice. The Jerusalem insignia likewise reflects the persistence of a traditional design and custom of spelling.
IV

While the Qumran scrolls have provided more than ample materials—in fact an overwhelming and embarrassing quantity—for the orthographic practice, or rather confusion of the period from the 2nd century B.C.E. through the 1st century C.E., they could hardly have been expected to supply data for the crucial earlier period in which the origins of Massoretic spelling lie. The Qumran community itself does not antedate the latter half of the 2nd century B.C.E., and the bulk of the manuscript materials necessarily belongs to the period following the settlement there. That some of the MSS, especially of biblical books, might be of an earlier date was a possibility to be considered: thus the great Isaiah scroll could be dated by experts to the latter part of the 2nd century B.C.E., and a fragment of Ecclesiastes to about the middle of the same century. With the refinement of palaeographical analysis in the last few years, and the examination of hundreds and hundreds of documents from this period, a sequence dating of Qumran MSS has proved feasible. Substantial agreement in procedures and results has been achieved by the principal workers in this field, chief of whom is Professor Cross. His provisional study in JBL\(^{13}\) fixed the order and dates of a wide selection of Qumran MSS within relatively narrow limits. It has now been superseded by his definitive analysis of all presently available Qumran material (in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright, 1961).

With the vast amount of material now available, and with absolute control provided by dated documents interspersed through the latter part of the period, the dating of the Qumran MSS is virtually certain throughout: we may allow a maximum variation of 50 years in the dating of particular MSS. As was to be expected, the large majority of documents from Qumran date from the period of Essene occupation (*i.e.*, from the late 2nd century B.C.E. to the late 1st century C.E.). Nevertheless, Cross has identified several MSS of an earlier date, some from the early and middle 2nd century B.C.E., and a few fragments even older than these. They may have been brought to Qumran by the first settlers, or procured from other sources. In any case, there are now three biblical MSS which belong, according to Cross’s analysis, to the period from *ca.* 275–175 B.C.E., and may reasonably be regarded as the oldest surviving fragments of the Bible. These MSS, only one of which has been published in part (4QSam(b))\(^{14}\) now offer us data concerning Hebrew orthographic practice in the 3rd and early 2nd century B.C.E., thus enabling us to close partially the gap in the history of post-Exilic spelling; the situation in the

\(^{13}\) “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran”, *JBL* 74 (1955), 147-72.

5th–4th centuries remains obscure. In view of the fact that complete publication of these MSS is some years off, and because of their critical importance for the study of Hebrew orthography in the post-Exilic period, and particularly for the origins of Massoretic spelling, Cross has made the necessary transcriptions available to me for a provisional orthographic analysis.\(^{15}\)

Cross classifies the documents as follows:

1. The oldest MS is apparently 4QExod(f), containing Exodus xl, 8–27 and dating from ca. 275–225 B.C.E. or roughly 250.

2. 4QSam(b) contains 1 Sam. xvi,1–11; xix,10–17; xx,26–xxi,6; xxiii,9–17, and is to be dated ca. 250–200 B.C.E., or about 225.

3. The last is 4QJer(a), containing Jer. xii,17–xiii,6 and xvii,10–25, and is to be dated between 225 and 175 B.C.E., or about 200.

There is no need to press for a precise dating of the MSS in question at this time, and since the science of Hebrew palaeography has not yet achieved the exactitude or the prestige of Greek epigraphy, we can allow considerable leeway without debate. We intend therefore to treat the documents as roughly contemporaneous and as coming from the latter half of the 3rd century or, at the latest, the early part of the 2nd. The fragments comprise a random selection of sufficient length to secure representative orthographic data, though some characteristic forms are lacking for the reconstruction of a complete picture of the manuscripts’ orthography. Our concern is especially with the use of vowel letters in the orthography of the documents, and more particularly with the representation of the medial vowels, since the indication of final vowels had long since been regularized, and the pattern of use remained relatively unchanged from the 9th or 8th century on. There is a significant exception to the general rule: in pre-Exilic inscriptions the 3rd masculine singular suffix attached to nouns in the singular is regularly represented by the letter \(\text{he}\), whereas in these documents, as in MT commonly, \(\text{waw}\) is used. The vowel in question was presumably \(\delta\), though this is not certain for pre-Massoretic vocalization (i.e., we are dependent upon Massoretic vocalization for this pronunciation: it may have been \(\text{uh}\) in pre-Exilic times and possibly \(\text{aw}\) later, contracted to \(\delta\) in post-Exilic times). Thus the significance of the shift from \(\text{he}\) to \(\text{waw}\) is not altogether clear, though the use of \(\text{waw}\) in this situation is sufficient to demonstrate that our documents belong to a definitely post-Exilic stratum of Hebrew orthography.

A second modification of pre-Exilic spelling relates to the 3rd masculine singular suffix with plural nouns (Massoretic \(-\text{aw}\) ) which is represented in pre-Exilic inscriptions simply by the letter \(\text{waw}\), while in the present documents,

---

15. I have consulted with Cross, at various stages in the study, and wish to express my appreciation for many helpful suggestions. I must bear responsibility for the conclusions, such as they are.
as in MT generally, by -yw. There is some difficulty in explaining the appearance of the pre-Exilic form in the southern dialect, though it seems to derive ultimately from -ayhu. The post-Exilic form -yw is incompatible with Massoretic vocalization -aw, and reflects rather the vocalization -ayw from ayhû with syncope of the he as very often in spoken Hebrew (so Siloam rë'êw for MT rë'éhû, cf. Jer. vi,21 וַיֵּשָׁה, which is wrongly vocalized.16 Once again we have a characteristically post-Exilic form both in our 3rd century documents and MT.

To sum up: the use of vowel letters in the final position in the documents under consideration is identical with prevailing practice in MT. Thus he is used to represent final å, ê, and ô, e.g., ז (kô) in 4QJer(a). Waw is used for final û and ô (derived from aw—the question of the contraction of the diphthong must be considered further), and yodh for final ˇ and ˇ (derived from ay). So far as the final vowel letters are concerned, it is clear that the general system which goes back to the 9th century B.C.E. underwent specific changes in the post-Exilic period, and that by the 3rd century at the latest they were firmly incorporated into standard orthographic practice. The unanimity of our 3rd century sources, and their identity with Massoretic practice, suggest that the pattern must actually have originated earlier, perhaps in the 4th or even 5th century.

V

It is in connection with the use of medial vowel letters that more fruitful results can be obtained, however. The general pattern is the same in all three documents, and corresponds closely to that of MT, though with certain significant exceptions. We may summarize the evidence as follows:

1. There is no use of vowel letters to represent short vowels, as in MT.
2. The same is true with regard to medial å and ˇ. This is also the common practice of MT.
3. Waw is used for û and for ô which results from the contraction of aw. Yodh is used for ˇ and for ˇ which results from the contraction of ay. The question as to when these diphthongs contracted is not easily settled. In pre-Exilic orthography the chief evidence for the contraction of the diphthongs is the loss of the original waw or yodh, while the presence of the waw or yodh is evidence of its retention. The situation in post-Exilic orthography is complicated by various factors, including the persistence of historical spelling, i.e. the preservation of waw or yodh after contraction, so that the letter becomes

in effect a vowel indicator, and by the evidence of Massoretic vocalization, which indicates that the diphthong was contracted in certain instances, e.g. the construct state of nouns like bêt and môt, and preserved in others, e.g. in the artificial forms like bayit and māwet. If contraction had taken place we would then expect examples of two concomitant phenomena: 1. the occasional loss of originally diphthongal waw and yodh, since the sounds would fall together with vocalic ô and ê, which are not always or even regularly represented by the corresponding vowel letters. 2. Extension of the use of waw and yodh to cases of ô and ê which did not originate from the corresponding diphthongs aw and ay. In other words, we would expect similarity in orthographic treatment of sounds which fell together, or at least some overlapping. It is too much to expect that the Hebrew scribes could have maintained a formal, i.e. orthographic distinction for any length of time or with consistency when the phonemic support for the distinction had been lost. Even in modern times with our massive scientific knowledge of linguistics, of etymologies, and the principles governing historical spelling, we continually make mistakes in attempting to preserve and reconstruct older forms, and the mistakes fall into the pattern of contamination described above. It can be safely asserted that once different sounds have fallen together, orthographic distinction between them on the basis of historical practice or etymology cannot be long maintained consistently. In MT, the system of vocalization reflects extensive contraction of the diphthongs aw and ay, and the resulting vowels ô and ê are assigned the same value as the ô and ê which derive from the original vowels ä (or u), and i (i.e. hölem and šère: there are undoubtedly distinctions in quantity, and we should reckon with instances of short hölem and šère, but the system used does not indicate these, while it does indicate an identity in vowel quality). Massoretic spelling, as distinct from vocalization, is less clear on this point. On the one hand it carefully preserves the distinction between ê derived from ay, which is consistently represented by yodh, and ê which is derived from i, which is rarely if ever so indicated. This regularity can hardly be explained as a survival of historical spelling, but is rather rooted in a difference in pronunciation. It may be explained in either of two ways, or a combination of them: either the diphthong had actually been preserved and not contracted, or the šère is a short vowel as distinct from the contracted diphthong which is long, and is therefore not represented in the orthography. Whether the second explanation can be used to cover all cases of the shift i > ê is debatable, however. On the other hand, the Massoretic treatment of the ô vowel (hölem) involves extensive representation of vocalic ô, derived from ä (rather than u, which is not indicated by a vowel letter, thus implying that the vowel is short) as well as diphthongal ô, derived from aw. This can be taken to mean that the
δ sounds have fallen together, and thus that contraction of the diphthong has taken place. On the whole it would appear that Massoretic spelling and vocalization point in the direction of diphthongal contraction: that the contracted diphthongs δ and õ are represented by waw and yodh, that the vowel δ derived from ā is similarly represented by waw, although not consistently, while e derived from i and o derived from u are not represented in the orthography because they remained short vowels.

VI

When we turn to the new documents from the 3rd century, we find that two of them, Exod(f) and Jer(a), conform closely to the orthographic pattern of MT, while Sam(b) diverges. The latter makes no use of waw to represent the vowel õ (hōlem), but distinguishes carefully between the diphthong which is always represented by waw and the vowel which is not. This implies strongly that the õ vowel was not represented orthographically, and that the contraction of the diphthong had not yet taken place. Since all three MSS come from approximately the same period, it would appear that this was a time of transition, with Sam(b) preserving an older orthographic tradition and the other MSS belonging to the newer pattern. We also seem to have reached the point of origin of Massoretic spelling as such.

The only significant distinctions in spelling practice among the MSS, and between them and MT, concern the use of waw as a medial vowel letter for õ (derived from ā). There are other differences, but these are minor and may be mentioned in passing. Thus there are a few instances in which Massoretic vocalization indicates an i vowel, where the MSS do not have yodh to represent the vowel. Sam(b) spells the name “David” dwd regularly, as often in MT, even though the second vowel is apparently long, as the spelling (with yodh) elsewhere in MT, and in many places in the Qumran scrolls, shows. In Sam(b) (as MT here), we undoubtedly have a case of historical spelling, the survival of the older, pre-Exilic spelling (which we would expect in the case of names particularly) alongside the development of the more “correct” fuller spelling. In Exod(f) at xl, 18, we have בְּרִיתִי for MT בְּרִיתָיו which is more regular. This may also be the survival of an older spelling (cf. Jon. ii, 7 בְּרִיתָיו) or more likely a scribal slip reflecting the current slurring of the vowel (which is unaccented) in ordinary pronunciation. There are two similar cases in Jer(a): הָשָּׁנִים for MT הָשָׁנִים (xvii, 14) and מָשָׁנִים (MT same, xiii, 1), where the expected yodh is omitted, probably as a reflection of current pronunciation of the unaccented pretonic syllable (i.e., the vowel was not heard distinctly or regarded as long). Other explanations are possible; in any case such exceptions do not undermine the general pattern, but only prove that scribes are human.
We may now turn to the evidence for the spelling of ō in our documents:

1. For Sam(b) we have the following—ō is never indicated in the orthography, with the possible exception of four words:
   a) לֶמֶד, lē mō 'ēd (1 Sam xx,35, as in MT). Here the waw is etymologic, i.e. derived from the diphthong aw: *maw'īd > mō'ēd.
   b) יְבִנְיָן, yōnātān (MT יְבִינָי, but elsewhere יְבָינָי). Here again the waw is etymologic, deriving from an original diphthong. MT spelling is archaizing or hypercorrect, since intervocalic he was lost early in ordinary pronunciation (MT vocalization is an artificial backformation from yōnātān). Thus: *yahuna-tan> * yawnatan > yōnātān.
   c) יְהוֹם, hayyôm (xx, 27, 34, as MT). Again the waw is to be considered etymologic: i.e. *yawm > yôm. A second root, ym, is reflected in the plural yāmîm, as also in the curious (but repeated) form ym for "day" in pre-Exilic Judahite materials. We must reckon with a more complex dialectic situation in Judah in which bi-forms of the type yawm/yam, qawl/qal, etc., existed side by side.
   d) מָגָום, māqôm, (xx,27,37; xxi,3 as MT). This is the most difficult form, since it is usually derived from *maqām (root qm). If this derivation is correct then it would be the only case of the use of waw for vocalic ō (from ā) in Sam(b). The consistency of usage with this word (all three cases), and the complete absence of any other examples of such use of waw (though there are numerous instances of ō from ā in the materials and an impressive number in which MT has waw but where Sam(b) omits), indicates that another explanation is implied if not required. On the analogy of Arabic and Syriac formations from the same root, we suggest that māqôm derives from *maqawm rather than *maqōm, and that the waw is etymologic here also. The bi-form maqām > māqôm may also have existed, since MT preserves a number of cases in which the waw is omitted (though only in combining forms with preposition or suffix, where a possible change in pronunciation may be involved). The plural form (mēqômôt) may likewise be derived from the simple form *maqāmāt rather than one with the diphthong, thus conforming to the pattern suggested in (c) above.

As another illustration of metaplastic formations we may suggest the different spellings of the word Jerusalem. MT spelling of the last syllable is simply -lm, implying a pronunciation -lēm, while the vocalization (a permanent Qerē) -ayim points to an original diphthong -aym. We know now that this vocalization is not artificial but derives from a tradition going back at least to the 2nd century B.C.E. as shown by numerous examples in the Qumran scrolls.

17. Cf. Syriac qawmā, qawmethā and Arabic تَأَمُّهَةٌ، قُومٌ
in which the yodh appears in the last syllable (-lym). This can only signify the diphthongal form -aym, as yodh is not used to represent either seghol or šere.

The principal difference between Sam(b) and MT is in the representation of the ô vowel (derived from ā), as the following table indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>4Q Sam(b)</th>
<th>Verse M.T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>בֶּכְשָם</td>
<td>xvi,6 בֶּכְשָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>כֶּפֶת</td>
<td>xvi,7 כֶּפֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>הַחַלֶל</td>
<td>xix,12 הַחַלֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>שַׁהָר</td>
<td>xx,26 שַׁהָר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>אֶסֶר</td>
<td>xxi,10 אֶסֶר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 2, the word qōmātō is apparently derived from *qāmat rather than *qawmat, although we have argued that māgōm derives from *maqawm rather than *maqdā. Our point is that both basic forms existed in the language, that any given substantive may be derived from either root, and that we may expect considerable mixture in the use of forms.

From the evidence presented it is clear that Sam(b) not only uses waw as a mater lectionis less frequently than MT, but follows a consistent pattern, which is no longer the case with MT: it distinguishes between diphthongal ô and vocalic ō, thus implying that there was a difference in the pronunciation of these sounds, i.e. the diphthong had not yet been contracted. We must in view of these data assign orthographic priority to Sam(b). It reflects a phase of Hebrew spelling earlier than that of MT. Cross drew this conclusion on general grounds along with the important observation that Sam(b) also preserves a text of Samuel which is demonstrably older than that of MT, and apparently even of the Vorlage of the LXX.18 We are dealing therefore with an archaic MS which preserves a tradition, both textually and orthographically, considerably older than the date of the MS itself. As a conservative estimate we suggest the 4th century or even late 5th for the pattern, both textual and orthographic, preserved in Sam(b).

VII

The evidence for the use of waw for ô in Ex(f), which must now be regarded as the oldest known MS of the Bible, is as follows: the usage is not consistent, though a general pattern emerges—there is extensive use of waw, contrary

to the practice of Sam(b) and closer to what we find in MT. It is to be noted however that the orthography of the MS as a whole is somewhat irregular, unlike Sam(b), which is a model of consistency, and it must therefore be used with caution. The following cases are clear examples of the use of \textit{waw} for \(\hat{o}\) (from \(\hat{a}\)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4Q Ex(f)</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>M.T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. יוהו</td>
<td>xl, 9, 13</td>
<td>והו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יוהו</td>
<td>12, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>והו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but יוהו</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>והו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. עלים</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>שלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ליווהים</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ליווהים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. באהת</td>
<td>20 (3 times), 21</td>
<td>באיה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. זפח</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>זפח</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are apparently all cases of \(\hat{o}\) derived from \(\hat{a}\); \textit{waw} commonly appears when the \(\hat{o}\) occurs under the accent but not always, \textit{cf.} ליווהים. There are notable differences in detail between Ex(f) and MT, though elsewhere MT spells these words as does Ex(f). However the spelling of the \textit{nota accusatìvi} before suffixes with \textit{waw} is very rare in MT, though common in Ex(f) and in many later Qumran texts. It is clear that by the 3rd century and possibly earlier, \textit{waw} was already being used to represent medial \(\hat{o}\). If we are right in supposing that this usage developed as an extension of the use of \textit{waw} for the contracted diphthong \(aw > \hat{o}\), then it would mean that the diphthong \(aw\) had contracted by the 3rd century at the latest. Since the evidence of Sam(b) points in the other direction, \textit{viz.} that contraction had not yet taken place, and the MSS are roughly contemporary (in fact in Cross's opinion Ex(f) is somewhat older than Sam(b)), we must look for some other explanation of the use of \textit{waw} for \(\hat{o}\) (\textit{i.e.}, it may be independent of the use in connection with the diphthong) or suppose that the two MSS reflect a linguistic transition, in which the archaic Sam(b) preserves an older pattern of pronunciation and orthography, while Ex(f) reflects a later, contemporary usage. The orthographic pattern represented by Ex(f) cannot be later than the early 3rd century, and may be as old as the 4th. That of Sam(b) must be correspondingly older, though in view of the date of the MS itself it can hardly ascend beyond the early 4th century, or possibly the late 5th.

There are additional cases in Ex(f) where \textit{waw} is not used although the corresponding word in MT is vocalized with \(hölem\) (and in one case spelled with \textit{waw} in MT):
In some cases the omission of the waw may be due to carelessness, in others to the survival of historical spelling, and in still others to a difference in pronunciation or interpretation of the word in question. Thus Nos. 1 and 3 are proper names where we would expect historical spelling, as in MT. No. 2 may have been understood as a singular form, especially as MT also omits the expected waw marking the plural. Nos. 5 and 6 may involve a difference in pronunciation especially as MT regularly spells without waw (the original vowel behind the holem may have been u rather than a, and in these MSS as in MT ō from u is not represented in the orthography). No. 4 is the only clear case of omission, and this is doubtless a survival of older spelling practice in Ex(f) (the spelling without waw occurs elsewhere in MT).

MT and Ex(f) are closer to each other in the matter of the use of waw for ō than either is to Sam(b). At the same time there are important differences between them; particularly as regards the spelling of ’ōt-. Ex (f) goes beyond MT generally in the direction of the fuller spelling of the later Qumran MSS.

VIII

The evidence for the use of waw for ō for the third MS, Jer(a), is as follows: the pattern is very similar to that of Ex(f), and also to that of MT. The following cases illustrate this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4Q Jer(a)</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>M.T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. נטש</td>
<td>xii,17</td>
<td>נטש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. אואר</td>
<td>xiii,1,2,4</td>
<td>אואר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ימוה</td>
<td>xvii,11</td>
<td>ימוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. חשתנ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>חשתנ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. א策ר</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>א策ר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. מגא</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>מגא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (ב)ים</td>
<td>17,18, etc.</td>
<td>(ב)ים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that there is widespread use of *waw* for *ō*, comparable to what we find in MT, though more extensive in Jer(a) than MT for this passage. *Waw* is used for the contracted diphthong: Nos. 4, 6, 7 and possibly 3 (which is peculiar); *waw* for *ō* from *ā* in the tone position is common: Nos. 1, 2, 9, 12, 13. Nos. 5 and 8 involve difficulties in interpretation of the form, though MT usually omits the *waw*. No. 10 is a case of metathesis in Jer(a) where MT יבָּא is the correct reading. No. 11 shows the *waw* used in an unaccented position, though the form may involve a secondary accent: 'ābōtēkem. There are in addition a number of cases in which *waw* is omitted although MT vocalizes with *hōlem*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4Q Jer(a)</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>M.T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. אביה</td>
<td>xvii,18</td>
<td>יבָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. חלֵך</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>לֹך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. מב</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>לַמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. אביה</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>יבָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. שמע</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>לַש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. עשת</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>לַש</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal examples involve the Qal active participle, both singular and plural, where in agreement with regular MT practice *waw* is not used. The careful orthographic distinction in a MS not otherwise noted in this fashion suggests that the pronunciation differed, perhaps due to the position of the accent. The *ō* of Massoretic vocalization is confirmed however by later Qumran scrolls (as well as linguistic analysis). The only other instance of omission in Jer(a) is No. 3, where MT also omits the *waw*.

IX

The orthography of these three early scrolls from Cave IV of Qumran is the same in all essentials except for the use of *waw* to represent *ō*; *ō* < *aw*
is regularly represented by waw, while Ï is never so represented. Sam (b) apparently does not represent Ï (from ä) at all, while Ex(f) and Jer(a) generally do, though with exceptions (discussed above), which arise either as a result of historical spelling or differences in contemporary pronunciation (as distinguished from Massoretic vocalization); these in turn depend upon the position of the accent and the length of the vowel in question. There is also the possibility of scribal error. None of the MSS is identical with MT in spelling practice in the passages under consideration, and there are general as well as detailed differences. Nevertheless all three exhibit features which can be matched in MT taken as a whole, and MT could be reconstructed from the evidence of the three MSS under consideration.

The earliest or most conservative spelling is that of Sam(b), which probably reflects normative Israelite spelling of the 4th century B.C.E. There are numerous significant differences from 6th century practice to suggest an upper limit for Sam(b)'s orthography in the 5th century. The other two MSS exhibit freer use of waw as a mater lectionis, but may also be based upon usage going back to the 4th century—not earlier in our judgment since it would then be difficult to explain the survival of the older tradition in a 3rd century MS like Sam(b). In addition, the irregularity in the practice of these MSS suggests that the extended use of waw was of recent origin, and that these MSS reflect a period of transition both in spelling and pronunciation.

It may be premature to draw general conclusions about MT on the basis of the material now available, but certain points may be made now. MT shares with all three early MSS the same orthographic practice with regard to final and medial vowel letters, with the single exception of the use of waw for Ï (< ä), which varies between Sam(b) and the other documents. This alone argues for a long stable orthographic tradition stemming from scribal schools of the early post-Exilic period. Massoretic practice with regard to the use of waw for Ï might well be described as a compromise between the defective spelling of Sam(b) and the extended orthography of Ex(f), and is in fact very close to that of Jer(a). It may be further argued that Massoretic spelling was deliber¬erely designed to combine the best features of the different orthographies current in the 4th–3rd centuries, preserving continuity with the older conservative tradition of Sam(b), and at the same time incorporating the helpful features of the newer spelling exhibited in Ex(f) and Jer(a). We may place the origins of Massoretic spelling as a definite orthographic system in the late 3rd or early 2nd century, and describe it as a learned recension based upon the best practice of the preceding period. Apparently with official support, it gained primacy during the next two centuries, and was ultimately successful as the official biblical spelling, sweeping the field of all rivals.
THE QUMRAN MANUSCRIPTS AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

BY

P. W. SKEHAN

Washington

As indicated in the outline distributed to the members of the Congress, this is in the nature of one more preliminary report, mainly of the Qumran cave 4 materials on which the writer has himself been working. We may begin by recalling the fact, already indicated by F. M. Cross 1) and confirmed by the further study of J. T. Milik of the various biblical materials from Wadi Murabba‘at, that a definite terminus ad quem for the variety of texts that Khirbet Qumran provides occurs between the two Jewish revolts; somewhere before A.D. 135. The standardizing of the text as regards orthography, conformity to a selected prototype which yields in all essentials the consonants of the Masoretic text, and definitive scribal rules for its transmission, was clearly an accomplished fact at the time of the second Jewish revolt: this is verifiable explicitly for several books of the Pentateuch (Gen., Ex., Deut.), for Isaias, and for the Minor Prophets. The Wadi Murabba‘at materials have none of the variability of text, format and orthography that is to be found at Qumran.

It has already been indicated by Prof. Cross that the Qumran manuscripts of Genesis, six in number, provide nothing of special textual interest beyond a few isolated readings. The same is by no means true, however, with respect to the other books of the Pentateuch, in which we are clearly dealing in many cases with recensional variations. For the paleo-hebrew scroll of Exodus of which a preliminary announcement was published by the writer, 2) there is still no definitive indication as to whether or not one can class it as Samaritan in any sectarian sense. In view of the known attitude of the community towards the “men of Ephraim and Manasses”, however, the probabilities are all against it. We may now add the fact that

Cross is preparing a manuscript of Numbers (4 Q Num*) in square-letter script that contains expanded readings hitherto known only from the Samaritan recension—a manuscript with text that is in other respects of a mixed character, going sometimes with LXX against Sam. and MT, and sometimes with MT against LXX and Sam. When one adds to this a manuscript of Exodus (4 Q Ex*) of distinctly Septuagintal type, 1) and the ending of the Song of Moses from Deuteronomy published by the writer, 2) which has also pronouncedly Septuagintal affiliations, it becomes clear that, with the exception of Genesis, the books of the Pentateuch still circulated in Palestine down to the First Revolt in copies with varying recensional backgrounds.

This may perhaps be the point for a reflection of a more general character. There are, it will be recalled, some 100 biblical manuscripts from cave 4 at Qumran. At the end of two years’ acquaintance, in varying degrees, with these materials, the writer is still not aware of internal evidence which would urge either that any one of these manuscripts was copied from another identifiable manuscript among the finds, or that any two had a common immediate prototype. Put in another way, this is to say that the biblical manuscripts of the fourth cave at Qumran have a spread in time of some three hundred years; that their origins are to some extent necessarily diverse, and that nothing in the materials to my knowledge shows that there was a specific type of text for any book to which the community felt itself especially committed, and which it endeavored to propagate from the scriptorium of the settlement.

Coming back to the Pentateuch in particular, one fact that should perhaps be stressed is that Qumran is not giving us, in these books, a multiplicity of unknown readings. Nor does it absolve us of applying to the readings it does provide, whether or not these are in accord with a known Greek or Samaritan text, the same critical judgment with which we approach the Masoretic text itself. Partisans of a supposed superiority of the Septuagint in particular still tend today, as in earlier times, to regard the evidence of the Greek as though from place to place, and from book to book, it were all on one plane. Nothing could, of course, be further from the truth; and even in such an instance as the end of Deut. xxxii, where materials from the LXX and material from Qumran combine to suggest that

the Masoretic text is in certain respects defective, it is still the fact
that these alternative recensions themselves are on specific points
demonstrably corrupt and inferior. 1)

The books of Judges, Kings, Esdras-Nehemias and Chronicles
in Qumran cave 4 have not yielded enough material for serious
textual discussion. Prof. Cross has already indicated that in Josue
and Samuel there is a strong Septuagintal cast to the Hebrew manu-
scripts from Qumran 4. This is the less surprising in that for Samuel
in particular the Masoretic text has long been recognized as partly
in disorder and as containing lacunae which the Septuagint and the
Old Latin help to fill. From the twofold viewpoint of the amount
of text preserved, and the direct value of that text as a source of
fruitful criticism of the Masoretic tradition, the Books of Samuel
are in fact unique at Qumran.

For the remaining books it may be briefly said that the only areas
in which notable and extensive differences from the consonantal
text of the Masora are still possible would be the Minor Prophets
and Jeremias. The writer has been working on one manuscript of
the Minor Prophets, from about Herodian times, and finds that it
presents the early books in the order given in the Masora, and that
nearly all its verifiable text is quite ordinary, except for a rather
full orthography of the known Qumran type. The texts of Ezechiel,
and of the Ketubim as a whole, offer no differences of recensional
character, and a quite limited number of interesting variants.

For Isaias, the complete scroll from cave 1 remains textually the
most interesting document, and there is nothing among the 15
manuscripts of cave 4 which is recensionally different from the
received consonantal text, or yields improved readings in any signi-

1) I refer in particular to the reading ’mr Yhwh in Dt. xxxii 37; though in my
judgment the secondary and conflate character of verse 43 in these witnesses
is equally patent. Incidentally, it is now possible, another piece of the “Song of
Moses” manuscript (4Q Dt 9) having been acquired this year, to clarify the very
troublesome arrangement of the stichoi in Dt. xxxii 37*-41*, the next to last
column of that text. When it was published in BASOR I felt obliged to assume,
methodologically, that the text must have been written uniformly, either one or
two hemistichs to the line. Neither arrangement could lead to a satisfactory
result; I therefore assumed a number of lacunae. Though the new fragment is
a small one, it is sufficient to show that the column had some lines with two
hemistichs, and others with only one: of an 11-line column, lines 1-4, 9 and 10
had each one hemistich; while lines 5-8 and 11 had two. There is nothing else
quite like this at Qumran, and it can only be attributed to the individual scribe’s
desire to end his text, as he in fact did, exactly with the bottom of his final column.
ificant degree. Only a few detailed considerations suggest themselves. Probably our oldest manuscript (4Q Is*) contains Is. xlii 4-11; in xlii 4 it already has the well-known variant brît 'ôlam for brît 'am. Since the reading is quite impossible, we have no reason to be grateful. Published mention has already been made 1) of the late manuscript (4Q Is*) which contains such names as Yhwh, Yhwh šb̄w̄t, 'lw̄ynw, and the like, in paleohebrew script. This is almost unique among square-letter biblical manuscripts in Qumran cave 4; 2) but it occurs again in biblical materials from two other caves. In general, also in non-biblical manuscripts, this is a late phenomenon at Qumran; and our oldest witness to a differentiation in script for the tetragrammaton is still probably the Fuad papyrus of Deuteronomy in Greek, 3) in which the name appears in the square-letter Hebrew script.

The point perhaps still deserves to be stressed, that among other things which the large scroll from cave 1 illustrates for us is an exegetical process at work within the transmission of the text itself, in Hebrew. In J. Ziegler’s excellent Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 4) he provides two extensive chapters (pp. 103-134; 134-175) on the relationship of the LXX of Isaias to the other Old Testament books, and on the reciprocal influences, within the book, of one passage on another where some association of thought or phraseology has led to harmonizing. In the former of these chapters he allows (p. 105) for the possibility that borrowings from the other O.T. books into the text of Isaias may already have been present in the translator’s Vorlage; in the other chapter he leaves open (p. 134) the like possibility that the harmonizing of similar or related passages within the book of Isaias may also have been done, in many cases, in a Hebrew text leading up to the copy which stood before the translator. Now, IQ Is* and the LXX of Isaias are not recensionally connected, though they have an occasional reading in common; but they are mutually illustrative, because the cave 1 manuscript gives us, for the first time in Hebrew, the kind of glossed and reworked manuscript that the LXX prototype must have been. I subjoin to

1) By the writer, in Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17, 1955, 42-43.
2) One occurrence of 3lw̄ynm which seems to belong to a badly deteriorated MS. of Leviticus remains to be verified.
4) A. T. Abhandlungen xii, 3; Münster i. W., 1934.
this paper a list of some twenty-seven passages in the large scroll containing unique readings, each of which is dependent on another passage in Isaias or on a specific reading from some other prophetic book. 1) The phenomenon is too frequent and well-defined, especially in the second half of the scroll, to be indeliberate. It is in fact a part of the technique which, when applied more consistently and on a broader scale, produced the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch. The process is, as already stated, an exegetical one, excluded for the future by the definitive standards of text transmission that accompanied the stabilization of the consonantal text between the two revolts. Since Isaias was quite evidently the most studied book outside the Pentateuch, it understandably reflects the result of this study in pronounced degree, on the one hand in 1Q Is and on the other in the LXX rendering. Of the cave 4 manuscripts of Isaias none seems to be of this type. In 4Q Is, the latest of them, the text of Is. xi 9 has been accommodated to that of the very similar verse Hab. ii 14—but that is about all.

It has been in conjunction with the text of Isaias that the writer has examined to some extent the likely effects of the extrabiblical documents at Qumran in providing us with text-critical materials for the O.T. itself. This examination has been tentative, and has been centered on a book for which we have now fragments of quite a number of manuscripts showing, as already indicated, rather little significant variability in the text. It is therefore hardly surprising that the conclusion thus far is largely negative: allusions and lemmata in the extrabiblical documents may yield some points of detail, but will not alter our understanding of the textual history of the book. This is by no means to exclude the eventual importance of
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careful study along these lines, as more and more material continues to be published; here tribute has of course to be paid to the thoughtful exploratory article of C. Rab in the *JTS* of last year. 1) Two considerations would, in fact, suggest that the scope for such study may be somewhat larger and more challenging even than Dr. Rab in has indicated. One, already mentioned, is that there is not now any good evidence, so far as I know, that the sect committed itself to consistently transmitting a standardized form of text for any biblical book. The other is that the principle of “limited variability,” as Dr. Rab in has described it, with analogies especially from Coran transmission, is still visible at work within the Jewish tradition, preserving and expounding consonantal variants from the known Masoretic standard, as late as the Targum to the *Ketubim*. Since we already know that the *peshers* of Qumran can contain a *lemma* and an explanation which are in fact at odds with one another as to the text, we can be quite sure that both they and the other extrabiblical documents will bear repeated scrutiny before the last variant has been identified and evaluated. On the other hand, the writer has already had occasion to indicate 2) that genuine variants which do occur, for example in the large Isaia scroll from cave 1, are at times matched in the extrabiblical materials from Qumran by the standard Masoretic reading for the same place.

For the Psalms, the outline you have received suggests a good deal of preoccupation with the external arrangement. For this there are two reasons. One is the fact that the Qumran cave 4 manuscripts reflect a practice of transmitting the Psalm text in a form in keeping with the verse structure, parallel with the more mechanical mode of transmission contained in the later codices and printed bibles. The other is the omissions and rearrangements of entire Psalms, which do occur, and which raise the question how far they may be significant.

With respect to arrangement in verse form, the most interesting document is 4Q Ps*, carefully prepared on whitish leather, in a hand of the Herodian period, 18 lines to the column, at least eight columns to the skin; each line contains a single hemistich. The Psalms now represented are xci-xciv, xcix-c, cii-ciii, cxii-cxvi, cxviii. Psalm cxvii (the short one) was certainly included. Psalms civ-cxi were demonstrably omitted, though several fragmentary manuscripts from 4Q

---

2) In *CBQ*, 17, 1955, 41.
contain one or more Psalms from this part of the book (Pss. civ-cv, cvii, cix). Considering the short, narrow columns with ample spacing between, it is most unlikely that 4Q Ps\(^{b}\) ever contained the entire Psalter. Its text is quite close to the Masora, even in orthography. In Ps cii 20 it gives mimrôn godô for the Masoretic mimrôm godô; but the verb hisqîp and the parallel hemistich both favor the Masoretic reading.

4Q Ps\(^{b}\) is apparently of the Hasmonean period. As indicated in the outline, this Ms arranges the Psalms and their titles as they still appear in the Masora: there is no special separation between title and text, the selah appears as though part of the continuous text, and stichometric arrangement is not observed. What remains of it are portions of Pss. v-vi, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv-xxxvi, xxxviii and lxxi, liii-liv, lxvi-lxvii and lxix. Psalm xxxii was omitted (as is the case also in another, unpublished, ancient portion of a Psalter, not from cave 4 at Qumran). Psalm lxxi, which has no title, is given in continuous text with Psalm xxxviii, as though it were part of the same Psalm. The best explanation the writer can offer for this is that the 6th and final verse of Psalm lxx is quite similar in thought and diction to the last verse of Psalm xxxviii, and that on this basis some scribe or reciter of the Psalms grouped Psalms xxxviii and lxxi, having in mind the sequence lxx-lxxi. In view of the presence among our fragments of Psalms lxvi-lxvii and lxix, an explanation based on the identity of Psalm xl 13-18 with all of Psalm lxx would encounter difficulties.

4Q Ps\(^{b}\) presents both some good readings and some quite bad ones. In Ps. xxxviii 20 for (\(\text{rv}^\text{Ôybay}\) hayyîm ('äse'mu) of MT, this Ms. reads hinnâm as is required by the parallelism. In Ps. lxix 11, for MT's wâ'ebke(h) (bassôm napâl) the Ms. has wâ'ak. In Ps. lxxi 6 for the well-known crux (mimmrôm 'immî 'attâh) gôzî, the Ms. reads 'ozzi. But in Ps. lxix 4, where MT has kâlû 'ênây myyahhel (lî'hôbây), this Ms. has kâryû sinnay, or, if you prefer, sînay. \(^{1}\) And in Ps. xxxviii 21 for MT's yiś'ônû tahat rodpî tôb, the Ms. has ysossûnî tahat dâbr ôb.

Two other Mss. of the Psalter deserve brief mention. Of one (4Q Ps\(^{a}\)) there are extant fragments of only Psalms civ and cxlvii—including the fragment on which Psalm cxlvii ends and Psalm civ begins. The other (4Q Ps\(^{c}\)) is a late and very regular hand, with tittled

\(^{1}\) Sinnay suggested itself first, because of the opposite corruption in Cant. v 12, where for 'ênâ(y)w A. VACCARI rightly restores 'inmây(y)w.
alephs, with the standard order of the Psalms (Pss. xlviii-lii are best preserved), but with the Qumran type of full orthography. Like 4Q Isc, it would seem to come from the closing years of the sectarian settlement. Occasionally, as in Psalms xviii, xxvii and xxxvii, it shows an arrangement with two hemistichs to the line. In Ps. xviii 33-36 this arrangement is, however, a mechanical one which no longer fits the parallelism. Consistent examples of this type of arrangement are found only in the two Mss. (4Q Ps. *d, °e) of the long alphabetic Psalm cxix.

We come now to the Septuagint materials with which Qumran cave 4 provides us. Of a leather ms. of Numbers, written about 30 letters to the line in a hand of the first century B.C., there are extant portions of iii 30-iv 14. Some of the fragments were recovered from the cave itself in the controlled excavation by the archaeologists. With this paper will be published the transcription of iii 40-42 and iv 6-9: two fairly continuous passages which represent more than half of the material.

4Q LXX Numbers

iii 40-42

a]ΡΙΘΘΗ Theta

41. λημψει: lege λημψη, codd.

iv 6-9.

διω)ΤΗΠΑΣ[και

επι την τραπεζαν την προ]ΚΕΙΜΕΝΗΝ Ε

πιβαλουσιν επ αυτην μι]ΑΣΩΝ[α]ΚΙΝΘ:

νον και δωσουσιν επ αυι]ΣΩΝΒΑΙ

α και τας θυισκας και τ]ΟΥΣΚΑΙ
In general, the text is that which we know; for example in iv 7
the expression την τραπεζαν την προκειμενην is a unique occurrence
in the LXX to represent șulhan happānim, and the reading occurs
identically in our fragments. There are, however, notable variations
in diction which indicate a deliberate recensional treatment of the
book at a very early period. The reading αριθμησоν in iii 40 is to
be found in no other manuscript in this place; but various forms
of the verb αριθμείν are a characteristic feature of codex A nine
times in Numbers ii, and again in iii 16, as against the επισκεπτεῖν
of the codex B. This latter verb is of course the standard LXX
equivalent for τρεπ̌ in the book of Numbers and elsewhere; and it
occurs (at least its first two letters occur) in the Qumran manuscript
in iii 42. In Numbers iv 6 and 8, the term for the carrying-poles or
baddim in our manuscript alone is διωστήρας, all other Greek witnesses
having αναφορές; but the term διωστήρας is used for baddim
regularly in the LXX of Exodus. On the other hand, in Numb. iv
11 of the Qumran MS. the same Hebrew term is represented by
αρτηράς, a word otherwise known to us in LXX only from Neh.
iv 11, where the Hebrew is quite different. In Numb. iv 9, the equivalent for *môrât ham'môr* is not *την λυχνιαν την φωτιζουσαν* as in practically all manuscripts, but uniquely [*την λυχνιαν της φαυσεως*, using for *mâr* a rendering that occurs otherwise in LXX only in Gen. i 14-15 and Ps. lxiii (lxxiv) 16, with four scattered occurrences (Exod. xxv 5-6; *Sym.*, Exod. xxxv 8; *Al.*, Lev. xxiv 1) in the known hexaplaric materials. The impression which the writer derives from this is that a somewhat awkward Greek rendering of Numbers has been reworked anciently to yield the recension contained in our later codices.

The papyrus manuscript of Leviticus (4Q LXX Lev*), of which again some fragments were obtained from the controlled excavations, is in a hand closely akin to that of the Fuad papyrus of Deut., and is datable accordingly to the first century B.C. Averaging about 27 letters to the line, it presents us with numerous fragments of chapters 2 to 5 of the book, from which ten separate segments of text can be pieced together (ii 3-5; ii 7; iii 4; iii 9-13; iv 6-8; iv 10-11; iv 18-20; iv 26-29; v 8-10; v 18-24). Its only special feature is that in the midst of the Greek text familiar from the LXX codices, the divine name here appears not as Κύριος, but as ΙΑΩ — a form previously known to us in manuscript only from the margin of the codex Q of the Prophets. The reading *των εντολών Ιαω* in iv 27 is ineluctable; and in iii 12 the last two letters of the same name can be verified—Κύριος does not occur in the document. This new evidence strongly suggests that the usage in question goes back for some books at least to the beginnings of the Septuagint rendering, and antedates such devices as that in the Fuad papyrus or the special scripts in the more recent Hebrew manuscripts of Qumran and in later Greek witnesses.

We come finally to the scroll of Leviticus on leather (4Q LXX Lev *), of which we have Lev. xxvi 2-16 in lines of about 47 letters. This is the full length of one column of 28 lines, with stitching broken away at the left, where the margin is intact for the last 12 lines. The upper left of the column and the ends of all the lines are missing; the hand is apparently of the first century A.D. A new section at xxvi 14 is marked by a spacing of about three letters' width within the line and by a horizontal paragraph mark in the margin. Unfortunately, the divine name in any form does not occur in the preserved text.

That text is in the main the rendering of Leviticus with which we
are familiar; nevertheless, in the limited material we have (of which a full publication will be subjoined to this paper) there are ten separate readings which are unique. Of these, nine are farther from a mechanical rendering of the Masoretic text than what is contained in the codices; one is closer, though this one (1. 15) depends on an inference as regards the quantity of text to fill a gap. None of these unique readings has anything to offer for the criticism of the Hebrew consonantal text itself. There are also five readings for which the Qumran MS. provides direct evidence, on which the later Greek codices are notably divided; with regard to these the scroll shows no systematic affiliation. Two of the unique readings, in the writer's judgment, can only be extremely early. In xxvi 11, for καὶ οὐ βδέλυγεται η ψυχή μου υμας, the Qumran reading is καὶ οὐ βδε- λυγομαι υμας; and in xxvi 12, for (καὶ υμεῖς εσεσθε μοι) λαος the Qumran text has εθνος. Of these Qumran readings, the former introduces an anthropomorphic turn which is not in the original text; and the latter, in rendering 'am by εθνος, violates the pattern by which LXX regularly applies εθνος to the gentiles, and λαος to the people of Israel. The general impression with which the writer is left is that we have here one more book of the O.T. in which a single early Greek rendering seems to have undergone a good deal of what we would today call critical revision, in the period even before Origen.*

Patrick W. Skehan

4 Q LXX Lev.* Lev. xxvi 2-16.

µο]ΥΦΟΒΗΘΗΣΕΓ[ω
πο]ΡΕΥΗΣΕΚΑΙΤΑΣΕΝ[αλς
τη]ΓΗΙΜΩΝΕΝΚΑΙΡΩΙΑΥ[τον
κ]ΑΙΤΟΝΞΥΛΟΝΕΝΚΑ[
5
]ΑΜΗΤΟΣ[τον]ΤΡΥΡΓ[ητον
σ]ΠΟΡΟΝΚ[αίφα]ΓΕΚΘ[ε
κ]ΑΤΟΙΚΗΣ[ετε
ε]ΙΡΗΗΝΝΕΝΤ[ηι γηι υμων] ΚΑΙ[ε]
]ΈΚΦΟΒΏΝΥΜΑΣ[καλα]ΣΩΛΩ[
10 
κ]ΑΙΠΟΛΕΜΟΚΟΥΔΙ[ελε]ΤΕΕΤ[ει
διωξει]ΞΕΧΡΟΥΟΥΣΜΩΝ[κ]ΑΙ[
διωξ]ΟΝΤΑΙΤΕΤΕΥΜΩΝ[κατον
μ]ΥΡΙΑΔΑΚΑΙΠΕΟΝΤΑ[ι
μαχαρα]ΚΑΙΕΠΙΒΛΕΨΕΦΥΜΑΣ[
15 
µο]ΥΗΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ[σ]TAI[
παλαι]ΑΜΕΤΑΤΩΝΝΕΩ[ν
ΚΑΙΟΥΒΔΕΛΕΟΜΑΙΥΜΑΚΚΑΙ[
ΚΑΙΥΜΕΙΣΕΓΕΕΘΕΜΟΙΕΘΝ[ος
ΞΑΓΑΓΩΝΥΜΑΣΕΓΗΝΣΑΙΓΥ[πτον
20 
ΣΥΝΕΠΙΨΑΤΟΝΖΥΓΟΝΤ[ΟΥ
ΜΕΤΑΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΣ ΕΑΝ[
ΠΡΟΣΤΑΓΜΑΤΑΜΟΥΑΛ[α
ΓΜΑΣΙΜΟΥΠΡΟΧΘΙ[η
ΤΑΣΕΝΤΟΛΑΜΟΥΑΛ[α
25 
ΚΑΙΕΓΩΠΟΙΗΚΩ[ΨΨΡΑΝΚΑΙΤΟ[ν
ΚΑΙΤΗΝΨΥ[χην
ΥΜΩΝ[ν]}
1. 2. An omission of about the length of καὶ ποιησήτε αυτὰς must be supposed.

1. 3. την γην υμῶν: codd. υμίν cf. MT.

1. 4. τον ξύλον εν κα[ ]: MSS. τα ξύλα των πεδίων αποδώσει τον καρπον αυτών = MT. τον ξύλον sic; en κα[φω αυτού…?]

1. 5. αυτό: as B*Ay Ethiopic; αλοητός B* FGMN etc. Lev. xxvi 5 is the source of Amos ix 13 LXX, where the same confusion exists; in Lev. αμητός is thus a very early corruption (MT dayiś = αλοητός) and Amos LXX could primitive­ly have adopted either term.

τρυγ[ητθν]: corrected from σπορον by the same hand; the ρ dotted, in the MS.

1. 9. [ο] εκφοβων υμας: as F bmn Armen. Cyri.; υμας ο εκφοβων B etc.

1. 10. καὶ πολέμος ου διελευσεται [δια της γης υμων]: in its primitive place, as in MT; so G, etc.; B*AFM etc. have it twice, here and before verse 6; B* before verse 6 only; gnpt Ethiopic omit it entirely.

1. 12. πέντε υμῶν: εξ υμῶν πέντε codd.

1. 15. [μο]υ η διαθήκη ε[σ]ται [μεθ υμων?]; codd. και στησω την διαθήκην μου μεθ υμών as MT.

For παλαια και παλαια παλαιων of codd. this MS. can have had no more than παλαια παλαιων cf. MT.

1. 16. μετα των νεω[ν]: codd. εκ προσωπου νεων.

1. 17. ου βδελυξομαι υμας: all witnesses ου βδελυξεται η ψυχη μου υμας.

1. 18. μοι as FGMN etc.; μου BAkx.

εθνος : all witnesses, and 2 Cor. vi 16, λαος (b w Armen. εν εις λαον).

1. 19. ενηκης for εκ γης.

1. 20. τον ζυγον πα[ν δεσμον]: so dnt Lat. Origen μοι; most witnesses τον δεσμον του ζυγου.

1. 22. μου: omit ταυτα as Boh. Ethiop. Lat.

1. 23. [προστα]γμαται μου; all witnesses, κριμασιν μου.

1. 24. αλ[λα ωστε?]: codd. ωστε; d n Armen. και; Ethiop. και ωστε.
ASPECTS OF THE TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF THE BIBLE IN
THE LIGHT OF QUMRAN MANUSCRIPTS

SHEMARYAHU TALMON

I

The discovery of the Scrolls from the Judaean Desert has added a new dimension to Biblical text criticism. It goes without saying that these MSS which precede the oldest extant MSS of the MT by more than a millennium, in view of their antiquity, are of unsurpassed importance for an investigation into the early history of the text of the OT. Much already has been learned from research carried out so far. More is to be expected from the edition of yet unpublished MSS, and from an ensuing evaluation of their contribution to a better understanding of the processes by which the Bible text was transmitted.¹

The new material often helps in elucidating the genesis, and the history of individual variants in which one or more of the ancient VSS differ from the MT. They also open up new possibilities for the recovery or the reconstruction of the factors which underlie textual variation. The sifting of these cases, their classification, and a statistical assessment of the frequency of their appearance may make possible the systematic presentation of the processes which can be proved empirically to have been conducive to the emergence of variae lectiones. The pertinent information gained from these first-hand sources, because of their scope and their primacy, should enable scholars to improve on previous attempts along these lines, such as F. Delitzsch's Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament (Berlin–Leipzig 1920).

Prior to the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls, observations on the skill and the peculiarities of the ancient copyists of the Biblical text could be inferred only from the analysis of variants which are extant in mediaeval Heb. MSS,

or had to be abstracted from deviating translations in the ancient VSS. With
the pre-Christian Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran at our disposal, we now are
in a position to verify principles established by inference, and to put them to
a practical test. The Scrolls afford us a completely new insight into ancient
scribal craft and give us an unexampled visual impression of the physical
appearance of the manuscripts in which arose the Biblical *variae lectiones.*
We now can observe at close range, so to say *in situ,* scribal techniques of
the Second Commonwealth period which left their impression on the Bible
text in subsequent stages of its history. We can perceive the manuscriptal
realities which were the breeding ground of the variants that crop up in the
extant witnesses to the text of the Bible.

That the Qumran Scrolls indeed exhibit scribal conventions and techniques
which were generally prevalent in Jewry of the Second Commonwealth is
easily proved from the fact that the sectarian scribes in many details followed
rules which tally with those laid down by the Rabbis for Torah-scribes of the
"normative" community.² There is obviously nothing specifically sectarian
in the external appearance of the Qumran Scrolls, nor in the scribal customs
to which their copyists adhered.³ The same holds true for the majority of the
deviating readings found in them. The impression of dissent that goes
with the Biblical Scrolls from Qumran derives from the secession of their
scribes from normative Judaism, and has no roots in the MSS as such. That
is to say, it must be attributed to socio-historical processes which engulfed
these scrolls, but in no way to their textual or manuscriptal character. Gene-

tically the Biblical texts from Qumran are "Jewish". They became "sectarian"
in their subsequent history.

What makes the evidence of the Scrolls especially valuable is the fact that
they present not just one horizontal cross-section view of a stabilized version,
such as is the Massoretic *textus receptus.* Because of their textual diversity,
the kaleidoscope of the textual traditions exhibited in them: their concurrence
here with one, here with another of the known Versions, or again in other
cases their textual exclusive individuality, the Biblical MSS found at Qumran,
in their totality present, in a nutshell as it were, the intricate and variegated
problems of the OT Hebrew text and Versions. The concentration of processes

² This was pointed out by the late E.L. Sukenik already in 1947 in his first report on the
Scrolls: א"מ. סופים, מנהליות נוהלות (רומאיה וירש) א--א.
³ A notable exception are the enigmatic scribal marks or symbols found in the margins
of Is-a for which, as yet, no adequate explanation was offered. See: *The Dead Sea Scrolls
of St. Mark's Monastery* 1, ed. M. Burrows (New-Haven 1950) p. XVI. It appears that
these signs are peculiar to Is-a. Only some of the simpler ones turn up also in other
Qumran MSS.
which obtain in the history of the Bible text, in a comparatively small corpus of MSS, small in comparison with the bulk of Hebrew — Massoretic and Samaritan —, Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Latin etc. MSS which have to be sifted, collated and compared in the course of the critical work on the Bible text, a corpus which moreover is relatively homogeneous with respect to time and place of provenance, make the Qumran Scrolls an ideal subject for a pilot-study on these processes. Although the results gained from an analysis of the Qumran material cannot be applied without qualification to the wider field of comparative research into the MT and the VSS, we may derive from them certain working hypotheses which then have to be verified by application to the wider problem.

Thus the situation at Qumran reflects on a basic issue in OT textual research, namely the moot problem of the establishment of a Hebrew textus receptus. The coexistence of diverse text-types in the numerically, geographically and temporally restricted Covenanter community; the fact that (some or most of) the conflicting MSS, very probably, had been copied in the Qumran Scriptorium; and that no obvious attempts at the suppression of divergent MSS or of individual variants can be discovered in that voluminous literature, proves beyond doubt that the very notion of a Biblical textus receptus had not yet taken root at Qumran. The superscribed corrections in lQIs\(^a\) (henceforth Is-a) which in the majority of cases, though by no means in all, bring the deviant basic text in line with MT,\(^4\) or with a proto-Massoretic textual tradition (lQIs\(^b\) = Is-b) cannot be adduced in evidence for a supposed tendency to revise Is-a towards an established Qumran recension. This evidence is set off, in fact is neutralized by a Deuteronomy MS from Cave 5, roughly contemporary with Is-a.\(^5\) Here the corrections in practically every instance run counter to the proto-Massoretic tradition, and align themselves with a Septuagintal text-type.

We have no reason to doubt that this “liberal” attitude towards divergent textual traditions of the Bible was prevalent also in “normative” Jewish circles of that period, \textit{i.e.} in the second and first centuries B.C.E. It actually can be shown that according to Rabbinic testimony, even the model codices that were kept in the Temple precincts not only exhibited divergent readings, but represented conflicting text-types.\(^6\) Phenomenologically speaking the situation that prevailed in the ’azarah may be compared, though with quali-


fications, with the one that obtained in the *Scriptorium* at Qumran. The difference consists in the fact that in the end the Temple codices were collated, probably in the first century C.E., and what is more important, that Rabbinic Judaism ultimately established a model text and strove to banish deviant MSS from circulation. However at this stage the comparability of "normative" with Qumran practice breaks down. The active life span of the Covenanters-community ends sometime in the first century B.C.E., although sporadic attempts at restoration vibrate into the first or possibly into the second century C.E. However also the latest manuscripts from Qumran which give evidence to the local history of the Bible text in the crucial period, the last decades before the destruction of the Temple, do not present the slightest indication that even an incipient *textus receptus* did emerge there, or that the very notion of a model recension ever was conceived by the Covenanters.\(^7\)

The presentation of the sum total of the Biblical documents from Qumran as a small-scale replica of the "MT and VSS" issue, derives further support from one more characteristic of that material. The Qumran finds exhibit, as stated, a basic homogeneity with regard to the time and the place of their provenance. There are no grounds to doubt that these MSS were written in Palestine, and that a great majority of them, if not all, were copied at Qumran. It also may be considered as established that, some odd items excepted, the bulk of the MSS in the Qumran library was copied within a span of not more than three hundred years, approximately from the middle of the third century B.C.E. to the middle of the first century C.E.\(^8\) In view of these circumstances the marked diversity of textual traditions which can be observed in these MSS presumably derives from the temporal and/or geographical\(^9\) heterogeneity of the *Vorlagen* from which the Qumran MSS, or some of them, were copied. Thus, in addition to the horizontal cross-section view of the Bible text at Qumran during the last phases of the Second Commonwealth period, the Qumran material also affords a vertical cross-section view of the transmission

---

9 The case for an existence of local recensions of the Bible text in view of the Qumran evidence, recently was argued by W.F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible", BASOR 140 (1955) 27-33; F.M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 188-194; see also the latter's forthcoming paper in HThR in which unpublished material from Qumran Cave 4 was utilized. The present author is indebted to Prof. Cross for permission to read this paper in typescript.
of the Bible text, in which are reflected various chronological layers, and geographical or social-strata traditions. These circumstances further enhance the similarity of the problems relating to the Bible text at Qumran with those adhering to the wider issue of the relations of the MT and the VSS.

The situation which obtains at Qumran holds out one more possibility of comparison with another phase in the history of the Bible text. In conformity with a basic characteristic of Second Commonwealth Judaism — normative and dissenting alike — the Covenants’ religious concepts were Bible-centred. Their original literary creations, such as the War-Scroll, the Hodayot, the Sectarian Manual, and the Zadokite Documents swarm with verbatim Bible quotations, paraphrases and allusions. Their most fundamental beliefs and practices reflect the attempt to recapture, and to typologically re-live Biblical Judaism. It is this Scripture-piety which produced the pesher technique, so indicative of the Covenants’ system of Bible hermeneutics, by the aid of which Biblical history was actualized, and made existentially meaningful. In this unceasing process of quotation, interpretation and adaptation, the Bible text at Qumran was exposed to a fate which is comparable to that which the hebraica veritas experienced on a wider scale in Rabbinic Judaism, and in the orbit of Jewish and Christian communities that had recourse to translations of the Hebrew original. The deliberate insertion of textual alterations into Scripture for various reasons of dogma, style etc., the uncontrolled infiltration of haphazard changes due to linguistic peculiarities of copyists, or to their characteristic concepts and ideas, which may be observed in the transmission of the Bible text at large, have their counterparts in the “Qumran Bible”. The study of these phenomena at Qumran again is facilitated by the comparative compactness of the material, and by the decidedly more pronounced manner in which they become manifest. We thus encounter in the Qumran writings developments of Biblical text-transmission which may be considered prototypes of phenomena that emerge concurrently and subsequently in the text-history of the Bible in Jewish and Christian tradition, albeit in less concentrated form, and at different grades of variation.

10 For a discussion of these issues cp. E.Y. Kutscher, הластון והרטקע הלשון של מעליית ועתיקות, esp. pp. 45-70.

11 Basic information on the utilization of the Bible in these works is provided in the scholarly editions of the texts. A detailed discussion of the Biblical quotations and allusions in the Hodayot pl. I–III is offered by P. Wernberg-Moller in his article in the present volume.

12 This aspect of Qumran Sectarianism often is referred to in the voluminous literature on the Covenants. See also my forthcoming discussion of “The ‘Desert Ideal’ in the Bible and at Qumran”, in: Studies and Texts 3, ed. A. Altmann (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University).
II

The foregoing general remarks will be illustrated in this paper by an analysis of the manuscriptal conditions which, in the first stage, fathered the development of "double-readings", and ultimately were conducive to the Massoretic techniques of variant-preservation in the Kethîb–Qerê system, and in the Midrashic 'al tigrê technique.

Two main types of conflation must be clearly distinguished. On the one hand, a double reading may result from the routine insertion into the main text of marginal or intralinear corrective notes and annotations together with the readings which they were meant to supersede. On the other hand, conflation will result from the premeditated intentional effort on part of a scribe to preserve variant readings which he considered equal in value and worthy of preservation. This type of conflation is a well-attested trick-in-hand of the transmitters of the Bible text. It was widely practiced by scribes and copyists, Jews and Christians, throughout centuries, in the Heb. original and in translations.

Lacking a universally recognized device of variants-notation, not to be confused with correction, the parallel readings either were recorded in the margins and between lines, or else were incorporated prima manu (p.m.) into the text-base, whenever this could be done without serious disruption of syntax or distortion of sense. But also when the variant initially had been noted p.m. outside the normal text-base, it easily could be transferred into the text by a subsequent copyist who used the annotated MS as his Vorlage. Although the practical results of variants-conflation will coincide with those of the routine conflation of a mistake with its correction, the two phenomena must be kept apart. Routine conflation always is due to a copyist's default and runs counter to the original corrector's intentions. Variants-conflation secunda manu indeed also results from scribal lapse, but it always puts into effect the purport of the first-hand collator, namely the intentional preservation of variant readings. Methodologically, therefore, the two types of conflation outlined above are different. But in practice we have no safe means to decide in each case whether the marginal or intralinear notation from the outset was intended to replace a reading in the main text, whether it was meant to be added to the text base,

13 See the present writer's "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text", Textus 1 (1960) 144-184 (henceforth DRMT); and the notes on Ex. 15:2 and 1 Sam. 15:32a in VT 4 (1954) 206-207, respectively VT 11 (1961) 456-457.

14 On these, see the present author's "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament", Scripta Hierosolymitana 8 (1961) 335-383 (henceforth SROT).
or whether it was considered a mere note, to be kept apart from the text proper also at subsequent copyings. The external similarity of emendation, restitution and annotation, all of which were entered in the margins or between lines, could be conducive to conflation by mistaken interpretation of the collators’ notations.

It is one of the great advantages of the Biblical MSS from Qumran that in them we yet can perceive conflation in the different stages of its execution. The Qumran Scrolls furnish us with the means to trace step by step the intentional preservation of alternative readings on the one hand, and the perpetuation by default of scribal mistakes together with their corrections on the other hand.

III

Let us first consider the category of routine conflations which resulted from the mistaken insertion of superscribed or adscribed corrections into the text base.

Superscription or marginal adscription as a means of correction was as familiar to the sectarian scribes as it is to the modern writer or copyist. It is unfortunate that in most cases, especially in Is-a, it cannot be decided whether the first hand is at work correcting a recognized and admitted mistake, or whether a second hand thought fit to emend a text with which the initial scribe had found no fault. On the whole the corrections are towards the MT. Accordingly they are ascribed to a second hand who used a proto-Massoretic MS as his Vorlage. However there are significant exceptions to this rule.

These two different types of correction make themselves manifest in the very first line of Is-a in which we find three cases of superscribed single letters: לִמְּךָ, רְוֹשֶׁךָ, וְשִׁבְיוֹת. The first two seemingly are instances of corrected lapses which, at the same time, bring the text of Is-a in line with the (proto-) Massoretic readings. In the third the opposite is the case: a normal MT-type reading (כְּיָמִים) is (mis)corrected towards the Aramaic determined morphology of the sectarian copyist. The first two may be ascribed to the initial scribe with much probability, the third with absolute certainty.

On pl. iv, 3 (Is. 3:25b) the insertion amounts to two letters. A typical variant reading — יָמִין (2nd pers. plur. fem. of יָמִין), supported by all VSS,15 which is a better parallel to וְיָמִין of the first stichos than is the Massoretic נְבָרָתָה (2nd pers. sing. fem. of נָבָר) was corrected towards the reading exhibited in the MT by the superscription of בְּיָמִין (2. pers. plur. fem. of

15 T: נְבָרָתָה; G: οἱ ἡσυχώνεις μιᾶν; Aq.: οἱ δυνατοί σου; V: fortes tui. See also: A. Rubinstein, VT 4 (1954) 320.
However no full identity with the MT reading was achieved. Here we seem to be dealing not with a corrected mistake p.m., but rather with a (subjective) emendation s.m. based on a MT-type Vorlage.

Similarly, complete words were added to the basic text of Is-a by super­scription. Again we can differentiate between omissions by default which were filled in p.m. or possibly s.m., and between emendations of what a second hand interpreted as a textual mistake perpetrated by the initial copyist. Thus the superlinear הָיְתָה in Is. 23:8 certainly is a correction p.m. of an obvious omission in the basic text. That by this correction Is-a is brought in line with the MT is an accidental corollary, and is immaterial for the issue on hand.

In Is. 8:17 the acc. part. יָני was inserted by superscription before יָני, in accordance with the prevalent usage of Is-a. Here the superlinear correction goes against the MT, and most certainly stems from the original copyist.

Much less clear is the situation with regard to the word ובם which is added overartner in Is. 19:12. The basic text of Is-a, as it stands, causes no difficulties. Th correction makes it identical with the MT (=T,G) which reads ובם in this verse, in vv. 16, 18, 25, and especially in v. 17 where imagery is employed which is virtually identical with the imagery of v. 12. But, on the other hand, also the single tetragrammaton is well re­presented in this chapter (vv. 19, 20, 21, 22). Accordingly it seems preferable to ascribe the insertion of ובם in v. 12 to the emendatory activities of the MT-oriented corrector, and not to the first hand. The same goes for the superlinear addition of וְרֵא in Is. 14:19 to the basic reading of Is-a וְרֵא which indeed may, but need not be a simplified reading of the somewhat obscure Massoretic: וְרֵא (=G, V). Whatever the case may be, the resti­tion of ובם adjusts Is-a to the MT.

The random examples adduced so far clearly show that superscription was a technique recognized by the scribe and the corrector of Is-a as a means for restituting letters or words which had been omitted by default from the text base. These interlinear and marginal notations contained a tacit, but nevertheless explicit directive for future copyists to restore the superscribed or adscribed textual items into the text base of their own copies for which the annotated MS served as Vorlage. This restoration would be a mere mechanical re-transfer from the margin or from between the lines into the line proper.

16 In the main tradition of T אָבִי is not rendered: מְשֻׁחַיָּה. MSS. f, c insert וְרֵא before וְרֵא whereas in the First and Second Bomberg Bible (b, g) the word follows upon וְרֵא. Qimhi's commentary (ed. L. Finkelstein), as quoted in A. Sperber's edition of the Targum, has the interesting variant: וְרֵא מְשֻׁחַיָּה. Could be a miswritten which thus would tally with וְרֵא which seems to underlie V: ad fundamenta laci. Cp. Kedar's discussion of this reading on p. 187 of this volume.
and would not require any re-adjustment in the text-base of the Vorlage. Since such corrections p.m., or s.m. of omissions and mistakes perpetrated p.m. most probably constituted the majority of marginal notations, they created a psychological readiness in copyists to restore superscriptions or adscriptions which they found in their Vorlage into the main text of their own copy. Herein may be found the roots of routine conflation.

It is here that the Qumran Scrolls lend the support of manuscriptal facts to theoretical considerations. Let us first discuss some cases of hypothetical doublets which could have arisen, but in fact did not arise from such an Is-a reading. An intriguing instance of correction by superlinear insertion is found in Is. 43:3. Here the basic text of Is-a has no equivalent for מָשְׂפִּיט of the MT. Its shorter reading אֲנִי הָאֲולָהֵי קְרֹשׁ יַשָּׁרְאָה is syntactically without fault, although metrically it lacks somewhat in length in comparison with the second half-verse. A second hand whose ductus is clearly distinguishable from that of the first, and who uses defective as against the latter’s plene spelling (الألوهيى), added יֵּאָרֵך in between the lines. This is a good synonymous reading of the Massoretic מָשְׂפִּיט. Thus the difference between Is-a and the MT which in the first stage consisted of the lack of one word, in the second stage developed into a varia lectio. A subsequent collator, not a mere copyist, of Is-a and the (proto-) MT easily could have combined the two readings into a non-extant doublet: אֲנִי הָאֲולָהֵי קְרֹשׁ יַשָּׁרְאָה מָשְׂפִּיט for which cp. e.g. Is. 49:26 (MT=Is-a): כִּי אֲנִי ה', מָשְׂפִּיט וּנְגָּאֵל אֲבָרִי יִצְרוּ ( = G, T).

The probability of routine-conflation increases when we consider not restorative but corrective superscriptions which are meant to “replace” a component of the text-base. As a rule the tendency towards conflation will be checked by appropriate marks which prescribe the excision from the text of the component that is to be replaced by the marginal notation. There are two instances of this kind, which hypothetically could have resulted in conflatio.

1. Is. 21:1  Is-a: מְמַדְּבָּר בֵּא מַאֲגַרְסָע בְּנָהְו הַשָּׁפַט מְמַדְּבָּר בֵּא מַאֲגַרְסָע
   MT: מְמַדְּבָּר בֵּא מַאֲגַרְסָע הַשָּׁפַט

The basic reading of Is-a which is reflected in S: מַאֲגַרְסָע which is found in S: מַאֲגַרְסָע, perhaps inadvertently substituted מַאֲגַרְסָע, which is found nine times in the OT19 including one mention in Is. 39:3, for the hap. leg. מַאֲגַרְסָע הַשָּׁפַט 20 of MT which underlies G: φοβέρον, and T (?): φοβεράν. The superscription of נוֹרָה with the

19 Seven times connected with the verb אוּב: Deut. 29:21; Josh. 9:6, 9; 1 Ki. 8:41 = 2 Chr. 6:32; 2 Ki. 20:14, and esp. Is. 39:3. Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 478.
20 However twice מַאֲגַרְסָע is found: Deut. 1:19; 8:15.
concomitant deletion of בהודח may confidently be attributed to a second hand by reason of the different ductus. Thus we deal here with the subjective emendation s.m. of a possibly bona fide reading p.m.

2. Is. 12:6 Is-a: רוחש תי תוארי וה א יא ה מ ת MT: תוארי וה יא ה מ ת

The basic reading of Is-a: הנב הקן קינינ presents a to all means and purposes synonymous variant of MT's ישמה דצוו. Whereas S: ישמה דצוו clearly sides with the MT, T's כנשאה דצוו appears to go with Is-a p.m., although the evidence is not altogether decisive. Again it would appear that a bona fide variant reading of the first hand, was subsequently (s.m.? corrected towards the MT by the superscription of יסחב. However it seems that the concomitant deletion here affects only the second letter of the word קינינ, thus creating the basis for a reading יסחב בניינ which indeed comes nearer to MT than Is-a p.m., but is not identical with it. This reading is mirrored in G: של ענורקונן תי סיו.

It does not require much imagination to reconstruct the reasoning of a copyist of Is-a who, in spite of the deletion mark in Is. 21:1, and because of the only partial deletion in 12:6 would have interpreted the superscriptions not as substitutions for components found in the text-base, but rather as faultily omitted intrinsic parts of it, which he therefore restored to their proper place without altering the text-base. In both cases this could easily be done. In Is. 21:1 it would have resulted in the doublet מארץ רוחש תי (ודארת ה) for which cp. Deut. 1:19 — המֶּּר רֶּּנ וּה נוּרֶּּר. In 12:6 the outcome would have been יסחב תת קינינ for which cp. e.g. יסחב תת קינינ (Is. 37:22 = 2 Ki. 19:21).

Such a hypothetical development is even more immanent in the following instance of hypercorrection:

IQIs* 41:20

In Is. 41:20 a series of four synonymous verbs is used to describe the future

21 Cp. Is. 10:24 MT: יָשְּבַת צִיוֹן, T: יָשְּבַת צִיוֹן, S: יָשְּבַת צִיוֹן, Jer. 51:35 MT: יָשְּבַת צִיוֹן T: יָשְּבַת צִיוֹן, S: יָשְּבַת צִיוֹן (probably resulting from an intentional or unintentional confusion of /שׁ/ with /שׁ/).

22 Cp. Is. 1:8; 16:1; 52:2; 62:11 MT: בְּהַלְבָּה הָרֹעִך, T: הָרֹעִך, S: הָרֹעִך (probably resulting from an intentional or unintentional confusion of /שׁ/ with /שׁ/).

23 Kutscher (op. cit., 474) maintains that תָּה was struck out altogether.
recognition by the poor and the destitute of God’s mighty deeds: דְּרֵצֶם יְסֵפָה רִשָּׁפָה יְשׁוֹבֵל יְזִרּוֹ כִּי יְזַהֲכֵת אֲדָמָה. The MT here is supported by the verbatim rendition of the first two and the fourth verb in T (דְּרֵצֶם יְשׁוֹבֵל), and by the latter’s interpretative rendering of the crucial third: יְשׁוֹבֵל דַּחְלַת עֲלֵי לִבּוֹת. However Is-a reads here יְשׁוֹבֵל, and has רִבְצַן as a superscription, most probably introduced s.m. The basic ריביץ clearly is a variant reading. Whether it is due to a mere interpretation of the apocopated יְשׁוֹבֵל or whether it is a true varia lectio, may be left undecided at present.

The G translation ἐννοηθώσιν, which may reflect, possibly strengthens the latter proposition. But, since this specific verb is a hap. leg. in the Greek translation of Isaiah the evidence is not conclusive. Also the fact that the combination דְּרֵצֶם יְשׁוֹבֵל recurs in v. 22 in inverted order, both in the MT and in Is-a: יְשׁוֹבֵל בֹּלֵב גְּדוֹלָה, makes us believe that ריביץ of Is-a, instead of יְשׁוֹבֵל in the MT, results from faithful adherence to a Vorlage which is yet mirrored in S: וּרְבִּית, and not from slovenly word substitution.

Of more importance for the issue on hand is the fact that the superscribed emendation subsequently was disqualified by its enclosure within deletion-dots. Thus the basic non-MT ריביץ was restored to its original validity. This two-stage correction might have led an imaginary copyist to consider the interlinear as a restituted omission and not as an emendation. As a result he would have conjoined this verb with ריביץ, thus creating the hypothetical doublet: דְּרֵצֶם יְשׁוֹבֵל רִבְצַן יְשׁוֹבֵל יְשׁוֹבֵל יְזִרּוֹ כִּי יְזַהֲכֵת אֲדָמָה.

It is obvious that the chances of an actual conflation will considerably increase in cases in which a variant reading is superscribed or adscribed without any accompanying critical symbols.

IQIsa 36:11

Is. 36:11 Is-a: דְּרֵצֶם יְשׁוֹבֵל יְזִרּוֹ כִּי יְזַהֲכֵת MT: דְּרֵצֶם יְשׁוֹבֵל יְזִרּוֹ כִּי יְזַהֲכֵת אֲדָמָה

The redundant יְזִרּוֹ of Is-a, which has no equivalent in the VSS, was entered in the right hand margin exactly in line with the following word יְזַהֲכֵת אֲדָמָה. יְזַהֲכֵת is a parallel reading of יְשׁוֹבֵל with which the preceding line ends. Thus we

24 Cp. e.g. Is. 49:14 where the non-Massoretic superscribed emendation אֲדָמָה is deleted by “pointing” in favour of the basic אֲדָמָה ( = MT).
25 Kutscher (op. cit., 430) assumes that in the first part of Is. 36:11 echoes יְסֵפָה in the
have here a true variant-notation, a Qere-type entry which was registered alongside the Kethib-type reading נב, and was never meant to be integrated into the text proper. However the probability of its integration is much furthered by the favorable manuscriptal conditions which could easily induce a copyist of Is-a to take נב as an integral part of the original text-base.

We can now proceed from hypothetical to actual routine conflation. While in the preceding instances Is-a was presented as a possible basis for an ensuing doublet in an imaginary MS for which it might have served as the Vorlage, in the examples to follow the faulty doublet actually occurs in Is-a.

We presume that a reading cum superscribed emendation lies at the basis of the following doublet in Is-a 51:11 which, however, was emended post facto, by the erasure of one of its components.

The extant text of Is-a reads here נב, as against מופתיי יתנ, of MT which is supported by the VSS.\textsuperscript{26} In the parallel, Is. 35:10, both MT and Is-a read מופתיי יתנ. Moreover, whereas the root מופתיי is represented twice more in the Book of Isaiah (1:27; 29:22), מופתיי is not found in it at all. Even if one assumes that the sectarian scribe substituted מופתיי מופתיי for מופתיי מופתיי under the influence of scriptures which use מופתיי in reference to Israel's dispersion (Jer. 50:17; Joel 4:2; Esth. 3:8),\textsuperscript{27} his reading still must be considered the lectio difficilior, with a fair claim at originality. Accordingly, מופתיי may be deemed a synonymous reading of מופתיי, and its textual equivalent. This equivalence is further indicated by the fact that מופתיי actually had been written also in the text-base of Is-a where it preceded מופתיי, but was subsequently erased, possibly by a second hand. If indeed this was the case, the scroll initially contained the doublet מופתיי מופתיי which, as we assume, resulted from a conflation of the main reading with a supralinear or marginal variant which the scribe of Is-a had found in his Vorlage.\textsuperscript{28}

second part of the parallel verse 2 Ki. 18:26 — אלהי תמר נב יתנ. This supposition is highly improbable in view of the fact that in Is. 36:11b Is-a altogether deviates from MT, and from the parallel reading in 2 Kings.

\textsuperscript{26} G: καὶ λελυτρωμένοις; T: ומיתנ; S: מיתנ ומשרויא דוד.

\textsuperscript{27} Cp. Kutscher, \textit{op. cit.}, 433. A similar situation may underlie the present text form of Is-a in Is. 2:4: שמש בּ נב והנה יתנウェכ בּ שמש בּ נב. The crossing out of בּ and the superscribed lamed bring Is-a into conformity with MT, whereas in the preceding instance the erasure fortified the deviance of Is-a from MT. The reading of Is-a indeed may be explained as a conscious, or unconscious harmonization with the first stichos of the verse (Kutscher, \textit{op. cit.}, 489), but in itself it is the lectio difficilior. The pron. lamed is found in the parallel passage Mic. 4:3, and prevails in the OT (Job 32:12; Prov. 9:7, 8; 15:12; 19:25, and esp. Is. 11:4), whereas מופתיי is found only twice (Gen. 31:37; Job 9:33).
IV

Now we can turn to the premeditated retention of parallel readings by conscious conflation, as reflected in Qumran Biblical MSS.

We find in the Scrolls, just as in the MT and the VSS, fully-fledged doublets which have been already incorporated in the basic text. These may be arranged under the following two headings:

1. Doublets which are reflected also in extra-Qumran Bible texts, and therefore obviously are rooted in an all-Jewish (not specific-sectarian) textual tradition.

2. Doublets which are found only in Qumran MSS. These cases, which may be assumed with much probability to have arisen at Qumran, illustrate the collation activities of the sectarian scribes. At the same time Qumran MSS, and especially Is-a, present instances of interlinear or marginal critical notations which in MT or in one of the VSS have become part and parcel of the main text. Here the Qumran material fulfills two functions:

3. (A) It illustrates the manuscriptal conditions which are the basis of double-readings, and enlightens us on the technical aspects of conflation. (B) It assists in the discovery of presumed doublets in other extant text-traditions of the Bible.

Not in all cases are we in a position to determine the sources from which the constituent variants of a doublet were culled, due to the paucity of non-standardised textual traditions which survived the normalising attention of scribes and revisers. Yet often one of the components of a doublet (e.g. in Is-a) turns up as a single reading in the MT or in one of the extant VSS. This can cause no surprise in view of the disparity of the textual traditions of the Biblical books which may be observed at Qumran. In the same fashion as the harmonization of variant readings by conflation was practised by Greek or Aramaic translators and copyists, and by scribes of the MT, it was employed by the Covenanters. Also in this respect the atmosphere of scribal activities at sectarian Qumran resembles that which prevailed in normative circles.

At the present, our interest lies with the particular Qumran text-traditions, and not with the text of a given Biblical book as such. Accordingly all the illustrations to be adduced quite naturally will be cases of textual deviations of a Qumran MS from the MT and/or from one or more of the ancient VSS.

1. Double-readings in Qumran MSS which presumably derived from a Vorlage.

   a) In Is. 37:9 the reading of Is-a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ישמש וירשב ירשלא מלאכימו</th>
<th>חסונא וירשב ירשלא מלאכימו</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undoubtedly combines the MT wording in Is.</td>
<td>with that of the MT parallel in 2 Ki. 19:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Cp. DRMT, 133. The sectarian scribe's awareness of the MT readings in 2 Ki. chs.
Since the doublet is reflected also in G: καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπέστρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους, it may be considered as being derived from a text-type which was utilized both by the sectarian scribe and the Greek translator.

b) Is. 51:23 Is-a:

Here, as in many other cases, it cannot be decided by any objective means whether the MT, probably supported by T (cp. Is. 49:26), and S (?), has a defective text, or whether Is-a indeed presents a conflation. If, by rule of thumb, the shorter MT reading is taken to be original, the redundant τοὺς ταπεινωσάντων of Is-a may be explained as an interpretative gloss of the hap. leg. or else simply as a parallel reading. The two roots חרות and בותכ are employed in parallelismus membrorum in Lam. 3:33. Whatever the case, the doublet is proved to antecede the text of Is-a by its appearance in the translation of G. It is possible that the common Vorlage was influenced by the similarity of ideas and expressions in Is. 60:14: וְהֶשְׁתֹּתָה עֲלֵיהֶם נַפְסֵי (מָךְ) מָצֲאֶיתָה וּרְאֶה (מָךְ) מַעְנֵי

c) 1 Sam. 2:24 4QSam: Αλά Βιν Κι Λα Οὴ ἔποιες ἡμών Ασαρ Ανάπο Σχολατ

The Qumran text is very fragmentary. However, the restoration, as proposed by its editor F.M. Cross, Jr., may be considered almost certain, in view of the fact that it differs from those found in the parallel account of Is. chs. 36-39, and his utilization of both text-traditions, significantly illuminate the early textual history of the Book of Isaiah. This issue will be discussed in a separate publication.

30 In the Origenic tradition the word is shown to be an addition to the Hebrew text by means of an obelus.
31 This fact has fathered the suggestion (BH) to insert — ὀλίγοντες. Accordingly we may assume that the, with regard to MT, redundant καὶ τῶν ταπεινωσάντων se in Is. 51:23 indeed stands for Is-a. The Greek words in question are absent from Aq., Sym., and Orig.
32 The second line is omitted in the Luc. tradition, and in some late witnesses.
of its virtual identity with the Greek rendition. Again it can be stipulated that the doublet was found in a textual precursor of 4Q Sam which both the Qumran copyist and the Greek translator used as their Vorlage.

2. Doublets which arose in the basic textual tradition of Is-a.

In the examples to follow only one of the components of a presumed doublet in Is-a is yet extant singly in other textual traditions. Accordingly we assume that here conflation arose in the Qumran Scroll. In some cases this assumption can be supported, though not proved, by circumstantial evidence. The decision to classify these double-readings as intra-Is-a conflations can be maintained only as long as the doublets are not found also in extra-Is-a text-traditions.

a) A clear case of an extended variants-combination may be found in Is. 38:19–20. The two verses actually are mere reiterations with only slight variations in spelling, and one possible sense-variant. At the same time it is obvious that Is-a adhered to a sentence division which differs from that of the MT, and probably underlies also G.

\[
19 \text{(a): } \text{יהיה ידוהי אלמ ספיטא הימ ודגי ספינא אטמאะחא וחהששנינא} \\
20 \text{(b): } \text{יהיה ידוהי אלמ ספיטא הימ ודוגי ספינא אטמאะחא וחהששנינא}
\]

None of the extant witnesses to the Book of Isaiah exhibits this doublet which thus is shown to be of particular Qumran vintage. It is obvious that the doubling could not have resulted from a scribal mistake, as is suggested by Kutscher, and this for two reasons:

Accidental dittography of complete syntactical units may be assumed only when evident manuscriptal reasons can be adduced to back up this assumption, mainly homoioiteleuton or homoioarkton. Neither of these can account for the present doublet in spite of the phrase -\( \text{ך} \) which recurs at the end of both v.18 and v.19. According to the proposed syntactical analysis, in Is-a the phrase does not close v.19, but is followed by -\( \text{ך} \) with which the verse ends.

Against the assumption of accidental doubling militates the even weightier fact that the textual peculiarities of the (b) reading which exhibits a defective spelling (אטמאחא, ידוהי), as against the plene spelling of the (a) text (אטמאחא, ידוהי) were faithfully preserved.

On ground of the spelling alone we can confidently state that the (b) variant stems from a text-type which differed from that of the Is-a text-base, where,

34 Some further concurrences of sentence-division between Is-a and G against MT, were discussed by the present author in “DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah”, Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (= ASTI) 1 (1962) 62–72.
plene spelling prevails. On the other hand, the interlinear and marginal corrections in Is-a often are distinguished from the basic text by their defective spelling. Compare e.g. the superscribed נאכל in 43:3 with the lower-case נאכל. Thus we may surmise that variant (b) in 38:20 and some of the marginal or interlinear corrections were derived from the same extra-Is-a text, or text-types.

Can this Vorlage of the (b) reading be further defined? The variant of (b) נאכל, as against (a) נאכל of (a), is of no help. But the remaining varia lectio נאכל might point the way. It is evident that (b) here reads the divine epithet 'eloah (אלה) instead of the proposition יָדוּ in MT. The (b) reading is not supported by any other witness, whereas the MT variant is possibly, although only poorly, attested in S’s rendition of נאכל by the direct object האֵלֵּה, אֵלֵּה, reflected also in the redundant paraphrase יוֹתֵן בְּבוֹדֵרֶה of T. Sym.’s קֶרֶץ אֵלֵּהַ אֱלֹהֵי נַפְסַךְ seems to mirror נאכל. The other VSS have preserved a medial stage between נאכל of MT and נאכל of (b). T’s main reading: רְכָּל אֵלֵּה כַּי, and possibly also G’s: כֹּל אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּדַי. The other VSS have preserved a medial stage between נאכל of MT and נאכל of (b). T’s main reading: רְכָּל אֵלֵּה כַּי, and possibly also G’s: כֹּל אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּדַי. For the Targum this was already recognized by Qimhi ad loc. who comments: “It appears that Jonathan translated this נאכל as if (it were pointed) with sére, like אֱלֹהֶיךָ וָאֲדֹנֵיכָ (Gen. 26:3, 4).” He then goes on and quotes with disapproval Ibn Ezra who, following T, interpreted נאכל to mean נאכל אֱלֹהֶיךָ — “these are the creeds/tenets”. It seems, in fact, that Qimhi suspected Ibn Ezra of implying that he had based his comment on an actual variant vocalization נאכל, since he emphatically professes: “In no book have I seen נאכל pointed otherwise than with segol, and in the construct-state with נאכָּל.”

The vocalization of נאכל as the plur. demonstr. pron., as it transpires from the Aramaic and Greek renditions, and from Ibn Ezra’s commentary, is now supported by the consonantal variant נאכל found in the incomplete Isaiah Scroll (Is-b). However, we cannot be certain whether the scribe of Is-b, like T and G, took נאכל to represent the plur. demonstr. pron., or whether he

36 Here we differ from Kutscher (op. cit., 432) who maintains that נאכל simply was omitted in the (a) reading, as is the case in MS. Ken. 96.
37 I.L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden 1948) 69, considers נאכל אֱלֹהֶיךָ and MT the probable original reading.
38 יַרְאוּ נָאְאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, יַרְאוּ נָאָל=מְכֹּל דֶּרֶךְ נְהָרֵי אֶרֶץ, Y. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden 1948) 69, considers נאכל אֱלֹהֶיךָ and MT the probable original reading.
considered it a defective spelling of ידוהי, siding with (b). But it may be considered as certain that the copyist of Is-a thus interpreted the consonantal group ידוהי in his (a)-type Vorlage, and transferred it to his own MS with the waw filled in, as a variant reading.

If the textual development indeed followed the above reconstructed pattern, the doublet in Is-a 38:19–20 would give witness that the scribe of Is-a collated a proto-Massoretic with a (proto-) Is-b text with the resulting conflation of the present (a) and (b) variants.

From here follow some further considerations which will be discussed at a later stage.

b) Is. 14:2

The conflation of כאדוהים אל מcidade with כאדוהים אל מcidade smoothed over by the insertion of the conjunct. waw, is found in Is-a only. In this case both the conflated readings are preserved singly in extant textual witnesses: כאדוהים אל מcidade is the reading of MT, G, S, and is reflected in one branch of the T tradition (Cod. Reuchlinianus, ed. de Lagarde), whereas another MS of T (Bibl. Nationale MS. 1325) mirrors the parallel reading כאדוהים אל מcidade.39 This circumstance decisively weakens Kutscher's implied suggestion that Is-a merely harmonized אתו of v. 2a with ואתו of vv. 1 and 2b.40

c) Is. 35:9

The double negation לא ליאדוהים, which has no equivalent in MT or the VSS, suggests that the scribe of Is-a conflated two readings.41 In view of the fact that Is-a faithfully retains the twenty odd occurrences of לא in the Book of Isaiah,42 and by virtue of the plene spelling of לא which is characteristic for the Is-a base, this latter variant should be deemed primary in the present

39 Not mentioned by Kutscher op. cit., 429.
40 If one accepts Gottstein's supposition, for which no manuscriptal evidence can be adduced, that T originally had the compound reading לאדוהים ולאדוהים (Biblica 35 [1954] 35), the doublet in Is-a would have to be classified as derivative from a Vorlage.
41 See also Kutscher, op. cit., 430. In Is. 33:21 the two words are employed synonymously in parallelismus membrorum.
42 Among these are found three cases of triple לא in one verse (33:20; 40:24; 44:9), and three of double לא (26:10, 14; 33:23).
43 One MS Ken. — לא.
setting. Thus *3 must be considered a synonymous reading which was collated into the MS from a (proto-) Massoretic-type text, such as e.g. Is-b.

d) Is. 62:7

Is-a:

עֶז יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת הָעָלָמִים תְּפִלָּת הַאָרֶץ

Is-b:

עֶז הָאָרֶץ

MT:

עֶז יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת הָעָלָמִים תְּפִלָּת הַאָרֶץ

T:

עֶז יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת הָעָלָמִים תְּפִלָּת הַאָרֶץ

S:

עָלַּמִּים תְּפִלָּת הַאָרֶץ דְּנֵי קֹדֶשׁ דְּנֵי קָדָשׁ

G: έν διορθώσει καὶ ποίησιν

The synopsis of all the extant witnesses to this verse reveals a typical case of textual expansion if the Is-b reading is considered original, or of contraction in Is-b if MT or one of the VSS is chosen as departure point for the textual comparison. Either way, Is-a exhibits a conflated reading.

The shortest reading, with only one verb in the sentence, is found in Is-b. Its preserved text is very fragmentary indeed, but may be reconstructed as follows: 45 *אֶז יְהוָה חַד לִבָּם וַיִּשְׂרוּ אֶת יְרוּשָׁלָיָּם אָרֶץ* The reading, against *לָבָם* in MT and Is-a (=T: מִן קְרֵם) which is supported by G’s υμίν, proves that Is-b presents here a deviant text tradition, to which also the absence of μηδε in the preceding verse (found in all other VSS) gives evidence. Viewed against this background, the omission in Is-b of MT’s and Is-a’s jaw (G: διορθώσει, T: דְּנֵי קֹדֶשׁ) cannot be considered a lapsus calami resulting from homoiarkton.

MT and all the VSS have two verbs, the first of which is obviously doubled in Is-a: *עֶז יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת הָעָלָמִים* Since this duplication has no parallel in any other witness, it may be ascribed, with much probability, to the scribe of Is-a. What it boils down to is a combination of two forms of the causative of the hif’il formation יִיֶרֶץ and the polel formation יַיְרִץ. Both formations are found in the Book of Is., in MT as well as in Is-a: the hif’il in 9:6; 14:21; 40:20 (MT: יִיֶרֶץ; Is-a: יִיֶרֶץ); the polel in 45:18; 51:13; 54:14 (MT: יַיְרִץ; Is-a: יַיְרִץ). Stylistically one cannot be preferred over the other, and they must be considered

44 The reading of Is-b in 62:6-7: *אֶז יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת הָעָלָמִים* lets one suspect that in MT and Is-a this obvious doublet was camouflaged by variation to read: "אֶז יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת הָעָלָמִים* G has preserved only the first component of the suspected doublet: סֶפֶר פֵּטַר בָּמְנָדוֹך. The main tradition of T exhibits the first variant in an apocopated form (K: לָרְחָץ; b, g.: לָרְחָץֶל). (לא מסכין לָכְך).

45 Cp. Zeph. 3:19: מַעַּה מַעַּה. Nowhere in the Bible does לָבָם carry a double object. May we assume two possible basic readings for Is. 62:7, namely

46 In the lacuna between the preserved *ג* of the following word, there is room for four to five letters at most.
synonymous. One is inclined to postulate that the scribe of Is-a culled them from two MSS that were at his disposal, and conflated them in his copy.

e) Is. 40:19 Is-a: 
MT: נְכֶּּךָ תָּוָּשֶּׁׁ<
T: אֵלָּמָּא נְכֶּּךָ תָּוָּשֶּׁׁ<
G: μὴ εἰκόνα ἐποιήσεν τέκτων
Aq.: μὴ γλύπτον ἐξώνευσεν

The redundant נְכֶּּךָ תָּוָּשֶּׁׁ of Is-a which is reflected in T's עַבָּד, S's רַעְעַד, and G's ἐποιήσεν probably is a variant of MT: נְכֶּּךָ תָּוָּשֶּׁׁ (miswritten in Is-a as נְכֶּּךָ תָּוָּשֶּׁׁ 48), which was correctly rendered ἐξώνευσεν by Aq. More confident than Kutscher, and in spite of the garbled syntax of Is-a, we tend to propose that its scribe conflated a MT-type and an extra-Massoretic reading in his copy.

f) Is. 30:6 Is-a: 
MT: מָּשָׁא בָּהָמָּה בָּנֶּּךָ מָּשָׁא בָּהָמָּה בָּנֶּּךָ <

All the VSS concur here with MT in recording only two appositions to הבארק which is recorded by Is-a as against three in Is-a. The word-pair צֵדָּה רַצְתָּה is found again, though divided, in Is. 8:22, and once more, with a slight variation, in Zeph. 1:15: צֵדָּה רַצְתָּה מִדָּה. In other formations the roots צַדְּרְי and צַדְּרְי appear as pairs also in Deut. 28:53, 55, 57; Jer. 19:9; Ps. 119:143. Never is the redundant צֵדָּה of Is-a combined with either. This makes the Is-a reading a lectio difficilior which can hardly be explained by Kutscher's contention that צֵדָּה — "parished land" spuriously arose in the text under the influence of צָדָּה — מִדָּה (MT: מִדָּה) in the continuation of the verse. 49 Accordingly we are led to assume that צֵדָּה is a variant reading for either צֵדָּה רַצְתָּה (possibly due to graphic confusion) which was incorporated by the scribe into his text.

g) Is. 40:18 Is-a: 
MT: אָלָא מְּיַוָּהָה אָלָא מְּיַוָּהָה <

MT here has the support of all the VSS. The variant reading of Is-a, which in fact constitutes a doublet, accordingly must be considered an inner-Is-a

47 A somewhat similar situation obtains in MT to Is. 35:5. Cp. DRMT, 177.

48 For an interesting example of the also otherwise abundantly documented interchange of מַסְּכָךְ see B. Kedar-Kopfstein's note on Is. 14:31 in Textus 2 (1962) 143-145. Kutscher's supposition (op. cit., 195) that Is-a in 40:19 possibly substituted the Rabbinic מַסְּכָךְ for Biblical מַסְּכָךְ is ingenious but hardly warranted in view of the retention of מַסְּכָךְ in 44:10. There T renders it: בָּאָרָי, S: נְכֶּּךָ. Theod.: χωνευσεν, whereas G omits the word.

49 Kutscher (op. cit., 429) compares Ps. 63:2. As a contrasting image also Is. 41:18 = Ps. 107:35 can be adduced.
development. It appears that the scribe combined two wordings of an idea which is found twice in ch. 40, in v. 18 and again in v. 25, and which are kept distinct in MT and the VSS. The basic difference between them is in that one refers to God, the direct object, by the noun אל and the 3rd. pers. pron. Ли; while in the other He, being the speaker, refers to himself by the 1st pers. pron. Ли and the pronominal suffix רנ: 50

v. 18: Ли אל מירא ומידת ו楪ו (רנ) v. 25: Ли יקר ו_midimוד

h) A fairly obvious case of conflation of two interrogative particles may be found in

Is. 36:19 Is-a: רבי קדישא
MT: רבי הצביא

The VSS support MT in that only one interrogative word is mirrored in them, but it is not possible to decide which of the two: כ or נ was in their respective Vorlage.

The non-MT variant החציפה constitutes the retention of a form which had been already employed in the preceding verse (36:18, MT = Is-a), whereas כ is a variational form of interrogation.

A class by themselves are the doublets which result from a combination of parallel readings that present the same word-stock, but differ in the word order. 51

i) Is. 22:14 Is-a: עמי לכמה הצעית הזה לכמה
MT: עמי לכמה < תענית הזה לכמה
T: עמי ישיחיק תבשון נורן לכות
S: לא חסינך לעבש חסא
G: ודיו toח apathēσεται υμίν αὕτη καὶ ἀμαρτία

One of the readings conflated in Is-a had the pers. pron. לכה precede the subject נוח. This order — עמי לכמה נוח הזה — which also is reflected in G and S, is well represented in a Yemenite textual tradition, as evidenced by the quotation of the verse in one Yem. MS of the Bab. Tal. Ta’anit 11a, and in some MSS of the (Yem.) Midrash ha-Gadol to Gen. 37:29 (MSS. י.ע; ed. M. Margulies 637, 18), and to Ex. 32:6 (MSS. ש.ת; ed. M. Margulies 50 Kutscher (op. cit., 56, 250, 447) assumes a mere contamination of v. 18 by v. 25, but this seems unlikely.

51 Examples of inverted word-order in Is-a in comparison with MT, were assembled by Kutscher, op. cit., 450-451.
681, 9). In the other reading the pers. pron. followed upon the noun. This is the arrangement of MT, supported by T, and one MS of G. 52

The difference in spelling לָכֵם against לָכֵּם may point to the derivation of the two readings from different text-types. 53

j) Is. 57:18

אָרָשֶׁלָם לָאָוֹתָם לָאָוֹתָם דֱָלֵב הָאָבָלוֹתָמ

MT: אָרָשֶׁלָם < תָּהוֹמָה שִּׁלְיָי

T: אָשָׁלָם < תָּהוֹמָה לָהוּ

S: מֶשֶׁר = בָּרַיָא לָהּ

G: קָאי אֶּדֶּנָּא אָוְּדָה פָּרָקְלַקְטָסִין אָלֶּתְעִין

The reading of MT (= T, S), in which the dat. pron. לִלְכָּא follows upon the direct object, was conflated in Is-a with the reading presented by G in which it precedes it. The force of the G evidence is somewhat weakened by the omission in its translation of the second dat. object דֱָלֵב הָאָבָלוֹתָמ. This may have caused the transfer of the dat. pron אָוְּדָה. However the same word-order is maintained also in MSS of G, in Aq., Sym., Theod. and Orig., where the missing clause is restored.

k) Is. 64:1

בְּכֵה אֵשֶׁל הָלְוְּדִיקָה שִׁמְכָּה לַדְּרִירְךָ

MT: בְּכֵה אֵשׁ < לַדְּרִירֶךָ שִׁמְכָּה

G: קָאי קַאְקַאֲאוֹסִי פּוּרִּיָּס שִׁפְּנַנְיְטִוּן קַאי פַּאֲנֵרְמַון

לֶדְרוֹעַא שִׁמְכִּי לַסְּמָאָוָא גַעֲמִי

In view of the exegetical difficulties inherent in this verse it cannot be decided for definite whether the first (וֹדִירֶךָ) simply was omitted in MT (followed by T, Sym., Theod.,) or whether it accrued in Is-a (followed by G). In the first case, (וֹדִירֶךָ) would be the dat. object of both the verbs פּוּרִּיָּס and שִׁפְּנַנְיְטִוּן. In the second a conflation of the following two readings must be assumed:

לַדְּרִירְךָ שִׁמְכָּה מַלְּדוֹעַא שִׁמְכָּה לַדְּרִירְךָ

Also the most closely amalgamated type of conflation found in MT, the crossing of two variants in one word which results in hybrid readings, is not absent from Is-a.

1) Is. 1:31

וֹזִיה הַשׁנֵם לַנְּדָרֶתְךָ שִׁפְּנַנְיְטִוּן לְיִנְצִיָּךְ

MT: הַשׁנֵם לַנְּדָרֶתְךָ שִׁפְּנַנְיְטִוּן לְיִנְצִיָּךְ

Here the Is-a reading results from the combination of a noun defined by

52 Cp. J. Ziegler (ed.), Isaias (Göttingen 1939) ad loc.
the def. art. πάντα (MT) with its parallel definition by the 2nd pers. plur. poss. suffix ἐν τοῖς οίκους which is reflected in the 3rd pers. plur. poss. suffix found in the main VSS — G: η ἵσχυς ἀντον T: κεφάλην S: υποστήθησί
d)
The enigmatic άνθρωπός of Is-a as against άνθρωπος of MT in Is. 34:14 can possibly be explained as a hybrid reading.55 We propose tentatively that the scribe combined the otherwise attested πᾶν, some sort of desert — being (Is. 13:22, Is-a: άνθρωπος; Jer. 50:39), with the hap. leg. ἃνθρωπος (Gen. 36:24) which carries a similar connotation. The VSS are of no help here, since the Heb. synonyms would be similarly translated.

n) An uncompleted case of hybrid reading of the same type may be found in Is. 30:23 where the present text of Is-a αὐτῶν has been superimposed upon the variant (αὐτοῦ). The ἡ at the end of the word αὐτόματα clearly is a correction of an underlying law. The initially intended definition by the 2nd pers. sing. poss. suffix ἀυτοῦ (Ζ: τῆς γῆς σου) was superseded by the definition with the aid of the def. art. αὐτόματα (= MT; T: άνθρωπος).

Conflation possibly may explain the following reading of Is-a.
o) Is. 61:6 Is-a: 56

The phrase ἣττα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἑπτάδεκα μισθώσεως is a crux interpretum. No satisfactory derivation for ἄνθρωπος has been proposed.57 T: τίτις S: θαυμάζεται and G: θαυμάζει are of no help. But the Is-a reading in conjunction with Aq.'s rendition may point the way.

We assume for Is-a a combination of the MT spelling

54 Cp. Josh. 7:21, 36 (Josh. 7:21), (ib. 8:33), (2 Ki. 15:16), and see DRMT, 178–179. After considering the possibility of conflation, Kutscher seems to prefer the doubtful explanation that the scribe of Is-a (inadvertently?) transferred from one determination to the other in the process of writing (op. cit., 445).
55 The possibility was suggested by Kutscher, op. cit., 238 (Joseph Callaway) who tentatively explains the form as a combination of πᾶν + σωμάτων θέλοντας (ib., 165). Mr. A. Hurvitz has drawn my attention to a comparable case of proper nouns conflation in the Genesis Apocryphon XXI, 29, ed. N. Avigad and Y. Yadin [Jerusalem 1956]). Here a seeming combination of ἀυτός (Gen. 14:5) with ἀυτόματα (Deut. 2:20) resulted in ἄνθρωπος.
56 At first sight this could be explained as a plene spelling of ἀνθρώπως with the αλφεί serving as mater lect. for pataq. Cp. Is. 30:31 MT: άνθρωπος, Is-a: άνθρωπος.
57 Cp. E. Nötscher, VT 1 (1951) 300: θαυμάζει
58 J. Ziegler (op. cit., 168) following Fischer and Wutz, supposes that influence of Aram. וּבְכֵבֶת and of the in content similar passage Is. 60:5 may explain the use of σωματίζειν in the instance under review.
reflected in Sym.'s στρηνιάσατε) with a spelling which is mirrored in the renderings of Theod. and Aq.

Theod.'s ύψωθησεσθε clearly is derived from λαν in the meaning “high”, for which cp. Is. 17:6,9 (עָמָר (עָמָר) = “branch”, “tree-top” (?). In a different connotation appears to be reflected in Aq.'s rendition: πορφυρωθησεσθε, (faultily quoted by Hier., in his commentary as: πορφύρα ἐνδύσεσθε). We propose that the translator here had in mind the Rabbinic “hem of a garment”, which sometimes was made of purple, cp. Mishnah Nega'im 11, 10: תָּלָךְ שָנַּרְאָה בַּכֶּנֶּס מַכְּלָה המַרְחִיהַ שְׁכַּבִּי. אָמֵלְיָה וַיַּאֲרֵמְתוּ. In translating και ἐν δόξη αὐτῶν πορφυρωθησεσθε, Aq. probably took ροκκָדָּה חָצְמָר to mean: “Ye will put on their splendour (like) purple”, thus exhibiting his familiarity with Rabbinic language. We may assume that this same concept underlies the conflated reading of Is-a.60


Kutscher explains the redundant ḫē of Is-a as due to Aram. influence.61 Thus both verbs would be (inverted?) imperfects. However, a case can be made for the supposition that Is-a contains a fully developed doublet which may be observed in statu nascendi in MT. The underlying alternative variants then would be ἀπεστρέψατο τὸ πρόσωπόν μου απ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠλπικήθη.62

The assumption that in one variant ἐλπίς was read as an absolute inf. is borne out by the vocalization of the waw with shewa in MT, and by G's rendering it as a 3rd. pers. sing. which points to a consonantal stock without the prefixed aleph of the 1st pers. sing. imperf.

q) Is. 11:9 Is-a: רְאֵי חַתְנֵךְ נָא מִלְּאַהֲוּ תְּבֵית הָרָאֵר MT: רְאֵי חַתְנֵךְ נָא מִלְּאַהֲוּ תְּבֵית הָרָאֵר

Here, as in similar cases in the MT,64 we postulate that in Is-a the 3rd pers. sing. fem. perf. מִלְּאַהֲוּ (= MT) was conflated with the parallel imperf. form מִלְּאַהֲוּ which possibly is reflected in T's: רְאֵי חַתְנֵךְ, and S's: רְאֵי חַתְנֵךְ.

59 Theod.'s translation is not preserved here. G. is of no help.
62 Kutscher, op. cit., 266.
3. (a) Is-a readings and corrections which constitute the basis of double-readings found in MT.

a) On pl. iii, 20–25 (Is. 3:15–18) Is-a three times records the tetragrammaton accompanied by what in the MT is considered its Qerê perpetuum — ידיעו. In v. 18 the Tetragrammaton is written in the line, with דכנמ inserted on top of it. In v. 17 the situation is reversed. In both cases the superscribed reading is presented as a correction by the “pointing” of the lower-case reading. Here the corrector quite clearly indicated the superiority of, or his preference for the superlinear variant. Obviously this is a matter of choice which is not rooted in the intrinsic primacy of one or the other reading since the correction alternately goes both ways, but rather derives from the idiograph of the Vorlage used by the corrector, which was not identical with the MT. MT reads in both verses וְיִדְעָה. In both these instances the substitution character of the superscription is made manifest by the pointing of the variant to be deleted. This is sufficient safeguard against the mistaken combination of the two by a later copyist. We encounter a different situation in the remaining instance, the first in the row of three, which has a direct bearing on the issue on hand, the emergence of double-readings. In v. 15 the superlinear ידיעו is added without the deletion of the lower-case Tetragrammaton (cp. also 28:16; 30:15; 65:13). It is impossible to decide whether the omission of the deletion-points is due just to a lapsus calami on part of the corrector, p.m. or s.m., or whether the express purpose of the correction was the restoration of what the corrector considered to be an accidentally missing ידיעו. Thus the superscribed word would constitute not a variant of the one in the line, but rather an addition to it. The latter assumption derives support, though not proof, from the MT which in fact reads the double-name ידיעו יהוה. The dooublet, and such it appears to be, accordingly did not arise in Is-a, but rather stems from a proto-Massoretic text-type which possibly preceded Is-a, but certainly is external to its textual tradition. Thus Is-a p.m. represents the earliest text-form of this specific case, Is-a s.m. the transitional stage, and MT the ultimate doublet-phase, also present in Aq.: κύριος κύριος (πιπι πιπι).

b) Is. 24:4 MT: אָמַלְרִי מָרֵם עֲמָרָה
Is-a: אָמַלְלִי מָרֵם עֲמָרָה

As Kutscher correctly observed, the reading of the verb in the sing. (אָמַלְלִי) proves that the lack of עֲמָרָה in the text-base of Is-a is not just a case of faulty omission, subsequently corrected. The shorter text of Is-a underlies also the renditions of G (ol γυναικός τῆς γῆς) and S (ורמר אֲדָרָה) which have no equivalent for עֲמָרָה. This is moreover missing also in one MS Ken. T follows MT: תַּקֵּחַ עֲמָרָה דָּרָה. Accordingly the reading עֲמָרָה (אָמַלְלִי) may be conceived of as a
parallel of (פָּחַד) which in Is-a was collated between the lines from a not anymore extant text-type. At a subsequent copying for which a MS of the Is-a type served as Vorlage, the superscribed variant was misconstrued as a corrected omission, and was reinstated in the text proper. This resulted in a doublet, as exhibited by the present MT.

In passing we may observe that a similar conflation of (פָּחַד) with (פָּחַד), the very opposite of (פָּחַד), occurred in the MT of 2 Ki. 24:14: לְמֹדְלָתָהוֹרִים. Here again the word שָׁם is not translated in G: of πτοχοὶ τῶν θησ. It appears that in this case the two basic readings may still be found singly in parallel passages:


\[\text{c) Is. 21:17 MT: רַשָּׁאָר מֵאָשֶׁר קֹשֶׁת בֹּנְרִי בּוֹרֵי קֹדֶם יִמַּשְׁרֶה. ~} \text{Is-a: בּוֹרֵי קֹדֶם.} \]

The shorter basic reading of Is-a, without the (redundant?) מְדֹלָתָהוֹרִים, underlies the main Targumic tradition: יִבְנוּי נַרְבָּא. It also is found in one MS Ken. The parallel reading מְדֹלָתָהוֹרִים, which was interpolated between the lines in Is-a, is found singly in G: מְדֹלָתָהוֹרִים. MT, followed by G: מְדֹלָתָהוֹרִים מָן הַמַּדְלְתָהוֹר. S: מְדֹלָתָהוֹר מְדֹלָתָהוֹר, and some witnesses of T (L[RN]), presents the double reading which resulted from the integration of the superscribed variant into the text proper.

\[\text{d) Is. 56:12 MT: נְתַחַּה הַכָּה יְם מְחַר יִתְרַע בְּנְזֵי מַצָּר. ~} \text{Is-a: יִתְרַע בְּנְזֵי מַצָּר.} \]

The shorter basic reading here has the support of T: נְתַחַּה הַכָּה יְם מְחַר יִתְרַע בְּנְזֵי מַצָּר, and possibly of S: נְתַחַּה הַכָּה יְם מְחַר יִתְרַע בְּנְזֵי מַצָּר. One MS and some printed editions of T (bogf) though mirror MT: נְתַחַּה הַכָּה יְם מְחַר יִתְרַע בְּנְזֵי מַצָּר. G does not render the verse at all. Aq., Theod. and Sym. restored the missing passage in complete agreement with MT. The same pertains to Orig.

In view of T’s (and S’s) concurrence with the base of Is-a, we are inclined to assume that the superscribed וְיִרְצָי constitutes a variant notation which at a subsequent stage of copying was embodied in the main text, thus creating the doublet found in MT.

65 These passages will be discussed separately.
66 Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 439 who, though, fails to mention the evidence of T and Theod. which supports the basic Is-a text.
e) Is. 61:1 MT: יִטְנָו מַשָּׁה בַּאֲרֵי וַעֲרָרָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה
שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה

Is-a: יִטְנָו מַשָּׁה בַּאֲרֵי וַעֲרָרָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה
שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה לֶהֶבֶת לְוַשְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה

MT is supported by all VSS. The shorter Is-a text may well have resulted from the omission of שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה which subsequently was restored as a superscription. However the waw prefixed before לֶהֶבֶת makes it quite clear that it cannot have been an integral component of the basic Is-a reading, unless it is conjoined with לֶהֶבֶת לֶהֶבֶת (שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה), against the Massoretic sentence division. It therefore may be surmised that the superscribed שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה represents a variant reading, not otherwise attested, which the writer or corrector of Is-a collated into his copy. If that is the case, MT would exhibit a faulty conflation of the two variants. While לֶהֶבֶת לֶהֶבֶת appears to be the smoother expression (cp. Ez. 34:4, 16), the reading שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה can be maintained, by its comparison with 2 Sam. 10:3; Ps. 111:9. In the first reading the whole series of infinitive constructs, etc. would be dependent on the finite verb מָשָׁה. In the second, only לֶהֶבֶת would be dependent on מָשָׁה, while the finite שְׁנֵי לֵבָנָה would open a new series of infinitive constructs.

3. (b) One more category of double-readings in the MT, on which the Qumran Scrolls throw light, remains to be mentioned. These are readings in which a Qumran MS will exhibit only one component in its text-base, without any superlinear or marginal variant-notation, as against a fully fledged doublet in the MT. Some such instances have been discussed by the present author in a previous publication in which the MT served as the point of departure. Further suggestions are made in what follows.

It goes without saying that in many cases of a supposed doublet in the MT, the single reading in the Is-a which serves as the controlling standard can be interpreted as a defective reading resulting from faulty omission. The situation is comparable to the choice between a dittography in one text or a haplography in another, where either decision would result in a satisfactory reading. A good example of such a situation may be seen in

Is. 3:22 MT: מָשָׁה תְּאֶסֶף וּמָשָׁה תְּאֶסֶף וּמָשָׁה תְּאֶסֶף

Is-a: מָשָׁה תְּאֶסֶף וּמָשָׁה תְּאֶסֶף וּמָשָׁה תְּאֶסֶף

Here the Greek and the Targumic evidence appears to support MT, and a haplography in Is-a is as good an assumption as a variant conflation in MT.

68 DRMT, 162 (Is. 14:12), 163 (12:2), 168 (35:8), 169 (37:18), 177 (25:5).
It is possible, though, to present the in Rabbinic Hebrew widely used "措施" (found only once in the OT, Ruth 3:15), as an interpretative reading of the hap. leg. "措施" which is extremely rare also in Rabbinic language (Tos. Kelim B. B. 5, 4; ed. Zuckermandel, 595).

The scales can be tipped in favour of the doublet assumption whenever it is supported by one of the following:
Concurring evidence of an independent ancient Version.
Where no such support is forthcoming:
One component of the double-reading can be shown to be redundant on grounds of metrical, syntactical or sense considerations, or else can be explained as a harmonizing intrusion from a parallel passage.

We shall open this series with the analysis of a MT reading which already at some previous occasion was presented as arising from conflation by its comparison with a parallel MT reading, and with its rendition in G, and whose doublet-nature now can further be substantiated with the aid of Qumran evidence.

a) 2 Sam. 5:11 MT: יזמר ופיי צורת ע møן קיר
4Q Sam:\nWe postulate that the redundant פי in MT represents the reading פי *מ therein which is yet extant in G^n: כחי וקיסות ליון, and for which cp. also 1 Chr. 22:15 - פי (G: οικοδόμοι λίθων και κτέτονες ξύλων).

The synonymous Qumran variant צורה קיר turns up in MT and G of the parallel passage, 1 Chr. 14:1,70 and in the Lucianic tradition (oc\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2}): כחי וקיסות תיוו. The MT doublet underlies two Greek minuscules: כחי וקיסות תיוו. T paraphrases: כחי וקיסות תיוו. It is feasible that פי arose out of the Heb. פי after the rendition of פי in MT doublet.

b) Is. 26:6 MT: η^π τ^ο α^λ β^αν ν^ηαν
Is-a: יזמר ופיי צורת ע møן קיר
The redundant פי (sing.) of MT, which is the reading of S: פי, has no equivalent in the Greek tradition, and is also absent from one MS Ken. It is, probably, a variant of פא (plur.) which was inserted into the text base (= T).

69 This passage will be published by F.M. Cross, Jr., in his forthcoming paper in HThR.
70 In inverted order: D^οί ανά βαν νηαν.
c) A probable case of conflation, possibly involving a misreading, is the following:

Is 59:13 MT: דָּבֶרּ שֵׁשָׁק וְתַהַר הַרְוָה מָלֵל דִּבְרֵי-שָׁכֶר
Is-a: וּדָבֶרּ שֵׁשָׁק וְתַהַר מָלֵל דִּבְרֵי-שָׁכֶר

The VSS support the consonantal base of MT as it stands and follow also the Massoretic sentence division, which has a break after הרוּה, taking מָלֵל as the regnant verbs of כָּלִיר שָׁכֶר. All the Greek sources, and S (בְּטֶנֶנָא) derive from פַּטְרָה “to conceive, to become pregnant”. G and Sym. render it by κύειν, Theo. and Aq. by עָנָה לְגָרָה. Thus understood דָּבֶר makes a poor parallel for the remaining verbs מָלֵל and מִנָּה, and at the same time clearly shows the translators’ dependence on an earlier verse in the same chapter, 59:4. There דָּבֶר parallels מִנָּה, and is again rendered by κύειν in G, these being the only two instances in which G employ this verb in the OT. It is feasible that מִנָּה intruded into MT 59:13 from v. 4, possibly due to the correspondence of ideas expressed in those two verses, and the further similarity of the phrases employed in them – v. 4: דָּבֶר שָׁא: מִנָּה. If that is the case, the combination הרוּה מָלֵל would not constitute a true doublet.

However, with some grammatical license, הרוּה can be, and probably should be derived from פַּטְרָה – “to teach, to instruct”, as was done, and correctly so, by some mediaeval commentators, e.g. Qimḥi (in his father’s name), and Rashi (as a second proposition to its derivation from פַּטְרָה “to shoot, to throw”, for which he quotes Ex. 15:4). דָּבֶר שָׁכֶר...הרוּה thus would make an excellent alternative reading of הרוּה מָלֵל, and could well be taken as a variant notation which was conflated with the basic reading. The restored two variants, individually make for a better metric structure than the present doublet:

d) Is. 57:18 MT: אָנַחְתָה אָבָא פָּתַח לֵיאָלְכָּלִיל < נִחְוְמִים לְלֵיאָלְכָּלִיל
Is-a: אָנַחְתָה לֵיאָלְכָּלִיל נִחְוְמִים לֵיאָלְכָּלִיל

The renditions of G: καὶ παρεκάλεσα; T: ἀράθηται et al. and S: ναραθήται convincingly show that MT אָנַחְתָה probably should be emended

72 If מָלֵל is seen simply as a miswritten dittography of מִנָּה; cp. BH.
73 Sym.: έν γάστρι δέλθων.
74 The noun κύησις is used in Ruth 4:13.
75 Cp. Is. 9:14; Hab. 2:18 – מָרֵד שָׁכֶר.
77 The ensuing noun נִחְוְמִים is translated by the same root, and so is לֵיאָלְכָּל in 61:2.
78 Retained, though, by Aq.: καὶ καθοδηγηθησα. 
to read אֲבָנָה (cp. BH). In that case, אֲבָנָה could well be a parallel variant of אֵיתָן which in this combination is not found again in the OT, whereas the pi'el of אֵיתָן is recurrently employed in the Book of Isaiah and elsewhere to describe God's reconciliatory intentions for Israel (49:13; 51:3, 12; 52:9; 61:2; 66:13; further 40:1; 54:1; 12:1). Thus the redundant אֱהָנָה would have to be considered a variant-gloss which intruded into the text-base of MT (but is missing from two MSS Ken.), and resulted in a cumbersome lengthening of the second half-verse.

e) Is. 24:22 MT: אֶפְסָפָה אָסֵפָה עַל בֵּר וְנָפַר עַל מְסַכֶּר

On the basis of the lopsided parallelism and the unwieldy structure of the MT, and in view of the fact that G renders only אֶפְסָפָה על בֵּר and ... of the first half-verse, Seeligmann raised doubts as to the original authenticity of the words אֶפְסָפָה אָסֵפָה. He then hesitatingly, although to my mind correctly, suggested to take אָסֵפָה as a corrupted variant gloss of אֶפְסָפָה, namely אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה. This assumption derives further support from the Origenic and Lucianic traditions which do render אָסֵפָה but again omit אֶפְסָפָה again omit אָסֵפָה את אֶפְסָפָה but again omit אָסֵפָה את אֶפְסָפָה. The Hebrew original of this reading which is also reflected in T: יְכַפְּרוּ וְנַעֲשֵׂהוּ אֶפְסָפָה לְאֶפְסָפָה (where אָסֵפָה appears to equal אֶפְסָפָה), has now been recovered in Is-a, whose text, at the same time, witnesses to the originality of אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה.

We therefore can endorse, with only a slight adjustment, Seeligmann's conclusion that the variant notation אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה, “must have crept into the Hebrew text during the centuries that elapsed between the composition of the Septuagint and that of the later (Greek) versions”, since Sym.'s rendition, as quoted by Eus., already reflects the word in question: καὶ ἀθροισθήσονται ἀθροισμόν εἰς λάκκον καὶ συγκλεισθήσονται εἰς συγκλεισμόν.

---

79 G translate אֶפְסָפָה אָסֵפָה – דָּוָאָה and לִשְׁמָה in 61:3 - דָּוָאָה Did they read the same verb in both verses? An interchange between אֶפְסָפָה אָסֵפָה and לִשְׁמָה אָסֵפָה can be observed also in 1 Sam. 2:20 MT: אֶפְסָפָה אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה (= G: ἀποσιώσατε). See: F.M. Cross, Jr., BASOR 132 (1953) 22.

80 The noun נוֹמָה is found twice more in the OT, Hos. 11:8 and Zech. 1:13. In Is. 66:11 נוֹמָה is employed, for which cp. Jer. 16:7 and Job 15:11; 21:2 (bothث). None of those is construed with נוֹמָה.

81 καὶ συνάξονται καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν εἰς ὀχύρωμα καὶ εἰς δεσμώτηριον, with transferred to the end of the verse. The crucial phrase εἰς δεσμώτηριον is absent from the Orig. and Luc. tradition.


83 The additional phrase obviously stems from Theod., as maintained by Seeligmann, ib.

84 Possibly representing אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה אָסֵפָה or some reading like it.
In the following two instances the doublets assumedly found in the MT, occur in the form of hybrid readings:

f) Is. 63:3 MT: נана ינב שרה
   Is-a: ינב שרה יבשלם

The phrase is missing in G, and is rendered paraphrastically in T: καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐνδύματά μου ἐμόλυνα. The queer form ΤΙ ΒΙ ΚΙ has been explained as a possible Aramaism, or simply as a miswritten ΤΙ ΒΙ (BH),\(^{85}\) which latter we find now in Is-a.

We suggest to explain ΤΙ ΒΙ ΚΙ as a combination of the not extant ΙΝΑΛΑΤ with the alternative variant ΙΝΑΛΑΤ (=-Is-a, and S: ΧΝΑΛΑΤ). The former would take up the 1st pers. imperf. which is mirrored in ἀναλαται ...ἐρωμαι of MT (cp. also ...τι). These words are omitted from Is-a whose text here is much shorter. The latter (למאכלי) would follow the 1st pers. perf., as found in דר withd at the opening of the verse.

An identical conflation of a perf. with an imperf. form, is found in the Scroll reading to Is. 11:9: ממלאת, MT: ממלאת.\(^\text{86}\)

g) Is. 23:11 MT: ממלאת, MT: ממלאת, MT: ממלאת
   Is-a: ממלאת, G: άπολέσαι αυτής τήν Ισχύν
   T: שֵׁלֵשְׁיָהוּ חָשְׁמָה

Kutscher offers the learned but unconvincing explanation of the unusual MT reading as possibly being an attempt on behalf of the prophet to employ a characteristically Phoenician plur. ending ב instead of the usual ב ending. He admits though that the ב ending never is found in inscriptions with an appended 3rd pers. plur. fem. poss. pron.\(^{87}\)

We suggest that ממלאת in MT arose from a conflation of ממלאת\(^{88}\) of Is-a, for which cp. in this context (Is. 17:9; 23:4, 13), with a parallel reading ממלאת,\(^{89}\) which is not extant for the passage under review. The synonymity of מלת and ממלאת as an epithet of God can be proved

1. from their serving alternately in combination with a third synonym — ממלאת, ממלאת
   Joel 4:16: ממלאת
   Ps. 91:9: ממלאת

\(^{86}\) Cp. above, p. 117.
\(^{88}\) The plur. of ממלאת is found only in Dan. 11:19, 38, 39.
\(^{89}\) The plur. ממלאת from ממלאת is not extant in the Bible. ממלאת occurs in Jer. 21:13; Na. 2:13; Job 37:8; 38:40; Cant. 4:8.
2. from their being employed alternately in one and the same context,
Jer. 16:19: "ורא רואים ומוכרים"^90
Ps. 90:1: "ואדוני מתן אתה לי לנהל"^91

3. from their being used alternately in a recurring passage,
Ps. 31:3: "_ud תבש ממעיחו"—71:3: "ud תבש ממעיחו"—
In both passages a noun derived from פ"ש is found in the continuation,
31:5, רמא/mL יאืนוי, 71:7, נוכיו/mL יאствие.

V
The coexistence at Qumran of varying text-formations of the Bible, and the absence of any noticeable attempt at establishing one universally recognized recension of binding force, must have confronted the Qumran scribes with the problem of what attitude to take towards these conflicting not yet assessed and rated textual traditions. The individual scribe could solve this problem by adhering faithfully to the MS which he had chosen, or had been assigned, as the Vorlage for his own copy. In a reasonable number of instances, such as were discussed above, he could perpetuate parallel readings which he found in other MSS that were at his disposal, by noting them in the margins or between the lines of his own copy or, sometimes, by integrating them in his text-base. Now, these devices, which were a common stock-in-trade of the ancient Bible scribes regardless of their socio-religious affiliations, are mere practical expediences that may work fairly well, up to a certain point, for the individual copyist, but cannot satisfactorily solve the problem of the community's disposition towards divergent, but equally well documented, readings. In Bible MSS which are intended for public use, critical annotations must be kept to a practical minimum. In fact even these relatively few marginal entries will tend to disappear at subsequent copyings by sheer routine omission, unless they are absorbed into the text proper. Even where authoritative guidance is absent we may find a spontaneous tendency towards the simplification and the stabilisation of the textual traditions of the Holy Writ and other hallowed books. This process cannot be expected to culminate in complete unification,^92 but it will effectively circumscribe the scope, and reduce the number of textual

^90 Cp. further Is. 25:4; Na. 1:7; Ps. 27:1; 28:8; 37:39, et al.
^91 Some MSS of MT read here "ונועי". Also a graphical confusion of ו-ג may have caused the interchange. Cp. Josh. 15:29 where the MT reads רבעהית for the patently correct ב.ElementAt (=G ad loc. and MT Neh. 11:27).
^92 Cp. DRMT, 146–150.
types which are allowed a continued existence, until, if ever, conscious official redactional activities set in.

The impending gradual disappearance of variant readings which, on objective grounds, could not be declared to be intrinsically inferior to those which happened to have taken root in the predominant textual traditions, may well have been viewed with misgivings by those concerned with the preservation of Scripture. The practical advantage of traditing a fairly standardized text-type for communal-cultic purposes was set off by an understandable apprehension for the unrecoverable loss of, to all appearances, valid and venerated textual traditions of the Biblical books, which per force would result from the above outlined process. Contradictory as it may sound, such pro and ante deliberations seem to have produced diverse techniques of non-manuscriptal variant preservation which helped balancing the tipped scale of the favoured text-tradition(s) that became increasingly predominant, to the exclusion, and the, to all intent and purposes, complete suppression of less favoured variae lectiones.

Here again, a comparison with attitudes and techniques that were current in the normative community is in order.

The prevalence in Rabbinic circles of trends of thought, such as were outlined above, may have been responsible for the perceptible latitude in the employment of the Bible text in scholarly discussion which conspicuously contrasts the unceasing efforts to establish an exclusive textus receptus for public worship and for official text-transmission. Whereas deviant readings were banned from books which were earmarked for these latter categories, they were readily accepted and used as bases for Midrashic exposition.\(^93\) In fact, at times it appears that such an officially discarded variant was not employed merely as just a convenient peg upon which to hang a Midrash that was on hand, but rather that the Midrash in question was constructed on a variant that had been barred from the textus receptus in order to give it a non-manuscriptal lease on life. This supposition especially applies to the specific type of the 'al tiqrê Midrash,\(^94\) in which an established text is suspended, as it were, and another reading becomes the point of departure for an ensuing Midrashic comment, by means of the introductory formula: “do not read..., but rather read...”. A famous case in point is the 'al-tiqrê Midrash (Bab. Tal. Berakot 64a) which hinges on reading in Is. 54:13 — בנויה — “thy builders”, instead of MT: בנויה — “thy sons” (cp. G: τέκνα; T: בנויה), a variant which now has turned up in Is-a as an emended reading: יבניא.\(^95\) Similarly, the Midrash:

\(^93\) Cp. TSL, 14–15; 386–374 (1932).

\(^94\) נא שומשנה, א. טקבר, אסמרל, א. אניקסל, י. סאלקלפניז ו. אר顯ל, ב.

\(^95\) Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 171 who points out that the Midrash appears to echo the reading
can be anchored in the different textual traditions of Is. 9:19. Here the MT (= Is-a) reading: "they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm" (G: τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ) is abandoned, as it were, for a variant — “his offspring”, which underlies T’s paraphrastic rendering: "καὶ οἱ προσώποι οὗτος καὶ οὗτος", and Sym.’s rendition: τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ. Both readings seemingly were conflated in the main stream of G^AB: τοῦ βραχίονος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ.

We do not propose that every extant al-t. Midrash can be shown to have arisen from a yet identifiable textual variant. This certainly is not the case. Variæ lectiones which supposedly triggered off the emergence of many a Midrash of this type have been lost for us, together with the (suppressed) MSS which exhibited them. Here is a possible example. Is. 2:22 (missing in G) warns before reliance on man “for wherein is he to be accounted of” — רְמָּו הַשֵּׂר הָאָדָם. The MT reading בְּרֶמֶא is reflected in T: מַעְרֹת עַהֲדוֹ, S: מַעְרֹת אֲדֻמַּיָא מָנָה עֲשַׂר, and Aq.: έν τίνι ἐλογίσθη αὐτός. Now this phrase, among others, is employed in an al-t. Midrashic comment on Prov. 16:5 (Bab. Tal. Sotah 4b) as pr of f that “everyone that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord”: “Ula said (he is considered) as if he had built a bamah", and then goes on to quote Is. 2:22, winding up with: “אַלָּהֵכְן מַעְרֹת אֲדֻמִּיָא". At first glance it appears that here a mere different vocalization of the same consonantal group is involved. But the fact that the point of departure for the exposition in question is a Biblical proverb which castigates “the proud in heart", suggests another possibility: an interchange between ב and ר, with the resulting reading רְמָּו in Is. 2:22. This word can be construed as a (synonymous) parallel of בָּאָמָה (Ez. 16:24, 25, 31, 39), and in fact sometimes is textually confused with it (Jud. 4:5 MT: רְמָּו, G^B: βαμα; 1 Sam. 22:6 MT: רְמָּו, G^BL: בָּאָמָה; cp. DRMT, 157–158). Or else רְמָּו can be derived from רְמָּו — “to be exalted”. In an association with רְמָּו לָב (Prov. 16:5) this would bring to mind the expression רְמָּו לָב (לָב — hybris which recurrently is referred to in Is. 2:11, 12, 17, adjacent to רְמָּו in 2:22. Interestingly, this latter concept emerges in the V rendition of Is. 2:22: ε x c e l s u s reputatus est ipse, which accordingly also may be based on a reading רְמָּו.97

Moreover this specific type of Midrash progressively degenerated, and ultima-
of Is-a, and stresses the fact that the first בְּרֶמֶא in MT of Is. 54:13 was retained in Is-a. Also in 49:17 Is-a reads בְּרֶמֶא instead of MT: בְּרֶמֶא. But there the copyist may have been influenced by the context. See. H.M. Orlinsky, Tarbiz 24 (1954) 4 ff. Cp. further the Midrashic comments in Bab. Tal. Sotah 12b on 1 Chr. 2:18, and in Cant. Rab. 137 on Cant. 1:5 where בְּרֶמֶא is implied instead of MT: בְּרֶמֶא, respectively תַּבְעָה.

96 Cp. Yalqut on Isaiah ad loc. (ed. J. Spira, 75), et al.
tely the 'al tiqrê formula often was employed, even when the Midrash in question could not be related to an actually extant reading, by definition originally a sine qua non requirement, and had become a mere exegetical Spielem­
ment.98 Vice versa the introductory formula of a genuine 'al tiqrê Midrash often was dropped, so that now the same exposition sometimes is preserved in parallel versions, both with and without that formula.99

These short remarks which are intended but to sketch cursorily the genesis and some phases of development of the 'al tiqrê Midrash lead one to presuppose the existence of a transition stage from manuscriptal notation to extra-manu­scriptal Midrashic preservation of Biblical variant readings. It appears that also these aspects of text-transmission can yet be traced in Qumran writings.

A few comments on the textual character of the variants which assumedly underlie the 'al tiqrê Midrash, and many a Midrash not so designated, are called for, before we enter into a discussion of the pertinent Qumran material.

In a majority of cases the textual variations involved are of the simplest and most common types: interchange of graphically similar letters or of auricular close consonants; haplography or dittography; continuous writing of separate words or division of one word into two; plene or defective spelling; metathesis, differences of vocalization, sometimes entailing a change of verb conjugation. Some cases of more complicated textual phenomena do not affect the overall impression.

With respect to the issue on hand, we note that only under exceptionally favourable circumstances can we hope to find the very same reading recorded both as a variant-notation in a yet extant Hebrew manuscript or as a double­translation in one of the VSS, and at the same time also in its non-manuscriptal form as the basis of an 'al tiqrê Midrash. Such a propitious concurrence of independent evidence characterizes the following instance, although in the Mi­drashic factor the 'al tiqrê formula is not present.

98 This and related techniques of variation on Biblical themes in Midrash-exegesis, were discussed and illustrated by I.L. Seeligmann in his valuable study “Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese”, Suppl. to VT 1 (1953) 150-181, esp. 159-160.

99 The Sam. variant in Num. 11:32 – יִשָּׁתַחֲנוּ לָהּ שְׁחָרִיתָה (ed. Blayney) as against MT יָשֶׁתֵּר לְהָלָה שְׁחָרוֹת which is reflected in an al-t. Midrash in Sifre Num. § 98 (ed. Friedmann 26b) which is adduced in extenso without the introductory formula in Bab. Tal. Yoma 75b; Jer. Tal. Nazir 53c IV, 6, and in Yalqut Shim'on I, 635 on Num. 11:32. Another Sam. variant in Ex. 12:17 – קָטֵל וְלֹא יָצָאוּ מִיַּדְיָכֶם (= G: κατα τοὺς μετὰ τὴν ἐντολήν τούτην) as against MT – מַלְאָכָיו appears to underlie the al-t. Midrash (cp. Rashi ad loc.) in Mekilta d'Rabbi Ishmael, Tractate Pislpa, ch. 9 (ed. Horowitz-Rabin, 32; ed. Lauterbach, 74) which again is quoted without the formula in Mekilta d'Rabbi Shim'on b. Yohai (ed. Epstein-Melamed, 22:3); cp. further Rashi to Bab. Tal. Yoma 33a: Meg. 6b.
In this case a double translation of the two letters ה ה in G (and possibly also in T) to Ps. 29:1 is involved. The crucial passage in MT: ה בהל ביני古老 is rendered by the Greek translator: ενεγκατε τω κυριω υιοι θεοθ
ενεγκατε τω κυριω υιους κριων,
and by T: οι θεοθ θεοθ θεοθ θεοθ θεοθ.
Here the first line in G, and the first phrase in T, conceive of the underlying Hebrew text as an invitation to divine beings, υιοι θεοθ, to praise God (cp. Ex. 15:11; Ps. 89:7; Dan. 11:36, et al.). In its general meaning the passage thus may be compared e.g. with Ps. 97:7 and Job 38:7, to which latter also Ibn Ezra ad loc. alludes. This most natural explanation is further reflected in the Rabbinic tradition which identifies מלוות υιους as “angels” — מלוות υιους. However the second rendition of G — υιους κριων — clearly derives from the plene spelling מלוות υιους = “(young) rams” (for which cp. מלוות υιους in v. 6), construed as the syntactical object, and paralleling מלוות υιους in the second half-verse. The same possibly also applies to the redundant מלוות υιους in T, and certainly to Jerome’s translation: adferite filios arietum.

The above evidence indicates that the variant spelling מלוות at some time or other was extant in manuscripts, and was retained in the extra-Massoretic Greek tradition in the form of a variant notation (cp. also T). In the Massoretic manuscriptal tradition this variant-reading מלוות was discarded to the exception of some odd copies. But it did enjoy a Midrashic after-life. Shōher Ṭov ad loc. (ed. Buber, 116) relates מלוות to Israel, who are likened to helpless sheep over whom God will appoint David as shepherd; or again, and this time more in line with the Greek-Latin conception, presents Israel as “the sons of men slaughtered like sheep. Abraham said: I slaughter, Isaac said I am slaughtered”.

As already stated, this example is a rare case in which are yet preserved both ends of the transition process: the textual variant-notation in the form of a doublet in one (set of) extra-MT witness(es), side by side with the Rabbinic tradition in which the variant that was ejected from the MT was made the basis of a Midrash. However, ordinarily we shall have to content ourselves with illustrating the transition from one phase to the other by drawing on examples which individually reflect only one of them, but which, if viewed in conjunction, typologically represent the transition-process in toto.

We now can revert to the double-reading in Is-a 38:19 which was discussed on page 109, and in which we seem to discern the typical characteristics of a potentia ’al tiqrē Midrash. Again the pregnant consonant combination ה ה is involved.

100 Cp. Seder Eliahu Rab. ch. 2 (ed. Friedmann, 12).
As noted, Is-a here records in its text-base the variant \( \text{אלא ה} \) along-side \( \text{אי} \) which is the reading found in MT. The transition from MT \( \text{אלא ה} \) to Is-a \( \text{אלא ה} \), or \text{vice versa}, may be considered as textually exceedingly simple, especially since a potential intermediate stage – \( \text{אלא ה} \) – is yet extant in Is-b.

We thus may take as certain the manuscriptal coexistence, towards the end of the Second Temple period, of the above three readings which most probably derived from one another, either in the order \( \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \) or \( \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \). The problem of the actual historical development is of no relevance to the present issue. The scribe of Is-a obviously did not feel competent to decide on the respective merits of \( \text{אלא ה} \) and \( \text{אלא ה} \), or else deemed both worthy of preservation, and therefore, rather than choosing between them, integrated the two readings in the text of his copy.

At this juncture we are well within the phase of manuscriptal variants notation which, however, took place in one witness only, viz. Is-a, whereas in our other Hebrew sources and in the ancient VSS a decision was reached as to the retention of one reading and the rejection of the other(s). Now, it does not require much imagination to visualize the discarded variant \( \text{אלא ה} \) cropping up in Midrashic literature in the formulation: \( \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \). True, such a Midrash is not extant, to my knowledge, but it would have been in the very best tradition of the type to embark on an exposition which utilizes the simple graphic or linguistic variation \( \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \) which was found in Biblical MSS for the fashioning of an exegetical comment with theological or ideological undertones.

This pattern of development indeed can be observed in Qumran writings of the \text{pesher}-type which shares many features with the Rabbinic Midrash without being identical with it. In this setting we can perceive the simultaneous utilization of variant readings for expository purposes when only one of the given possibilities is quoted as actual Scripture. Here are three illustrations of the phenomenon in question.

a) Hab. 1:11 MT: \( \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \). The MT reading, which derives \( \text{אלא ה} \) from \( \text{רָשׁ} \) in 1QH p IV, 9–10. The MT reading, which derives \( \text{אלא ה} \) from \( \text{רָשׁ} \), is supported by G: \( \text{ץָלַשְׁתָּא} \) and T: \( \text{כָּכָהָ בֶּן} \). In the ensuing comment, which is based on the first part of the above Scripture, 1QH p clearly shows acquaintance, both with its own Biblical reading and also with that of MT (G, T), and with the Masoretic sentence-division: \( \text{אלא ה} \rightarrow \text{אלא ה} \). The second \text{pesher} (b), in which the salient word is \( \text{ץָלַשְׁתָּא} \) – “to despoil, to lay waste”, in all probability mirrors of the \text{Vorlage} from which 1QH p quoted, the verb being understood as derived from \( \text{רָשׁ} \). The first exposition (a), in which [חת קשת]...
“[their] house of guilt” is the pivotal expression, obviously is based on וּנְתָנָה as found in the MT which reading, though, is not explicitly quoted. However, it is possible that this very reading actually was adduced furtheron in 1QHp (IV, 14–15)101 where another pesher is introduced, but was lost for us in a lacuna: הָאָרֶץ הַזֶּה הָיָה לְשׁוֹחַת אַתָּה הֲוַיְאֶרֶץ. If this indeed can be maintained, we would have here what amounts to a variant-notation, in quotation, together with two Midrash-like expositions which are based alternatively on the one and the other of the parallel variants.

b) Hab. 2:16 MT: שָׁתַּה בָּם אָוהַת הָעָדָר — “drink thou, and uncover yourself”102 is quoted in 1QHp XI, 9 as: שָׁתַּה בָּם אָוהַת הָעָדָר — “drink thou, and become intoxicated”, a change of concept which may have resulted from a simple metathesis. Here MT is supported by T, and 1QHp by G,103 Aq. and S.

The interesting feature of this example is that, notwithstanding his own reading, the author of 1QHp sets his pesher to the tune of the MT variant in its obvious, but in Hab. 2:16 unsuitable derivation from the root מָעַל — “uncircumcised”: יִמַּל אֶפֶל אֶלֶף לְרָע — “he did not circumcise (the foreskin of) his heart”. Without employing the very formula, the pesher here exhibits the technical intricacies which characterize the Rabbinic 'al tigrê Midrash. We observe a similar suspension of an explicit Qumran reading in favour of an extra-Qumran variant which becomes the departure point for a Midrashic exposition.

The same factors seem to have been at work in the following instance, in which, though, the actual Biblical quotation was lost in a lacuna, and has to be restored by inference.

c) The first word on col. ii, 1 of 1QHp —เอสפר preceded by a lacuna at the lower margin of col. i, is the end of a quotation of Hab. 1:5, a verse which in the MT opens: רָאָה אֵשֶׁת הָבָשָׁת — “Behold ye among the nations, and regard...”. The pesher which is only partially preserved never mentions the word הָבָשָׁת — “nations”, but instead refers three times in a row to “the traitors” — הָבָשָׁת. It certainly can be postulated, as is done by I.L. Seelig-

101 Unless we assume that in this instance the sectarian author quoted only the second part of the verse starting, against the Massoretic sentence-division, with [רָאָה], and now deriving the word from שָׁתַּה.
102 This appears to be the required translation of the phrase, rather than RV: “and be as one uncircumcised”. כָּל אָלֶף מִצְרִים here should be taken in the meaning of מִצְרִים. The metaphor is rooted in a situation like the one described in the tale of Noah’s drunkenness (Gen. 9:2) which well may have been in the back of the prophet's mind. In addition to the above similarity, cp. Hab. 2:17–21 with Gen. 9:23–24 and Lam. 4:21.
mann,\textsuperscript{104} that the Biblical Vorlage with which the author of 1QHp was familiar, in fact contained the varia lectio שבדורנים. But one also could postulate that 1QHp here presents a case of a typical variant-Midrash. Bypassing the reading שבדורנים which he actually may have quoted, the author anchored his actualizing paraphrase in a parallel variant שבדורנים which he found in a manuscript of the text-type that seems to underlie G's οι καταφρονηται\textsuperscript{105}. Thus the emerging situation would be comparable to that which we encountered in the previous example.

The foregoing analysis leads us to conclude that the category of the variant-Midrash which in Rabbinic literature is best, though not exclusively, represented by the 'al tig\textSuperscript{\textdegree} type, in the Qumran writings is exemplified by the variant-pesher. The Qumran material thus offers proof for the high antiquity of this Midrashic category. At the same time the combined evidence of Qumran and Rabbinic techniques proves the contention that variant readings in the Biblical textual traditions were viewed with relative equanimity by both groups, and even were perpetuated by diverse manuscriptal and non-manuscriptal devices.

This conclusion opens up a new avenue of approach to the problem of the genesis and the early history of the Kethib-Qerê variants, an issue which we hope to discuss in a separate publication.

\textsuperscript{104} In his review of K. Elliger, \textit{Studien zum Habakkuk Commentar vom Toten Meer} (Tübingen 1953) in \textit{Kisjath Sepher} 30 (1954) 40.

\textsuperscript{105} It is of interest to remark that a similar pair of variants may be observed in Prov. 10:3 where the Ben Chaj\textsuperscript{\textdegree} edition and some MSS read ובזים instead of ובזים which is found in other MSS and printed editions, and also underlies the VSS.
The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

Catholic University

So many partial lists of Old Testament manuscripts from Qumran exist in the scholarly literature that it seems necessary to begin this account with
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a full inventory. The numbers to be given are minimal. They are given in four separate groups, for cave 1, for caves 2, 3, 5-10, for cave 4, and for cave 11; thus for the published material those especially interested can verify how these totals have been arrived at. A manuscript which contains any Psalm and no extant non-biblical material is counted as a Psalms manuscript. Three isolated bits from cave 4 are not counted, however; and 11Q Ps\textsuperscript{a} and 4Q Ps\textsuperscript{f}, both of which are definitely Psalms manuscripts incorporating non-biblical compositions, are included. A manuscript which contains any of the Minor Prophets is counted as a manuscript of the Twelve, as the evidence seems to require. The four manuscripts which indicate inclusion of two biblical books in a single scroll (two of Gen.-Ex., two of Lev.-Numb.) are counted one to each of the biblical books concerned. Since one of these manuscripts (4Q paleoEx\textsuperscript{1}) contains of Genesis only the bottoms of two letters from its last line of text, one could add one each to the totals for Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, but hardly to that for Genesis. Tentative identifications have been passed over when too little text is extant for certainty as to the nature of the manuscript.

There are, then, the following manuscripts. From cave 1: Genesis 1, Exodus 1, Leviticus 1 (with Numbers), Deuteronomy 2, Judges 1, Samuel 1, Isaiah 2, Ezekiel 1, Psalms 3, and Daniel 2. From the “minor caves” 2, 3, 5-10: Genesis 3, Exodus 3, Leviticus 2, Numbers 3, Deuteronomy 5, Kings 2, Isaiah 1, Jeremiah 1, Ezekiel 1, Minor Prophets 1, Psalms 4, Job 1, Ruth 2, Song of Songs 1, Lamentations 3, and Daniel 1. From cave 4: Genesis 11 (one includes Exodus), Exodus 11, Leviticus 4, Numbers 2 (one includes Leviticus), Deuteronomy 18, Joshua 2, Judges 2, Samuel 3, Kings 1, Isaiah 15, Jeremiah 3, Ezekiel 3, Minor Prophets 7, Psalms 17, Job 3, Proverbs 2, Ruth 2, Song of Songs 3, Ecclesiastes 2, Lamentations 1, Daniel 5, Ezra 1, Chronicles 1. From cave 11: Leviticus 1, Ezekiel 1, Psalms 3.

Included in this inventory are the ten manuscripts in the paleo-Hebrew script, which are four copies of Leviticus (one each from caves 1, 2, 6, and 11), two each of Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy, one of Numbers and one of Job. Translation materials are not included. Of Septuagint Greek texts, Qumran furnishes portions of Exodus (7Q1), Leviticus (4Q LXX Lev\textsuperscript{a}, b), and Numbers (4Q LXX Numb); and there are Aramaic targums of Leviticus (from cave 4) and of Job (from both 4 and 11).

These lists do not include materials of varying date from sites in the Judean desert other than the Qumran area such as the Wadi Murabba’\text{"a}t, Masada, Engedi, Khirbet Mird, and Wadi Khabra, though some of these texts will need to be mentioned in what follows. Neither do the lists take into account the extensive paraphrases of Torah texts from cave 4 being studied by J. Strugnell, nor the substantial number of phylacteries and mezu-
zas, with their excerpts (not always the traditional ones) of key Torah passages. No such lists can be absolutely definitive,¹ but the gleanings from further study of caves 4 and 11 cannot be expected to alter these totals by more than a few slight bits.

Qumran and the Canon

It will be noticed from the above that Esther alone, of the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament, has still not been found at Qumran. It is easy to discount an argument from silence, but when one considers the late origin of the Purim festival with which Esther is connected, its partial identification with the victories of Judas the Maccabee (whose Hasmonean kindred were abhorred at Qumran), and the rigidity in matters of the liturgical calendar that characterized the Qumran group, it seems more likely that the book was avoided than that it was simply not known. After all, the colophon to the Septuagint text of Esther, though of doubtful value for dating the translation, is usually taken to indicate that even in Greek the book of Esther was circulating by about 75 B.C. at the latest.

The recognized authority of the Torah and the Latter (Writing) Prophets at Qumran is beyond dispute on the basis of formal citations and commentary in addition to the copies of the text. The composite book of the Minor Prophets was known at Qumran in the Hebrew order of the books, and in its integrity; the inference that lies ready to hand from Ben Sira 49:10 is thus confirmed from the manuscripts. The “Former Prophets” (Josh., Judg., Sam., and Kings) are adequately represented, and show, like a part of the Torah evidence, a text type with Septuagintal affiliations. Among the “Writings,” the Psalms occupy a privileged place. While in at least two manuscripts the canonical Psalms are combined with other hymnic or wisdom compositions, there can be no doubt at all of the existence of the Psalm collection we know, and of its attribution in a general way to David. Job, Proverbs, and four of the five Megilloth are quite adequately represented; the only really scanty evidence is that for Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles. Daniel was much used at Qumran in its part-Hebrew, part-Aramaic text, without the expansions known from the Greek, as 1Q 72 already shows.

Most of the “Apocrypha” retained as canonical in the Vulgate are not represented at Qumran; so for I-II Maccabees, Judith, Baruch, and the Wisdom of Solomon. One can hardly suppose that the Qumran group would have shown special favor to the books which were composed in Greek (II Macc. and Wis.), or to the Greek text which survives to us from elsewhere of the others. Yet a bit of the Letter of Jeremiah (Baruch 6 in the Vulgate)

¹. The Psalms total above includes a cave 4 fragment of Psalm 89 being studied by Fr. J. T. Milik, which is in addition to the otherwise exhaustive Psalms inventory published by J. A. Sanders, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVII (1965), 114-23.
did turn up in Greek, in 7Q2. The case of Tobit, of which cave 4 contains four Aramaic manuscripts and one Hebrew one, is somewhat different; it is the long text of the Greek Sinaïticus manuscript and of the Old Latin version that is supported at Qumran. Also well enough known at Qumran was the book of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus); besides the stichometric fragments of 2Q 18, there are now to be included the first half and the last two words of the acrostic poem in 51:13-30. This occurs in 11Q Ps, columns 21-22, recently published by J. A. Sanders in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, IV. It is not too much to infer that the scribe of 11Q Ps or some predecessor of his wished to count this piece among the 4050 compositions he attributes to David, along with a scattering of other Hebrew texts that are currently in nobody’s canonical list.²

These data for the history of the Canon should be weighed in the light of various other considerations. Not liking Hasmoneans, the Qumran group would not have been partial to I Maccabees even in Hebrew, were it available to them in that form. On the other hand, they had ten copies of the various sections of Enoch in Aramaic (still without the Parables, chaps. 37-71), and twelve copies of the Book of Jubilees in Hebrew. Since they studied and applied the Jubilees calendar of 364 days, they no doubt took this book which enshrined it quite seriously. Of their own sectarian compositions, we know of fourteen copies of the community rule (Serefe, or “Manual of Discipline”), ten of the Zadokite “Damascus Document,” seven of the Thanksgiving Hymns (Hodayot), seven of the War Scroll, and six of the sapiential work represented in 1Q 26. Then there are three manuscripts of the Testament of Levi in Aramaic and one of the Hebrew Testament of Nephthali. All in all, the Qumran library gives the impression of a certain selectivity, but hardly of any fine distinction between a closed canon and all other texts.

Qumran and Septuagint Studies

The fragment of 4Q LXX Numb shown in Figure 12 will serve to illustrate one contribution of the Qumran texts to our knowledge of Septuagint origins.³ The years after the second World War witnessed a lively controversy, centered in England, between two distinguished scholars now dead, Paul Kahle and Peter Katz. Kahle insisted strenuously that in view of the confusion of evidence and the variations of reading inherent in the use of the Greek Old Testament in our earliest literary sources (Philoi, the New

---

2. Study of Ben Sira in this period will be further stimulated by the portions of thirteen fragmentary columns of it, from 39:37 to 44:20, announced by Y. Yadin, Yediot, XXIX (1965), 120-2 (Hebrew), as having been recovered at Masada in a hand of the early first century B.C. The connections of the Cairo geniza fragments of Ben Sira with a presumptive Qumran prototype have been stressed again by A. A. DiLeela in Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIV (1962), 245-67, and in his The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-critical and Historical Study, The Hague, 1965.

3. The manuscript has been partially published, including this piece, by the present writer in Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, IX (1957), 155-7.
Testament, Josephus, and early Church writers), any attempt to recover a single pre-Christian rendering in its primitive form from the extant manuscripts must be an illusory quest. He proposed instead that the Greek Old Testament grew after the fashion of the Palestinian Aramaic targums, in a welter of divergent and unrelated oral traditions that afforded no fixed form of text for general acceptance before the 4th century A.D. This position, which in the United States was strongly opposed by H. M. Orlinsky, always had against it the evidence of the ancient secondary versions from the Greek namely the Old Latin, the Coptic, and the Ethiopic. It was further belied by the two pre-Christian bits of Deuteronomy in Greek which had been recovered from Egypt before the Qumran discoveries (papyrus Rylands gr. 458 and papyrus Fuad inv. 266). To these the Qumran caves have added the four LXX manuscripts of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers enumerated above, plus the Letter of Jeremiah fragment. All fit quite clearly into the textual tradition that we know from the great 4th century manuscripts and

Fig. 12. The Greek fragment of Numbers from cave 4 at Qumran designated 4Q LXX Numb. Photo courtesy The Palestine Archaeological Museum.
thus counter the sweeping theory of Kahle with tangible facts. For example, the second line of text in the fragment here illustrated contains the Greek word *projkeimenén*. To place this in Numbers 4:7 with their aid of a Septuagint concordance, it was necessary only to fit the verb form with the proper prepositional prefix ("pro"), broken away with the missing beginning of the line. Yet in the whole Greek Old Testament this is the only place where this particular turn of phrase, "(the table) lying before (the Divine Presence)" is to be found (RSV: "table of the bread of the Presence"); the rendering is hardly an obvious or necessary one. Hence we are dealing with basically only one translation, in our fragment and in the later manuscripts.

The same fragment poses problems of its own, however. The last complete word it contains is the word *phauseós*, a part of the phrase "(the lampstand) of the lighting" in Numbers 4:9, where the later Greek tradition regularly reads "the light-giving lampstand" (RSV: "the lampstand for the light"). Now it happens that the Greek word in our fragment also occurs in Genesis 1:14-15 in connection with the same Hebrew word as in the Numbers passage. One way or another, it seems clear that the Septuagint text has at this point undergone a deliberate retouching of some sort.

Rather than from the Qumran texts, however, the key to a large part of the confusion in Septuagint textual evidence and the history of its transmission has come from a Greek Minor Prophets manuscript almost certainly from the Wadi Khabra, published by D. Barthélemy, O.P. In this manuscript, which he dates from the second half of the first century A.D., Barthélemy has identified a reworked form of the LXX translation of the Minor Prophets done in Palestine in accord with developing rabbinic hermeneutical principles, with the purpose of bringing the Greek text more closely into line with the Hebrew manuscripts in use there in the early first century A.D. These Hebrew manuscripts were still not completely standardized, as in the consonants of the now received Masoretic text, but they stood closer to the Masoretic text than did the Hebrew prototype of the original Alexandrian Septuagint for these books.

This early reworking of the Greek Old Testament text does not stand alone. In the Minor Prophets tradition, Barthélemy has been able to equate it with the seventh column, or *quinta editio* (V*α*), of Origen's Hexapla; with a series of approximations to the Hebrew in the Sahidic Coptic secondary version from the Greek, and in the Freer codex in Greek; and with the citations in Justin Martyr in the mid-2nd century A.D. The recension has certain fixed characteristics which make it possible to go further; most obvious, though only one of a whole complex of similar features, is the recurrent rendering

---

of the Hebrew particle gēm by kaige in Greek. Here Barthélemy was able to build on earlier studies of H. St. J. Thackery in the Greek books of Kingdoms (Samuel-Kings), and also to trace the same recension through a number of other Old Testament books. To summarize the results of this, the recension in question includes in its scope the later supplements to the short LXX texts of Job and Jeremiah, the "Theodotion" text of Daniel, the "Septuagint" renderings of Lamentations and (probably) Ruth, the text of II Samuel to I Kings 2:11 and of I Kings 22 and all of II Kings in the "Septuagint" column of Origen's Hexapla and in our printed Bibles. This recension, whose exact limits remain to be marked out, Barthélemy then equates with the work of "Theodotion," whom he situates in A.D. 30-50 and identifies with the Jonathan ben Uzziel of Jewish targumic and talmudic tradition.

Prescinding from the identification of "Theodotion" with Jonathan, the relationships described and the insights they afford do much to relieve Septuagint studies of certain continual embarrassments. It appears to be the "Theodotion" form of Daniel that is cited in the New Testament and by Clement of Rome; if so, something of what has been ascribed to the 2nd century personage Theodotion was already extant in the preceding century. Barthélemy's demonstration of the existence of an extensive work of revision of the Greek text in first century Palestine removes this anomaly. In addition, the relationship between "Theodotion" and Aquila (ca. 135 A.D.) is set straight, because Barthélemy can show that Aquila's work can show that Aquila's work depends on this "Theodotionic" revision, which it supplements, refines, and in the end, smothers with labored and rigidly applied devices.

Once the concept of widespread recensional activity in the Greek Old Testament text in Palestine by the first century A.D. is accepted, ramifications of it are not difficult to find. The secondary recension of the Greek Sirach, best known from codex 248 and the Old Latin, and now available for intensive study in J. Ziegler's critical edition of the book, is quoted in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Sir. 12:1 at Did. i:6, see Biblica LXIV (1963), 533-536); hence this is basically a first century recension. The variant Greek text of Proverbs 2:21 is quoted by Clement of Rome (I Clem. xiv:4); thus the reworked form of the first nine chapters of the Greek Proverbs is a product of the same early period. And in Ezekiel, J. Ziegler has shown that papyrus 967 (the Beatty-Scheide manuscript) displays a pre-Origen, first century A.D. recensional treatment of the text. In fine, instead of being at the beginnings of a "critical" reworking of the Greek text on the basis of the Hebrew, Origen comes near the end of the process, which was otherwise an entirely Jewish undertaking, in which Aquila built on "Theodotion," which itself built on earlier materials.

The nature of those earlier materials will take us back to the evidence afforded by the Hebrew manuscripts of Qumran. One last reflection on the Greek Numbers fragment seems necessary, however. It has been seen by good Greek paleographers, and dated tentatively at about the turn of the era, too early, seemingly, for Barthélemy's Jonathan ben Uzziel personage, whom he puts between 30 and 50 A.D. Yet the retouchings in the Greek text of Numbers in this fragment are already such as to suggest the Greek "Theodotionic" reviser. There are other reasons, we shall see, for placing the origins of revision work on the Greek text in Palestine prior to the Christian era; and it seems possible that Barthélemy puts his "Theodotionic" reviser slightly too late.

**Greek Bible Revision in Palestine before the Christian Era**

The key to the next step, forward in research, but backward in time, lies in the text of Samuel. We have noticed that there was a revision of its Greek text, part of the undertaking ascribed to Theodotion, which dates in fact from about the turn of the era. Was this revision founded, as we might offhand expect, on a translation made in Egypt in about the 3rd century B.C.? Besides the "Theodotionic" materials isolated by Thackeray and dated for us by Barthélemy's researches, there exists still another body of evidence for the Greek text of Samuel which has preoccupied scholars for a long time, and which has seemed inconsistent with any such Egyptian explanation. This is the text which, in biblical manuscripts is associated with Syrian sources and the memory of Lucian of Antioch (died A.D. 312). It cannot be of 4th century A.D. date because, as A. Mez pointed out in 1895, it is substantially the text of Samuel used by Josephus Flavius before A.D. 94. Barthélemy has been able to show that for those parts of Samuel and Kings (see above) in which the "Theodotionic" recension has invaded the general stream of Septuagint transmission through its use by Origen in the 5th column of his Hexapla, the adjoining material in the 6th column, an older text that formed the basis for the "Theodotionic" one, is in fact the same text that appears in the Lucianic manuscripts and in Josephus.

It is at this point that the Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran cave 4 begin to assume their full importance. Prof. F. M. Cross, Jr., has followed upon Barthélemy's publication with a study which has as only the first of its merits the fact that it specifies the exact nature of this "Lucianic" text of Samuel in Greek. From an examination of the various Greek texts in the light of his Hebrew evidence, Cross is able to show that the "Lucianic" text also is a reworking of a still older Greek text, with the purpose of bringing it
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into line with the state of the Hebrew text of Samuel in Palestine itself, perhaps toward the end of the 2nd, and certainly in the first century B.C. Thus besides a proto-Theodotion, we now have a proto-Lucian.

There are, then, three important stages of transmission of the text of Samuel (and Kings) in Greek, all three of them prior to the fixing of the Hebrew tradition with the received consonantal text near the end of the first cent. A.D. These are:

1. The earliest Alexandrian rendering, largely preserved for us in codex B, but only for the sections I Samuel 1:1—II Samuel 11:1 and I Kings 2:12—I Kings 21:43. This may be supposed, with H. St. J. Thackeray, to be the full extent of this first translation; it is certainly all that is extant.

2. The “proto-Lucianic” revision from the Hebrew, of the 2nd-first centuries B.C., done in Palestine, and including all of Samuel-Kings. This is found especially in the minuscule manuscripts b, o, c, e, in Josephus, and partly in the 6th column materials from Origen’s Hexapla.

3. The “proto-Theodotionic” recension of the first century A.D., which regularly builds on “proto-Lucian” and brings it much closer to what we now know as the Masoretic type of Hebrew text, though the two forms are by no means identical.

In the reconstructed “Septuagint” text of his Hexapla, Origen employed the first version of Samuel-Kings where it existed, and where it did not, he chose the third. Thus the nature and date of the second, or proto-Lucianic recension became obscured, and it took on for the future the character of a missing link, whose restoration to its proper place in the sequence makes a true historical perspective on the development of the Greek text possible for the first time. Since the same proto-Lucianic revision has survived to us also in our evidence for Exodus through Deuteronomy in Greek, where once again its date and significance have never been clear, it can be but small wonder that a scholar of Kahle’s calibre should have despaired of any unraveling of the resultant web. Cross, in his critique of Barthélemy, holds to a real function for the Theodotion of ca. A.D. 180, and for Lucian at the beginning of the 4th century. One proximate task in Septuagint studies, however, would seem to be the endeavor to ascertain how much of the function normally attributed to these worthies was already performed for them in the centuries before they were born, and with the priorities between them reversed.

**Qumran and the Transmission of the Hebrew Text**

In this matter, once again, the books of Samuel play a crucial role; and it is through the same article of Cross that new perspectives on their
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7. There is a transposition here; II Kings 20 and 21 are given in the Greek in the reverse order, hence the 43 verses for what is actually Masoretic text II Kings 20.

Hebrew text become available. The Qumran cave 4 evidence for Samuel is copious (in 4Q Sam\textsuperscript{a}; see fig. 13), is in part early (4Q Sam\textsuperscript{b}, end of the 3rd century B.C.), and there exist both in Hebrew and in Greek substantial bodies of related material against which to test it. To present only the results, Cross finds in the books of Samuel a chain of evidence for a distinctive Palestinian text type, the archetype to which he would place in the 5th century B.C. This line of transmission is witnessed to by the Chronicler (4th century B.C.), by 4Q Sam\textsuperscript{b} (3rd century B.C.), by 4Q Sam\textsuperscript{a} jointly with the proto-Lucianic Septuagint (first century B.C.), and finally by Josephus (at the end of the first century A.D.). It is the type of text to which, in its Lucianic manuscript witnesses, J. Wellhausen appealed in
1871 as a means of healing, if possible, the defects in the Masoretic tradition. For with all due respect to the scholars who would have it otherwise, it has long been held by serious students of Samuel that in their case the Masoretic text presents us with a truncated text with notable omissions, both deliberate and accidental; it is a text that is much below the standard of excellence observable in the received text of other Old Testament books.

Over against this early Palestinian text with its five centuries of traceable history, Cross sets a text that would have branched off as a local text in Egypt, not later than the 4th century B.C.; from this is derived the Old Greek rendering preserved to us in codex B as far as II Samuel 11:1 inclusive, where it stops. More sharply divergent from the Palestinian form of earlier times is the first century A.D. text reflected in the proto-Theodotionic materials; in general the Hebrew they suppose may be labeled proto-Masoretic. Close to, but not identical with this is our extant Masoretic text.

Faced with the problem of where the two latter texts, seemingly intrusive in Palestine, may have had their origin, Cross recalls that the rather frequent loss by homoioteleuton (similarity of ending) which the Masoretic text of Samuel manifests is suggestive of transmission in comparative isolation; and given the date of the appearance, first of proto-Theodotion and then of the Masoretic text form, he refers them "back to a local text preserved in Babylon in the fourth-second centuries B.C., reintroduced into Jerusalem in the Hasmonean or Herodian period" (p. 297). Some such solution does appear to be demanded by the data at hand.

Moving on from the books of Samuel, one can admit, with Cross, that the study of the Hagiographa and the Minor Prophets in the Qumran cave 4 materials is not at the point where clear inferences can be drawn regarding early textual families in these books. To quote him again, "The evidence for textual families for the time being is restricted largely to the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets, and the book of Jeremiah. Study has been directed first of all to those books whose texts are dramatic in their variety, and whose Greek versions are relatively trustworthy" (p. 286). The reflection is perhaps not out of place, that the texts which are dramatic in their variety (i.e., part Septuagintal, part Palestino-Samaritan, part proto-Masoretic) are in most cases those of the very books whose authority is longest and most firmly fixed. Genesis is an exception; its Qumran text is, says Cross, already allied with the textus receptus.

The present writer has had occasion to work on half a dozen Torah manuscripts from Qumran cave 4, five of them in the old paleo-Hebrew script and the sixth a separate copy of Deuteronomy 32. This last, with the Qumran evidence for Septuagintal readings in Hebrew in all parts of the Song of Moses, has been discussed by both Cross and myself before now. Two of
the others are too limited in scope for a good text sampling; and a not very careful Deuteronomy had best be considered with the large number of manuscripts of the book being studied by Cross. That leaves two copies of Exodus; the “Samaritan” type manuscript (4Q paleoExm; see fig. 14) already a number
of times described, and 4Q paleoEx₁, a manuscript in a tiny hand of perhaps
the beginning of the first century B.C. This last is quite near to the received
text, with only slight concessions to the tendency towards expanded readings
for the sake of clarity and smoothness.

For the books from Exodus through Deuteronomy, what emerges thus
far when the 4Q manuscripts are placed in the context of the Samaritan
recension, the Old Greek, the proto-Lucianic Greek, which makes itself felt
also in these books, and finally of the Masoretic text, is that in some degree
all these witnesses (the Old Greek least, the Samaritan text type most) except
the Masoretic text give evidence of a continuous expansionist tendency
in text transmission in pre-Christian Palestine. This expansionist feature in­
volves syntactical smoothing, harmonization of related passages, borrowings
from one section or one book to another of supplementary materials, and
sometimes an expanded orthography. A comparison of the short form of Jer­
miah, known now from its appearance in 4Q Jerᵇ as well as from the Septu­
agint, with the fuller Masoretic form of the book suggests that the editing
of the latter consisted largely of the application, presumably in Palestine,
of similar expansionist techniques to the shorter text.

The fullest instance of the expansionist technique is, of course, the
“Samaritan” recension of the Torah. This was complete in all its essentials
by the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. at the latest, as 4Q paleoExᵐ
(early in that century) shows. As Cross, following W. F. Albright, has re­
peatedly emphasized, the actual branching off of the Samaritan sectarian
textual tradition, as such, from this developing Palestinian type does not
antedate the period of John Hyrcanus I toward the end of that same century.
In the standard Hebrew text of Exodus 36-39 we have what may be one of
the earliest manifestations of this expansionist mentality, and one which,
apart from the Greek tradition, has won universal acceptance. Whatever
God tells Moses to have done, it must be said explicitly that the Israelites
actually did at Moses’ bidding, normally in the same order and in the same
detail; this is the rationale for the chapters in question.

Of the tendency for a sacred text transmitted in Palestine in the period
between the Exile and the first century A.D. to grow by accretion and re­
working on the basis of its own integral logic, so that the form becomes ex­
panded but the substance remains the same, we may see other instances in
the editorial process that has given us the book of Ezekiel, in the complete
Qumran Hebrew scroll of Isaiah (1Q Isᵃ) and, independently, in the Septu­
agint form of that prophet. The underlying attitude is one of explicit rever-
ence for a text regarded as sacred, an attitude of explaining (as we would put it) the Bible by the Bible in the very transmission of the text itself; but it is not the attitude of stern adherence to an unalterable Hebrew consonantal text that we meet with regularly after A.D. 70.

If this be a fair estimate of the evidence, what of the sound, tightly organized, unexpanded text of the Torah that stands in our Bibles? How has it not (except perhaps for the chapters of Exodus noted above) undergone the kind of development present in varying degrees in our other witnesses? Cross, in the article referred to, would root the Masoretic text of the Torah in a conservative Babylonian tradition, as he does for the books of Samuel. In any case, the received Hebrew text of the Torah appears again as an exceptional text, but this time, as an exceptionally good text.

With the recent publication of the Psalms scroll 11Q Ps and the non-Biblical materials which it contains, there will undoubtedly be a period of renewed speculation as to how far we can see the Psalter as a closed collection in the days of the Qumran community. Fr. J. Starcky is about to publish in the *Revue biblique* a collection of three non-biblical hymns, one of which is the "Apostrophe to Zion" of the cave 11 Psalter. Since these have been established as being part of a manuscript (4Q Ps) already known for the canonical Psalms 22, 107, and 109, the question will arise again there. With no special desire to press for an overly conservative answer to the question, the present writer will close this interim report by mentioning three small facts that seem to him to indicate dependence of the cave 11 Psalter on the complete collection of Psalms as we know it. One is that Psalm 133, which is detached from the group of "Songs of Ascents" in 11Q Ps, still retains the same title as the other Psalms of this group. A second is that Psalms 151A and B, compositions written for David on the basis of the text of Samuel, appear after the prose narrative about all David's compositions in the cave 11 collection (along with Pss. 140, 134, which in a reshuffling of the order may simply have been skipped at some earlier place). The third is that Psalm 146 stands in columns [i] -ii in 11Q Ps, and Psalm 145 in cols. xvi-xvii; yet after the 11Q text of Psalm 146:9 there stands an extra line based on Psalm 145:9 and 12.
The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text*

F. M. CROSS, Jr.

Harvard University

I.

The most striking feature of the biblical manuscripts found in the vicinity of Qumrân is the diversity of their textual traditions. We refer, not to the multiplicity of individual variant readings within manuscripts nor to the variety of orthographic traditions in which copies of biblical works are inscribed, but to the plurality of distinct text types preserved.¹

This plurality of textual families was not immediately manifest owing to the happenstance of discovery which directed attention first to the text of Isaiah at Qumrân. The two great scrolls from Cave I, together with the dozen or so fragmentary scrolls of Isaiah from Cave IV, proved on careful analysis to belong precisely to the Proto-Massoretic tradition, that is to the textual family from

* Address delivered on the occasion of the dedication of The Shrine of the Book, April 21, 1965.
which our received text derived. The text of Isaiah at Qumrân gave an important and unambiguous witness to the antiquity of the Proto-Massoretic tradition, and the several manuscripts illustrated vividly the range of variation and development within a textual family at home in Palestine in the last two centuries of the Second Commonwealth.

Non-traditional text types were first recognized when study was directed to the biblical manuscripts of Cave IV. An excellent example is the text of Jeremiah. A Hasmonaean manuscript, 4QJer, contains the so-called short recension of Jeremiah, a text type identical with that which underlies the Old Greek (Septuagint) translation. The latter is about one-eighth shorter than the received text. The Proto-Massoretic family is also represented at Qumrân, especially well in 4QJer, a manuscript from ca. 200 B.C. Study of the two textual traditions in the light of the new data makes clear that the Proto-Massoretic text was expansionist, and settles an old controversy. Those who have defended the originality of the traditional text by arguing that the Greek translator abbreviated the Hebrew text before him are proved wrong. The Septuagint faithfully reflects a conservative Hebrew textual family. On the contrary, the Proto-Massoretic and Massoretic family is marked by editorial reworking and conflation, the secondary filling out of names and epithets, expansion from parallel passages, and even glosses from biblical passages outside Jeremiah.


3 On the Palestinian origin of the Proto-Massoretic text of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and certain other books, see below.

4 A fragment of the poorly preserved manuscript is cited in Cross: ALQ, p. 187, n. 38.

5 On the script and date of this manuscript, see Cross: The Development of the Jewish Scripts, The Bible and the Ancient Near East, Fig. 1, line 5, and pp. 136-160. On the orthography of this manuscript, see D. N. Freedman: The Massoretic Text and the Qumrân Scrolls, A Study in Orthography, Textus 2 (1962), pp. 87-102.

6 For detailed documentation, see the forthcoming Harvard dissertation on the two recensions of Jeremiah by Mr. J. G. Janzen. As instances of glosses from outside Jeremiah, he cites Jer. 28:16, 29:32, and 48:45-6 (all omitted in the Old Greek). In analyzing several categories of conflation in the
The text of Samuel found in three manuscripts from Cave IV is non-Mas­
nersetic. 4QSama, an extensively-preserved manuscript of ca. 50-25 B.C., contains a text-type closely related to the Vorlage of the Septuagint. Its precise textual relationships can be defined even more narrowly. It is allied with the text of Samuel used by the Chronicler about 400 B.C. It is even more closely allied to the Greek text of Samuel used by Josephus, and surviving in a substratum of the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint. In short, its textual family is Palestinian, and corresponds to the Greek recension usually called Proto-Lucianic. 9

4QSamb, written by the same scribe who copied the Sérek Hay-yábad (1QS), preserves the same Palestinian text-type. The archaic manuscript of Samuel from Cave IV (4QSamc), dating from the third century B.C.,10 belongs to an early stage of this Palestinian tradition. Divergent textual families are represented also in the Pentateuch. A palaeo-
Hebrew manuscript of Exodus (4QpalaeoExm),11 and a Herodian scroll of Numbers (4QNumb)12 present a textual tradition closely allied to the Samaritan, a Palestinian text-form characterized by wide-spread glosses, expansions from parallel passages, and like editorial activity.13 We note that these textual traits of the Proto-Samaritan family are remarkably similar to those of the Proto-Massoretic (and Massoretic) text of such books as Jeremiah described above, and Isaiah, to be discussed below. In contrast to these expansionistic texts, however, the Massoretic text of the Pentateuch was remarkably short and conservative. One other manuscript may be cited to illustrate these deviant textual families found at Qumrán: 4QExa.14 This Herodian exemplar stands

Massoretic tradition, Janzen concludes that 'in the number of expansions from parallel passages [in Jeremiah], M[assoretic] exceeds G[reek] by a ratio of 6:1'.

7 On the dating, see Cross: The Development of the Jewish Scripts, Fig. 2, line 3, and pp. 166-181.
10 Cf. Cross: The Oldest Manuscript from Qumrán, JBL 74 (1955), pp. 147-172; and The Development of the Jewish Scripts, pp. 145-158, and Fig. 1, line 4.
11 Parts of this manuscript, formerly labeled 4QExab, were published by P. W. Skehan: Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran, JBL 74 (1955), pp. 182-187.
12 See provisionally, Cross: HTR 57 (1964), p. 287 and n. 27.
14 See provisionally the fragment published in ALQ², Pl. opposite p. 141, and p. 184, n. 31.
very close to the Hebrew text used in Egypt by the Greek translator of the Septuagint.  

II.

The plurality of textual types from the Judean Desert fall into distinct families limited in number. Their diversity is not fluid or chaotic but conforms to a clear and simple pattern. In the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, all textual traditions known from Qumrân and from the southern Judean Desert belong to three families. In the Latter Prophets only two families are extant. Moreover, none of these text-types is unknown. They have left their witnesses in textual traditions available before the discovery of the caves of Qumrân, in the received text, in the Septuagint and its recensions, in apocryphal Jewish works, in the New Testament, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and in Josephus.

The Hebrew textual families have left clearest traces in the Greek Bible. We are able to trace a series of as many as three stages in the recensional history of the Septuagint before the emergence of the Massoretic text. The Old Greek preserves a non-traditional text-type which is represented at Qumrân, for example, by 4QEx\textsuperscript{a} and especially 4QJer\textsuperscript{b}. In the second or first century B.C., the Septuagint was revised in Palestine to conform to a Hebrew text then current, represented at Qumrân by the manuscripts of Samuel from Cave IV; this is the Proto-Lucianic recension of the Greek Bible best known, perhaps, from Josephus, and the special readings of a small group of Greek witnesses. No

\textsuperscript{15} 4QEx\textsuperscript{a} also exhibits readings which are clearly 'Palestinian,' however, and we may observe that the Old Palestinian text of Exodus (i.e., the text of the fourth-third centuries B.C.) stood far closer to the Vorlage of the Septuagint than to the Samaritan text (sensu stricto). This is to be expected, however, if we are correct in describing the Egyptian text as a branch of the Old Palestinian, and if the recent analysis of Waltke is sound, showing that the Samaritan recension was influenced secondarily by the developed Massoretic tradition.

\textsuperscript{16} Within a textual family, there is, of course, a considerable range of minor variation, especially in texts of an expansionist character. An example of 'minor variations' are those found in certain Palestinian texts owing to the introduction of new, so-called plene orthographic style in the Maccabaean and Hasmonaean periods, an innovation that affected only a part of the texts in this tradition (see below).

\textsuperscript{17} The clearest witness to the Proto-Lucianic text actually is to be found in the sixth column of the Hexapla to 2 Sam.11:2-1; Kgs.2:11 (normally Theodotionic elsewhere). It is found as the substratum of the Lucianic Recension (hence 'Proto-Lucian') of Samuel-Kings, in the cursive boc\textsubscript{en}, in Joshua-Judges in the groups K gn dpt, and more faintly in the Pentateuch in the families gn dpt and (in Deuteronomy) o. In the Former Prophets, especially, the Old Latin also is often a witness to the Proto-Lucianic recension. See the discussion with references to the literature in the writer's paper in \textit{HTR} 57 (1964), pp. 292-297.
later than the beginning of the first century A.D., portions of the Greek Bible were revised a second time, this time to the Proto-Massoretic text. This Greek recension, called Proto-Theodotian or καίγε, is extensively preserved in a manuscript of the Minor Prophets from the Nahal Hever. In Jeremiah its text-type is preserved in Hebrew in 4QJer, in Greek in the supplementary additions to the Old Greek. In Samuel-Kings it has replaced the Old Greek in most witnesses in the section II Samuel 11:2-I Kings 2:11 and in II Kings. These three stages in the history of the Greek Bible, the Old Greek, the Proto-Lucianic recension, and the καίγε recension reflect in turn the three families of the Hebrew text isolated in the finds at Qumrân. If one distinguished the fully developed Massoretic text from the Proto-Massoretic, a fourth stage may be discerned, represented by the Hebrew text-type found, for example, at Murabba'at and Maṣada, reflected in Greek in the revision of the καίγε recension prepared by Aquila in ca. 130 A.D.

III.

Any reconstruction of the history of the biblical text before the establishment of the traditional text in the first century A.D., must comprehend this evidence: the plurality of text-types, the limited number of distinct textual families, and the homogeneity of each of these textual families over several centuries of time. We are required by these data, it seems to me, to recognize the existence of local texts which developed in the main centers of Jewish life in the Persian and Hellenistic age.

---

18 This manuscript has now been published by D. Barthélemy: *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, Leiden, 1963.
20 It need scarcely be said that these stages are not found for every book in the Hebrew Bible, either in Hebrew or Greek, and in the case of many books, especially those which became canonical late, never existed.
21 A theory of local texts was adumbrated by W. F. Albright in his study, *New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible*, *BASOR* 140 (1955), pp. 27-33. Against Albright, we should argue, however, that the local textual families in questions are not properly called 'recensions'. They are the product of natural growth or development in the process of scribal transmission, not of conscious or controlled textual recension. The steady accumulation of evidence from the Desert of Judah has enabled us to elaborate a 'general theory' and to document it in considerable detail. See the chapter on The Old Testament at Qumrân in *ALQ*, and The History of the Biblical Text in *HTR* 57 (1964), pp. 281-299. A similar approach is presented in the forthcoming article of P.W. Skehan on Bible. Texts and Versions in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, and in the Harvard dissertation of J. D. Shenkel: *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, 1964.
We may sketch the history of the local texts as follows. Three textual families appear to have developed slowly between the fifth and first centuries B.C., in Palestine, in Egypt, and in a third locality, presumably Babylon. The Palestinian family is characterized by conflation, glosses, synoptic additions and other evidences of intense scribal activity, and can be defined as 'expansionistic'. The Egyptian text-type is often but not always a full text. In the Pentateuch, for example, it has not suffered the extensive synoptic additions which mark the late Palestinian text, but is not so short or pristine as the third or Babylonian family. The Egyptian and Palestinian families are closely related. Early exemplars of the Palestinian text in the Former Prophets, and Pentateuchal texts which reflect an early stage of the Palestinian tradition, so nearly merge with the Egyptian, that we are warranted in describing the Egyptian text-type as a branch of the Old Palestinian family. The Babylonian text-type when extant is a short text. Thus far it is known only in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. In the Pentateuch it is a conservative, often pristine text, which shows relatively little expansion, and a few traces of revision and modernizing. In the books of Samuel, on the contrary, it is a poor text, marked by extensive haplography and corruption. While it is not expansionistic, it is normally inferior to the Old Palestinian tradition preserved in 4QSam, and often to the Egyptian despite the more conflate traits of the latter. It is not without significance that the oldest manuscripts from Qumrân are uniformly of the Palestinian family, or rarely, of Egyptian provenience. The first appearance of what we term the Babylonian text-type appears in the Former Prophets in the Proto-Theodotionic (καίγε) recension of the Greek Bible, and at Qumrân not at all. The evidence is more complex in the Pentateuch, but I am now inclined to believe that genuine exemplars of the Babylonian text-form at Qumrân are exceedingly rare, and late in date.

The grounds for the localization of these textual families are both theoretical and specific. In the textual criticism of ancient works, it is an axiom that texts which develop over a long span of time in geographical isolation tend to

\[22\] Cf. the conclusions reached by the writer in his paper. The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân, pp. 165-172. A study of an additional column of this text will be published shortly.

\[23\] Several old manuscripts of Pentateuchal books have escaped the severe reworking that produced the late Palestinian or Proto-Samaritan text, e.g., the early Hasmonaean text of Genesis-Exodus (\(4Q\) Gen = 4Q Ex). However, in key readings these manuscripts sometimes display Palestinian or Egyptian readings. Perhaps their assignment to a textual family should be left sub judice. Earlier the writer had assigned them to the Proto-Massortic tradition.
develop special characteristics, corrupt or secondary readings, haplographies and expansions, recalculated numbers and chronologies, etc., as well as preserving a pattern of primitive readings. These traits and peculiarities are transmitted producing series of filiated readings which distinguish the family. In turn, when textual families are detected, each with a particular series of special readings or traits, it must be postulated that such textual families arose in separate localities, or in any case, in complete isolation. Distinct textual families take centuries to develop but are fragile creations. When manuscripts stemming from different textual traditions come into contact, the result is their dissolution into a mixed text, or the precipitation of textual crisis which results in recensional activity, and often in the fixing of a uniform or standard text.

Our new evidence for Hebrew textual families yields, on examination, specific grounds for assigning each tradition to a certain locality, to Egypt, to Palestine, and to Babylon. The Hebrew text-type which was used by the Alexandrian translators of the Septuagint may be attributed to Egypt. Supporting such an attribution is not merely the provenience of the Old Greek text. W. F. Albright has collected evidence of pre-Septuagintal Egyptian influence on the text of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets.\(^{24}\) We have noted above that frequently the Egyptian text-type is closely allied with the Palestinian family, precisely the relationship which might have been posited of an Egyptian local text on *a priori* grounds. It should be said, however, that the range of agreement between the Egyptian and Palestinian text fluctuates rather widely in different biblical books. In the Pentateuch it is only in the earlier stages of the Palestinian text that there is a real convergence of the two traditions, suggesting that the Egyptian text separated relatively early, no later than the fourth century B.C., from the main Palestinian stream. In Samuel, the two families are much more closely related, suggesting that the archetype of the Egyptian text split off no earlier than the fourth century. In Jeremiah, on the other hand, the Egyptian text is to the farthest degree unrelated, requiring a special explanation, namely that the text of Jeremiah at home in Egypt derived from a time near or before the beginning of the special development of the Palestinian family, thus in the fifth or even the sixth century B.C. In Isaiah, or in certain of the later books, where the Egyptian tradition is virtually identical with the Palestinian, we are led to conclude that the Hebrew text underlying the Old

---

\(^{24}\) See his discussion in *BASOR* 140 (1955), pp. 30-33.
Greek separated from the Palestinian quite late, or indeed that a Palestinian
Hebrew manuscript was used for the Greek translation.

By far the majority of the Hebrew witnesses from Qumrân belong to the
Palestinian family. The evidence for the identification of the Palestinian family
is most easily delineated in Samuel. The three manuscripts of Samuel from
Cave IV, while not directly filiated, contain a single textual tradition, known
at Qumrân as early as the third century (4QSam\(^\text{b}\)), the early first century B.C.,
(4QSam\(^\text{c}\)), and in the late first century B.C., (4QSam\(^\text{a}\)). The earliest distinctive
witness to a text of the type of these manuscripts is found in the Chronicler.
As has been shown elsewhere, the Chronicler, shortly after 400 B.C., cited a
text of Samuel which stands in close agreement with the manuscripts of Qum­
rân, but, as is well known, sharply diverges from the received text.\(^\text{25}\) In the
second or early first century B.C., the same Palestinian text-form was used to
revise the Septuagint: the Proto-Lucianic recension. Finally Josephus at the end
of the first century A.D., made use of this Palestinian Greek recension in writing
his Antiquities. The Proto-Massoretic tradition appears in no witness to the
text of Samuel before the early first century A.D., and then in the second
Palestinian recension of the Septuagint, 'Proto-Theodotion.' In the Pentateuch,
the evidence is closely parallel. It has been observed that in the Chronicler's
citations from the Pentateuch, his text stands closer to the Samaritan recension
than to the Massoretic.\(^\text{26}\) There can be little doubt, I believe, that he utilized
the prevailing Palestinian text. At Qumrân two stages of the Palestinian text
are represented, an early form and the Proto-Samaritan form, the former
standing closer to the Vorlage of the Septuagint, the latter more expansive
including long synoptic interpolations found also in the Samaritan Pentateuch.
The Samaritan Pentateuch, as we have shown elsewhere, derives from the
Palestinian family, separating from the common Palestinian not earlier than the
Hasmonaean era.\(^\text{27}\) Other witnesses to this non-traditional, Palestinian textual
family are scattered through Jewish apocryphal works and the New Testament.
An especially useful example is the book of Jubilees. In its scriptural cita-

\(^{25}\) See Cross: ALQ\(^2\), pp. 188 f. and n. 40a; HTR 57 (1964), pp. 292-297; and the forthcoming paper
\(^{26}\) Cf. G. Gerleman: Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament, Lund, 1948, pp. 9-12, and especially
S. Talmon: op. cit. (above, n. 13), pp. 146-150.
\(^{27}\) See Cross: The Development of the Jewish Scripts, p. 189, n. 4; and the Harvard dissertation of
J.D. Purvis: The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect, 1964, shortly to be
published in monograph form; and Cross: HTR 59 (1966), pp. 201-211.
tions,\textsuperscript{28} it regularly sides with the Septuagint and the Samaritan (most often with the former), and in its readings in common with the Massoretic text, it is regularly joined by the Samaritan. This is, of course, precisely the pattern of the earlier forms of the Palestinian text. Charles in his analysis of the biblical text used by the author of Jubilees notes also its frequent alignment with the Syriac Bible.\textsuperscript{29} This datum is also significant since in the Former Prophets and in the Pentateuch, the Syriac is often a witness to Palestinian readings.

A word may be said about the orthography and script used in manuscripts of the Palestinian textual family.

Hasmonaean and Herodian exemplars of the Palestinian family often exhibit a \textit{plene} style of orthography, far fuller than that we are accustomed to in the Massoretic text. The introduction of this new style\textsuperscript{30} began sporadically in the third century, but was developed systematically in the Maccabaean era, and reached its most extreme form in the Hasmonaean age. The extreme, or baroque phase of the style is often associated with archaizing or, most often, pseudo-archaic grammatical forms. The best known text in this style is, of course, the great Isaiah scroll (lQIs\textsuperscript{a}). The extreme form of the style is, however, relatively rare. In its milder, dominant form, it appears regularly in texts inscribed in the Palaeo-Hebrew script, and in modified form is the style surviving in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The emergence of the style is most likely to be attributed to the literary activity which attended the nationalistic revival of the Maccabaean Age.

All manuscripts, so far as I am aware, inscribed in the new Palestinian orthography contain a text-type which on other grounds must be called Palestinian.\textsuperscript{31} The same is true of manuscripts written in the Palaeo-Hebrew character. Script and orthography thus may be useful clues in assigning texts to the Palestinian family. Of course, the great majority of our witnesses to the Palestinian text-form are not written in Palaeo-Hebrew script, and many in every period are inscribed, not in the new, or Maccabaean style but, in a more archaic, or archaizing orthography. We may cite again the Palestinian texts of the three

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{30} Its primary trait is the use of \textit{waw} to mark \textit{d} derived from etymological \textit{d}. Earlier orthographies restricted the use of \textit{waw} to signify \textit{u}, and later \textit{d} derived from the diphthong \textit{-aw}. See Cross and Freedman: Early Hebrew Orthography, New Haven, 1952, pp. 69 f.; and D. N. Freedman: Textus 2 (1962), pp. 87-102.
\textsuperscript{31} We cannot agree with the view of W. F. Albright: BASOR 140 (1955), pp. 29 f., that the text of lQIs\textsuperscript{a} is Babylonian.
Samuel manuscripts from Cave IV. 4QSamb, the archaic Samuel, is written in an orthography which is not only defective, but which has no parallel after the fourth century B.C. Long-ð is marked by waw only when it derives ethmologically from the diphthong -aw.\textsuperscript{32} Massoretic orthography is typologically much more developed and hence later. 4QSamc is inscribed in the baroque new style, replete with such forms as hw'h and mw'dh. 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, from the early Herodian period is written in the standard form of the new orthography.

The third or Babylonian textual family cannot be localized on the basis of direct evidence. We have described its traits which are very different from those of the Palestinian and Egyptian textual families, and have noted that it has appeared so far only in the Pentateuch and in the Former Prophets, and then only in relatively late witnesses. Texts of this family are never found inscribed either in Palaeo-Hebrew script or in the new orthography developed in Palestine in the Maccabean Era. Its orthographic tradition is not especially early, however, deriving in the main from orthographic usage which was first established in the third century B.C., and which continued to be widely used until the end of the Second Commonwealth.

The assignment of the family to Babylon rests on several lines of argument. It is a distinctive text-type, distant from both the Egyptian and Palestinian families. It must have arisen in isolation. On the one hand it cannot have arisen in a late eclectic recension to judge from the pattern of its superior readings (especially in the Pentateuch). This would be too much to ask of the text-critical skills of the Rabbis. On the other hand, it is not a text drawn from a single or several old manuscripts, so archaic as to escape or predate the development of the Palestinian and Egyptian families. It is a text-type with a long independent history to judge from its special set of secondary readings (especially in Samuel-Kings).\textsuperscript{33} Since we know well the textual families of Palestine and Egypt, we must look elsewhere for its locale, most naturally to Babylon. Further, examination of the Palestinian witnesses to the text at Qumrân and in citations in Palestinian Jewish literature in no way prepares us for the sudden

\textsuperscript{32} Occasionally very archaic orthographic practices appear in 4QSamb. An example is the 'pre-Exilic' use of he for the 3.m.s. suffix -ð (<-uh <uhu), found in the following reading in 1 Sam. 20:38: 4\textit{imh}, LXX τοῦ πρι乳业ρίου αὐτοῦ, revised in MT to \textit{bn}r.

\textsuperscript{33} James D. Shenkel has shown (see above, n. 21) that in one section of the chronology of the Kingdom, the Egyptian and Palestinian tradition is based on one set of calculations, the Massoretic and Proto-Massoretic on another, the latter demonstrably secondary. The secondary system first appears in Kings in the καλύα recension, in our extant witnesses.
emergence of this text-type as a significant, much less dominant or standard text. Its choice in the time of Hillel as the textual base of a new revision of the Septuagint is the first hint of its coming importance. By the end of the first century A.D., it has become dominant, or in any case standard, to judge from its exclusive use in the texts from Maşada, Murabbacât, and the Nahal Ḥever. The simplest explanation of these data, it seems to me, is found in placing the development of this text-type in Babylon during the interval between the fifth century and the second century B.C., and to fix the time of its reintroduction into Palestine no earlier than the Maccabaean period, no later than the era of Hillel.

IV.

Before sketching the history of the biblical text from the time of its separation into textual families until the establishment of the Massoretic recension, it will be useful to analyze briefly an alternate theory of the development of the biblical text. This is the view which attempts to explain the complex data we have presented in terms of a distinction between a standard text and vulgar texts. In application, the Massoretic text is deemed 'standard', all non-traditional text-types 'vulgar'.

I have often argued that the terms standard and vulgar are anachronistic. Both imply that a standard exists, either that authorities have designated one text-type as standard, or to say the same thing, that an official recension has been promulgated. But this is precisely not the case in the period under discussion. There is no tendency toward the stabilization of the text at Qumrân, no drift toward the traditional text. Indeed neither in the Palestinian Greek witnesses nor in the citations of Jewish works composed in this era is there any evidence earlier than the time of Hillel that the recensional activities had begun which would ultimately establish an authoritative text.

Let us suppose, however, that our analysis is wrong, and that a standard text did exist in Palestine alongside vulgar text types over these early centuries. What kind of picture emerges? As for the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, we must say that no one used the standard text. The Chronicler used a vulgar text in the composition of his history. The author of Jubilees ignored the standard text. Palestinian revisers of the Greek translation chose, not the standard Hebrew text but the vulgar for their important labours. The Zadokite priests 34

of Samaria chose the vulgar text for their official recension... mirabile dictu. From a text-critical point of view, it is even more extraordinary that the standard text exercised no influence on the vulgar text. That there was no mixing, no contact, could be explained only, I believe, if the 'standard' text were the property of a tiny cabal, secretly preserved, copied, and nourished. Moreover, even if all this were true, we should have to ask, why do the vulgar texts fall into two distinct, homogeneous families?—that is, if one wishes to dispose entirely of resort to an explanation in terms of local texts. Such a picture of the textual situation can only be described as bizarre, and we are left wondering why the little circle who hid the standard text away for these centuries suddenly decided to publish it.

Perhaps there are other grounds upon which we may legitimately label Masoretic or Proto-Masoretic texts 'standard', non-traditional text-forms 'vulgar'. Our criterion might be one particular characteristic of the text itself. Since the Pentateuch and Former Prophets in the received text are clearly short texts, perhaps we may discover here a valid criterion to distinguish the standard from the vulgar text-forms. As is well-known, the Alexandrian grammarians based their recension of Homer on the principle of the superiority of the short reading. While haplography also produces short readings, and the text of Samuel is demonstrably defective by reason of extensive haplography, there can be no denying that the received text of the Pentateuch is a marvelously compact and well-preserved text, from the point of view of the modern textual critic. The difficulty arises when we look at the received text outside the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. The traditional texts of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, for example, are notoriously expansionistic, marked by conflations, readings added from parallel passages, and harmonizing. The Egyptian text of Jeremiah and 4QJerb contains a text tradition which is drastically shorter as well as far superior to the Masoretic text. Indeed the texts of these books possess all the expansionistic traits characteristic of the 'vulgar' (Palestinian) textual family. This is true of the Proto-Masoretic texts of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel at Qumrân; it is also true of the developed Masoretic texts of these books. In short, the criterion cannot be sustained.

It may be observed that the Proto-Masoretic text of 1QIsa, and the Egyptian Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint, often go beyond the other Proto-Masoretic texts of Qumrân, as well as the Masoretic text in the extent of their expansionistic character (cf. P. W. Skehan: VT Supplement IV [1957], p. 152). However, the expansions, happily, are not always the same as those in MT, and we are given some control of the additions, double readings, etc., in the Masoretic text.
The criteria of orthographic or linguistic development have occasionally been used to ferret out 'vulgar' text forms. It is true that the Rabbis chose an orthographic and linguistic tradition which by-passed the innovations of Maccabean orthography, and the archaizing and modernizing features preserved in this orthography. But as we have seen, Proto-Massoretic manuscripts may appear in late orthography, non-traditional manuscripts in the most archaic. The same must be said for late or early, archaic or modernizing grammatical forms. It was probably the choice of the Pentateuch text which established orthographic principles for the remainder of the Bible, not the selection of an orthographic tradition which determined the choice of text.

These criteria will not justify the use of the distinction standard/vulgar in describing the text-forms later to be selected and established as the Massoretic recension. This is because no one textual family was selected by the Rabbis or scribes when the era of textual crisis and recension arrived. In the Pentateuch, a Babylonian, or in any case, non-Palestinian textual tradition was chosen, in the Latter Prophets a Palestinian.

V.

If we put together all the evidence now at hand, woven together, to be sure, with occasional skeins of speculation, I believe that the history of the biblical text can be outlined as follows. Sometime in the Persian period, probably in the fifth century B.C., local texts began to diverge and develop in Palestine and Babylon. Certainly the Priestly edition of the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomic edition of the Former Prophets cannot antedate the late sixth century B.C. Presumably the local texts stem from copies of the Law and Former Prophets whose literary complexes had come into final form in Babylon in the sixth century, and which were then brought back to Palestine. The traditions concerning the text of Ezra may reflect these circumstances. In any case we must project the 'archetype' of all surviving local texts of these books roughly to the time of the Restoration.

In the early fourth century, the Chronicler used an early form of the developing Palestinian text, and sometime about this time the Egyptian text of the

---

36 See D. N. Freedman: The Law and Prophets, VT Supplement IX (1962), pp. 250-265. With possible exception of the short text of Jeremiah, we know no evidence of the survival of Exilic editions of a biblical work surviving independently in Palestine.
Pentateuch broke off from the Old Palestinian text, to begin its independent development. The separation of an Egyptian text of Jeremiah was probably earlier, that of the text of the Former Prophets rather later. Meanwhile in Babylon the third of the incipient textual families was developing, continuing in isolation until its reintroduction into Palestine, perhaps in the Maccabean era when longings for Zion and Parthian expulsions coincided to bring large numbers of the Jews to Palestine, or perhaps later in the second or first century B.C. At all events, the Babylonian textual family was not selected for the early (Proto-Lucianic) revision made in the second or early first century B.C. It was taken up in the Proto-Theodotionic reworking of the Old Greek translation prepared in Palestine at the beginning of the first century A.D.

Probably the Proto-Theodotionic recension of the Old Greek coincided with earliest recensional endeavours on the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch and Prophets. In any case between the era of Hillel and the first Jewish Revolt the Massoretic text came into being. The principles which guided the scholars who prepared the recension were unusual. The recension was not characterized by wholesale revision and emendation, nor by eclectic or conflating procedures. Nor was a single, local textual family chosen. In the Pentateuch the current Palestinian text-type was rejected, and along with it the Palaeo-Hebrew script and orthographic innovations that marked certain of its exemplars. Rather the conservative, superb text of Babylonian origin, recently introduced into Palestine, was selected for the standard text. In the Former Prophets, the same pattern was followed, a Babylonian text was chosen, despite the existence of the superior Old Palestinian textual family. Presumably the pattern was set by the selection of the Pentateuch. In the Latter Prophets, the scholars shifted textual families. In these books a Palestinian text was chosen, perhaps because Babylonian texts were not available. However that may be, the orthographic type chosen was not the new \textit{plene} style common in many Palestinian manuscripts beginning in Maccabean times.

The process of recension was basically one of selecting traditions deriving from two old textual families available in Palestine in the first century A.D.

There was some leveling through, not always successful, of the conservative orthographic style chosen, and some revision, within narrow limits, was undertaken.\footnote{Cf. \textit{ALQ}, p. 191 and n. 45.} The process was not evolutionary or adventitious, but one of careful
selection between sharply differing traditions. It was in short a systematic if not radical process of recension.

The promulgation of the new, standard recension evidently took place sometime near the mid-first century A.D. The text used to prepare the καὶ γέ recension at the beginning of the century is Proto-Massoretic, not Massoretic. Readings which differ both from the older Greek, and from the developed Massoretic text are not few or insignificant, especially in Samuel and Kings. While the Proto-Massoretic text is well-known in many books at Qumrân, there is no exemplar of the Massoretic text, and no evidence of its influence. On the other hand, the Rabbinic recension appears to have been the accepted text in other circles by 70 A.D., and in the interval between the Jewish Revolts against Rome, became the reigning text in all surviving Jewish communities. Its victory was complete and rival textual traditions shortly died out, except as they were preserved frozen in ancient translations or survived in the text of an isolated sect such as the Samaritans.
LUCIAN AND PROTO-LUCIAN

TOWARD A NEW SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM *
EMANUEL TOV

Much new material on the Septuagint revisions has been revealed recently through both archaeological finds and philological investigations. The present paper deals with one of these recently discovered revisions — the so-called proto-Lucianic revision. Since any analysis of this revision is by its very nature closely related to Lucian's revision, we shall first outline the three major opinions proffered on the nature of his revision and the essence of the MSS boc2e2.

From Ruth 4: 11 onwards, Lucian's revision is contained in boc2e2, as has been suggested by de Lagarde and corrected by Rahlfs. Our remarks, however, will be limited to the four books of Reigns since they have been the subject of the majority of investigations concerning Lucian's revision.

Alfred Rahlfs' thorough study Lucian's Rezension der Königsbücher, published in 1911 1, formed the basis of the communis opinio on Lucian until the last two decades. Rahlfs described how, on the one hand, Lucian brought the Old Greek into conformity with the Hebrew, while, on the other hand, he removed the Old Greek from MT by freely revising its language and style. Rahlfs further realized that Lucian's fourth century revision reflects many ancient variants, which Rahlfs named proto-Lucianic since they are also to be found in various sources preceding Lucian by several centuries. We shall later return to these proto-Lucianic elements.

It was Rahlfs' great achievement to have described the three layers composing Lucian's text. As a rule, however, he underestimated the importance of proto-Lucianic elements 2, and his views doubtlessly need revision also in view of recent findings and studies.

* A paper read in the IOSCS section of the VIIth Congress of the IOSOT (Uppsala, August 7, 1971) and previously at the Biblical Symposium in Jerusalem (February 28, 1971). The writer wishes to express his thanks to Prof. I. L. Seeligmann for helpful comments and encouragement. I am also much indebted to Prof. F. M. Cross who has stimulated my interest in the problems discussed in this paper.

1 Septuaginta Studien 3 (Göttingen 1911).
2 Cf. P. L. Hedley, HThR 26 (1953) 69 : * Rahlfs has always admitted that Lucian may
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A completely novel view of the nature of \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 was suggested in 1963 by Père Barthélemy in his \textit{Devanciers d'Aquila}. After describing the characteristics of the newly discovered \textit{kaige} revision, Barthélemy turned to a precise analysis of the second part of 2 Sam. Barthélemy showed that in this section the main LXX MSS contain the \textit{kaige} revision, while the Old Greek, surprisingly enough, is found in \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2. In order to prove this, Barthélemy showed that \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 and the other MSS have a common basis, and he further demonstrated that the \textit{kaige} revision revised the tradition embodied in \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 in conformity to the Hebrew. The details of Barthélemy’s views are too well-known to bear repeating.

It must be granted to Barthélemy that, as a rule, \textit{kaige} is more literal than \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2; but this situation does not necessarily imply that \textit{kaige} revised \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2. The relationship between \textit{kaige} and \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 could be viewed differently.

The following remarks should be made with regard to Barthélemy’s views:

1. His examples are selective and exclude those showing that \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 are more literal than \textit{kaige}.
2. There is much internal evidence in \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 indicating that they contain a revision, even in the second part of 2 Sam.
3. Barthélemy’s conclusions refer to the whole of the LXX, while his investigation is limited to one section of Reigns.
4. Finally, Barthélemy dismisses the historical evidence concerning Lucian’s revisional activities with too much ease.

A third view of \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 was proposed in 1964 by F. M. Cross, Jr. While working on the 4QSam manuscript, Cross realized that this Hebrew source contains many proto-Lucianic readings. In light of this new evidence, Cross suggested that \textit{boc}_2\textit{e}_2 are composed of two different layers: a substratum containing a proto-Lucianic revision of the Old Greek towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam, and a second layer containing the historical Lucian’s corrections. Cross' have used a Syrian text that differed from those current in other districts, but he has consistently depreciated the value of the recension.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{SVT} 19 (1963).  
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. F. M. Cross, Jr., \textit{The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert}, \textit{HThR} 57 (1964) 295, n. 44.
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}, 281-299.
\textsuperscript{7} Cross has published only a few examples of proto-Lucianic readings of 4QSam; the complete text has yet to be published.
thesis has been elaborated by several of his students, mainly by Shenkel in his study on the books of Reigns.

While I agree with the position that \( \text{boc}_2 \) are composed of two layers, I would question whether the substratum is indeed a proto-Lucianic revision. Has it really been established that this substratum was a revision rather than simply another Greek text? Why need one assume such a revision? If such an assumption is necessary to explain those elements in \( \text{boc}_2 \) which approximate the LXX to MT, it must be pointed out that Lucian derived such elements mainly from the "Three" and the fifth column of the Hexapla, as Rahlfs has shown.

As a result of the above reflections and on the basis of my own study of Lucian and other ancient sources, I would like to propose a new working hypothesis on the nature of \( \text{boc}_2 \). My suggestion is programmatic and tentative, based on pilot studies rather than on systematic investigations of all the sources involved. This work still remains to be done, and, in fact, many studies are needed to verify this working hypothesis.

Like Cross, I propose that \( \text{boc}_2 \) in the books of Reigns are composed of two layers. The second layer is the historical Lucian, and I suggest that its substratum contained either the Old Greek translation or any Old Greek translation. We shall later return to this problem. Although one may continue to use the term proto-Lucianic (or pre-Lucianic) when referring to the elements of the Old Greek substratum, one should not assume a proto-Lucianic revision as such, since the existence of such an intermediary stage has not yet been proved. One could thus suggest that our proposal forms a compromise between the views of Barthélémy and Cross.

I should like to support the working hypothesis with the following five arguments:

1. — It has always amazed me that the text of \( \text{boc}_2 \) is evidenced in so wide a range of sources, both before and after Lucian’s supposed floruit (300). Of these sources, the proto-Lucianic are, of course, the most interesting. These include:
   - the Hebrew 4QSam*¹⁰,
   - two so-called "proto-Lucianic" papyri, namely the Manchester

---

* J. D. Shenkel, Chronology and Recessional Development in the Greek Text of Kings (Cambridge, Mass., 1968).
* The fact that diametrically opposed tendencies are visible in \( \text{boc}_2 \), makes such an assumption very plausible.
¹⁰ See F. M. Cross, Jr., op. cit.
Pap. Ryl. Greek 458 of Deut.\textsuperscript{11} and Pap. 2054 of Psalms, the various fragments of the Vetus Latina\textsuperscript{12}, the substratum of the Armenian translation\textsuperscript{13}, the text quoted by Josephus\textsuperscript{14}, the text quoted by Pseudo-Philo in his \textit{Biblical Antiquities}\textsuperscript{15}, the text quoted by various Church Fathers: Clemens of Alexandria\textsuperscript{16}, Theophilus of Antioch\textsuperscript{17}, Tertullian\textsuperscript{18}, Hippolytus\textsuperscript{19}, Cyprian\textsuperscript{20} and Origen\textsuperscript{21}.

To these sources one should probably add the Coptic translation of the Greek\textsuperscript{22} and possibly certain elements in the Peshitta\textsuperscript{23}.

Contrary to the beliefs of some scholars\textsuperscript{24}, I disagree with the opinion that the enumerated sources have been retouched by so-called « Lucianic revisers ». In some instances such an assumption is either impossible or close to impossible.

The list of sources which reflect the text of \textit{boc}_{2} after the historical Lucian is equally large. It contains both the text quoted by

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Th. Stockmayer, \textit{ZAW} 12 (1892) 218-228; however, Stockmayer’s conclusion, which is phrased in the title of his article (« Hat Lucian zur seiner Septuagintarevision die Peschito benützt? » : yes!), cannot be vindicated.
\item\textsuperscript{16} See especially L. Dieu, « Retouches Lucianiques sur quelques textes de la vieille version latine (I et II Samuel) », \textit{RB NS} 16 (1919) 372-403.
\end{itemize}
various Church Fathers and the text reflected in the Gothic, Slavonic and so-called Syro-Lucianic translations of the LXX. Some of these sources are undoubtedly based on Lucian, but in other cases it has yet to be determined whether the post-Lucianic sources are based on the ancient substratum of \( \text{boc}_2 \) only or whether they reflect the Lucianic text as a whole. This is especially true since some of these sources are very close to Lucian’s *floruit* and/or are not derived from the area of Antioch.

It cannot be coincidental that so many diverse sources reflect a proto-Lucianic text in the books of Reigns. The only logical solution appears to be that all the above-mentioned sources reflect elements of either *the* Old Greek translation or a single Old Greek translation underlying Lucian’s revision. The non-Lucianic MSS contain a different, and, sometimes later, text tradition. We shall later dwell on the differences between \( \text{boc}_2 \) and the non-Lucianic MSS.

2. — The studies dealing with the character of the assumed proto-Lucianic revision stress that this revision generally left the Old Greek unrevised. This view is based upon a comparison of translation options in \( \text{boc}_2 \) and the Old Greek which shows that both have a common vocabulary, on Shenkel’s investigation of the identical chronological systems of the two as opposed to the chronological systems of MT and the *kaige* revision, and on the fact that both traditions start the third book of Reigns at 1 Ki. 2: 11. But if the assumed proto-Lucianic revision is so close to the Old Greek and frequently left it unrevised, would it not be more fair to characterize the substratum of \( \text{boc}_2 \) as Old Greek rather than a proto-Lucianic revision?

3. — It has been recognized by scholars that the contents of the Hexapla’s sixth column in the second part of 2 Sam. are very close to \( \text{boc}_2 \). For Barthélemy the sixth column thus contains the Old Greek, while the other MSS in that section contain the *kaige* revision. For Cross it contains the proto-Lucianic revision « in relatively pure form ». Since in this section Origen placed the *kaige* revision in the fifth column, it would be more understandable in our opinion for

---


26 See especially J. D. Shenkel, *op. cit.*


29 Cf. J. D. Shenkel, *op. cit.*, 10 ff. and further section 2 of the appendix to this paper.

30 Cf. e.g., D. Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, 128 ff.

31 F. M. Cross, Jr., *op. cit.*, 295.
the Hexapla's sixth column to contain the Old Greek than an unknown revision about which we possess no ancient records. Furthermore, a probable parallel is found in 2 Kings, where Burkitt suggested long ago that the Quinta contains the Old Greek. One notes that, as in the second part of 2 Sam., the main MSS of 2 Ki. contain the *kaige* revision, and here, also, *bocē₂* resemble one of the columns of the Hexapla, in this case the Quinta. However, the resemblance between *bocē₂* on the one hand, and the sixth column on the other, has yet to be investigated in detail.

4. — In a recent article in *HThR* 33, Klein has rightly shown that the additions in the Greek Chronicles harmonizing the text with 2 Ki. reflect the textual tradition of *bocē₂* rather than *kaige* 34. This situation would seem to indicate that the translator of Chronicles, naturally enough, took the Old Greek text as his basis 35.

5. — In another recent article in *HThR* 36, Shenkel demonstrated that in the synoptic sections of Samuel and Chronicles the Greek Chronicles is based on the Old Greek of Samuel. He found that in the *kaige* sections there is a much greater agreement with *bocē₂* of Samuel than in the non- *kaige* sections 37. An analysis of Shenkel's data proves that in all sections the Greek Chronicles is based upon the Old Greek, which in the *kaige* sections is reflected in *bocē₂*.

We have adduced five arguments in favor of our working hypothesis that the substratum of *bocē₂* contains the Old Greek or Old Greek elements. We therefore suggest that the study of *bocē₂* should

35 The alternative explanation that the historical Lucian harmonized the two Greek texts has been discussed by Klein and Allen in *HThR* 61 (1968) 483-495.
36 This possibility, which seems to us the best explanation of the evidence, is rejected by Klein after some consideration: « This pre- *kaige* text, which served as the source for the Par supplements, could be either the Old Greek hitherto unknown, or, as seems more likely, the proto-Lucianic recension » (ibid., 104).
38 According to Shenkel's statistics, 74 % of the words of 1 Par 17-18 agree with the OG of 2 Sam 7-8 (non- *kaige*) and 3 % disagree with the OG in favor of *bocē₂* in that section. Oh the other hand, 56 % of the words in 1 Par 19 agree with the *kaige* MSS of 2 Sam 10 and 13 % disagree with the same MSS in favor of *bocē₂*. The amount of agreement between 1 Par 19 and the *bocē₂* MSS in 2 Sam 10 is actually much greater than the numbers indicate: 1. the 56 % agreement between 1 Par 19 and the *kaige* MSS of 2 Sam 10 include many instances when *kaige* is identical with *bocē₂*; it would actually be more correct to state that in such cases 1 Par agrees with *bocē₂* of 2 Sam 10 while the *kaige* revision has left the text unrevised. 2. The number of assumed agreements between 1 Par 19 and the Old Greek of 2 Sam 10 would have been larger than 13 % if the historical Lucian had not inserted his own revisions in *bocē₂*. 
be founded on a new basis, different from that of previous research. The contents of \( \text{boc}_2 \) should be studied anew, especially in the light of the proto-Lucianic sources. While the above-mentioned five arguments partially relied on studies which have already been published, few studies have seen light on which a renewed investigation of \( \text{boc}_2 \) may rely. Therefore, I carried out some pilot studies, and it seems to me that an internal investigation of \( \text{boc}_2 \) supports the working hypothesis which I have suggested.

When starting to elucidate the details of the working hypothesis in the light of the above-mentioned arguments, one will immediately discover that it is no easy task to define criteria for unraveling the three layers of which \( \text{boc}_2 \) are composed, viz. the Old Greek substratum, Lucian’s borrowings from the « Three » and the fifth column of the Hexapla, and Lucian’s own corrections. Criteria have to be defined as to which elements belonged or could have belonged to any one of the three layers. In this respect one of the main problems is that certain characteristics of \( \text{boc}_2 \) which scholars have always assigned to the historical Lucian were actually extant in Lucian’s Vorlage. In a short and very instructive article, Father Bonifatius Fischer showed in 1951 (cf. n. 20) not only that the so-called Lucianic tendencies were already extant in the Vetus Latina, but also that the Vetus Latina — no doubt an early translation of the Old Greek — reflected some of these tendencies against \( \text{boc}_2 \) and the other MSS of the LXX. In other words, additions of subjects, objects and names, changes between nouns and pronouns, short contextual additions, harmonistic additions, certain translation equivalents, several doublets, some linguistic changes and translations instead of transliterations are not late Lucianic phenomena, but belonged to the very first stratum of the LXX. To these examples one may add several in which \( \text{boc}_2 \) reflect the original Greek text which has been corrupted in all other MSS. And, last but not least, the most striking examples of proto-Lucianic elements are provided by those readings which reflect early variants. These variants, which can rather easily be pinpointed and which are of immense importance for Biblical scholarship, form the largest group of proto-Lucianic readings.

Even though it appears illogical that original renderings would have been changed by a later hand to transliterations (mainly of unknown words), the present writer hopes to have established this process for some of the LXX revisers; see « Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the O. T. — A Further Characteristic of the kaige-Th. Revision? », Textus 8 (1971).

Some categories of proto-Lucianic readings are exemplified in the appendix to this paper.
Since it can be proved that certain readings of $boc_2e_2$ were extant in pre-Lucianic sources, one must consider the possibility that many typologically similar readings were pre-Lucianic as well. This point should not be overstressed, however, since it is not impossible that in some cases the historical Lucian acted according to the same principles which guided the original translators.

In concluding this point, I should like to emphasize once again the importance of the Vetus Latina and other pre-Lucianic sources in pinpointing the ancient elements of $boc_2e_2$. It seems to me that an investigation into the first stratum of $boc_2e_2$ is of primary importance in solving the « riddle of $boc_2e_2 ».

A second line of investigation will attempt to pinpoint readings which the historical Lucian derived from the « Three » and from the Hexapla's fifth column. This investigation is limited by its very nature since Lucian's sources have been preserved only partially. From the outset it is probable that the majority of the quantitative revisions towards MT are derived from the « Three » of the fifth column, but again on this point one should be cautious. The second category of proto-Lucianic readings in the appendix shows that some of Lucian's quantitative revisions may already have been found in his Greek Vorlage.

Much research has to be done on the changes which Lucian himself introduced. One immediately thinks of several Atticistic changes such as the replacement of Hellenistic forms as εἶπαν and ἐλάβοσαν with εἶπον and ἔλαβον, λήμψει with λήψει and of the change of the passive aorist ἐγένθη to the middle aorist ἐγένετο. 40.

Lucian probably also introduced certain stylistic corrections, such as the insertion of synonymous words. However, much investigation remains to be done in this field as well; a comparative study of translation equivalents in the different sections and MSS of the LXX should determine which $boc_2e_2$ synonyms were introduced by Lucian and which belonged to the old substratum. In this respect also, the Vetus Latina and other pre-Lucianic sources are of help 41.

I must end my paper with an open question. I have suggested that the substratum of $boc_2e_2$ contains either the Old Greek transla-

---

40 After I finished writing this paper, I had the opportunity to read S. P. Brock's unpublished dissertation, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel (Oxford 1966). In this pioneering and thorough study, Brock discusses several Atticizing and stylistic changes by the historical Lucian.

41 For example, of the few stylistic changes which Brock assigned to Lucian in his article mentioned in n. 4, two are already evidenced in the Vetus Latina (cf. the translations of אָלֶד in 2 Sam. 11: 7 and of יַע in 2 Sam. 11: 11).
tion or any single Old Greek translation. The non-Lucianic MSS contain the *kaige* revision in two sections in the books of Reigns, and in three sections they reflect a text which is usually described as the Old Greek. My suggestion poses few problems in the *kaige* sections: here the Old Greek is contained in the substratum of boc$_2$e$_2$, while *kaige* and the second stratum of boc$_2$e$_2$ reflect later corrections of this old substratum. However, how should one explain the relationship between boc$_2$e$_2$ and the other MSS in the non-*kaige* sections? It appears to me that in these sections we should continue to characterize all non-Lucianic MSS as the Old Greek. But in the instances in which boc$_2$e$_2$ deviate from the other MSS I suggest a modification of the general opinion on the latter MSS for which I consider two alternatives:

1. — In his publication of 4QLXX Lev*, Monsignor Skehan has shown that in many details the Qumran fragment reflects the Old Greek, while all extant MSS have been retouched. This situation shows how little one should trust the MSS of the LXX, especially when they reflect MT literally. In the historical books there obtains a situation which parallels the problem raised by 4QLXX Lev*: whenever the boc$_2$e$_2$ reading is at variance with MT or renders it freely, the reading found in the remainder of the MSS, as a rule, agrees with MT, and could thus represent a later revision. In other words, in the non-*kaige* sections the substratum of boc$_2$e$_2$ always represents the Old Greek, while the other MSS as a rule reflect the Old Greek, but at times their text has been retouched.

2. — As an alternative possibility it may be suggested that both the boc$_2$e$_2$ reading and the one found in the other MSS represent two parallel Old Greek traditions.

Since the relationship between the readings of boc$_2$e$_2$ and that of the other MSS may, as a rule, be described as that between an original and its revision, one may prefer the first possibility. However, at the present state of knowledge of the proto-Septuagint question it is hard to solve this problem. I have therefore characterized the substratum of boc$_2$e$_2$ as containing either the Old Greek or any Old Greek translation. The latter possibility allows for the existence of other Old Greek translations.

---

41 Since there is no doubt that boc$_2$e$_2$ and the other MSS of the LXX are genetically interrelated in all sections of the books of Reigns, it is likely that the *kaige* revision was based upon the Old Greek substratum of boc$_2$e$_2$. However, it has yet to be determined whether this substratum of boc$_2$e$_2$ was identical with the assumed Vorlage of *kaige* or whether one should posit two closely-related Old Greek traditions (OG$^1$ and OG$^4$).

In conclusion, I propose that the existence of a proto-Lucianic revision of the LXX has not been established. I further suggest that the substratum of boc₂ₑ₂ contains either the Old Greek or any single Old Greek translation. It should perhaps be noted that the correctness of the first suggestion does not hold any implication for the validity of the second.

APPENDIX

Some categories of proto-Lucianic readings reflected in boc₂ₑ₂ in the books of Reigns.

1. Proto-Lucianic variants (≠ MT) — the majority of the proto-Lucianic readings belong to this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam.</td>
<td>13:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam.</td>
<td>18:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. boc₂ₑ₂ = La = MT ≠ LXX — the historical Lucian could have derived these readings from the « Three » or the Hexapla's fifth column, but since they are reflected in La, they may have been original.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>boghe₂ Chr(vid)</th>
<th>LXX (rell)</th>
<th>Laᵺ</th>
<th>et tripartitum fecit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Sam.</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ki.</td>
<td>17:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Ancient doublets

1 Sam. 16:14  
MT  
boc₂e₂ Syr  
LXX (rell)  
La  

Ancient doublets  

Cf. further B. Fischer, « Lukian-Lesarten... », 177.

4. boc₂e₂ reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other MSS has developed

1 Sam 9:24  
MT  
Nabe-osvwyz(mg)b₂c₂e₂(txt) Syh  
B  
A  
Laᵇ = boc₂e₂  

4. boc₂e₂ reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other MSS has developed

1 Sam. 10:2  
MT  
bioc₂e₂  
gv  
LXX (rell)  
Laᵇv = boc₂e₂  

4. boc₂e₂ reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other MSS has developed

1 Ki 18:32  
MT  
oc*₂e  
Hz(mg)c²?  
dip  
LXX (rell)  

4. boc₂e₂ reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other MSS has developed

5. boc₂e₂ contain a translation while the other MSS contain a transliteration

2 Sam. 17:29  
MT  
a(mg)bgōz(mg)c₂e₂ Arm  
LXX (rell)  
Laᵇ  

5. boc₂e₂ contain a translation while the other MSS contain a transliteration
La\textsuperscript{v} lactantes vitulos
Clem. Alex. I, 98 μοσχάρια γαλαθηνά

Cf. further B. Fischer, « Lukian-Lesarten... », 176.

6. \textit{boc}_{2}e_{2} add subjects or objects (these additions could reflect variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>om.</th>
<th>bhoxb_{2}e_{2} Co</th>
<th>Σαμουηλ</th>
<th>LXX (rell)</th>
<th>om.</th>
<th>La\textsuperscript{bv}</th>
<th>Samuel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 10:23</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>bhoxb_{2}e_{2} Co</td>
<td>Σαμουηλ</td>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>La\textsuperscript{bv}</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ki. 21:20</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>bioc_{2}e_{2}</td>
<td>'Ηλιας</td>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>La\textsuperscript{Luc}</td>
<td>Helias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. further B. Fischer, « Lukian-Lesarten... », 176.

7. Contextual additions (these additions could reflect variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>om.</th>
<th>Mbgioy_{2}za_{2}e_{2} Arm</th>
<th>καὶ ὁμοσεν αὐτῷ</th>
<th>LXX (rell)</th>
<th>om.</th>
<th>La\textsuperscript{v}</th>
<th>et iuravit ei David</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 30:15</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Mbgioy_{2}za_{2}e_{2} Arm</td>
<td>καὶ ὁμοσεν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>La\textsuperscript{v}</td>
<td>et iuravit ei David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 9:3</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>bdghiopc_{2}e_{2}</td>
<td>καὶ ἀνέστη Σιαούλ καὶ παρέλαβεν ἐν τῶν παιδάριων τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπορεύθη ζητεὶν τὰς ὀνους Κις τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Peshitta</td>
<td>καὶ παλιὰ λαοὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ λατι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The internal division of the books of Reigns

In the following sources III Reigns starts at 1 Ki. 2:12:

\textit{boc}_{2}e_{2} Vat. Syr. 162 (cf. A. Rahlfs, \textit{Septuaginta-Studien} III,
9. Translation technique

1 Sam. 9:27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אֵלֶּךָ (ב)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b'b(txt)oz(mg)c2e2 Arm</td>
<td>אֵלֶּךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>μέρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La^b</td>
<td>in loco summo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Sam. 11:7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>μετὰ τῶν μικρότερων</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boc2e2</td>
<td>εἶς ὕγιανεν Ἰωάβ καὶ εἰς ὕγιανέν τὸ λαός καὶ εἰς ὕγιανεν ὁ πόλεμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>εἶς εἰρήνην Ἰωάβ καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ πολέμου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La^b</td>
<td>recte est Joab et recte est populus et recte est exercitus belli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sam. 4:4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>יִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּרְבֵּים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boz^2c2e2</td>
<td>οὗ ἐπεκάθητο τὰ Χερουβιμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>καθημένου Χερουβεῖμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La^bv</td>
<td>ubi sedebat in cherubin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Grammatical changes

1 Sam. 1:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>יִשְׂרָאֵל רָבוֹ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boc2e2</td>
<td>προσεκώνησαν καὶ ἔπορεύθησαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX (rell)</td>
<td>καὶ προσκυνοῦσι καὶ πορεύονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La^v</td>
<td>adoraverunt ... abierunt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sam. 2:25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ἀνάμ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bozc2e2 Syr^J Or Chr</td>
<td>εἶν δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX(rell)</td>
<td>καὶ ἔὰν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La^vCyp^r</td>
<td>si autem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts
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The primary focus of interest in the present essay is upon ques­tions of Greek recensions in the books of Reigns. I wish, however, to introduce my discussion by reviewing the data on divergent Hebrew text types garnered largely from the discoveries in the Wilderness of Judah. One cannot overstress the importance of this new knowledge of Hebrew textual traditions, each with its own integrity and special characteristics, for the discussion of Greek recensions. Nor can one forget the long-time impasse between what we may call translation theories and recension theories devised to explain the origins and development of the Greek Bible. So long as the history of the Hebrew text remained obscure, no consensus was gained in the study of text forms of the Greek Bible. In the books of Samuel, the effective use of the Greek Bible in the reconstruction of the Hebrew text declined from the publication of Wellhausen's dissertation (1871) until it reached a nadir in the textual studies of P. A. H. de Boer. Even the discovery of the Dodekapropheton from the Nahal Héber and its publication and brilliant analysis by Father Barthélemy did not convince all Septuagint specialists that the major strata in the manuscripts of the Greek Bible consisted primarily of an Old Greek translation and a series of recensions of that translation. No small part of the intransigence of such scholars stemmed from the anachronistic assumption that a single Hebrew textual tradition prevailed throughout the interval of the development of the Greek Bible. In fact we must deal with a complex history of Hebrew textual traditions before the emergence of the recension which lies at the base of the Massoretic text in the course of the first century of the Christian era. The history of the Hebrew text parallels precisely the history of the Old Greek translation, and its recensions. Each sequence or development in one has its reflex in the other and furnishes data to date the parallel sequence. Any theory of the development of the history of the Greek text must comprehend the data supplied by both the history of the Hebrew text and the history of the Greek text.
if it is to be adequate. To deal exclusively with one or the other or primarily with one or the other is to court or create too simple or asymmetrical solutions and hypotheses.

1. The publication of the great Isaiah Scroll of Cave 1, Qumrân 1 in 1950 gave us our first glimpse at a Palestinian text of Isaiah of the mid-second century B.C. 3 Cave 4, Qumrân has provided an additional fifteen fragmentary manuscripts to the two exemplars from Cave 1. These spread in date from the early second century B.C. (earlier than lQIs 3) to the late Herodian period, some two centuries and a half. All the Qumrân manuscripts of Isaiah belong to a single textual tradition, and may be described as congeners of the archetype of M, i.e., proto-Massoretic in our terminology. All these manuscripts of Isaiah share the expansionistic character of the traditional texts of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, that is, they are marked by conflate readings, explicating pluses, double readings, and like harmonization. While the Old Greek text of Isaiah, or rather its Vorlage, belongs to a different textual tradition, it is one which is closely allied and shares the expansionistic or "full" attributes of the proto-Massoretic tradition. It may be observed, indeed, that the text of lQIs 3 and the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint often go beyond the other proto-Massoretic texts of Qumrân, as well as the Massoretic text in the extent of their expansionistic tendency. However, the expansions, fortunately, are not always the same as those in M, and we are given some control of the additions, double readings, etc., in the Massoretic tradition. 4

There is every reason to believe that the text of Isaiah at Qumrân, over the interval of two and a half centuries represented by manuscripts, reflects a text at home in Palestine. It follows that the Massoretic text is a recension of the Palestinian text of Isaiah. As we shall see, the Palestinian text was characterized by intensive scribal reworking and expansion, especially in the Maccabean era late in its history. Again, the close relationship between the proto-Massoretic text and the Septuagint tradition is expected to judge from other instances where we have reason to believe the textus receptus stems from the Palestinian biblical text. The baroque orthographic tradition found in the lQIs 3 scroll (among many others) is a mark of a Palestinian text. It is refracted in orthographic
practice of the Maccabaean age in inscriptions from Palestine, and frequently is found in the Palaeo-Hebrew manuscripts of the Pentateuch as well as in the Samaritan scribal tradition which branched off from the common Palestinian practice in the first century B.C.  

Most of the one hundred eighteen biblical manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumrân must be identified similarly as "proto-Massoretic" and "Palestinian" in type. This is true of manuscripts of Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, and the Writings, most of which appear to have expansionistic texts both in the textus receptus and at Qumrân. Especially obvious cases include the "full" texts of Ezekiel, Proverbs, Psalms, and Job. Job also appears in Palaeo-Hebrew at Qumrân. The point is noteworthy since all the Palaeo-Hebrew texts from Qumrân contain a Palestinian textual tradition.

2. Deviation from this pattern of "proto-Massoretic" = "Palestinian" does occur at Qumrân in three groups of manuscripts, the most significant manuscripts we possess for the reconstruction of the history of the biblical text before its stabilization in the Pharisaic recension (M). All came under my eye first in the examination of the manuscript fragments from Cave 4. Virtually all of these Hebrew witnesses from Qumrân do bear the marks described above of the Palestinian text (as might be expected); but they are not proto-Massoretic.

Three manuscripts of Jeremiah were recovered from the excavations in Cave 4, Qumrân. Two, 4QJer 1 a dating from the end of the third century B.C. 2 and 4QJer 1 c from no earlier than the end of the first century B.C., present the long text of Jeremiah with virtually no significant deviations from the traditional text (M). Certainly they are to be labeled proto-Massoretic and Palestinian. The third manuscript, dating from the Hasmonaean period, it should be noted, is radically different in its textual tradition preserving the short textual tradition of the book of Jeremiah known hitherto only from the Old Greek translation. 3 As has often been observed, these two textual traditions may differ recensionally in origin. So great is their difference in length and order that the long text cannot be supposed to have developed between the second half of the third century B.C., the date of the Old Greek translation, and the fixing of the Palestinian textual tradition in the Massoretic recension of Jeremiah. As a
matter of fact, there is no room at all if we suppose the Septuagint of Jeremiah was translated from a Palestinian text type of the third century B.C. The full-blown, expansionistic text of Jeremiah is already present at Qumrân in the third century B.C.! Moreover, the Hebrew textual tradition underlying the Greek and 4QJer\textsuperscript{b} is a short, pristine form of the text of Jeremiah, comparable only to the short, conservative Massoretic text of the Pentateuch. Like the latter, it shows few expansionistic glosses or conflations, few traces of revision and modernizing. I cannot believe that these radically variant textual types were transmitted side by side in Palestine over many centuries. As I have argued elsewhere,\textsuperscript{10} distinct textual families take centuries to develop but are exceedingly fragile creations. When manuscripts stemming from different textual traditions come into contact, the result is their dissolution into a mixed text, or the precipitation of a textual crisis which results in recensional activity, and often in the fixing of a uniform or standard text. The short text of Jeremiah must have developed in isolation, in a community in which it was not exposed to the intense scribal activity which produced the long Palestinian recension, indeed in a community in which its text was rarely copied and restricted in use and circulation. I should argue further that the short text of Jeremiah branched off very early from the Palestinian textual tradition, perhaps as early as the fifth, or even the sixth century B.C. (within a generation or two of Jeremiah's death in Egypt). The evidence drawn from an analysis of these variant textual traditions of Jeremiah appears to be most satisfactorily and parsimoniously comprehended by a theory of local texts, distinguishing the short text of Jeremiah as Egyptian in origin and attributing 4QJer\textsuperscript{b} or its archetype to the Jewish community in Egypt which persisted through the Persian and Hellenistic ages.\textsuperscript{11}

The manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Cave 4, most clearly manuscripts of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, also exhibit traits which identify them as Palestinian. They tend to be fuller than M, characterized by explicating pluses, synoptic or parallel readings intruded in the text, well known from the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch, harmonizing: in short, by expansions. Many MSS appear in the full Maccabaean orthography best known from lQIs\textsuperscript{a}; many appear in the moderately full
orthography reflected in the Samaritan Pentateuch, both markers of a Palestinian style ultimately rejected by M. Such manuscripts as 4QPalaeoEx⁰ and 4QNum⁰ clearly reflect a common Palestinian tradition of which the Samaritan recension is a late collateral witness. There can be no question of these being Samaritan manuscripts. This text type is found in both the palaeo-Hebrew and Jewish character, early and late at Qumrân. It is a textual tradition found in the Chronicler,¹⁴ in Jubilees, in the New Testament, and in other Hellenistic Jewish works.

These Palestinian manuscripts stand much closer to both GBL and the Samaritan tradition than to M. Yet even the earliest Qumrân exemplars are clearly distinct from the Hebrew textual tradition underlying the Septuagint. We have to do with three distinct textual traditions, a Palestinian text type, the Vorlage of the Old Greek, both fairly full texts, and the short, relatively pristine text preserved in the Massoretic text. When forced to label these three textual traditions, all well known before the discoveries at Qumrân in fact, we are faced with two plausible alternates, I believe. We can search for isolated socio-religious communities (to use Shemaryahu Talmon's terminology) in Palestine which might have guarded these textual traditions and preserved them intact. Or we can look to major Jewish communities, inside and outside of Palestine, which may have nurtured and preserved these variant text types over centuries in isolation. The first alternative in the case of the Pentateuch is difficult to maintain in view of the evidence that priests in Samaria (of Zadokite extraction), priests at Qumrân of Essene affiliation, as well as various Jewish authors, all used the same Palestinian text. We cannot attribute the three textual families to the Jewish parties in Palestine. The rise of the three major parties must be dated to the second century B.C.,¹⁵ too late to give the textual types a sectarian Sitz im Leben. The Hasidic communities out of which both the Essenes and Pharisees sprung evidently knew only the Palestinian textual tradition found in the third and second century B.C. manuscripts found at Qumrân. Once again, it is simplest to look to the Jewish community in Egypt as the conservators of the text type used in the Greek translation made in Alexandria.¹⁶ The textual family out of which the archetype of the Pharisaic recension was made differs radically from both the Egyptian and Palestinian textual
tradition. It shows no influence of the local traits which marked the
development of the Palestinian text and stands even further aloof from
the Egyptian than does the Palestinian text. We have been inclined to
seek its origin in the third major Jewish community in the Persian and
Hellenistic ages, in Babylon.

We turn finally to the Former Prophets, especially to Samuel, the
most fully preserved of the biblical manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumrân.
Joshua seems to fit to the pattern found in Qumrân Samuel texts. Judges
and Kings unfortunately are extant at Qumrân only in a few small frag­
ments.

The three Samuel manuscripts from Qumrân are all fuller than M.
4QSam$^a$ and 4QSam$^c$ exhibit most of the traits of the Palestinian tradition
in the Pentateuch and in the Major Prophets and Writings. They are much
fuller texts than the textus receptus. Many of their pluses are expan­
sionistic, and they reveal contamination by the popular Palestinian
orthography of the Maccabaean period. 4QSam$^b$, the archaic Samuel scroll
of the mid-third century B.C., on the other hand, was inscribed in a
uniquely primitive orthographic tradition, far more defective than the
later Samuel MSS, and for that matter, than any of the other scrolls from
Qumrân. Its affinities with the Vorlage of the Old Greek (G$^BL$ in 1
Samuel) are close, but the most extraordinary characteristic of 4QSam$^b$ is
its high proportion of original readings, whether they be in agreement
with the Greek, or in agreeeent with M, or against both in its relatively
frequent unique readings.$^{17}$

The Massoretic tradition in Samuel is wholly absent from Qumrân. Our
earliest evidence of its existence is the kaige Recension which replaces
the Old Greek in the $\beta$ by section of Reigns. In view of the date of the
Dodekapropheton of Barthâlémy, we must date its appearance in Palestine no
later than the beginning (sic!) of the first century of the Christian
era.$^{18}$ On the other hand, the Palestinian tradition found in the Cave 4
manuscripts of Samuel is reflected in the text of Josephus,$^{19}$ the closest
ally to the Qumrân textual tradition, in Pseudo-Philo,$^{20}$ and, remarkably
enough, in the text of the Chronicler in synoptic passages,$^{21}$ certifying
its Palestinian origin.
The received text of Samuel (M) resembles in its outward traits the Pentateuchal tradition we have called Babylonian. It is remarkably short especially over against the Palestinian tradition of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, 4QSam\textsuperscript{c}, and Josephus. Its orthographic style is close to that of the Massoretic text of the Pentateuch though often even more defective (primitive). In fact, it is a text in a poor state of preservation. While it is uncontaminated by the scribal reworking which expanded the other two textual families, especially the late Palestinian text of Samuel, it is a text riddled with haplographies, some of paragraph length. It appears to stem from a locale in which Samuel was not intensively used and in which scribal traditions were extremely conservative, presumably from the same milieu as the received (Babylonian) text of the Pentateuch. In view of the fact that the Old Greek of Samuel, while allied fairly closely with the Qumrân texts of Samuel, is nevertheless distinct, we must again recognize three parallel streams of textual tradition, three distinct local texts, as in the Pentateuch.

3. In our reconstruction of the history of the Old Greek and its recensions we find the history of the Hebrew text recapitulated. The Old Greek translation of the Pentateuch and Samuel transmits a Hebrew textual tradition at home in Egypt, and ultimately a branch of the Old Palestinian text of the fifth or at latest fourth century. Its text form is full in these books, inferior in the Pentateuch to proto-Massoretic (Babylonian) text, and inferior in Samuel to the Old Palestinian exemplar 4QSam\textsuperscript{b}. On the other hand it is, over all, clearly superior to the proto-Massoretic (Babylonian) text of Samuel.

The second stratum is the so-called proto-Lucianic recension, a subject to which we shall return. It consists apparently of a light sprinkling of readings derived from the Palestinian textual family of the type found in the three Samuel manuscripts from Qumrân, to which the Old Greek was sporadically corrected. To this proto-Lucianic recension we should assign the text of Samuel in Josephus, and in my view an early stratum of the Lucianic recension (boc\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2} in Reigns), and the sixth column of the Hexapla in Reigns section \(\gamma\) (2 Sam. 10:1-1 Kgs. 2:11). Whether the Itala was translated from the proto-Lucianic recension or translated from the Old Greek is not certain and must be determined in future studies. I am
inclined to assign its base provisionally to the proto-Lucianic tradition. The "proto-Lucianic" recension can be discerned only in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. Much confusion has entered the discussion at this point. Proto-Lucianic readings are discerned in Samuel according to the formula $G^L = φ = M^G$. Readings where $G^L$ agrees with $M$ against $G^B$ are inadmissible since they may be Hexaplaric readings or corrections arising in a late stratum of the Lucianic text. However, in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, in the Minor Prophets and in most if not all of the Hagiographa, the textual base of $M$ is the Palestinian text. Thus proto-Lucianic readings cannot be discerned owing to the restrictions of our method of isolating them. "Proto-Lucianic" readings in such cases are corrections to the Palestinian, i.e., the proto-Massoretic, text and cannot ordinarily be distinguished from $kaige$ revisions to the proto-Massoretic text or later Hexaplaric corrections to the standard Massoretic text. In the past, the primary data for isolating the proto-Lucianic recension derived from the $βγ$ and $γδ$ sections of Reigns. With the demonstration by Barthélemy that in these sections the $kaige$ Recension has replaced the Old Greek, most of this evidence disappeared. Many readings formerly labeled proto-Lucianic are merely Old Greek, the substratum of the Lucianic tradition preserved in $boc_{2e2}$.

The third recension we may call $kaige$ or proto-Theodotionic, now best known from the Dodekapropheton of Barthélemy and sections $βγ$ and $γδ$ of Reigns (2 Sam. 10:1-1 Kgs. 2:11; 1 Kgs. 22:1-2 Kgs. 25:30). Confirmation that 2 Sam. 10:1-1 Kgs. 2:11 ($βγ$) is recensional is overwhelmingly given by $4QSam^a$ which has scores if not hundreds of readings in this section which follow the formula $4QSam^a G^L = φ = G^M$. The date of the $kaige$ Recension is early first century of the Christian era (at latest) to judge from the date of the script of the Dodekapropheton. Its base is proto-Massoretic, the earliest evidence for the presence of the Babylonian text of Samuel in Palestine. Symmetry would suggest that the $kaige$ Recension was made from the proto-Lucian recension rather than directly from the Old Greek, but we have no basis upon which to establish its precise textual base, again owing to methodological restrictions. Typologically, the $kaige$ Recension should be later in origin than the proto-Lucianic since it is the first evidence of the presence of the proto-Massoretic text in
Palestine, dominated from the time of the Chronicler by the Palestinian text of the Pentateuch and Samuel. It is, moreover, the first of a continuing series of recensions toward a text of Babylonian type which includes later revisions of the Theodotionic school and Aquila. Thus we should date the proto-Lucianic Greek no later than the first century B.C., and as Barthélemy has suggested, proto-Lucianic activity may have begun on the Old Greek from the moment of its introduction into Palestine, in the late third or second century B.C.

The recensions of Aquila and the Hexapla bring us to the era after the Massoretic Hebrew recension of the Babylonian textual tradition had become authoritative. The Hebrew recension evidently dates from the era of Hillel since it is the exclusive textual form found at Masada (before A.D. 73) and in the hands of the soldiers of Bar Kosiba (spanning the interval between the Jewish Revolts, A.D. 70-135). The new, standard recension is wholly absent from Qumrân. It is curious that neither the full orthography of the Maccabaean era and later nor the palaeo-Hebrew script was adopted in the text now promulgated by the Pharisaic school. These are evidently additional signs of its non-Palestinian background.

4. The discussion of the problems of the proto-Lucianic and Lucian have been greatly advanced by the papers of Barthélemy and Tov.

Tov suggests that there are two strata in the Lucanian recension, "the second layer is the historical Lucian, and...[the first layer] its substratum contained either the Old Greek translation or any Old Greek translation." We need not, I believe, spend time in discussing the latest stratum of the Lucanian text. Barthélemy is willing to go so far as to speak of "une recension grécisante" though he persists in his doubts that the martyr Lucian took any role in its creation. We can agree also with Tov to the degree that he reckons with the Old Greek as the substratum of Lucanian text. There are in my view, however, three strata, not two, in the Lucanian text of Reigns. Tov's two-strata analysis describes the Lucanian recension elsewhere in the Greek Bible where the textus receptus is the Palestinian text. The third or middle stratum in my view are corrections of the Old Greek to a Palestinian Hebrew text type in Reigns where three textual traditions exist, and where the textus receptus is non-Palestinian. The strata of the Lucanian recension are thus
symmetrical with the three text types: Old Greek (Egyptian), proto-Lucian (Palestinian), Lucianic proper (Babylonian). Proto-Lucianic readings belong to three formulae: $G^L(4QSam) \not= G^B/M$ (in which M and $G^B$ are not in agreement), $4QSam$ Josephus $M \not= G^B$, and $4QSam$ Josephus $= G^{BL}M$. The second formula in the past has been explained away with the assertion that Josephus on these occasions corrected his Greek Bible by his Hebrew text. The addition of $4QSam$ complicates the equation making this explanation problematic. I do not believe Josephus corrected to Palestinian readings; if he did, he is a "proto-Lucianic" reviser himself! The third equation in my judgment regularly identifies proto-Lucianic readings in Josephus hitherto beyond our control. An excellent example of such a reading is the lost paragraph found in $4QSam^a$ and Josephus$^b$ before 1 Sam 11:1 describing an earlier otherwise unknown campaign of Nahash, king of Ammon. The temporal reference $\text{wyhy kmw hds}$, "after a month" found in $4QSam^a$ ($G^{BL} \text{ καὶ εγένηθε οὕτω μηνα}$), and hopelessly corrupted in M (10:27b $\text{wyhy kmhry}s$) is a reference back to this lost episode, certifying its originality in the text of Samuel. Here we have an instance in my view of a "proto-Lucianic" reading or rather a Palestinian reading in Josephus' Greek text which was suppressed in the later history of the Lucianic recension.

The proto-Lucianic text in Samuel in my view was essentially $G$ with intruded Palestinian readings, many (as in $4QSam^a$ and Josephus) in agreement with M. One may question whether it was a recension carried out at one time and place, or a text form arising in a tendency or drift toward the Palestinian text effected by various, unsystematic correctors. I do not believe we are yet in a position to answer this question although it may be that continuing research in Palestinian witnesses, especially in the Samuel scrolls from Qumrân, and in the biblical text quoted by Josephus, will finally provide an answer.
Notes


3. W. F. Albright's early contention that the prototype of 1QIs derived directly from Babylon has proved wrong. His identification of its text-type, however, as "proto-Massoretic" has been reinforced steadily by newer data. See his paper "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (1955), 27-33.


6. See below on the Pentateuchal texts in Palaeo-Hebrew allied to a Palestinian tradition common to both Qumrān and Samaria. The Palaeo-Hebrew script, firmly rejected in the Pharisical recension of the first century of the common era, may also have found its way to Egypt. Professor Orlinsky has astutely discerned that the Greek text of Job was translated from a Palaeo-Hebrew manuscript; see provisionally his *Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job V* (*HUCA* 36 [1965], pp. 40, 43-46) and esp. § C (forthcoming).

7. Note that this statement alters the position I took in my earliest papers. I now believe that the 4Q MSS of Samuel are Palestinian and that the archaic Pentateuch MSS I first took to be proto-Massoretic are in fact Old Palestinian as opposed to the usual late Palestinian Pentateuchal texts. In short, the situation in the Pentateuch precisely parallels that in Samuel (see below, n. 11).

8. The discovery of the dated manuscripts from the Wādī Dāliyeh of the late fourth century B.C. and the El-Qôm ostraca inscribed in Aramaic and Greek with date formula of the mid-third century B.C. now provide firm pegs for dating derivatives of the Aramaic character used in Palestine. The chronology of the earliest Qumrān biblical scrolls proposed in the writer's paper, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," *BANE*, pp. 133-202, must be labeled "minimal," and may be low by a generation. 4QEx and 4QSamb certainly are mid-third century B.C. at latest, and 4QJerá belongs to ca. 200 B.C.


11. Father Barthélémy (Proceedings of IOCS, 1972, p. 60), noting my unwillingness to adopt Albright's argument that the Hebrew text used by
the Greek translators had undergone recensional work in Egypt, then writes "I honestly think that F. M. Cross should give up his 'Egyptian Hebrew text' of Samuel-Kings, for its distinctive quality has only been shown (?) a propos of an Egyptian queen's name. It would be better to begin the textual history of Samuel with the old Palestinian form which the fragments from Cave IV, Qumrân have brought to light, and which more or less constitute the Vorlage of the old Septuagint, concerning which a process of recensional activity of a proto-Lucian type must have been begun almost as soon as the translator had finished his work." Let me say first of all that I should accept immediately Barthélemy's critique of Albright's interpretation of the Egyptian queen's name. I have also argued against Albright that the local textual families discerned in the variant textual traditions of which we have witness in Samuel and in much of the Pentateuch are not properly called "recensions." They are the product of natural growth or development in the process of scribal transmission, not of conscious or controlled textual recension (IEJ 16 [1966], 85, n. 21). In the case of Jeremiah, recensional activity may have been involved in the origin of the two surviving local texts. [See now E. Tov, "L'Incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," RB 79 (1972), 189-199.] In any case, my arguments for identifying an Egyptian textual tradition have never rested on Albright's evidence for Samuel-Kings. In my publication of the first fragments of 4QSam\(a\) (recovered in Father Roland de Vaux's excavations in Cave 4), I assumed that the text of 4QSam\(a\) was a congener of the Vorlage of the Old Greek (G\(BL\)). With the study of other fragments of 4QSam\(a\) and 4QSam\(c\) (from ca. 100 B.C.), and especially 4QSam\(b\) from the mid-third century B.C., I became increasingly dissatisfied with this explanation as over simple. The text of 4QSam\(b\) was much superior to the contemporary Hebrew text used by the Alexandrian translators, and not infrequently in agreement with M when the latter preserved a superior reading. While 4QSam\(a\) often was in agreement with G\(BL\) (G\(L\) in section \(\beta\gamma\)) in readings where M was haplographic, they agreed much less often in readings arising in expansions or other secondary readings. In short, I believe that both in the Pentateuch and in Samuel-Kings we have three distinct textual families. While what I have called the Egyptian and Palestinian are more closely affiliated, and evidently go back to an Old Palestinian archetype, I believe this archetype to be no later than the fourth century in the case of Samuel. In the case of the two texts of Jeremiah, I think the reasons for positing an Egyptian as well as a Palestinian text are compelling; in the case of the three textual families of the Pentateuch, I think the arguments are strong for identifying an Egyptian textual tradition, and in the case of Samuel-Kings, the arguments are not weak, and my tripartite division of tradition is bolstered by the analogy with the Pentateuch.


13. For sample readings, see ALQ\(^2\), p. 186, nn. 35-36.


16. We make this assertion in the face of the claims of the Letter of (Pseudo-)Aristeas (§ 176) that the Jewish highpriest sent to Ptolemy both translators and scrolls engraved in gold. The letter is, of course, propaganda intended to establish the Septuagint as authoritative.


18. Barthélémy's dating of the Dodekapropheton is minimal, and we cannot suppose that the copy of the Greek text found in the Nahal Ḥéber is the autograph.

19. See the forthcoming dissertation of Eugene Ulrich which compares the text of Josephus with the Qumrân manuscripts of Samuel. It shows clearly, I believe, that there is no reason to suppose that Josephus made use of a Hebrew text. Rather, he simply used a Greek text of Samuel of proto-Lucianic type.


21. See *ALQ*², pp. 188f. and n. 40a; *HTR* 57 (1964), 292-297; and Werner Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," *HTR* 58 (1965), 349-363.

22. S. Talmon in the *Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 197, insufficiently recognizes the resemblance of the textual traditions surviving in M in the Pentateuch and Samuel. He correctly describes the short text of the Pentateuch as compact and pristine, the short text of Samuel as haplographic and corrupt. However, these are the descriptions of the modern textual critic. From the point of view of the ancient scribe, both texts were short and primitive in orthography. Had the rabbis sought the best text of Samuel, best from a scientific, text-critical perspective, obviously they would have chosen a manuscript like 4QSamᵇ which no doubt would have been available to them. In fact they rejected the common Palestinian tradition.

23. See below on the paragraph missing in 2 Sam. 11 from M and GBL but preserved in 4QSamᵃ and Josephus, and certainly original.

24. Haplography is by far the most common scribal error as typists and linotype operators will ruefully testify. The textual critic's preference for the *lectio brevior* derives from his experience with textual traditions which have suffered conflation and secondary expansion which is the rule in the majority of textual traditions with long histories. He must be on his guard, however, against the occasional textual tradition in which haplography and secondary omissions are frequent as well as the occasional haplography in a prevailingly full text.

25. See above note 11.

26. Jeremiah presents a rare exception to this characterization.

27. As my student Dr. Walter Bodine has shown, the sixth column in
Judges is a "Palestinian recension," corrected to Hebrew text, which is unrelated to the kaige-Theodotionic recension (in Judges found in $G^B$). In Judges, however, this Palestinian recension is not found in the Lucianic witnesses ($gn$ pt and congeners). This suggests that the term "proto-Lucanian," appropriate in Reigns, is too limited a designation for the recension in question.

28. The formula is useful, of course, only where it can be shown that $G^B$ and $G^L$ reflect genuine Hebrew readings which differ from each other and from $M$.

29. The examples in $ALQ^2$, pp. 188-189, n. 40a, and in $HTR$ 57 (1964), 294, are arbitrarily chosen from the beginning and the end of the section as noted. See also now the extensive textual notes to Samuel in the New American Bible where many new readings from $4QSam^A$ are cited.

30. George Howard in his paper "Frank Cross and Textual Criticism," VT 21 (1971) has attacked my views on the proto-Lucianic recension. I should have been happier had he shown some knowledge of my more recent discussions, notably the lecture published in $IEJ$ 16 (1966), 81-95. In any case, he asserts (pp. 442f.) that "perhaps the most salient problem connected with Cross' theory is his assumption that the καύγε recension is a revision of the Proto-Lucianic text as represented by minuscules $boc_2e_2$. There is absolutely no uncertainty in Cross' mind that this is true. 'There is no doubt,' he says, 'that this Greek text was an early attempt to revise the standard Septuagint into conformity with a Proto-Massoretic text.'" I must confess to some bewilderment. Does Professor Howard suppose that my term "standard Septuagint" means the "proto-Lucianic recension"? I have never used it so. Had he looked elsewhere he would have discovered that I have written of "the Proto-Theodotionic reworking of the Old Greek translation." As a matter of fact, I have never written that the kaige Recension was made from the proto-Lucianic recension, and can assure Professor Howard that his remark that "there is absolutely no uncertainty in Cross' mind" is inaccurate. There is nothing but uncertainty in my mind on this issue. Howard also asks how I can identify "an Egyptian Hebrew text of Samuel-Kings with a Greek text that no longer exists." Of course the Old Greek is not lost in sections other than $ßγ$ and $γß$ so that we can calculate its characteristics over against $M$ and the Samuel MSS of Qumrân. The Itala also may be a witness to the Old Greek in $ßγ$ and $γß$ rather than to the proto-Lucianic recension. In any case, an Old Greek stratum in $boc_2e_2$, in Josephus, and in the Itala persists, in the latter two cases overwhelmingly dominates. Here I stand with Barthélémy in effect. At most the proto-Lucianic text is a light revision of the Old Greek, consisting of occasional corrections to the closely allied Palestinian text. The Old Greek thus is not unknown to us; it is not lost in such a radical sense. I wonder what Professor Howard thinks. Does he suppose that the Vorlage of the Old Greek, after sharing many traits and readings with $G^L$, Josephus, $4QSam^A$, and $4QSam^c$ suddenly shifted at the beginning of 2 Samuel 10 into a proto-Massoretic text type while Josephus, $G^L$ and the Qumrân Samuel MSS persisted unchanging in their non-Massoretic character?

31. Cf. F. M. Cross, $IEJ$ 16 (1966), 90f.; see now also, Barthélémy,
"Les problèmes textuel de 2 Sam 11, 2-1 Rois 2, 11," pp. 24f., who adds to my arguments for a Hillelite date.


34. Tov would argue, I am sure, that in the formula $G^L_4QSam =/= MG^B$, where $M$ and $G^B$ are in agreement, the text of $G^B$ was corrected secondarily toward $M$. Thus $G^B$ would take on a very different character from that we have generally attributed to it, having suffered very extensive Hebraizing and/or Hexaplaric contamination. Indeed, $G^B$ would have the strange look - having exceedingly frequent corrections to $M$ which involve the omission of Greek readings, very rare corrections to $M$ where $M$ has a plus over the common Greek witnesses (asterisked passages in the Hexapla). I prefer to regard most of the shorter readings of $G^B$ as primitive, stemming from its Vorlage.

Even so, there remain a sprinkling of proto-Lucianic readings which cannot be identified as Old Greek. To introduce "another Old Greek" rather than the Old Greek is, in the present state of our knowledge, a less "parsimonious" solution than positing a proto-Lucianic stratum.

See also Ralph W. Klein, "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns," *HTR* 60 (1967), 93-105.


36. *HTR* 57 (1964), 295f., n. 44.
I The History of the Bible Text - The Present Stage of Research

The discovery of the biblical manuscripts from Qumran triggered a widespread renewed interest in the comparative textual research of the Bible, and foremost in the history of the Bible text. Of special importance in this respect was the late W. F. Albright's attempt in 1955 to throw "New Light on Early Recensions of the Bible." In retrospect, it may be said that this short article in fact became the launching pad of a whole new school in biblical textual studies, in the formation of which Frank M. Cross, Jr. has played a dominant role. It appears, though, at present that the impetus effected by Albright's initial paper, and accelerated by later papers and monographs in which followers of the "three recensions" school developed the new lines, recently has perceptibly slowed down, possibly or even probably because scholars quite legitimately now are busy consolidating the new positions won during the last twenty years or so. This situation prompts me to present here some thoughts about new directions which should be and could be profitably explored in the field of textual research in direct conjunction with the wider realm of biblical studies. These new tasks are not incumbent exclusively on scholars whose preoccupation is the Bible text proper and the history of its transmission in the original Hebrew and in the Versions, but rather do they call for the cooperation of students in areas of biblical research which traditionally are considered separate domains of investigation.

Before mapping out some such new avenues, it seems advisable to offer in a nutshell a summary of the main stages that have led to the situation which one encounters now in biblical textual studies.

Before the discovery of the biblical scrolls from Qumran, i.e., until the middle of this century, an impasse had occurred with respect to theories about the early history of the Bible text, its genesis, and the ways and vicissitudes of its subsequent development. Rival conceptions had hardened into two polarized theories: de Lagarde's "Urtext" hypothesis
and P. Kahle's "Vulgaertexte" theory, with some scholars working out variations on the basic ideas within the framework of one or the other. One had turned away, to a large degree, from theorizing about those ultimately unattainable "first stages," i.e., the earliest form or forms of the Bible text. Instead scholars became preoccupied with the sifting of extant variants, and tried to establish "textual families," especially within the field of the Greek translations, and the relations of these families to each other. Textual errors, assumed or real, were collected, collated and categorized, and attempts were made to devise by a synopsis of all Versions a typology or typologies of inter-versional emendations.  

One wonders why, in view of these variegated endeavours, no attempt was made to publish an eclectic text of the Hebrew Bible, parallel to what von Gall, e.g., did for the Samaritan Pentateuch. 6 True, scholars occasionally tried their hand at re-establishing the presumed original text of this or that piece of biblical literature. 7 But one refrained, and in my judgment justifiably so, from going all the way by putting before the reader a reconstructed, supposedly original text of Hebrew Scriptures. The situation has not changed to this very day. At best, scholars will speculate on the "proto-text" of one or another version, but will not attempt to recover the Hebrew Urtext of a biblical book, let alone of the entire Bible.

The discovery of the Qumran biblical material opened up new horizons. After some initial doubts and varying appreciations of its antiquity, the preponderant majority of scholars subscribed to the opinion that the bulk of the scrolls and fragments discovered at Qumran stem from the last two centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E., with some dating certain fragments earlier into the third, and even fourth century B.C.E. 8 One now had access to biblical manuscripts from a very early period which previously had been altogether beyond the scope of textual research proper, i.e., research based on actual manuscript evidence.

The sifting and evaluating of individual variants continued, and with renewed vigor. The field was enriched by the crop of novel readings that turned up in Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran, and by the emergence of what sometimes can be taken to be the "Hebrew originals" of previously known versional variants. At the same time, new possibilities opened up for
manuscript-based investigations into the early history of the Bible text. These possibilities were made especially attractive by the circumstance that, *mutatis mutandis*, the Qumran biblical material in *toto*, and the problems that it presents to the student, approximate the Massoretic Text and Versions issue. Concomitant with the horizontal cross-section of the Bible text at Qumran during the last phases of the Second Temple period, the material affords us a vertical cross-section, i.e., a diachronic view which reflects at least three centuries of the history of the Bible text, within a closely circumscribed geographical setting. It thus can cause no wonder that the Qumran manuscripts soon became the point of departure for a novel theory with respect to the early history of the biblical text.

As said, it was W. F. Albright who laid the foundations of the new hypothesis. An analysis of the Qumran biblical materials available in 1955 led him to the suggestion that most manuscripts and fragments essentially can be aligned with the known ancient Versions of the Bible, including the MT, which in *toto* can be traced back to three local revisions that solidified in Babylon, Palestine and Egypt during the second half millennium B.C.E. Albright's mere sketch of this theory was fully worked out by Frank M. Cross who thus defined its bases: "Any reconstruction of the biblical text before the establishment of the traditional text in the first century A.D. must comprehend this evidence: the plurality of text-types, the limited number of textual families, and the homogeneity of these textual families over several centuries of time. We are required by these data...to recognize the existence of local texts which developed in the main centers of Jewish life in the Persian and Hellenistic age." Cross commendably introduced a significant change in Albright's terminology: "Against Albright, we should argue, however, that the local textual families in question are not properly called 'recensions.' They are the product of natural growth or development in the process of scribal transmission, not of conscious or controlled scribal recension."

This theory, which is yet in the process of being revised and further refined by Cross and his students, appears to have attracted surprisingly little comment either from European scholars, with few exceptions, or for that matter, Israeli students of the Bible text. It has remained largely confined to a rather restricted setting on the American scene. One does
not gain the impression that the "three local texts" hypothesis has aroused, as it surely deserves, a new debate on the basic issues in question. Actually one seems to observe again a concentration on partial problems which indeed are constituents of the overall theory, and a concomitant shying away, as it were, from the very heart of the matter. Much attention is given to the internal developments of the Greek Version or Versions, evoked especially by Barthélémy's critical appraisal of the fragments of a Greek Dodekapropheton from Qumran which sparked a spate of publications on the kaige revision of the Old Greek translation. The question of the relationship of this revision to Theodotion and proto-Theodotion, to Lucian and proto-Lucian, to Josephus' Greek text, and to the MT is in the forefront of ongoing textual research. This reflects on the major problem of the internal composition of Reigns, and the unity or compositeness of the Greek translation of other biblical books. Of exceeding importance is the renewed debate on whether the diverse Greek sources, or at least some, e.g., Aquila and Symmachus, should be judged independent translations made directly from the Hebrew original, or whether they are rather in the nature of revisions of one basic first translation. This discussion has some repercussions on the "two-translators" theory which had been proposed by Thackeray, Baab, Herman-Baumgaertel and others, by which one attempted to explain the inner linguistic and sometimes terminological diversity or duality of the Greek renditions of several biblical books, e.g., Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Now, a trend makes itself felt to substitute for "two translators" "one translator and a reviser." In reference to the Urtext versus Vulgatertext debate, recent developments, on the whole, appear to weigh the scales in favour of a more consolidated concept of the early text of the Bible, although it would seem that the new school has not aligned itself outright with the de Lagardians. While highly appreciative of the systematic effort to bring some method and order into the baffling diversity of text-types and textual variants which can be observed at Qumran, and certainly within the wider compass of the Hebrew Text and Versions, I yet entertain some reservations with regard to certain major aspects of the "three local families" theory. The theory implies that the three local texts derived directly from one
Hebrew proto-type, and that this archetype is to be dated at the latest in the fifth century B.C.E., that is to say more than half a millennium earlier than de Lagarde's Urtext or Rosenmueller's Ur-rezension. I would yet maintain, as I did several years ago, that notwithstanding the additional information and further analyses along these lines which have been forthcoming lately, the "three local texts" hypothesis cannot satisfactorily explain the restricted plurality of text-types at the end of the pre-Christian era. It appears that the extant text-types must be viewed as the remains of a yet more variegated transmission of the Bible text in the preceding centuries, rather than as witnesses to solely three archetypes. The more ancient manuscripts are being discovered and published, the more textual divergencies appear. The relatively limited number of distinct textual families which are extant at the end of the pre-Christian era may be explained to have resulted from two factors, among others: historical vicissitudes which caused other textual families to disappear; and the lack of a major prerequisite for the preservation of a text tradition, namely its acceptance by a sociologically definable integrated body.

This last factor raises an issue which is not sufficiently considered by students of the Bible text: the social and societal aspects of the preservation of literature, first and foremost of sacred literature. A hallowed text-form adopted by a specific group has a decidedly integrating effect. A Gruppentext is as much a socializing agent as is a Gruppen­sprache. This certainly applies to the Massoretic Text which became the standard version of the Synagogue; the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch which gained authoritative status in the Samaritan community; the Greek Version, and later the Latin, that were hallowed by the Church. One does not encounter the same degree of textual solidification at Qumran. The diversity of textual traditions preserved in the Covenanters' library may in part have resulted from the variegated sources of provenance of at least some of the manuscripts. These probably were brought to Qumran by members of the Community who hailed from diverse localities in Palestine, and from various social strata. From the very outset, one therefore should expect to find in that library, as indeed one does, a conflux of text-traditions which had developed over a considerable span of time in different areas of
Palestine, and also outside Palestine, as in Babylonia, and in different social circles. These diverse Vorlagen were continuously copied by the Covenanters' scribes at Qumran, even in the restricted compass of their scriptorium. The relatively short period of uninterrupted existence of the Covenanters' community possibly was not conducive to the emergence of one stabilized text form, if they were at all concerned about establishing a textus receptus. It stands to reason that also other constituted deviant Jewish communities may have embraced one specific text-type in their time. But with the disappearance of these groups also their respective literary heritages disappeared or were suppressed, and with them their particular biblical textual traditions.

The scope of variation within all these textual traditions is relatively restricted. Major divergencies which intrinsically affect the sense are extremely rare. A collation of variants extant, based on the synoptic study of the material available, either by a comparison of parallel passages within one Version, or of the major Versions with each other, results in the conclusion that the ancient authors, compilers, tradents and scribes enjoyed what may be termed a controlled freedom of textual variation. The exact limits of this "variation-scope," though, cannot be accurately established intuitively, nor can they be gauged from mere sample collations. An investigation into this matter, based on a thorough and comprehensive synopsis of all types of variants, glosses, intentional modifications, etc., which can be ascertained in our sources is an urgent desideratum.

The limited flux of the textual transmission of the Bible appears to be a legitimate and accepted phenomenon of ancient scribal tradition and not a matter which resulted from sheer incompetence or professional laxity. This fact, and our ignorance of literary standards and norms practised in the crucial period of the second half-millennium B.C.E., seems forever to proscribe any endeavour to restitute an assumed original of the biblical books. Beyond that, there arises an operational problem which harasses the editor of a critical edition of the Bible, and with which e.g. we are at present faced, working on the Book of Jeremiah for the Hebrew University Bible Project. The one-time existence of a short text of the Book, deduced from the Greek Version which exhibits a text which is considerably
shorter than the MT, gains further probability from the Hebrew frag­ments of Jeremiah found at Qumran. The preliminary reports published by their prospective editor, Frank Cross, and now also by J. G. Janzen, sug­gest that Qumran has preserved for us fragments of what amounts to a Hebrew Vorlage of the short Greek Text of Jeremiah. The considerable difference in sheer bulk makes labelling these traditions "pristine" and "expansionist" sound rather inadequate. The very comparability of so widely divergent traditions seems to be questionable. From here follows the further question, whether the collation of the short Greek and/or Hebrew text in the apparatus of the considerably fuller Massoretic Version can at all be justified on methodological grounds. Similar considerations pertain to the Book of Esther. The variance of the Greek traditions among themselves, and vis-à-vis the Hebrew, appears to preclude a system­atic collation of these widely divergent texts.

In view of these facts, I would propose that a major problem to be investigated with regard to the history of the Bible text is not so much the existence of a limited plurality of text-types, but rather the loss of other presumably more numerous textual traditions. Thus phrased, the issue of whether a single Urtext broke up into "three distinct local fam­ilies" in which subsequently and separately manuscript variants emerged, or whether conversely, primal traditions which varied among themselves to a limited degree progressively lost their lease on life and ultimately crystallized in a restricted number of Gruppentexte should be studied from a new angle.

II "Higher" and "Lower" Criticism - New Perspectives

The Albright-Cross hypothesis has considerably extended the histori­cal reach of the enquiry into the history of the Bible text. Kahle already had attempted to push the study of the history of the text in all its ram­ifications beyond the terminus non ante quem which his predecessors had tacitly or explicitly considered as the starting point of their investiga­tion, namely the end of the Second Commonwealth or the early period after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. The "three textual families" theory penetrates deeper into history, since it assumes that these textual families "developed slowly between the fifth and first centuries B.C., in
Palestine, in Egypt, and in a third locality, presumably Babylon. Thus, the investigation of textual phenomena, and of the developmental history of the Bible text is carried down into a period in which some biblical literature was yet being authored, and other parts were being re-dacted or edited. To put it differently, in that period diverse literary processes which affected biblical writings in their totality, then were carried out concurrently. The recognition of this circumstance should have alerted scholars to some new issues and endeavours in the wider field of biblical studies: the investigation of the possible comparability and likely interdependence of literary phenomena which, on the surface, obtain on different levels of the literary process. If the history of the Bible text is no longer considered to become the object of systematic study only after the creative impulse, i.e., after the authoring of biblical literature had come to an end, but rather as partly overlapping with it, then it obviously becomes legitimate to probe into the possibility that the textual enquiry, designated "lower criticism," may illuminate issues that are usually debated in the orbit of "higher criticism." The "shorter" versus the "expansionist" text of Jeremiah on the surface is a textual problem and thus comes under the heading of "lower criticism." But if the roots of the question go as deep as the fifth century B.C.E., the issue, in fact, connects and concurs with problems of "higher criticism," namely the presumed intrusion of non-Jeremianic material into the book ascribed to the prophet.

Another illustration of the same issue is the pericope in Isaiah ch. 38 which reports on Hezekiah's illness and the prophet's intervention as a healer could be similarly viewed. The absence of Hezekiah's יְהוֹאָשׁ, the King's prayer-psalm recorded in the Book of Isaiah (ib. vv. 9-20), both from the parallel in 2 Kings 20 and 2 Chr. 32 (where also other parts of the narrative in which the prayer is set are missing), prima facie is a structural problem which belongs in the realm of "higher criticism." As against this, the somewhat different textual order of the components of the pericope in the First Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa) will correctly be dealt with as an issue of "text," and thus comes under the heading of "lower criticism." Would it not be in order to investigate whether one set of problems could not have some bearing on the other, foremost the "textual" on the "structural"?
In the present context, a full analysis of the rather complex problem would be cumbersome, and therefore will be discussed in a separate paper. Here it must suffice to outline the main points involved, highlighting their bearing on the issue under review. In doing so, we shall concentrate on the Hebrew text, with only occasional references to Versional variants.

Of the four extant Hebrew parallels, 2 Chr. 32 presents by far the shortest and Is. 38 the most expansive text. The latter also is reflected in 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} with one significant deviation, shortly to be analysed. 2 Kings 20 occupies a medial position with respect to the extent of text presented. There can be little doubt that the Chronicler's text, which clearly is based on the 2 Kings version, has been severely abbreviated. The account comprises 22 verses in Is. 38, and 11 in 2 Ki. 20. It was compressed into one single verse in 2 Chr. 32:24. The process of editing appears to have been carried out rather mechanically by telescoping the beginning of the narrative - בָּרָאָם תֹּאַשׁ תָּלָה (2 קִנְיָן וְוַדַּק הַלַּמֶּנֶּה (cp. 2 Ki. 20:1 and Is. 38:1 MT and 1QIs\textsuperscript{a}) - with the catchphrase - יִרְדּוּבָּה הַנְּחָל לְנַחַל - which alludes to the "sign" - נִחֲלָה (2 Ki. 20:8-11; Is. 38:7-8, 22) - given by the prophet to the king to assure him that he will recover from his illness. The two components were awkwardly combined by the apocopated phrase לְנַחַל נִחֲלָה, presumably referring to Isaiah, with the contents of the message missing. LXX has here the more fitting but probably "improved" rendition καὶ ἐπηκουσέν (or BH: ἀκουσά) σὺνῷ which does not require a direct object. Neither the summary in 2 Chr. 32:4 nor the full narrative in 2 Ki. 20:1-11, reflected also in both the MT and 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} of Is. 38, exhibit any hint that would make the reader expect the additional psalm - קָלַלְכָּה - which follows in Is. 38:9-20 upon the conclusion of the narrative. This obvious addition which elaborates on Hezekiah's short prayer (ib. vv. 2-3) bears witness to a paraphrastic tendency that affected the prophetic narrative, most probably after it had been incorporated into the Book of Isaiah. Upon weighing the evidence, the expanded Isaiah parallel is found to be secondary to the shorter, or more "pristine" Kings account. In essence, the issue is of a structural nature and pertains to the field of "higher criticism." It resembles the contrast between the short Greek (and Qumran Hebrew) and the expanded Massoretic text of Jeremiah, which standard
procedure considers a textual problem, and which is discussed under the heading of "lower criticism."

A "textual" dimension attaches to the relationship between the two witnesses to the Isaiah text, the MT and 1QIs. The Qumran text lacks verses 38:21-22 which in the present MT conclude the composite narrative (vv. 1-8) cum prayer-psalm (vv. 9-20) pericope: "Then Isaiah said, 'Let them take a cake of figs, and apply it to the boil, that he may recover.' And Hezekiah said, 'What is the sign that I shall go up to the house of the Lord?'

It is generally agreed that these two verses are misplaced in the MT, probably as a result of homoioteleuton, since both the בֶּן לֹא and the concluding appendix end on the words דָּבַר יָהוָה, preceded in one instance by לע (Is. 38:20) and in the other by the graphically similar הנָא (ib. v. 22). Therefore they are generally transposed after v. 6, to a position parallel to the one they occupy in the 2 Kings arrangement. The verses clearly were before a reviser of 1QIs. He supplied the missing passage s.m. by squeezing most of v. 21 into the remainder of the last line of ch. 38 - omitting, though, the word לא - and then wrote the word לע and all of v. 22 vertically in the left-hand margin. However, the fact that the first scribe neatly ended his copying of ch. 38 by using up only about one-fourth of the last line, leaving the remainder blank, seems to suggest that his Vorlage contained a shorter text than the MT. This supposition gains in probability when one bears in mind that 1) the unemended 1QIs text and the MT without the appendix read smoothly, indeed read better than the fuller 2 Kings text; 2) Hezekiah's question "... ile the fig-cure in 2 Ki. 20:8 - conveniently left out in the Is. reading, is a pedantic and superfluous enlargement; 3) the reference to a fig-pad לָלֵל... which the prophet prescribed as a cure for the King's affliction makes Isaiah the type of wonder-healer that is known from prophetic narratives in the historiographies, but is altogether out of tune with the traditions told about him in his book. The reference to the "cure" (v. 21) in the appendix to Is. 38 thus is recognized as a secondary intrusion from the 2 Kings parallel. 4) The definition of the King's malady as "boil" (NEB) - on the surface looks like an "informed" interpretation of the very general remark that Hezekiah had been taken critically ill
In actual fact it is a tendentious elaboration which probably was intended to present the king's illness in the typical manner of a divinely decreed affliction. Whereas יִלְוֹם usually refers to any illness which affects man in the course of nature (cp. e.g. Gen. 48:1; 1 Sam. 19:14; 30:13; 1 Ki. 14:15; 15:23, 17:17; 2 Ki. 8:7, 29; Neh. 2:2 et al.), יִלְוֹם like רֶבֶן - plague and equally יֵרֶבֶן - leprosy in the narrative parts of biblical literature, is conceived of as a topos, a sign of divine wrath (Ex. 9:9-11; Deut. 28:27, 35), especially in the Job story (Job 2:7). Since the fig-pad element is not alluded to in the compressed 2 Chr. account nor in the base text of 1QIsa, it is conceivable that it should be viewed as an alternate tradition of the sun-dial sign which also indicates God's acceptance of Hezekiah's prayer. This latter is present in all four versions of the narrative, including the catch-phrase reference יִתְנָסָא in 2 Chr. 32:24.

We are led to the suggestion that the retrospective reference to the healing of Hezekiah's illness, defined as יִלְוֹם, and the recapturing of the sun-dial sign in MT Is. by the question put into the king's mouth, constitute an appendix. Together with the main narrative in vv. 1-8, it is intended to form an inclusio-like frame for the inserted prayer-psalm בּוֹדָד: while v. 21 (the fig-pad) is a topical doublet of vv. 7-8 (the sun-dial sign), v. 22 links the renewed reference to the King's illness in Is. 39:1 (= 2 Ki. 20:12) with the initial narrative, thus arching, as it were, over the intrusive element of the prayer-psalm. The present 1QIsa text indeed contains the psalm. But the omission of the closing verses, i.e., the fig-pad parallel and the inclusio, seem to reflect a shorter version in which the psalm and the "fig-pad" episode had not yet been incorporated into the Isaiah version of the 2 Kings tradition. 1QIsa, with the prayer-psalm, thus represents, on the one hand, a medial stage of structural development between MT Is. and MT Kings, and lacking the fig-pad reference, on the other hand, appears to have a more pristine tradition than MT Kings in which the sun-dial sign and the fig-pad already are conflated.

The above analysis rooted in structural criteria that divide MT Is. from MT Kings (and Chr.), on the one hand, and in textual criteria which constitute a deviation of 1QIsa and MT Chr. from MT Is. and Kings, on the
other, clearly illustrates the interdependence of the two phenomena and of the respective disciplines of structural-"higher" and textual-"lower" criticism. It reveals the parallelism of the "fig-pad" and the "sun-dial" signs which presumably had been alternately employed in parallel versions of the Hezekiah story. The transposition of MT Is. 38:21-22 after v. 6 in order to align the text with MT Kings, subscribed to by virtually all commentators and translators, must be considered improper procedure, both from the viewpoint of structural and of textual analysis.

III Biblical Stylistics and the Textual Study of the Bible

It would appear that another field of comparative research is even closer at hand than the "lower" and "higher" criticism issue. It concerns the study of biblical stylistics on the one hand and the textual study of the Bible on the other. In this area of prospective interdisciplinary research, new ground can be broken.43

Let me explain what I have in mind.

It may be considered an established practice in biblical studies to separate the discussion of stylistics from the study of the forms and the history of the Bible text. The subject-matter examined in the one field is adjudged to be intrinsically different from that which comes under scrutiny in the other. Biblical stylistics are taken to deal exclusively with the ways and techniques of literary creativity, while in the study of the text one is concerned with processes which were operative in the preservation and transmission of the finished product. Consequently, distinctive methods seem to be required for an analytical investigation into these disparate fields of research. These distinctive methods again call for a specialization and a degree of expertise which result in a rigid departmentalization of the study of biblical literature. The scholar who has made the problems of biblical stylistics his main pursuit will be drawn away from questions which pertain primarily to the history of the Bible text. On the other hand, the student who has chosen as his domain the comparative study of the witnesses to the Bible text seldom will occupy himself with the genesis of literary forms or with the evolution of biblical stylistic devices. The few notable exceptions that there are only prove the rule. The resulting division of labor further widens the gulf
between these two areas of biblical studies which become oriented towards different frameworks of references and which are subjected to analysis by different sets of tools. In practice we arrive at the crystallization of two self-contained disciplines covering two areas which barely touch upon each other.

In this division also a time element is involved. The study of biblical stylistics is rooted in the phase of biblical literary creativity which is taken to have come to an end in the initial stages of the codification of biblical literature, when style stopped developing. Roughly at that stage divergent textual traditions emerged which make possible the study of the textual history of the Bible. The dividing line between these two phases may be set approximately at the end of the third century B.C.E. \(^44\)

As a technical corollary of the division between biblical stylistics and the study of the Bible text in matters of method, these issues often are examined independently of each other in specialized works whose scope is consciously limited to the one or the other. On the one hand, there are histories and descriptions of the "biblical literature" which take no notice of textual problems whatsoever, such as, e.g., K. Budde, Geschicte der althebraeischen Literatur (Leipzig 1909), J. Hempel, Die althebraeische Literatur und ihr hellenistisches-juedisches Nachleben (Potsdam 1930), and A. Lods, L'histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive (Paris 1950). On the other hand, concerns of stylistics and literature, together with other problems, are altogether excluded, e.g., from F. Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament (Edinburgh 1892), B. J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions (Cardiff 1951) and E. Wuerthwein, Der Text des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart 1973) which deal solely with aspects of the textual history of the Bible. Even more revealing is the arrangement of the discussion of these subject matters in comprehensive Introductions to the (Literature of the) Old Testament. The part or parts which deal with style and literary forms usually precede the analysis of the biblical books in their traditional order, while the formation of the canon and the history of the Bible text are dealt with in what amounts to an appendix. \(^45\)

This arrangement forcefully underlines the distinctiveness of the field of biblical stylistics from that of the study of the Bible text. With this
division of spheres goes the notion that a transfer of analytical tools from one to the other can hardly be justified, since one cannot assume *prima facie* any inherent similarity in the processes under observation in the one and in the other.

One certainly has to acknowledge the methodological necessity and the practical advantages which are provided by this division of the spheres of study. However, since we are dealing with one closely-knit complex of literature - notwithstanding the variety and diversity of phenomena involved - we should ask ourselves whether or not there are common basic features which can be discerned in these different emanations of biblical literary creativity. We do not refer to the widely practised employment of stylistic criteria, such as *parallelismus membrorum*, for the emendation of a supposedly faulty text. What we have in mind are fundamental formative elements which assumedly were operative on the author level as stylistic patterns and in the transmission-stage as their editorial and textual modification.

The mere quest for such common fundamental elements in biblical literature *ab initio* implies that we do not rule out the possible transfer of principles and formative techniques from the sphere of literary composition to that of textual transmission. In fact we expect such transfers to occur to a high degree of probability in a literature which experienced the transition from a state of relatively flexible and modifiable oral tradition to a more stabilized written transmission and ultimately to textual uniformity. The transition from one stage to the other was not disruptive, but rather was it a smooth and gradual process which moreover affected biblical literature in a staggered sequence: different biblical books were subjected to the progressive stages of transition at different periods. This even-flowing development allowed for a continuum of values and for a transfer of standards from one stage to another, by means of variation and adaptation. Thus, stylistic conventions which had been of decisive importance in the formation of oral tradition did not cease from being operative in the stage of written transmission. They also left their imprint on the work of editors and revisers, and are reflected in scribal techniques which were conducive to textual stabilization. Therefore, in analyzing the processes and methods that are mirrored in the
transmitted text-forms of the biblical books which represent the final written crystallization of initially oral traditions, we should not lose sight of the continuous impact of basic stylistic maxims on processes of textual transmission.

Let me illustrate the continuity posited here by an example of a scribal technique which most probably was employed already in the biblical setting on different levels of the creative literary process, and persisted in the same duality of employments in post-biblical writings. In the scribal category of finis notations, biblical literature twice employs the technical term על כל מה. Both instances are found in the Book of Jeremiah. It seems likely that in one, Jer. 48:47b, the notation על כל מה which concludes the Oracle against Moab (48:1-47) was part of that unit before it became integrated into the Book of Jeremiah. We may surmise that it is the concluding remark of an author, although the definition of the term in this context would be rather difficult. In the second instance, Jer. 51:64b, the notation ועל כל מה decidedly should be ascribed to an arranger or editor of the book who appended it here after a preceding expansion of the collection of oracles credited to Jeremiah. The finis notation at the end of ch. 51 quite definitely proves ch. 52 to be in the nature of an appendix.

The very same term על כל מה again serves as a finis notation in the post-biblical collection of proverbs that are known under the name of Ben-Sira. There it introduces a colophon-like summary, appended to the end of ch. 51, which is closed by a doxology of the type found at the endings of each of the five collections which constitute the Book of Psalms: על כל דברישמעון בן ישעיה שמעון בן סאמר. תבכה שם ענן בן יוחנן בן אלעזר בן יוסף. This can be little doubt that this notation stems from the pen of a copyist or an editor of Ben-Sira’s proverbs, and not from the pen of the author, who in fact had closed his book by a preceding colophone that comes at the end of ch. 50:29 (42):

Now, while the author’s colophon is extant in all versions of the book, the line ועל כל מה which we take, with others, to be a scribe’s or an editor’s notation, is found only in the Hebrew text and is missing from the Greek, the Syriac and the Latin.
The proposed analysis of the employment of the finis notation thus illustrates the persistence of a biblical literary technique which has its equivalent in pre-biblical Mesopotamian scribal tradition and in post-biblical literature. At the same time it exemplifies the diversified employment of one and the same technique on different stages of the literary process - by an author, an editor or arranger, and possibly a copyist - and thus proves the literary process to constitute a continuum which facilitates the transfer and the adaptability of underlying basic norms and concepts.

IV

The assumed continuity of literary maxims and techniques, employed by literati who were active in the creation, preservation and transmission of the literary product, viz. the books of the Bible, becomes practically a certainty when, as is done by the "three recensions" school, the process of text recension and preservation is taken to have begun as early as the fifth century B.C.E. It stands to reason that at that stage of the development of biblical literature, and also before it, authors and copyists were not clearly separable classes of literary practitioners. One rather may presume that a unio personalis was the rule: an author often served, when the need or the occasion arose, also as the editor, transmitter, scribe or copyist of his own works or of the work of others. A comprehensive integrated concept of the diverse facets of this literary process would help us better to understand the biblical prophet's variegated literary pursuits which crystallize in the complexity of a prophet "book."

In the early post-exilic period, Ezra the Scribe represents this type of literate. Later in the Mishnaic period, the eminent Tanna R. Meir (second century C.E.), Akiba's most prominent disciple, was active both as a creative teacher and as a prodigious scribe. Now, if the post-exilic fifth century and the Tannaitic alike indeed was a man of many parts, a comprehensive literate who could be author, editor, transmitter, scribe or copyist when performing different aspects of his profession, it surely must be agreed that his literary techniques would not automatically change whenever he turned from one task to another. Quite to the contrary, it may be taken for granted that some basic canon of literary conventions
would be followed by him in all the variegated performances of his craft, obviously with some variation and adaptation of the basic rules and modes to the specific requirements. It is possible, or even probable, that such scribes were busy at Qumran with copying sanctified literature while creativity of a biblical or a quasi-biblical stance continued, as can be deduced e.g. from the supernumerary compositions in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11, the Hodayoth, and possibly the Temple Scroll, etc.

We can go one step further. The contemporaneity of the diverse literary processes of authoring, editing and copying, with regard to different components of the biblical canon, makes it likely that similar literary traditions were followed, at least to some degree, also by men who specialized in one specific aspect of the literary process, if such specialization had already begun to emerge. That is to say, the professional copyist in his work would follow, mechanically and instinctively or deliberately, literary prototypes and techniques by which the historiographer abided and which the historiographer emulated, let us say, from the narrative or the oratory biblical style. The phenomenon could be defined as "variations on common basic literary standards." This continuity of literary modes over the centuries, and across the diverse aspects of the literary process, appears to be reflected in the gamut of connotations that attach to such a basic term as "bible" in biblical and in post-biblical rabbinic literature. The famous Baraita in Baba Bathra 14b-15a defines by the term "D^" Moses' authoring of the Torah (the Balaam Pericope and the Book of Job) - the compilation of the Book of Psalms by David with the help of (or transmitted by) ten sages of old - as well as the transmission or the canonisation of Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes by (King) Hezekiah and his college - Our modern differentiation between the diverse aspects of the literary process, for which we also would coin and employ different terms, simply did not concern the ancients, who entertained, so it seems, an all-inclusive comprehensive view of literature.

The same comprehensiveness seems to be reflected in the diverse manifestations of what I would define as "basic literary modes." The issue requires a full-fledged study. Here space permits only the presentation of some examples.
Returning for a moment to *parallelismus membrorum* which we mentioned in passing, it certainly is true that this basic device of biblical and other ancient Near Eastern writers is not to be taken as merely an ornamental figure, but rather as "the main building principle" of biblical poetry and to some extent also of biblical prose. One concurs with L. Alonso-Schoekel's statement that *parallelismus membrorum* "ist kein rein auesserliches Stilmittel, sondern eine Haltung und eine Denkweise." If this is indeed the case, it would be shortsighted to assume that this fundamental principle was employed exclusively by "productive" writers and had no impact whatsoever on the "reproductive" arranger, scribe and copyist. *Parallelismus membrorum* and the underlying tendency to reiterate matters stated once in a somewhat different phrasing, together with some other cardinal literary modes, must be considered emanations of fundamental Semitic and Hebrew thought processes and literary concepts which permeate the entire range of biblical literary activity.

**IV Stylistic and Textual Interchangeability of Words**

Let me begin by discussing the phenomenon of "interchangeability" rooted in pragmatic synonymity which often results from the break-up of word-pairs that sometimes are in the nature of a *hendyadys*.

Ia. On the creative-literary level, interchangeability expresses itself in the employment of a word-pair in *parallelismus membrorum*, in a fixed (A-B) or an indiscriminate order (A-B or B-A) where one component in practice can substitute for the other.

1. A pair in case is דַּקְנָה - כּוּרָשׁ. In Is. 2:9 we encounter the pair in the A-B sequence: דַּקְנָה כּוּרָשׁ אֲשֶׁר | כּוּרָשׁ דַּקְנָה. In Is. 31:8 the sequence is B-A: כּוּרָשׁ דַּקְנָה אֲשֶׁר | דַּקְנָה כּוּרָשׁ (cp. further: Job 9:12; 38:26; Prov. 30:2 etc.). Because of their synonymity, דַּקְנָה and כּוּרָשׁ can serve alternately in one and the same idiom. Is. 21:9 has כּוּרָשׁ אֲשֶׁר whereas in 22:6 we encounter the parallel expression כּוּרָשׁ דַּקְנָה. Cp. further Is. 2:20 - לָלֹא אֲשֶׁר | לָלֹא אֲשֶׁר (cp. further 1QIsa; G) with Is. 31:7 - לָלֹא אֲשֶׁר | לָלֹא אֲשֶׁר (cp. further 1QIsa; G).

2. How do we now assess the character of the very same interchange when it occurs between two MT parallels such as
Is this instance to be considered a textual variant or a stylistic variation?

b. The issue becomes further complicated when one comes to consider this very same interchange of דת and שן when it occurs between the MT and a translation and between a biblical Hebrew text and its citation in extra-biblical literature.

In the rendition of

3. Lev. 27:28-29

the Aramaic Targums clearly follow the MT in differentiating consistently between דת and שן. In contradistinction, the LXX uniformly render both Hebrew words by ἄνθρωπος. This is in keeping with the apparent inconsistency of the LXX in rendering the two Hebrew terms which are kept well apart by Aquila - שן = ἄνήρ, דת = ἄνθρωπος with a limited number of exceptions. In view of the foregoing examples, it can be surmised that this Greek custom does not reflect consistency but rather may indicate the continuity of the biblical synonymous employment of the pair of words as a literary device which as a result could be used interchangeably.

c. This suggestion can be buttressed by the following observation. The biblical verses quoted above turn up as a telescoped quotation in the Damascus Fragments which read (editio C. Rabin):

4. CD ix, 1: ... cuid adem ash ribim adem mele ... cuid adem ash ribim

Although there are some queries with regard to the exact interpretation of the passage, it should not have gone unnoticed that the Qumran text in its threefold reiteration of the noun שן reflects the Greek threefold mention of ἄνθρωπος. It thus presents additional proof for the one-time existence of a text-tradition of Leviticus which differed from the MT in precisely the same interchange of שן and דת which constitutes the core of the variation between two identical verses in parallel accounts (Ps. 105:14 and 1 Chr. 16:21) and in recurring imagery within one and the same biblical book in the Massoretic Version (Is. 21:9 and 22:6; 2:20 and 31:7).
IIa. Another example of the same kind is the following:

5. ראהו מַלְאַכְוָל כָּל - אֵית נָבְרָר serves as a hendyadys, e.g. in 1 Sam. 14:52 and in Ruth 2:1, which can be broken up into its two components which then serve separately in a parallelistic structure, as in Jer. 14:9.

b. So far we certainly are in the realm of biblical stylistics. Is this yet so when the two terms in question are employed alternately in two parallel expressions but in two different books of the Bible:

6. Ps. 24:8 יְהָוָה אֵישׁ מֶלֶצְתָּה as against Ex. 15:3 יְהָוָה אֵישׁ מֶלֶצְתָּה, or should this be counted as a "textual variant"?

c. By established rules, we certainly must consider the same interchange as a textual variant when it occurs between two Versions:

7. In distinction from the above MT reading in Ex. 15:3: יְהָוָה אֵישׁ מֶלֶצְתָּה, the Samaritan reads there יְהָוָה בָּנְוָר מֶלֶצְתָּה. It seems that this decidedly textual variation, irrespective of whether it is unpremeditated or intentional, illustrates the persistence of modes of style in the practices of text transmission. The tradent or the copyist of the Samaritan Version made use of the same controlled freedom in the transmission of the text vis-à-vis the MT as did the writer of Psalm 24 in respect to Ex. 15, or vice versa. Should these two instances, indeed can they, be dealt with in complete separation from each other, one under the discipline of stylistics and the other under textual criticism?

III. הנחל and נחל are a pair of synonymous verbs which are employed interchangeably

a. on the creative-stylistic level in parallel members of one and the same sentence, in either the A-B or the B-A order, as e.g. in the following instances to which many more could be added:

8. Gen. 27:37 [II] ואהו כֶּל אַחֳרִי נָחֲרִי לָעְבָּדֵיו
 Josh. 7:19 [II] שָׁמִים נָא בְּכָרִי לַיְהוָה אָלְהָיו יְשַׁיא [II] חֹל לַחֹוָד
 Ez. 4:2 [II] וַנִּתְהַלְּעָלָה מַחְבְּחָה
b. The two verbs can be alternately employed in the same context, as e.g. in the matter of appointing a king. The basic passage:

9. Deut. 17:14-15

is reflected in the wording of 1 Sam. 8:5-6 which deals with the negotiations between Samuel and the people that preceded the election of Saul. There, as well as in 1 Sam. 9:23-24 נ幹ל and are consistently employed as alternatives (cp. further Hos. 13:10-11).

c. Again, נ幹ל and נ幹ל can serve alternately in a given idiom.

10. Whereas in Lev. 26:6; Num. 25:12; Hag. 2:9 and 1 Chr. 22:9 the notion of "peace" is expressed by נ幹ל, Num. 6:26 has the phrase: נ幹ל נ幹ל.

11. The opposite notion of "destruction and waste" can be indicated either by תדננ תדננ תדננ (Jer. 6:8) or alternately by תדננ תדננ (Ez. 5:14). A similar interchange obtains between Mal. 2:14 and Ez. 35:1-9 where the combination נ幹ל נ幹ל נ幹ל נ幹ל נ幹ל נ幹ל is recurrently used to describe the future fate of Edom (vv. 3, 7, 9), but where also turns up in a similar phrase (v. 4).

d. While all the above instances come under the heading of stylistic interchanges, the very same verb-couple constitutes the variant element in two variae lectionis between the MT and the Samaritan Version.


13. In Lev. 8:9 an inverted situation obtains: MT has twice נ幹ל whereas Sam. in both instances reads נ幹ל.

We surely must ask ourselves whether the Sam. deviation from the MT is intrinsically different from the interchange of the two verbs in question in synonymous expressions in the MT, such as discussed above, or in parallel members of a biblical verse. Unless definite criteria can be established for a methodological differentiation between the above identical phenomena, the Sam. variants vis-à-vis the MT must be viewed as emanations of the same literary-stylistic modes and processes which underlie the
internal interchangeability of the two verbs. In editing the biblical text of Leviticus, one would record the Sam. readings for practical purposes as variants in the apparatus. But this appositioning of the one reading in the main text and the other in the apparatus in no way can reflect on their relative merits, nor does it establish the variation to be of a "textual" (in distinction from being of a "stylistic") nature.

e. The complexity of the issue increases when translational Versions are brought into the picture.

14. The Greek verb-pair τυθτίναυ and δοδο*να exhibits the same, or at least a similar, interchangeability as the Hebrew pair "JfD and D**t£?. Both Greek verbs, in complete parallelism with the two Hebrew equivalents, express e.g. the notion of appointing someone to office. It therefore cannot cause any surprise that in the LXX either one of the Hebrew pair can be rendered by either one of the Greek pair. The usual rendition of ןוֹל would be δοδο*νא whereas סֶפ is preponderantly rendered by τυθτייו. However, in Jer. 1:5 MT: מֻּלָּה לָמַל אֶל נַחַר יִשְׂרָאֵל is translated in LXX: τεθεικά δε (cp. v. 10). The same situation obtains in v. 18, MT: מַלָּל, LXX: τεθεικά δε and in v. 15, MT מַלָּל, LXX: וָאֶהְסֻכֶּנ. In Jer. 9:10(11) the LXX renders the double employment of מַלָּל in MT (ונא ... וְנָחַר) once by δοδο*ו and once by δοדומא, possibly to avoid repetition. Josephus, however, preserved also in the first instance a form of τυθτייו: וָאֶהְסֻכ, and thus may reflect a tradition which rendered the Hebrew root מַלָּל twice by τυθτייו, unless he avoided repetition by rendering like Aq. the second mention - δοדומא.

f. A conflux of the literary and the textual interchangeability of סֶפ and מַלָּל can be observed in the Book of Ezekiel with respect to the idiom .. סֶפ or ב סֶפֶן מַלָּל, in the meaning of 'turn accusingly or threateningly towards someone or something.'

15. In 6:2; 13:17; 21:2 (G 20:46); 21:7 (G 21:2); 25:2; 20:21; 29:2; 38:2 the LXX render the expression by στηρίξω which translates סֶפ/סֹפ in Jer. 17:5; 21:10; 24:6; Am. 9:4.

16. The same stem is employed twice to render מַלָּל, in Ez 14:8 MT: מַלָּל מִּלָּל וַיֹּא אוֹלָה
LXX: στηρίξω
15:7 MT: רֵבָּהָה אַחֲרֵי מָתָי ... מְשַׁרֵּפָה אַחֲרֵי מָתָי
LXX: ὑπεκατάθει τοὺς στήριξιν

While these cases can be categorized as "textual interchanges," the pragmatic synonymity of the word-pair שִׁפְחָה/טַלְתָּל quite legitimately became a fructifying element in biblical and subsequently in post-biblical midrashic expostulation. In the description of Israel's iniquities in ch. 14, the two verbs alternate in a recurring phrase. Once the reading is

17. Ez. 14:3 MT: לִמְכַשֵּׁל לְעֹבֵד בָּתָר נָכָה פָּדוּת
LXX: ἐσθηκαν, while in
14:4,7 MT: לִמְכַשֵּׁל לְעֹבֵד רָשָׁת נָכָה טָפָר
LXX: ὑπεκατάθει the variation with שִׁפְחָה is introduced. At the culmination of the passage, when Judah is threatened with retribution, measure for measure, the two verbs are skilfully combined in midrash-fashion imagery:

18. 14:8 MT: רֵבָּהָה אַחֲרֵי הָדוֹחַ לָאָרָה לְמַשָּׁלֵיהו
LXX: γένομεν στήριξιν

It is probable that the unusual hiph. of שִׁפְחָה here was chosen on purpose. It suggests a possible derivation of the form שִׁפְחָה from the root שָׁמַח in evoking an association with

15:8 MT: רֵבָּהָה אַחֲרֵי מָתָי
LXX: καὶ διήπατο τὸν γῆν εἰς ἀρανισμὸν

and obviously was thus understood by the Greek translator of 14:8: γένομεν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔρημον καὶ εἰς ἀρανισμὸν.

It is of interest to note that the midrashic utilization of the pragmatic synonymity of שִׁפְחָה/טַלְתָּל was carried over into post-biblical literature. The Qumran Pesher of Habakkuk (1QHabP v. 1 ff.) quotes verbatim:

19. Hab 1:12MT: וַיַּהֲדֹהַה לְמֵשָׁלֵיהוּ, but then goes on to interpret the phrase: בְּבִילֵי בְּשֵׁרְיָהוּ אַל אֵת מַשָּׁלֵיהוּ כָּלַה הַרְגָּשָׁה. Although the choice of וַיַּהֲדֹהַה in this instance may be a mere free variation, in view of the foregoing discussion, it is better taken to constitute a post-biblical reflex of a biblical stylistic-textual tradition.
V Stylistic and Textual Conflation

Another phenomenon which can be observed on diverse levels of the biblical literary tradition is that of "doubling" or "conflation." Again, I intend to indicate here only the main lines of approach which I think should be followed in a full-fledged investigation of the issue. I shall do so by choosing an inverted order of presentation, beginning with "doubling" on the textual level, and tracing from there the impact of the same phenomenon on the "stylistic" levels.

IVa. The issue of "double readings" resulting from textual conflation is well known and so widespread that it requires little if any illustration. Conflation can be observed in a wide variety of configurations in the Hebrew Versions of the Bible - MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, Qumran biblical manuscripts - as well as in the ancient translations. In a previous discussion of this phenomenon, I proposed to explain the motivation of the scribe or the translator to record more than one reading in a given context as revealing his reverence for transmitted readings between which he could not choose, with the aid of the criteria at his disposal. Textual conflation thus is not merely a technical corollary of multiple text transmission, but at the same time also points to an important aspect of the ancient literati's attitude towards the biblical text. The awe for the hallowed material and a basic conservatism balanced the concomitant tendency to modulate and diversify, and thus helped in bringing about a progressive stabilization of the Bible text. The inclination to preserve diverging traditions, which should not be identified with a predisposition towards "expansion," becomes especially strong in later strata of the textual evidence, such as e.g. the Lucianic revision of the LXX. However, it is by no means restricted to them. "Doublets" turn up also in the main LXX tradition on which the Lucianic revision is based. Often such doublets result from the conflation of diverging Hebrew readings which were preserved alternately in two parallel accounts in the MT. Thus the

20. LXX of 2 Sam. 7:13 ἀντίς έλεγκμονον μου οἶκον τῷ ονόματι μου combines the MT ** with the variant in the parallel 1 Chr. 17:12 - * There the Greek follows the Hebrew verbally.

b. An analogous situation obtains in the following instance, except that
here the Greek doublet appears in the Chronicles reading.

21. 1 Chr. 19:3 ούχ δόγως ἐξερευνήσωσιν τὴν πόλιν τοὺς κατασκοπηθέντας τὴν γῆν

2 Sam. 10:3 ἀλλ οὐχ δόγως ἐρευνήσωσιν τὴν πόλιν καὶ κατασκοπηθέσαν αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦ κατασκεψασθέν αὐτὴν

The LXX of Chr. exhibits a combination of the parallel readings in the MT which deviate from each other in the alternate employment of *V>y and VTK which in the context were considered to be of pragmatic equivalence:

1 Chr. 19:3

2 Sam. 10:3

It is of interest to note that within the 2 Sam. tradition the said interchange of *V>y and VTK was preserved in T. The main manuscript evidence renders somewhat surprisingly ΝΥKİ τῇ, i.e. exhibits, as it were, the Chronicles variant. However, some manuscripts (y w) and printed editions which represent the Tiberian tradition (T), adjusted the translation to the MT by reading: ΝΩΠΩ τῇ.

The above MT variants, and their "conflation" in the LXX of Chronicles, indicate, as said, that *V>y and VTK were considered by the Hebrew biblical writers to be a pair of pragmatically synonymous nouns which therefore could be substituted for each other under controlled circumstances. Again, as already stated, we have no reason to assume that this "freedom of variation," in this as in other such cases, was restricted to the Hebrew authors of Samuel and Chronicles. To the contrary, we may expect that identical or similar interchanges affected the text tradition of the above vocables also in different settings. This indeed is the case.

It is found, at least three times in the Book of Jeremiah:

22a. Jer. 4:29 MT: ἐστὶν ἡ πόλις πάντα ἡ πλῆθος καὶ ἡ ἡτέρα

LXX: χώρα

Here, V, S and Sperber's main text of T follow the MT, with T ms. g reading ΝΥ ΚΤ. Jerome adduces in his commentary both readings: (civitas sive) regio. Again,

8. Jer. 29:7 MT: ἡ ἀνάρρησις τῆς ἐβραίων τῆς οἰκουμένης

LXX: τῆς χώρας

All other ancient Versions reflect the MT in the above and in also the
following instance:

γ. Jer. 40:5 MT: 
LXX: dumpa ina 89

Commentators tend to prefer in these passages the Greek reading over the Hebrew (at least with regard to the first two cases), and justify their decision by considerations of contents and meaning.90 One tends to explain the "inferior" MT reading in 4:29 as a possible lapsus calami engendered by in the second half of the verse.91 Volz (op.cit., p. 31) even posits that an assumed abbreviation was misunderstood as = Ληρος. This reconstruction and the professed preference for the Greek readings are unwarranted in the light of the recognition of and as a pair of interchangeable synonyms, which also are employed parallelistically, as e.g. in Is. 1:7a1 II 7b8; Lev. 26:33ba II 33b8; 31 II 32 et al.

c. In other instances, the doubling gives evidence to Vokabel-Varianten in the Greek tradition which a copyist saw fit to combine, as e.g. in:

23. Am. 6:9-10 MT: 
LXX: doumou... 

In some cases, the double translation has preserved for us two different interpretations of the Hebrew text which may go back to divergent Hebrew Vorlagen, or else originated in the translation setting. They sometimes reveal a "midrashic" impact. The crucial term in Am. 2:16 MT: הלא is derived in the tradition either from הלא or, by way of inversion, from הלא. Both derivations were conflated in some Greek witnesses, among them a third century papyrus fragment, to read: הלא כומעא. The interchange of הלא and הלא which generated this Greek doublet in no way is restricted to the Greek version or to the translations alone. It emerged also in the synoptic study of other witnesses to the Bible text, e.g., Deut. 32:10 MT: יראתי והאלהי Sam: יראתי והאלהי 93

d. A comparable case of a Hebrew Vokabel-Variante appears to underlie the LXX doublet in:
24. 2 Sam. 20:19: έλ έξέλοπον ά έθεντο οι πάντοι ου του Ισραήλ ... έγω είμη είρηνικά τοιν στηρυγμάτων Ισραήλ where the MT reads: ἀλλ' έστησεν ἀλλιπώς Ισραήλ. Whereas είρηνικά renders ἀλλιπώς of the MT (=Τ: έστησεν), ά έθεντο clearly reflects a no longer extant Hebrew reading ἀλλιπώς. Barthélémy considers έθεντο to be "la forme ancienne," while "la second phrase (i.e., είρηνικά) parte la signature du recenseur palestinen" of the kaige group.

The Greek doublet appears to point to the interchangeability of the two Hebrew roots מָלֵשׁ and מָלָשׁ. This supposition is buttressed by the fact that they also constitute the measure of variation between 1 Sam. 2:20

25. MT: בְּנֵיה יְשַעַת לְךָ וְרֵעְךָ מִלְצָא אָבִי
LXX: ἀποτίσαι σοι κυρίος which now has turned up in 4QSam:

There can be little doubt that the Greek version here reflects the Qumran reading. ἀποτίσαι renders some thirty times forms of מָלֵשׁ, whereas the case under review is the only instance where it would reflect מָלָשׁ.

Again, it would seem that the "textual variability" of מָלֵשׁ and מָלָשׁ which generated the "double reading" in the LXX to 2 Sam. 20:19 emanated from their "stylistic variability." This may be seen from the following example.

26. There are four occurrences in biblical literature of the phrase: מָלָשׁ מָלֵשׁ בְּנֵיה (Gen. 44:4; Jer. 18:20; Ps. 38:21; Prov. 35:12) and three additional partial mentions of it (1 Sam. 24:20; 2 Sam. 3:39; Prov. 13:21). As against these we find once the reading Ps. 109:5 - מָלָשׁ מָלֵשׁ מִלְצָא אָבִי which is correctly rendered by LXX: καὶ έδέντα κατ' ἐμὸν and by T: έπὶ καὶ אָבִי. In view of the above parallel examples, there is no need to emend the MT to read simply מָלָשׁ מָלֵשׁ. Neither is there scope for M. Dahood's proposition to retain מָלָשׁ מָלֵשׁ, but to link with it the closing words of the preceding verse: אָבִי וְרֵעְךָ מִלְצָא, and to translate "My prayer they set down to my debit." The interchangeability of מָלָשׁ and מָלֵשׁ on the "textual" level has led us to the recognition of the same interchangeability on the "stylistic-formative" level which is reflected in the singular wording מָלָשׁ מָלֵשׁ in Ps. 109:5 instead of the usual phrase מָלֵשׁ מָלָשׁ, and makes any emendation unwarranted.
27. The recognition of the stylistic interchangeability which inheres in the verb-pair הביא - בִּא on the one hand, and in the pair הביא - בִּא on the other hand, leads to the conclusion that an interchange of הבִּא underlies also the variation between the MT and the LXX in the following instance:

Is. 57:18 MT: הביא הנבטים לפי הדברים (= 1QIs a, T, S)
LXX: καὶ έδοξα αὐτόν (= אָנַן or או). 100

The contention that what on the surface appear to be inner-Greek cases of "textual conflation" sometimes are the reflex of a Hebrew stylistic phenomenon is further borne out by the following example:

28. 1 Sam. 25:12 MT: הרדרר על כל הדברים והאותות is rendered verbally in LXX: κατά τα ρήματα ταύτα
Howevcer, in v.9 which constitutes the narrative basis of this reference, the MT: הרדרר על כל הדברים והאותות is represented twice in the LXX: καὶ λαλοῦσαν τοὺς λόγους τούτους ... κατὰ πάντα τα ρήματα ταύτα
It may be assumed that the LXX mirrors two alternative renditions of כל הדברים והאותות or, what is more likely, two original parallel Hebrew wordings: כל הדברים והאותות and כל הדברים והאותות.

e. The interchangeability of these expressions, despite the slight difference in their connotations, can be easily proved from an inner-Hebrew comparative analysis of parallel passages:

29. Deut. 32:46 Josh. 1:7
30. Jer. 27:12 Jer. 34:6
31. The two expressions interchange generally in the Book of Jeremiah.
Next to זא כל הדבר (נ) (35(42); 101)
A similar interchange obtains between the parallel or synonymous pair (acc. pronoun +) זא כל (כל) (16:10; 19:2 et al.), also זא כל הדבר is used (27:12; 42:5 et al.).


f. Of the same type is the linguistically legitimate employment of partitive (ם), in the sense of e numero, for the all-inclusive direct accus. preaced by מ. Let us illustrare this feature by again adducing at first what appears to be a "double reading," this time in the MT.

33. Num. 13:33 MT: ויש אלורים עת חָפֵלָה בֵּלֵי עֵקָלָם עֵקָלָם (Sam.; Trgs.) LXX: [ om. ] ΚΑΥ έχει, έωρα'χαμεν τους γυγαντας

Whether or not one accepts the likely definition of the second Hebrew clause as a gloss, it stands to reason that prior to the identifcation of the בֵּלֵי עֵקָלָם, who are mentioned exclusively in Conquest traditions (cp. Num. 13:22, 28; Deut. 1:28; 2:10, 11; 9:2; Josh. 11:22; 14:12; 15:13, 14; 21:11; Judg. 1:20), with the לְסֵלָה who turn up only in the antediluvian tradition of Gen. 6:4, the verse Num. 13:33 had been extant in two slightly divergent readings. One employed the direct object clause בֵּלֵי עֵקָלָם in identifying the לְסֵלָה as bene 'anag, whereas the partitive clause בֵּלֵי עֵקָלָם presented the bene 'anag as being part of the לְסֵלָה.

What interests us here, though, is not the exegetical issue but rather the textual conflation of two parallel readings in the MT.

g. The very same "textual-stylistic" difference constitutes three or four times the core of variation between the MT and the Sam., with the Greek and other versions aligning themselves here with the one, there with the other:

34. Ex. 18:12 MT: רִבֵּא אַדְּוֹרָה לְכָל כִּבֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל (= LXX: Targs.) Sam: רִבֵּא אַדְּוֹרָה לְכָל כִּבֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל

35. Ex. 20:24(21) MT: יְהִי מָלָא עֲלֵיהֶם עַל חֲלוֹתָם אַחַת שָׁלֵמוֹת אַחַת בְּשָׁרוֹת (= LXX, TFr.) Sam: יְהִי מָלָא עֲלֵיהֶם עַל חֲלוֹתָם אַחַת שָׁלֵמוֹת מִסָּכֶנֶן מֶסָכֶנֶן (= tSam, tO, tJ)

and possibly

36. Num. 23:10 MT: נַעֲשָׂה אַתָּה רֶכֶב יִשְׂרָאֵל (= LXX, tSam) Sam: נַעֲשָׂה אַתָּה רֶכֶב יִשְׂרָאֵל 107 (= tO, tJ ?)

One last example -
37. Lev. 11:28 MT: דוֹחֲנִים אֵין נְבָלָתָם (cp. v.40; 15:10)
Sam: דוֹחֲנִים נְבָלָתָם
(= LXX, MT 11:25).

The interchange of דוֹחֲנִים אֵין נְבָלָתָם (Lev. 11:28) with נְבָלָתָם (ib. v.25) in the MT proves that we are concerned with a phenomenon of stylistic synonymity which reverberates in variant readings in diverse witnesses to the biblical text.

h. 38. In Prov. 15:14 MT: לֹֽאְכָּלְכִּל חַרְבּוֹנַּה יִצְרֵי נֶפֶשׁ יִרְעַה אָוַּלָּה לֹֽאְכָּלְכִּל (Lev. 11:28) could be explained to have arisen from a simple scribal error, or from contamination by the adjacent mention of עֲלֵיה in v.13a, or else from the approximation of לֹֽאְכָּלְכִּל to the parallel couple לֹֽאְכָּלְכִּיל in 15:7. Because of these considerations, and because of the fact that the LXX - στόμα, S and T - אָפֶּרָה give substance to the gerē reading, most commentators prefer it over the kethîb. This preference indeed may be justified. However, in view of the recurrence of the very same interchange in biblical and post-biblical writings, the explanation of the variance between the kethîb on the one hand and the gerē and the Versions on the other as resulting from mere scribal processes, graphic error or contamination does not seem to be satisfactory. There are two instances of the same variation between ס and א in the textual tradition of Ben-Sira:

39. B-S 1:29 (26): אל תחלוף המסיב אתו וּבֵאָסְהוּ דָּשׁ (S, Syh, L)
G: גָּרָה סְדָמָאָדְוַן
40. 8:11 (15): אל תתקנה המסיב אתו והבירמה חאיר והפרケーキ
G: יִתְּפּוּ סְדָמָאָדְוַן (S: L: oritu)

A similar relationship obtains between the MT and the main Greek tradition in

41. Neh. 2:13 MT: אלֵ֖י נַחֲלָ֑ת תַּנְיִ֖זְוַן
LXX: καὶ πρὸς στὸμα πηγῆς τῶν συκῶν

It is further possible that the Greek renditions of the two alternative readings were combined in

42. Jer. 4:1 MT: אלֵ֖י תַּסְרַרְּרִים מַעֲבַרְּלָ֑ו תַּנְיִ֖זְוַן
LXX: εἶνεν περέλθη τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ προσωπον μῦν εὐλαβῆθη
Because of the similar terminology, the translator presumably associated the Jeremiah passage with

Zech. 9:7 MT: ἔσπευσεν τὸ ἀλέτον εἰς τῷ στήματος τοῦ πάπου καὶ τῷ βσπεύ-ματος τοῦ πάπου ἐκ μέσου ὅψθαντον τοῦ πάπου.

LXX: καὶ ἔξαρσεν τὸ ἀλέτον εἰς τῷ στήματος τοῦ πάπου καὶ τῷ βσπεύ-ματος τοῦ πάπου ἐκ μέσου ὅψθαντον τοῦ πάπου.\(^{114}\)

1. What is of importance in the present context is that the interchangeability of "Οβ/Δοβ" and "Βο/Πβ" has left some traces also within the Hebrew textual tradition, and possibly is rooted in a stylistic convention. A phrase based on Πβ in

43. Num. 12:8 MT: Λα Οβ δύναται ... Πβ ΑΛ Πβ ΑΛ Πβ

turns up with a variation in

Ex. 33:11 MT: ρόδη ἡ, ΑΛ Δοβ ΑΛ Δοβ

and is reflected also in

Deut. 34:10 MT: Ροδη βο συνάφη Μποράτζα καλόνσε δύναται το Πβ Πβ Πβ Πβ Πβ Πβ Πβ Πβ

which at the same time appears to constitute a reminiscence of

Num. 12:6 MT: ΑΛ Δοβ Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα Βολτάτζα

(= Vss).

Similarly, the reading of

44. Ps. 80:17 MT: Πλαγή Ἐνέργος (= Vss) is to be retained\(^{115}\) as a variation of the more usual image which appears to connect the concept of God's fury with an auditive impression emanating from His mouth. Cp. e.g. Ps. 104:7: "At your roar - ἔσπευσεν - they fled, at the sound of your thundering they took flight"; Ps. 18:16 (= 2 Sam. 22:16): "At your roar - ἔσπευσεν - Yahweh, at the blast from your nostrils" etc. (cp. further Is. 51:20). In Prov. 13:1, 8 and Eccl. 7:5 is connected with Πλαγή (cp. also Gen. 37:10; Jer. 29:27; Zech. 3:2).\(^{116}\)

45. Viewed in the light of the foregoing discussion, also the reading Num. 33:8 MT: Πάλ Πλαγή Δολόλος Πάλ Πλαγή should be judged as a variation on Παλ Πλαγή that occurs in the preceding verse (Num. 33:7,\(^{117}\) cp. Ex. 14:9), and which probably is the more correct transliteration of an Egyptian place name.\(^{118}\)

If this argument can be maintained, one suspects that the MT contained a textual or stylistic doublet in

46. Ex. 14:2 - Πάλατίς Πάλατίς Πάλατίς Πάλατις Πάλατις Πάλατις Πάλατις instead of Παλ Παλ Παλ Παλ Παλ Παλ Παλ Παλ resulted from a substitution, considered quite
legitimate, of one member of this word-pair for the other, and that this interchange was facilitated by the Hebrew place name \text{VKO}^\text{120} which like \text{ΓΤΡΠ} \text{^5} is constructed of the name of a deity and the prefixed noun \text{OS} which here replaces the Egyptian \text{TP} whose Hebrew translation would be ביה.

Upon analysis it thus becomes apparent that the proclivity to conflate does not emerge late, as it were, in the frame of text transmission, but rather has deep roots in earlier stages of biblical literature. It would be considered another basic literary mode. This mode expresses itself on the "creative" level, e.g. in the intentional retention of synonymous alternate idioms in a given unit, irrespective of its compass. Here are some illustrations of this feature:

47. 1 Sam. 18:12 tells us that Saul feared David because God was with him: רודא שלאר פָּקַק. Verse 15 in the same chapter repeats the statement, but gives as the reason for Saul's fear the fact that David succeeded in whatever he did: רוֹדֵה שֶׁאָלָה חַוָּה מַסְכָּל צָא ד.

48. A similar case is Deut. 31:24: רָהָה כַּלּות מֶשֶׁה לֶבַכְו אֶת דְּבֵר הָהוֹרָה הָאֶזֶר. The verse poignantly picks up the \text{finis} formula of v.30, and the word of v.1 preserved in the \text{Qumran} text tradition and mirrored in the Greek \text{xai συνέτελεσεν}, but probably mistakenly read מַלְאֵל in MT:

49. In some instances this type of stylistic conflation comes at the end of a more comprehensive unit. In the \text{Sinai} traditions, Israel's readiness to accept God's commandments is expressed in Ex. 19:8 by their saying: Whatever God said we will do - "כִּי אָשֶׁר דָּבָר הָוהָה נֹעַחָא. The same idea underlies the request that Moses mediate between them and God, with the undertaking that they will "listen," i.e., "obey" and "do" what God commands, 20:19: לְאָזֶרָא אֵלָה שֶׁאָלָה דָּבָר אֶת אָזֶרָא נֹעַחָא. The two decisive expressions לְאָזֶרָא and נֹעַחָא were combined in the culminating statement in 24:7: לְאָזֶרָא לָזֶרָא הָוהָה נֹעַחָא נֹעַחָא. This combination on its part is reflected in an inverted order of its components in Deut. 4:24:

k. At this stage, we enter the realm of "higher criticism," if we follow
established practice and terminology, since the above examples seem to
derive from different sources. But is this really the case? Does this
variation in Deuteronomy compared with the three Exodus passages indeed
reflect a different source? Could we not simply be concerned with another
instance of stylistic conflation with added inversion?

How do we judge the following case against the background of the
foregoing discussion?

50. MT of Jer. 44:3 exhibits what at first glance may be taken as a
double reading: ΠΡΤΠΚ D^HTK? Tny*? Tup*? ΓΟ>?
^ÜJDrt? *ltt*i> ΙΟΚ DTiyï *»3SD.
Upon further investigation one finds that one of the two expressions -
לטש לאלוהים אزادמ - is employed in the latter part of the book, in that
very chapter, not less than nine times (vv.5,8,15,17,18,19,21,23,25), and
turns up only twice in the earlier part (1:16; 19:4). Against this, the
other - ליעד אלאים אزادמ - is used exclusively in the first part of the
book, up to chapter 35 (8:2; 11:10; 13:10; 16:11, 13; 22:9; 25:6; 35:15),
and never occurs after 44:3. The conflation in 44:3 thus is recognized
as another "transition doublet," most probably of the stylistic variety,
and therefore should be retained. A problem, though, arises with the
collation of the Greek evidence. The overwhelming Old Greek tradition has
θυμαν, i.e. Θυμα only. Exceptions are the Hexapla (with asterisk) and
one minuscule (538) which exhibits Lucianic influence which add και λατ-
ρευευν. Can the shorter LXX reading here be judged "pristine" and superior
to the MT reading which on the surface appears to contain a textual con-
flation? Or should we not rather accept the stylistic vindication of the
apparent "textual doublet," and explain the shorter Greek reading to have
resulted from a wrongly applied reductionist tendency?

1. Another clear case of retention of two alternate expressions and the
concomitant emergence of a stylistic transition doublet can be observed in
the Book of Jeremiah.

51. In the first chapter (1:8, 19) we encounter twice the expression יָנָא
אלהי יתבשך which the LXX render εξαυρεύσαν &. The same expression turns
up with a variation in Jer. 30:11. The main Greek
tradition here has no rendition at all of the Hebrew text. But the Hexapla
and Theodotion have retained a translation in which is rendered by ςψζειν. The same holds true for the preceding verse. The third mention of the same phrase comes exactly in the middle between the above instances, and here the MT exhibits a transition doublet: Jer. 15:20 Ανὴρ Μααναὶς ιερονὶ, accurately rendered in T, whereas the Greek has only one verb: τοὺς Μααναὶς. In the next verse Μααναὶς ιερονὶ is consistently translated in T, but the LXX again have only one verb - ἐξαποθεοσάμενος δὲ - which patently is meant to render Μααναὶς.

One could surmise that the MT represents here a conflate expanded text, and could define the Greek as "pristine." However, taking into account other cases of "transition doublets," we are inclined to give preference to the fuller MT which exhibits a good biblical stylistic practice, and to regard the shorter Greek version as resulting from a pedantic mistaken predilection for brevity.

52. A similar situation obtains in the Book of Ezekiel. Here a singular reference in the first part of the book, Ez. 10:19 MT: ᾠνατολάς, rendered in the main Greek tradition ἀνατολάς, is set off by the recurring reference in the latter part, 44:1 MT: ᶻττυρατολάς (cp. 46:1, 12; 47:1, 3) which the Greek translates consistently κατ’ ἀνατολάς. In one intervening instance, again a "transition doublet" occurs: 11:1 MT: ῥυόταν αὐτὴ τὴν θάλασσαν ἀνατολάς which the Greek faithfully renders: τὴν καταντεύοντα θάλασσαν κατ’ ἀνατολάς.

53. A less distinct case of a structural transition doublet may be found in Jer. 15:11 MT: ἦλθεν ἐκ οὐρανοῦ οἱ δόξαι τῶν ἱερατῶν. Interestingly enough, here the Versions reflect the apparent conflate Hebrew text, with T, exhibiting a paraphrastic rendition. The first of the two crucial idioms - ἦλθεν ἐκ οὐρανοῦ - is employed four more times in the book, 2:27, 28; 11:12, 14, all of which precede the mention in the above transition doublet. The second - ναός - turns up twice more. Once, as could have been expected in view of the previous examples, subsequent to the doublet, in 30:4. However, the other occurs in 14:8, i.e., before the doublet, thus marring the expected symmetry of distribution. It nevertheless remains evident that the author of 15:11 (and one does not seem to doubt the
ascription of the verse to Jeremiah) purposefully retained here a combination of expressions which he uses elsewhere alternately. The same alternation may be observed, e.g., in Psalm 37. In describing the righteous' hope for delivery in times of stress, the poet once defines these as וּֽמֵּרָו (v.19), and once as וּֽמֵּרָו (v.39).

In the following instance of idioms-conflation in the book of Jeremiah, the "textual" and the "stylistic" aspects are most manifestly intertwined and constitute two interrelated emanations of one basic literary phenomenon.

Throughout the book, the two alternate expressions מַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו (3:17; 4:11; 8:6; 31:1) and וְלָֽעָּֽו (3:16, 18; 5:18; 31:19; 33:16) are employed without any discernible pattern of distribution. In all cases, T faithfully renders the Hebrew in accord with the MT: מַעְרָּא מַעְרָּא - מַעְרָּא (3:17; 4:11; 8:6; 31:1) and וְלָֽעָּֽו - וְלָֽעָּֽו (3:16, 18; 5:18; 31:19; 33:16).

In the following instance of idioms-conflation in the book of Jeremiah, the "textual" and the "stylistic" aspects are most manifestly intertwined and constitute two interrelated emanations of one basic literary phenomenon.

Throughout the book, the two alternate expressions מַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו (3:17; 4:11; 8:6; 31:1) and וְלָֽעָּֽו (3:16, 18; 5:18; 31:19; 33:16) are employed without any discernible pattern of distribution. In all cases, T faithfully renders the Hebrew in accord with the MT: מַעְרָּא מַעְרָּא - מַעְרָּא (3:17; 4:11; 8:6; 31:1) and וְלָֽעָּֽו - וְלָֽעָּֽו (3:16, 18; 5:18; 31:19; 33:16).

In these instances, the MT exhibits a conflation of the two expressions which is mirrored in T and in the LXX:


In the third - 33:15 - no LXX rendition is extant, but the Hexapla (with asterisk), Theod. and Luc, as could be expected, have preserved the above faithful Greek translation of the Hebrew.

Interestingly enough, these doublets occur as the last mentions of the expressions under review in the book (33:15; 50:4, 20) with the one exception of מַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו in 33:16. We cannot be far off in assuming that they were meant to tie together the alternate idioms in what amounts to a "summary-doublet."

In addition to these, the LXX alone exhibit one further such doublet, exactly at the opposite end, i.e., at the beginning of the book preceded in 3:16 by one single mention of וּמַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו in 3:15.

In addition to these, the LXX alone exhibit one further such doublet, exactly at the opposite end, i.e., at the beginning of the book preceded in 3:16 by one single mention of מַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו in 3:15.

55. MT: מַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו T: מַעְרָּא וְלָֽעָּֽו LXX: וְלָֽעָּֽו וְלָֽעָּֽו וְלָֽעָּֽו וְלָֽעָּֽו
In view of this situation, the unavoidable conclusion presents itself that the stylistic combinatory process exhibited in the MT and Versions in Jer. 33:15 (with the exception of LXX); 50:4, 20 transcended to the Greek translational level in 3:17. The obelos in the Hexapla relative to the second clause makes it unlikely that the Old Greek is based on a Hebrew Vorlage different from the MT which already contained the doublet. Any discussion of the textual problem involved certainly must be informed by its stylistic background.

n. In some other instances, "conflation" turns up in a "summary doublet":

welds together significant alternate terms of the two parallel narrative strands in the chapter. echoes v. 21 and the "tribal leaders" variant of the event reported:

As against this, reflects the "Joshua" variant and the crucial verses 22-23 in which Joshua appoints the Gibeonites to become:

We surely must ask ourselves to what degree the conflation of the expression with is, methodologically speaking, different from the conflation of salient expressions which characterize different versions of one and the same motif in biblical literature, as, e.g.,

Ps. 80:9, in distinction, considers the Exodus to have been the initial encounter of God and His people. The redemptive event is likened to the transplantation of the vine Israel from Egypt to the fertile grounds of Canaan. Is it too farfetched to assume that Hosea combined these two separate motifs by saying that God found Israel like grapes in the desert? (Hos. 9:10)?

c. While in the previous instances some vestige of the possibility that the doublets under review resulted from "textual" conflation yet remains, the following example patently belongs to the realm of biblical stylistics pure and proper. It is an instance of combination of literary images which culminates in a duplex or mixed metaphor. Both constitutive elements express figuratively protection from danger. One likens it to sheltering in the shade of a tree.
and, transferred to the human scene:

Is. 30:2-3 (ΠΟΓΙΚ) T*0*1 ΠΚ3 ΤΉΚ ΤΉΚ

the other to seeking safety under the wings of a bird:
Ps. 91:4

again transferred to a different scene:
Ruth 2:12

In this second image, the notion of shadow obviously is immaterial. Nevertheless, we twice find the two expressions stylistically combined in:

59. Ps. 36:8

with a further variation in:
60. 17:8

There can be no doubt whatsoever that here we are concerned with a literary-creative phenomenon which must be ascribed to the authors of the above psalms and not to an editor or a copyist.

The last examples analyzed lead us back to the ones with which we began our discussion in this section. Again, a basic maxim of biblical literature, the interchangeability of pragmatically synonymous words and expressions from which sometimes resulted a combining of the alternate elements was found to be operative in diverse developmental strata of biblical writings. On the "textual" level it fathered "double readings" in practically all witnesses to the Bible text. On the "stylistic" level it engendered "literary conflation," "transition doublets,""summary doublets" and "mixed" or "amalgamated metaphors." Once the inherent similarity which underlies all these emanations of one fundamental phenomenon is recognized, extreme caution is required when one comes to judge in specific instances whether one is confronted with a late copyist's "textual conflation" or with an author's primary "stylistic-structural amalgam." The decisions whether in a given case a "fuller" reading points to an underlying "expansionist" tendency, and whether the "shorter" variant represents a "pristine" tradition, must be informed by a concomitant literary analysis of the "stylistic" motivations that may underlie the "textual" facts.
VI Stylistic Metathesis and Textual Inversion

One other basic mode of biblical writing in the widest sense of the word appears to be the principle of "inversion." Its impact is of special weight and importance within the setting of "repetition" for which biblical writers and editors exhibit a distinct propensity. This concerns not only repetition of single words, often erroneously deleted by the ancient translators, and for that matter also by modern scholars, but also the reiteration of whole phrases, either in a direct sequence or as "distant parallels." "Reiteration" is an important feature of Hebrew and also of ancient Canaanite, foremost of Ugaritic composition. It makes for fixity of form and pattern. "Inversion" introduces movement into this fixity and variation into stereotype patterns. Repetition and variation by inversion thus should be viewed as primary complementary principles of biblical literature. Being such, we have no reason to believe that they were embraced solely by the creative writer. Rather, we should expect them to have been followed also by arrangers, revisers and editors whose endeavours affected biblical writings in subsequent stages of "in-libration." In fact, we may assume from the very outset that the effect of these standards can be traced also in the latest stages of the history of the biblical literature, i.e., in the diverse forms of its written textual transmission.

a. The most widely represented and best known manifestation of "inversion" in biblical literature is the chiastic arrangement of reiterative components in parallelistic sentence structure. The phenomenon had been already recognized by medieval Jewish commentators, but became common knowledge in the wake of Bishop Lowth's treatise on biblical parallelismus membrorum, probably the most essential feature of biblical writing which had its counterparts and antecedents in ancient Near Eastern literature. The increasing preoccupation with comparative research and the recognition of modifications within the principle of parallelismus membrorum which make themselves manifest in Ugaritic literature produced new insights into the diversified employments of parallelismus membrorum and chiasm in biblical literature. The intensity and multi-facetedness of research in this field highlights the centrality of the issue under review.
There is no need to illustrate here in detail the abundantly employed technique of parallelistic chiasm in adjacent cola. It prevails in poetic passages, but is found also in prose compositions which often exhibit this distinct literary feature. The following two examples will suffice:

61. Is. 28:7

The interdependence of stylistic and textual considerations become apparent already in this first case. In distinction from the chiastic A-B II B-A arrangement in the MT of the first two lines, the LXX twice exhibit the A-B sequence and retain only parts of the third line:

It cannot be decided on objective grounds whether the translator had a different Vorlage at his disposal, or whether he preferred the simple parallelistic structure to chiasm, legitimately availing himself of the literary licence to introduce slight changes into the text before him.

62. Prov. 1:26

We shall turn now to cases of "distant chiastic parallelism" which transcend the confines of one verse or adjacent verses, arching over at least one intervening verse:

b. In the following examples, distant chiastic parallelism is a formative element in passages which belong to different literary units in one and the same book:

65. Ez. 24:16

66. Ez. 27:31
This example elicits the attractive suggestion, which yet has to be further investigated, that literary inversion may be connected with reversal of contents. That is to say, when in a positive statement a word-pair is used in the A-B pattern, the B-A pattern will be chosen by the author, or by another writer who refers to this statement, in a recurrent employment when the statement takes on a negative sense, or vice versa.  

66. Jer. 2:27

67. Is. 5:11

68. Ez. 16:3

69. Ez. 17:17

70. Is. 40:21

c. In the next cases, the chiastic parallelism is rooted in a word-couple which in (a) actually resembles a hendyadys, and involves the further feature of the break-up pattern, and in (b) introduces a third component for the sake of variation. The construct (Gen. 11:28; 24:7; Jer. 22:10; 46:16; Ez. 23:15) and the syndetic parataxis (Gen. 12:1; 24:4; 32:10; Num. 10:30, cp. also Gen. 31:3), in the break-up pattern are the basis of chiastic parallelism in:

71. Esth. 2:10

72. Esth. 5:10
d. Inverted parallelism can be applied to more comprehensive speech units. Thus, e.g., the formula is employed in the Book of Jeremiah in alternating A-B and B-A arrangements. The A-B pattern is used in the first and in the two last mentions of the formula (Jer. 7:23 and 31:1, 33), forming an inclusio-like frame for the B-A examples (11:4; 24:7; 30:22).

Inversion sometimes is present in what may be described as inner-biblical quotations. In some such cases a passage is recurrently used in one book, either by the author or an editor.

73. Deut. 7:5

In two parallel passages which deal with transgressions which are to be punished by stoning, the procedure once is described in the A-B and once in the B-A pattern:

74. Deut. 13:10-11

75. Jer. 18:18

76. Ps. 95:6-7

77. Jer. 51:58

78. Hab. 2:13

A somewhat more involved situation obtains in a formula which appears
to have originated in the Book of Deuteronomy, and turns up recurrently as an inverted quotation in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

78. Deut. 32:35-36  
Jer. 46:21

In the following instances, one member of the synonymous pair is employed in an apocopated form, *pars pro toto*, either by retaining or by mentioning only:

79. Jer. 50:27  
Ez. 21:30, 34

80. Jer. 49:8  
Ez. 35:5

f. In some of the above examples, inversion could be discerned not only as a stylistic phenomenon, *sensu stricto*, but also as a structural principle which, to a degree, ties together "distant parallels." In some instances, we suggest that the two thus connected references may be viewed as complementary units of a literary frame of the *inclusio* or *Ringkomposition* type, which together delineate the extent of a given unit. It must be stressed that we are concerned with a phenomenon that can be established only empirically. Our approach perforce must remain descriptive. No prescriptive dimension can be attached to the results of the enquiry. In other words, principles which are elicited from selected passages by careful analysis cannot be employed subsequently to revise by them other units which do not follow plainly the same or similar lines of structure.

These restrictions apply to a degree to most aspects of literary analysis, and more so with respect to biblical writings whose canon of literary concepts and techniques was not handed down to us by the ancient writers themselves, but must be distilled by the student from the material. They are especially stringent in the issue under review, distant parallelistic inversion which serves as an *inclusio*, since in it the diverse phenomena of style, structure and text tradition are intricately interwoven. The analysis involves aspects of literary criticism which, as stated previously, usually are considered under separate headings. Moreover, since we have no
definitely objective means by which to control the results of our analysis, the discernment of actual illustrations of this technique, and their appraisal, depend to some extent on the sensibility of the individual scholar, and of his readers, to such literary intricacies and on his susceptibility to accrediting biblical writers with the technical accomplishments that are prerequisite for their application in literary practice.

With this caveat in mind, we can now turn to the presentation of the said technique, again demonstrating it by only a few examples.

81. An interesting illustration of intricate structuring can be seen in 1 Sam. ch.18. Although differing over details, commentators are unanimous in the identification of vv.17-28 as a unit which is set apart from the context, internally by subject matter, and externally by the features of a Ringkomposition, or by the Wiederaufnahme\(^\text{174}\) of vv.15-16 in vv.29-30. There can be no doubt that the diverse components of the passage were not simply juxtaposed but rather were they skillfully interwoven with each other, though without disguising the underlying compositeness. The overall issue requires a more detailed treatment than can be given in the present context. Therefore, we shall limit our analysis to the pericope 18:20-28 which, as is well known, in itself is composite. The passage combines two vignettes that depict Saul's attempts to ensnare David in what he hopes would become a fatal fight with the Philistines, by offering him in marriage either both his daughters - ד'lasticך - (v.21b),\(^\text{175}\) or else first the elder Merab and then the younger Michal. The narrative reflects salient motifs of the Jacob - Laban and his two daughters episode (Gen. 29:15-30), and possibly is modelled upon this prototype.

The Merab passage (vv.17-19) which ends in her being given in marriage to one Adriel of Meholah (cp. 2 Sam. 21:8 where Merab instead of Michal must be read with the Pesh. and LXX\(^\text{L}\)), possibly is an intrusive element, and is missing in the LXX version. In any case, it can be clearly separated from the Michal pericope which is encased between

\begin{align*}
18:20 & \text{תְּשׁוֹבָה מִיכָל בָּנָה שֶׁמֶרֶל אֲחַיָּרִים} \\
18:28 & \text{טְמֵנָל בָּנָה שֶׁמֶרֶל אֲחֵמָדָר}
\end{align*}
The stylistic relationship of these two distant parallels may be likened to that which often obtains between two adjacent cola in which identical verbs are recurrently employed: in the first, the predicate, a verb in the imperfect (ygtl) with waw consecutive, will precede the substantive; in the second, the predicate in the perfect (gtl) will follow upon the substantive. This schema is widely employed in biblical as well as in Ugaritic literature.

The discernment of an ancient stylistic-structural technique in the instance under review gives support to the results of compositional analysis arrived at by the literary-historical method.

A textual problem connects with the issue in the following instance.

82. In the introduction to the Book of Esther, Ahasuerus' courtiers are referred to by the term "Persia and Media" (1:3). This sequence "Persia and Media" is retained in the three other mentions in ch.1 (vv.14, 18, 19). These are all that there are until we come to the finale. There, in 10:2, the last reference is best understood as a "distant inverted parallel" of 1:19 which together encase the Esther-Mordechai-Ahasuerus story proper which begins in 2:1 and which the redactor of the book wishes to conclude with the "chronistic appendix" 10:1-3.

It is of interest to note that the LXX follow the MT as far as the three first mentions of the term are concerned (1:3, 14, 18) but reverse the order with respect to the remaining two cases which are crucial for our argument. In distinction from the preponderant sequence in ch.1, the rendition of v.19 is Μηδων καὶ Περσῶν (against the MT), and in 10:2 Περσῶν καὶ Μηδων (also against the MT). Thus the LXX preserve the chiastic relationship of these two references, but reverse the internal order. The effect of the inverted distant parallelism thus is retained also in the Greek.

83. Passing from narrative to poetry, inclusio by "distant inverted parallelism" can be illustrated by two recurring cola in David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan. Our sole concern is structural, and therefore real or imagined cruxes of interpretation will not engage our attention here.
In this instance, the LXX and T reflect the MT in all details, including the traditional reversed order of the components under review, as correctly observed by S. Gevirtz in the most recent detailed study of the poem. But neither Gevirtz nor previous commentators appear to have given heed to the inclusio pattern which arises from this repetition. Just as vv.17-18 are in the nature of a superscription to the "Lament" and are shown to be such by their exclusion from the inclusio, so v.26, though intimately related to the "Lament" is proved by it to be in the nature of an "afterthought" which refers solely to Jonathan and makes no mention of Saul. It is cemented to the "poem" by the repetition of a reflex of בזילא (v.25a) and v.21b in the closing line (v.27b), and by the repetition of the phrase ΟΗΙΫ ΨΨ (w.19a and 25a) in v.27a. The above two lines constitute the frame of a congruent structure which embraces the whole poem. Its second half constitutes an inverted reflection of the first: v.25 parallels v.19; v.24 v.20; v.23 v.21b-22. v.21a is an expansion which calls for a separate analysis.

84. A good example of Ringkomposition in prophetic literature, defined by Zimmerli as Rahmung, is found in Ez. 43:7-9.

v.9: "הש הוראה את חורת המפרים ומפרים והשלחנו והשלחנו את כל הסדרות... שהונח בשטח בטבעה... החיה על כלל... עלכלל... עלכלל... "The two verses encase v.8 which is a distinct reflex of the prophet's Temple-oracle in ch. 8:7-12. It shares with that passage the references to a wall inside the Temple building - which equals (8:7-8, 10) and - "abominations" (8:9, cp. 6 and 13) which equals (8:10) in the combination with "השלך" (8:9, 12, cp. v.6). By means of the inclusion in inverted parallels, the short text-segment Ez. 43:7-9, introduced by v.6 is recognized as a self-contained sub-unit.

In an analogical fashion, Ringkomposition seems to be involved in the pair of inverted parallels in
The tenor of the included passage, 13:10-12, which is of a cosmic-general character and remindful of the "doxologies" in Amos (4:12-13; 5:8-9; 9:5-6), decidedly sets it apart from the "oracle against Babylon" in which it is enveloped (13:1-8 and 14ff.). To put it differently: Is. 13:9-13, encompassed by inverted parallels, quite legitimately could be taken as a sub-unit which may have had a literary history of its own and which was inserted into the oracle against Babylon, either by the prophet himself or by a reviser. Viewed thus, what was defined as an inclusio assumes the function of a Wiederaufnahme which served to delineate the extent of the secondarily integrated material. This double entendre is basic to "inverted distant parallelism." It is often difficult to decide whether in a particular instance such parallelism should be taken as a structural-literary principle of the inclusio type and should be ascribed to the author, or whether it should rather be viewed as a "repetitive resumption," i.e., as a structural device of an "arranger" or an "editor." This inherent duality is highlighted in the following example: By content, imagery and compositional circumstance, the above unit presents some similarities with Jer. 30:22-31:1. This passage again is structured on the principle of "inverted distant parallelism":

We should mention from the outset that the separation of the second member from the preceding text, as indicated by the chapter division, is open to debate. This division follows one Hebrew manuscript tradition and the Greek (38:1), and begins an altogether new pericope with 31:1. Our printed editions are arranged accordingly, including BH. However, a number of old Hebrew manuscripts, among them the noted Leningrad codex which underlies the BH, have an empty space after 31:1, and none before it. This proves that their sedarim division connected 31:1 with the preceding verses and regarded it as a subscription rather than a superscription.
as the chapter system implies. This massoretic division, though, has a new parashah begin with 30:22, and thus does not put in full relief the inclusio pattern posited here.

The above two parallels develop a short oracle of doom against "the wicked" which basically is of a general nature. By means of the parallels, and the context, it becomes a vision of hope for Israel:

30:23  וַהֲוָהּ שָׁמֵרֵת יִהוֵה זְמַתָּה שֵׁלָה מַתָּנְגוֹרָה: עַל רָאשׁ רְשָׁעִים יִהוֵה
30:24  לָא יָשָׁב הָדוּרָן אָחָה יִהוֵה עַד עוֹלָם: עַד הָקֵי מִזָּמַת אֵל-בְּאֵדַרְדָּיו הָיָם

J. Bright correctly says of these verses: "They sit loosely in context here and may have been inserted to place further stress upon the judgment of Israel's foes hinted at in vss. 11, 16, 20c." But, like other commentators mentioned further on, he altogether disregards the inclusio by which the short passage is framed. Bright also refers to the assumed source of this intrusion, namely the repetition of these verses in Jer. 23:19-20, with minor variations and without the inclusio. There, in his judgment, "they fit splendidly after v.18 etc." In this appreciation he sides with, e.g., P. Volz: "30:23-24 aus 23:19-20 wiederholt," and "es ist nicht ein versprengter jemerianischer Spruch, sondern ein spaeterer Beitrag." Also W. Rudolph, S. Mowinckel, H. Schmidt and others stress the originality of the version in ch.23. As against this, Streane does not express a definite opinion with respect to the genuineness of vv.23-24 in ch.30, but states emphatically that they were introduced into 23:19-20 from ch.30. H. Cornill is less definite. He rejects the said "Achtzeiler" in ch.23 and admits that in ch.30 "wuerde er passen," but then concludes that also here we have a secondary intrusion: "die beiden Verse (sind) hier aus spaeteren Stimmungen und Verhaeltnissen heraus interpoliert."

It should have become apparent that in the case under review the stylistic-structural phenomenon connects with a literary-historical problem, namely the genuineness of the said passage in either Jer. 23:19-20 or in 30:23-24 or in both. The failure to observe the two-sidedness of the issue, to analyze the implications that arise therefrom, and to bring them to bear on the overall question underlines the lack of coordination in modern biblical studies of "stylistics" with "literary-historical" research.
We have yet to consider the "textual" dimension of this case. The investigation of the minor variations between the two Hebrew versions has not contributed to solving the question of the genuineness of the one or the other or both. Nor are the differences between the two Greek renditions of import in this matter. But the collation of the Hebrew with the Greek shows that the LXX has no rendition for the first of the two members of the assumed "chiastic parallelism," i.e. for Jer. 30:22. Cornill tends to discard the MT here for a variety of reasons, including two that concern us here directly: "v.22 ist ein isolierter schlecht gebauter Zweizeiler, welcher LXX fehlt, 31,1 uebel vorwegnimmt und schon durch die in dem ganzen Complex (chs.) 30 31 unerhoerte Anrede in der 2. Pers. Plur. hinlaenglich verdaechtig waere." P. Volz, echoed by W. Rudolph (ad loc.) defines it as "ein formelhafter Ausdruck" and an addition which "fehlt in G mit Recht." The possibility that a "reductionist tendency" of the LXX here may have ruined a perfect Hebrew stylistic-structural device simply never was considered. This is hardly an admissible procedure. In view of the forgoing discussion, the shorter LXX reading at the best can represent a different redaction of the Jeremiah text, but certainly should not be given preference over the MT, mistakenly designated "expansionist."

f. The variegated employment of "inversion" as a stylistic and structural tool in a diversity of forms forcefully underlines the deep-seated effect this technique had on biblical literature in the "creative" and the "recensionist" stages. Consequently, we may expect this literary phenomenon to have affected biblical writings also in the transmission stage: within the text tradition of one Version, foremost the MT; in inter-Version variants; and in extra-biblical quotations from Scriptures.

The conflux of the stylistic principle of "inversion" with the predilection for the preservation of stylistic variables by conflation sometimes results in "textual doublets" in which two inverted parallel expressions are conjoined. I have discussed some cases of this phenomenon in detail in earlier publications. Therefore I shall illustrate it here by only a few examples in which the literary analysis helps in solving an exegetical crux:
Although many emendations of this apparently clumsy bit of diction have been suggested, Montgomery correctly concludes that the MT which is reflected also in the ancient Versions is best retained. It appears that in the present Hebrew text two variants were conjoined which differ in the inverted arrangement of the two lines α-α′ and β-β′, of which α-α′ in addition present an internal chiasm:

1. לדרז יולדה נא יתת ... ודשתראית ביא רمرك
2. מвшейהית ביא רمرك ... אולח נא יתת לברך יתות

The ensuing two examples are somewhat more speculative

88. Num. 14:27

The MT is mirrored in the ancient Versions, but nevertheless seems to contain a doublet of inverted parallel readings. We suggest the following reconstruction of the underlying variants:

89. Lev. 11:21

The immediately following opening phrase of v. 22 should in fact be connected with v. 21 and should be understood as a variant of את כל תמציתו לא ירש. One of these variants is missing in the Sam. Pent. which combines elements of both to read: כל ירא ... לא יהי חסידים ואת כל תמציתו. מקדש ... חסידים. We propose to reconstruct the following inverted parallels:

6. כל תמציתו לא ירש חסידים
7. לא יהי חסידים ואת כל תמציתו

and to read v. 22 with the Samaritans:

8. מקדשים חסידים רמכ חסידים ראכל.
90. Lev. 17:14

The Versions, with the exception of the Targums, do not render the contextually difficult 
which most probably is an intrusive element from Gen. 9:4. Thus, the stichoi a and a’ are fully identical, are in better accord with the similar phrases in v.11, and suggest the above reconstruction of the inverted parallel readings that were combined in the verse.

91. 1 Sam. 28:19

The Versions render the crucial stichoi a and a’ almost verbally. (The most probably paraphastic changes in the Greek translation are of no concern in the present context.) In spite of the unanimity of our sources, commentators generally recognize α and α’ as parallels and tend to delete one of them although without analyzing the genesis of the doublet. The suggestion to view it as another instance of conflation of inverted synonymous readings appears to be a satisfactory explanation.

g. Stylistic inversion constitutes an intra-Version variation between two parallel wordings of the same subject matter, e.g., in the following instances:

92. 2 Sam. 22:45

Ps. 18:45

93. 2 Sam. 5:11

1 Chron. 14:1

94. Ex. 23:18

Notwithstanding some differences in wording, there is no mistaking the basic identity of these verses which are embedded in two versions of a short cultic catalogue of the pilgrim festivals.

h. Viewed against this background, the widely encountered textual phenomenon of inter-Version variation in the form of syntactical inversion cannot be judged to be merely an indication of ordinary scribal laxity. Many such
instances of textual inter-Version variation, even though not all, rather
should be considered evidence for the existence of equally valid text-
traditions which cannot be reduced to one common archetype, and/or scribal
manifestations of stylistic conventions which were continuously and legiti-
mately operative in the transmission stage of biblical literature.

These factors are more readily recognized in a synopsis of Hebrew
Versions than in a collation of Hebrew readings with translational vari-
ants. To be sure, attention must be paid to the expected impact from
changing conventions of syntax in a collation of Hebrew inversion-variants
in sources which may have been affected by diachronic linguistic develop-
ments, such as MT versus Sam. or Qumran material. This aspect, though,
more particularly requires consideration when inversion-variants in the
Hebrew original and in translations are compared, especially in a non-
Semitic target language. Here, the greater probability that peculiarities
of the meta-language may have induced a translator or a copyist to trans-
pose syntactical elements must be carefully evaluated. A cautious analysis
will reduce the number of instances in the translations that should right-
fully be dealt with under the heading of "original inversion variants"
stemming from a Hebrew Vorlage. However, the remaining cases suffice to
demonstrate the impact of legitimate stylistic inversion on translational
Versions which makes itself manifest in textual transposition.

a. A sampling of inversion-variants in non-massoretic witnesses to the
text of the Bible will sufficiently illustrate the validity of the above
argument. We shall first adduce examples from the Samaritan Hebrew Penta-
teuch Version and then present comparable evidence from the Qumran Scrolls.
The discussion of these will be kept to a bare minimum:

95. Ex. 5:3 MT:
   גלה נא דך שולשת ימי מדבר
Sam: גלה נא והמדбра דך שולשת ימי
96. Lev. 20:13 MT:
   ומעה עשוה שניבור מות רמה
Sam: והמעה עשוה מות רמה שניבור
97. 20:22 MT:
   ולא תחק עינה אגום אכון
Sam: ולא תחקו אתון אכון אכון

In the above instances, the inversion amounted to a reversal of the
order of some syntactical components (such as can be found in intra-MT parallels, e.g., 2 Sam. 7:20-1 Chr. 17:18; 2 Sam. 6:17-1 Chr. 16:1; 2 Sam. 10:11-1 Chr. 19:12) which often also constitutes the element of variation between the MT and parallel Qumran material.

β. In the following cases, the relation between the MT and Q material reflects the A-B versus the B-A arrangement of the two components of a pair of synonyms:

98. Is. 49:6 MT: 225
   לַחֲכֹתָהּ בַּשְּׁבָּם יַעֲכֹבָּהּ לַחֲכֹתָהּ בַּשְּׁבָּם יַעֲכֹבָּהּ
   נְגֶרֶרֶי יַשְׁרָאֵל נְגֶרֶרֶי יַשְׁרָאֵל
   עֵמֶק מְבַרֶת יַשְׁחֹר עֵמֶק מְבַרֶת יַשְׁחֹר
   מְלֵכָהּ עַד הָעֵשָׂר יֵולָה

99. 49:25 MT: 226
   נָבָר נָבָר הַשָּׁם הַשָּׁם
   נָבָר נָבָר הַשָּׁם הַשָּׁם
   מְלֵכָהּ עַד הָעֵשָׂר יֵולָה

100. 51:13 MT: 227
   יִרְוּ הֵבָלֶד עַל דָּבָר תַּלָּת הֶנְפִּישׁ וְגוֹנָה מַכָּא
   יִרְוּ הֵבָלֶד עַל דָּבָר תַּלָּת הֶנְפִּישׁ וְגוֹנָה מַכָּא

In other instances, inversion effected a syntactical rearrangement in Qumran parallels vis-à-vis the MT which is of the same type as the one observed between MT and Samaritan variants (examples 95-97) as well as between intra-MT parallels:

101. Is. 36:12 MT: 228
   אֶל אֲדֹנֵי אֲדֹנֵי שָׁלוֹחְנוֹ אֱלֹהֵינוֹ אָדֹנֵי

102. 1:30 MT:
   נַכְנָה אֶת אלֹהֵינוּ הָאָרֶץ נַכְנָה אֶת אלֹהֵינוּ הָאָרֶץ
   הַנְּכִי בַּתּוֹת בָּרֹעַ

103. 37:7 MT:
   הַנְּכִי בַּתּוֹת בָּרֹעַ
   הַנְּכִי בַּתּוֹת בָּרֹעַ

104. 38:19 MT: 230
   הָרָּה הַרָּה וּרְאוּ אָרֶץ וּרְאוּ אָרֶץ
   הָרָּה הָרָּה וּרְאוּ אָרֶץ

105. 62:8 MT: 231
   אִם אָמַת אֶת דֶּבָּךְ וְגַע אִם אָמַת אֶת דֶּבָּךְ
   עֹדָה וּדֶבָּךְ

106. 2 Sam. 24:16 MT:
   אֹמֶר (כִּי יִשְׂחַק בְּהֵם לָעָמִים)
   אֹמֶר (כִּי יִשְׂחַק בְּהֵם לָעָמִים)

A collation of the MT with Qumran parallels also reveals instances of
inversion of complete sentence parts, which was found to constitute the
element of variation between intra-MT parallels (examples 92-93) and which
sometimes resulted in 'double-readings' (examples 87-91). A case in point is

107. **Is. 37:33** MT: "עליה שלמה רלד היא אד שג זא של רלד יקחמה מנק רלד ישפלכ" ( = 2 Ki.19:32)

**משפח ישפכ עליה שלמה רלד היא אד שג זא של רלד יקחמה מנק**

There is ample documentation for changes of word-order in the LXX tra­
dition or part of it vis-à-vis the MT as well as between the major wit­
nesses to the Greek text. Discussing this issue with reference to the
text of Jeremiah, Ziegler quotes Origen who in his letter to Africanus
poignantly remarks on the numerous (syntactical) inversions:

\[\text{πολλά δὲ τολαίτα καὶ ἕν τῷ Ιερεμίῳ κατενοήσαμεν, ἕν δὲ καὶ πολλὴν μετάδεσαν καὶ}
\]
\[
\text{ἐναλλάγην τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευομένων εὐρομεν (Migne PG 11,50 Β).}\
\]

It remains, though, an open issue whether, as Ziegler does, it is correct to
define 235 the numerous examples of word-order variants in the A text vis-à-
vis the MT as **Umstellungen**, implying that the Greek tradition in these
cases changed the Hebrew text: "Es koennen 40 Stellen genannt werden, wo
A allein oder von einigen abhaengigen Zeugen begleitet, eine Umstellung
vornimmt," presumably for Greek stylistic reasons. 236 A similar explana-
tion is offered for **Umstellungen** in the B text tradition in comparison with
the MT where this is followed by the A text, although the suggestion is
weighed that B preserved in such instances an original different word
sequence. 237 However, what was not pondered at all is the possibility that
at least some cases of inverted word-order in the Greek translation may re-
reflect the same margin of stylistic licence which can be observed in a col-
lation of parallel Hebrew traditions of the Bible text.

This suggestion gains in probability in instances in which the LXX
concur with the MT arrangement of the verse, whereas the hexaplaric or the
Lucianic revision, which preponderantly correct towards the MT, exhibit a
surprising inverted arrangement. In analyzing some such cases in the Greek
tradition of Isaiah, Ziegler rather carefully raises the question whether
such transpositions indeed can be ascribed to Origen or whether they were
not already contained in his **Vorlage**: "Bei den Umstellungen erhebt sich
wiederum die Frage, ob sie alle auf Origenes zurueckgehen. Es ist moeglich, das bereits in dessen Vorlage solche Umstellungen standen.238 Bearing in mind the preceding discussion, we are inclined to answer this question more decidedly in the affirmative, especially when the inversion involves the transposition of components of a pair of synonyms in one of the revisions, and a fortiori in the basic LXX tradition:

108. Jer. 2:19 MT: יִשְׁרֵי רַעְלִי מְשַׁבְתֵּיהֶם וּתְהַלֵּךְ
LXX: παρελθεῖς σε ὅ τὰ ἀποστασία σου θαλάτσια καὶ ή κακία ἐλεγξεῖ σε
The second Greek noun κακία renders 89 times the Hebrew מָעָלְמָת which is the first noun in the MT. In view of this fact, it is only natural to assume that ἀποστασία renders here מָעָלְמָת,239 being derived from ἀπόστασις which translates שבול, e.g., in Jer. 3:14. It therefore is not surprising that the hexaplaric tradition adjusted the Greek to the MT by inverting the two translational nouns. Similarly, we discern an identical case of inversion of a pair of parallels in:

109. Jer. 8:20 MT: עַבְרֵי קָצִיר כָּל הַכּוֹז
LXX: δεξιᾶς ἄνδρος παριστά μυθωτος
110. Prov. 26:1 MT: כְּשָׁלֶג בֶּקְשָׁר קָמֶר
LXX: ὁσπερ ὄρος ἐν δίμην και ὁσπερ ὑπέτω ἐν θηρεί
In five other passages ἄνδρος renders the Hebrew noun כָּל (Gen. 8:22; Zach. 14:8; Ps. 74[73]:17; Prov. 6:8; 30:25 [24:60]), whereas μυθωτος translates 14 times קָשִׁיר (and once קָשִׁיר). Only once more, in addition to the above instances, it is used to translate כָּל (Micah 7:1).

The proposed identification of μυθωτος with קָשִׁיר is buttressed by a comparison of Prov. 26:1 with

111. Is. 18:4 MT: וִיהי זַיִּן אָלָר כָּל בָּלָה בֵּית קָשִׁיר
LXX:πόρος καθαρὸς καὶ καὶ ψευδής ὁρὸς θυματος μυθωτος μεσομπρόσ
ψευδής ὁρὸς recalls ὁρὸς in Prov. 26:1, both terms being connected in the two instances with μυθωτος = קָשִׁיר. In parenthesis we may add that the rearranged word-order of the LXX in the first stichoi of Is. 18:4 possibly reflects an original reading. It is suggested that the difficult עלֵי אָלָר should be read עלֵי אָלָר כָּל בָּלָה אָלָר, an expression which is employed in Is. 26:19.
Accordingly we would emend Is. 18:4 to read: יִצְרוּ אָרָרָר לְעָלָּדִי יְכַלּוּ בָּנֹות בָּנֹּת הַצְּרָא. 242 or in accord with the Greek positioning of φῶς at the beginning of the verse: τὸ φῶς θεοῦ γενομένου. Outside the LXX, ὁμήρος always equals 'crop-harvest.' It never carries the connotation of 'summer' that also can mean 'summer-fruit' (cp., e.g., Am. 8:1-2), exactly as does θέρος in extra-LXX usage. It is, therefore, reasonable to posit that the Greek translation of Jer. 8:20 and Prov. 26:1 inverted the MT sequence of the nouns פּוֹחַ and קְלָרִים.

In the last example to be discussed, the reversal of the massoretic word sequence in the LXX certainly can be explained to have arisen from translational stylistic reasons or from 'literary logic':

112. Jer. 4:28 MT: וַיִּשְׁכָּב וַיָּלֶד עָלָּי וַיַּעַר לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה וְלָא פָּרָה נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה וְלָא פָּרָה נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם نַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַчֲלֵיהֶנָּה לְרָם נַחֲלֵיהֶנָּה LXX: δύο τιν ελάλησε ΧΑΤ ού μετανοήσω ωρησα ουχ άπ' αυτής ἀποστρέψω αν' άπυκτυ

The MT here presents two word-pairs of opposite meanings, arranged in an a-a' b-b' order, whereas the Greek displays the more elegant a-b a'-b' pattern. Although it must be admitted that we may be concerned here with an inner-Greek inversion effected by a translator, we feel inclined to accord as much probability to the suggestion that the present Greek text reflects a Hebrew inversion variant displayed in its Vorlage.

6. Having retraced the impact of stylistic inversion on the textual transmission of the Bible text in various Hebrew and translational witnesses, we shall now turn to the investigation of the effect which this literary phenomenon had on quotations from biblical literature in post-biblical writings. The transposition of syntactical elements of a biblical verse in its secondary employment as a quotation in Qumran and rabbinic writings, or in the Apocrypha, often is interpreted to have resulted from scribal laxity or from lapses of memory, assuming that the post-biblical author quoted by heart and did not rely on a written source. 243

It is agreed from the outset that in a large percentage of cases of quotational inversions the above explanations indeed are valid. It may further be assumed that in other instances, inverted quotations reflect Hebrew or possibly translational variants which the quoting author found in his Vorlage of the biblical text in question. However, in view of the
foregoing discussion, it is suggested that also in this sphere of biblical text transmission the possibility should be considered that the principle of 'controlled variation' which was the legitimate right of biblical authors, editors, and likewise of transmitters and copyists retained a lease on life also in the post-biblical period and was utilized by writers who employed biblical quotations as building stones in their own compositions. We have no reason to doubt that if already in the early post-biblical period the later emerging insistence on literal exactness with regard to the Bible text would have been the established norm, rabbinic and Qumran authors would have meticulously abided by this norm. Even after discounting the inversion variants which can be readily explained to have resulted from transmissional phenomena such as mentioned above, some of the remaining instances require a different interpretation.

Rabbinic literature presents us with many instances of a fruitful employment of transposition and inversion in Scripture quotations for midrashic-exegetical and homiletic purposes, to the extent that it coined a special technical term for this technique - ר"ת,244 and established the exegetical rule - יָשָׁר הָאֱלֹהִים רוֹדֵשֵׁהוּ - 'invert (or rearrange) a verse and (then) expound it.'245 It would appear that in essence this method was considered a means by which to re-establish the supposedly original syntactical order of a verse which in the MT seemingly presented a case of ὑστερον προτερον.246 Like other literary-textual terms, such as לא תקנו ... ונח ... 'do not read ... , but rather ... ,247 רָדָס וְרָבָס in the course of time lost its original exact technical connotation,248 and inversion became a midrashic Spieelelement in Scripture quotations. However, the progressive dissipation of exactness in the employment of the term and the technique should not prevent us from recognizing the initially literary-technical character of the rabbinic concept of ר"ת.

Qumran writings have not preserved for us any specific terminology by which to identify literary phenomena and techniques that were operative in the Covenaneters' setting. However, there is no lack of proof that quotation-inversion was fully accepted by Qumran authors, whether deliberately and consciously or as a matter of tradition and routine. In some instances, as, e.g., in the comparison of
The midrashic-paraphrastic character of transposition becomes even more apparent in the following examples:

114. Zech. 11:11:

In other instances it would appear that the possible employment of literary chiasm to express by it contrasting moods or meanings to which attention already was drawn may be reflected in inverted quotations in Qumran literature, e.g.:

116. Ps. 119:22:

Since the combination probably a hendyadys, is unique in biblical Hebrew, little doubt is left that we are dealing here with a direct quotation by the author of 1QH from Psalm 119.

117. Ez. 22:26:

The unique combination of elements and the ensuing reference to the Sabbath in both instances again make it abundantly clear that CD VI,17 presents a paraphrased inverted quotation of Ez. 22:26. Similarly,

118. Deut 32:22

The proposal to read or possibly at the beginning of the line, rather than with Licht, derives from the recognition of the dependence of the Hodayoth passage on the text of Deut. 32:22, which Licht failed to recognize, and illustrates the potentials of stylistic analysis for textual research.
Similar instances of quotation inversion may be observed in a comparison of, e.g.
119. 1QW I,1-2 with Is. 11:14,
120. 1QW XI,7 with Num. 24:18,
121. 1QH VIII,23-24 with Jer. 17:6-8, and many more examples that follow the same pattern.

VII 'Biblical' and 'Post-biblical' - The Issue of Literary Continuity

The rich crop of quotation variants from biblical writings in Qumran compositions suggests that 'inversion' was considered by their authors a legitimate quotation technique. In this, as in many other matters, Qumran writers obviously followed basic trends and tenets of biblical literature. Since some of the earlier Qumran works are contemporaneous with the latest parts of the biblical canon, such as, e.g., the second half of the Book of Daniel, the comparability of the two sets of literature becomes almost self-evident. The specific issue discussed here, viz. the interrelation of biblical stylistics and the history of the Bible text and its relation to biblical quotations in Qumran writings, must be viewed in the wider setting of the Qumran Covenanters' ideology and their historical conceptions. The Covenanters conceived of themselves as the 'biblical Israel.' In their self-understanding, they identified their community with the 'remnant' of biblical prophetic visions (Is. 6:13; 7:3; 10:20-22; 46:3; Jer. 23:3; Micah 2:2 etc.). The 'New Covenanters' were, in their own view, the 'holy seed' (Is. 6:13; 7:3; Ezra 9:2 etc.), the direct descendants of pre-exilic Israel, who had returned to the Land. As a reward for their faithfulness to Israel's God and their steadfast adherence to His commandments they, and only they, had been saved from the utter dissolution of Israel and the destruction of the Temple (CD I,4-8; II,8; etc.). In their community, pre-exilic Israel was embodied and reconstituted.

In actual fact, the emergence of the Qumran community occurred in a historical setting which from the point of view of nascent rabbinic Judaism must be defined as post-biblical, whatever definition is accorded to this term. However, conceptually speaking, the Covenanters perceived themselves as standing within the framework of the biblical period, not less so than, e.g., the author of the Book of Daniel. In this fundamental aspect, the
'commune of the Bene Zadok' differs radically from other biblicizing ramifications of post-exilic Judaism that considered the biblical period a closed chapter in the history of Israel, a period which served them as a major source of inspiration. These contemporaneous Jewish communities, and foremost rabbinic Judaism, consciously had terminated the writing of 'biblical' literature. They innovated new styles and types of literary composition: the Apocrypha on the one hand and on the other the Mishnah and the various forms of Midrash. The emerging 'oral Torah' was deliberately segregated from the biblical 'written Torah.'

The rationalist teaching of the Rabbis found its expression in literary forms which most probably by intention differed fundamentally from the biblical literary genres in which was concretized the inspired teaching of former generations. In contradistinction, the Qumran Covenanters did not subscribe to the idea that the biblical era had been terminated, nor did they accept the concomitant notion that 'biblical' literature and literary standards had been superseded or replaced by new conceptions. It appears that the very concept of a 'canon of biblical writings' never took root in their world of ideas, whatever way the term 'canon' is defined. Ergo, the very notion of a closing of the canon was not relevant. This applies to the completion of the canon of Scriptures as a whole, and also to the closure of its major components. It would seem that not only did the complex of the Hagiographa remain an open issue, but also the collection of prophetic books was not considered sealed. Prophetic or quasi-prophetic 'inspiration' continued to inform the leaders of the Qumran community, who did not subscribe to the rabbinic dictum that with 'the demise of the last (i.e., the post-exilic) prophets Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi (prophetic) inspiration had departed from Israel' (Tos. Sotah 13,2 ed. Zuckerman 318,21-23; Bab. Tal. Sotah 48b; Sanh. 11b, etc.; and Seder Olam 30). Qumran literati considered biblical literature a living matter, and participated in the ongoing process of its creation. Their attitude to the biblical books and to the text of Scriptures may be better compared to that of the author of the Book of Chronicles toward earlier biblical writings, rather than to that of rabbinic authors toward the books of the canon. Like the Chronicler, or for that matter the author of Daniel, they related to the biblical literature from within, and not from without.
its orbit, as did the authors of the Apocrypha and the Rabbis. Like the Chronicler, the copyist and possibly also the author of the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11Q Ps²), as well as the authors of the Hodayoth, the Damascus Documents and similar works, introduced into the copies based upon their Vorlagen, and into their biblical quotations, paraphrases, word-substitutions and glosses and skipped phrases and passages which they considered unsuitable. In all these aspects they maintained a biblical stance, worked in a biblical vein, and used biblical stylistic techniques.

I am fully aware of the fact that a great number, probably an overwhelming majority, of Qumran variants in biblical scrolls and in Bible quotations resulted from insufficiently controlled copying and/or sometimes represent diverging Vorlagen. But I would also maintain that an undetermined percentage of these variae lectiones derive from the impact of ongoing literary processes of an intra-biblical nature, as illustrated by the examples adduced above. This proposition, no doubt, calls for further detailed investigation. However, already at this preliminary stage its potential importance for biblical studies becomes apparent when it is discussed within the frame of reference established by the 'three recensions' or 'three text-types' school. As was stressed at the very outset of this presentation, this new hypothesis has widened the scope of biblical textual research. It purports to evince the history of the text, as far back as the third century B.C.E., basing its arguments on manuscript evidence, and has deduced from this evidence preceding stages of the text in as early as the fifth or even sixth century B.C.E. In other words, in the Qumran material coalesce the phase of creative authoring of biblical literature with the ancillary phase of text transmission. The synchronous execution of these intrinsically different processes within the orbit of one set of literature, viz. the biblical writings, lends additional force to the suggestion that the diverse practitioners, the authors and the copyists, mutatis mutandis, employed the same or similar literary tenets and techniques. In view of the inherent ideologically biblical stance, Qumran literature, which chronologically speaking is set in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, closes to a large degree the developmental gap between biblical and rabbinic literature. The literary and stylistic analysis of Qumran works thus could provide new insights into the interdependence of these diverse sets
of ancient Hebrew writings and could help in recapturing some aspects of
the continuance of biblical literary norms into what customarily is desig­
nated as the post-biblical period.

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion sufficiently illustrated
the hypothesis that in ancient Hebrew literature no hard and fast lines
can be drawn between authors' conventions of style and tradents' and copy­
ists' rules of reproduction and transmission. It may be said that in
ancient Israel, and probably also in other ancient Near Eastern cultures,
especially in Mesopotamia, the professional scribe seldom if ever was
merely a slavish copyist of the material which he handled. He rather
should be considered a minor partner in the creative literary process. To
a degree, he applied on the reproductive level norms and techniques which
had informed his predecessors, the ancient authors, and which had become
his literary legacy. The right to introduce variations into the biblical
text, within limits, had come to the Bible-oriented copyists and quoting
authors of post-biblical works, together with the transmitted writings.
Mechanical faithfulness to the letter of the sanctified traditional litera­
ture is to become the rule only after the undirected and intuitive process
of canonisation had completed its course, i.e., not earlier than the first
century B.C.E. and not later than the second century C.E. The recognition
of the ongoing impact of stylistic techniques and norms on the textual
transmission of the biblical literature which results from the above analy­
sis must be given due attention in the scholarly discussion of issues per­
taining to the 'Text and Versions' of the Bible. 257
Notes


2. BASOR 140 (1955) 27-33.

3. The term "Version" is used here in reference to all witnesses of the Bible text, including the MT which, sensu stricto, is but a version of the now unattainable original Hebrew text.

4. A more detailed account may be found in S. Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," in: Cambridge History of the Bible vol. I etc., reprinted in the present volume.

5. A complete listing of pertinent bibliographical material would transcend the scope of this essay. Some notable works are, e.g.: F. De- litzsch, Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament (Berlin und Leipzig 1920); J. Kennedy, An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament (Edinburgh 1928); F. Perles, Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments (Muenchen 1895); Neue Folge (Leipzig 1922), et al.

6. A. von Gall, Der hebraeische Pentateuch der Samaritaner (Giessen 1918). Like von Gall's main text, such an eclectic edition of the MT would present a hypothetical text which never had had a manuscript existence. See my remarks on this issue in "Aspects of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in: Biblical and Armenian Studies ed. M. Stone, Suppl. to Sion vol. I (forthcoming).


8. A convenient summary of the history of the Qumran discoveries and a survey of theories about their dating and the identity of the Covenanters may be found in the standard works on these finds. See, most recently: J. A. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Scrolls - A Quarter Century of Study," BA 36,4 (1973) 110-148.


10. Ib. n. 21.

11. For surveys consult: H. M. Orlinsky, "The Textual Criticism of


23. This theory was applied to the LXX of Jeremiah by E. Tov in an unpublished thesis: "The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch" (Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1973) where also recent literature is adduced. See further n. 13.

24. P. Kahle has restated his views in: Die hebraeischen Handschriften aus der Hoehle (Stuttgart 1951); The Cairo Geniza2 (Oxford 1959); "Der gegenwaertige Stand der Erforschung der in Palaestina neu gefundenen hebraeischen Handschriften," ThLZ 79 (1954) 81-94, etc. Proponents of the de Lagarde school like H. M. Orlinsky and P. Katz have not expressed themselves unequivocally on the 'three recensions' theory.

25. See my remarks in CHB, 193ff. (reprinted in this volume).


27. K. H. Graf, Der Prophet Jeremia erklart (1862) x1 ff., calculated that 2700 Hebrew words of the MT, or about one-eighth of the overall text, are not represented in the LXX. Cp. also F. Giesebrecht, Das Buch Jeremia2, HAT (Goettingen 1907) xxv ff.; A. W. Streane, op. cit.; E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique litteraire dans le livre de Jeremie," RB 79 (1972) 189-199.


32. F. M. Cross, Jr., IEJ 16 (1966) 86.

33. It is immaterial for our present purpose whether the MT=Is\textsuperscript{a} reading יְהֹמַל is retained or whether יְהֹמַל is preferred.


36. An ancillary attempt to probe into the possible overlapping of issues of 'higher' and 'lower' criticism is made by E. Tov, RB 79 (1972) 189-199.
37. For this type of homiletic expansion which initially may have been of an extra-scriptural character see S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emsha' Fasuq and l1QPs", Textus V (1966) 12-21.


39. Cp., e.g., Ex. 5:3; 9:3; 15; Lev. 26:25; Num. 14:12, 2 Sam. 24:13-15; Ez. 5:17; 7:15, et al.

40. Cp., e.g., Num. 12:10; 2 Ki. 5:27; 15:5; 2 Chr. 26:20-23, et al.

41. It may be assumed that the elaboration which introduces גָמְלָו into the Hezekiah narrative constitutes a typological approximation to the tradition about King Uzziah's affliction by מָּעָן (2 Ki. 15:5 = 2 Chr. 26:19-21).

42. This technique of 'recapitulation' is widely employed in the biblical writings and can also be found in other literatures of the ancient Near East. The phenomenon which is to be discussed elsewhere in greater detail can be found, e.g., in Essarhaddon's vassal treaties. See for the present: R. Frankena, "The Vassal Treaties of Essarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy," Oudtestamentische Studien 14 (1965) 128, 132. I am indebted to Dr. J. H. Tigery for bringing this reference to my attention.

43. In some Introductions to biblical literature, stylistics are not discussed at all, and likewise literary forms and textual history. Issues of 'canon' are dealt with in a rather cursory fashion. See, e.g., S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T., rev. ed. (New York 1950).

44. The schematic division which appears to obtain in biblical studies can be illustrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Literary Process</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Stylistics</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>Composition,</td>
<td>Poet, Narrator,</td>
<td>1200-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(predominantly oral)</td>
<td>Historiographer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral and Written Tradition</td>
<td>Compiler, Redactor</td>
<td>900-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Criticism</td>
<td>Compilation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Text</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Written Transmission</td>
<td>Copyist</td>
<td>300-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. This system is exemplified in the 'Introductions' by O. Eissfeldt (Tuebingen 1964); E. Sellin - G. Fohrer (Heidelberg 1965); M. Z. Segal (Jerusalem 1946, Hebrew). In spite of some departures from this model also F. Bleek - J. Wellhausen (Berlin 1866), C. H. Cornill (Tuebingen 1905), R. H. Pfeiffer (New York/London 1941), et al., follow the same lines.

46. The assumed profound difference between the forms of oral tradition and written transmission should be toned down considerably. An investigation into transitional stages and into the possible transfer of techniques from one to the other is an urgent desideratum. These issues were not touched upon in such systematic works as E. Nielsen's Oral Tradition, STB 11 (London 1954) and A. B. Lord's The Singer of Tales (New York 1970),

47. The growth in stages of the latter part of the Book of Jeremiah (chs. 45-52) will be discussed in a separate publication.


50. An illustration of the interdependence of these diverse literary processes may be found in S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, "Aspects of the Literary Structure of the Book of Ezekiel," Tarbiz xlii (1972/73) 27-41 (Hebrew).

51. The required integrative approach in exegesis of biblical literature is most fruitfully applied by W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, BKAT (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969).

52. A detailed portrait of R. Meier may be found in W. Bacher, Die Aggada der Tannaiten, vol. ii (Strassburg 1890) 1-69. Tradition has it that R. Meier dedicated one-third of his income from his scribal activities to the maintenance of needy scholars (Midrash Koh. Rabba ad Eccl. 2:18ff.).

53. See below, examples 113-121.

54. J. A. Sanders, The Psalm Scroll of Qumran Cave II (11QPsα), DJD IV (Oxford 1965); idem, The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll (Cornell 1967).

55. To be edited by Y. Yadin. For the present see the editor's preliminary observations: "The Temple Scroll," in Jerusalem Through the Ages (Jerusalem 1968) 72-84 (Hebrew).


Tradition of the O.T.," ib., 335ff.; M. Dahood, Psalms, AB vol. I, xxiv; II, xxiii; III, xxxix-xli and indexes s.v. 'Break-up of Stereotyped Phrase.'

61. An up-to-date survey of the rapidly growing literature on this stylistic phenomenon which is shared by biblical with Ugaritic literature is given by M. Dahood in Ras Shamra Parallels, 73ff. To the list presented there, add Y. Avishur, "Pairs of Synonymous Words in the Construct (and in Appositional Hendyadys) in Biblical Hebrew," Semitics 2 (1971/72) 17-81.


63. פִּ diagn is translated ἀνής 764x and ἀνθρώπος 400x. מֵشاهد is rendered ἀνθρώπος 460x and ἀνής 27x. Cp. E. C. Dos Santos, An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint (Jerusalem n.d.) x.v. cit.


66. The hif‘il בְּיָהּ suggests that the phrase is a contracted quotation from Lev. 27:28 MT הָנָךְ לַמִּשֶּׁךָ ... וָנָּחְשָׁי לַמִּשֶּׁךָ with an interchange of מַטָּךְ and פִּלְנָךְ, and not from v.29, pace C. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (Oxford 1954) 45 and others, who adjust the CD reading to the hof‘al that occurs in MT Lev. 27:29 מַדַּעְלָךְ מַלָּעֲךָ. The assumed dependence on v.29 causes the further suggestion that the second mention of מַדַּעְלָךְ in CD ix,1 which has no counterpart in the MT is a free addition of the Qumran author (Rabin, ib. n.3). A comparison of the CD reading with the parallel MT passage leads one to propose that in any case the first מַדַּעְלָךְ should be emended to מַטָּךְ:

Lev. 27:29"אֶל כָּל גְּדוֹל אֶחָד וְלָמָּה אִישׁ מִלְחָד..."
CD ix,1 "כִּל כָּל גְּדוֹל אֶחָד וְלָמָּה מַטָּךְ"


70. פִּ_diag interchanges with פִג, as e.g. in Jer. 2:15 Therefore it also can form a parallel pair with לָמָּה, as e.g. in Jer. 3:19 Therefore it also can form a parallel pair with מַלָּעְךָ, as e.g. in

71. For reasons of assonance and paronomasy one would have expected here the combination נַעֲשֶׂה instead of פָּעְשֶׂה.

72. Comparable variations in the composition of idioms and epithets can be observed in the Versions. For the LXX see T. Muraoka, op. cit., especially p. 25ff.

74. Some 1450x, and almost 300x more with a preposition. As against this τυθηναυ renders ἄπλι only some 150x, and another 180x with prepositions.

75. Altogether close to 400x. δόσωναν is employed as a rendition of ἀπλι 27x. Cp. Dos Santos, *op. cit.*, s.v. cit.

76. All references are to the text and apparatus of the LXX Goettingen edition where available. In other instances the Cambridge (A. E. Brooke - N. McLean) or A. Rahlfs's *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart 1950) are used.

77. Ms. B here reads δώσω, possibly in approximation to the MT.

78. A. B. Ehrlich prefers this derivation in his *Nebene Judäer*, vol. iii (1901) 310. But in his Randglossen zur hebraischen Bibel, vol. v (Leipzig 1912) 48, he adopts the widely accepted emendation of the unusual hif'il to the qal form חיו.

79. See Ehrlich, *ib*.


82. A similar case may be observed in 2 Sam. 5:14-16 where the MT parallel reading of 1 Chr. 14:4-8 (+ וַיַּהֲלֵיהוּ לֵבַע) turns up in what amounts to an appendix in the LXX (2 Sam. 5:16a).

83. For the phenomenon of such inner-Greek variants see J. Ziegler, "Die Vokabel-Varianten der O-Rezension im griechischen Sirach," *Festschrift G. R. Driver* (Oxford 1963) 172-190 = *Sylloge* (Goettingen 1971) 615-633.

84. Chr. Ginsburg lists one printed edition and BH 4 four Mss which read here ךָ֣שַׁהַ֣.

85. The MT of Sam. is distinguished from the Chr. parallel by a more balanced structure.

86. Not too much weight, though, can be accorded to the Targumic evidence which derives from late manuscripts or even early printed editions.


89. With the exception of the cases listed here, the LXX never render יִרָע by χωρα or γη which translate יִרָע, חיו, לֵבַע, רִים. Hatch-Redpath do not list יִרָע under χωρα (1418a) or γη (240c), nor χωραα or γη under יִרָע (254).

moeglich" (op. cit., 278).
91. Thus Volz and Rudolph, loc. cit.
92. See n.83.
93. LXX: αὐταρκὴσεν and TO: όλοι οἱ πόροι possibly reflect a hif'il reading בַּלָּוי לְאֵילָה.
96. The editor of this fragment, F. M. Cross, Jr., considers the Qumran reading superior to the MT (BASOR 132 [1952] 22). In view of the above discussion this preference cannot be sustained on objective grounds.
97. Vide Hatch-Redpath s.v.
98. Thus F. Buhl in BH.
100. The rendition of בָּשַׁמֶּה by εὐεργετήσαται possibly resulted from an inner-Greek process facilitated by the fact that בָּשַׁמֶּה predominantly is rendered by a compositum of εὐεργετήσαται viz. εὐεργετέομαι.
101. Cp. the doublet in 1 Sam. 2:23, and my analysis in Textus I, 180.
104. G. B. Gray, Numbers, ICC (Edinburgh 1903) 151.
105. Targ. מִתְחָלָה וַתִּלֶּל עֵינַי.
106. Targ. ἔννοια τῶν ἱερευνητῶν.
107. It follows that the Sam. text is not intrinsically different from the MT and that the clause there is understood as a partitive rather than as an all-inclusive direct object. In this Sam. goes with the Targumic tradition - ΤΟ: ἀποδυδώμενον καὶ ἄλλα τῷ κατάλλαλα εἰρήνα ἀποδιδόμενον. Both the MT masc. form ἀποδυδώμενον and the Sam. fem. form ἀποδιδόντα are pragmatically synonymous with ἀποδυδώμενον. W. F. Albright's suggestion that MT ἀποδιδόμενον actually is a misread τοῦ ἄριστον (JBL LXXIII [1944] 213) which also is found in the forms τοῦ ἄριστον, τοῦ ἄριστον, τὸ ἄριστον, τὸ ἄριστον (W. v. Soden, Orientalia XXII [1954] 343) makes the synonymy of this noun with ἀποδιδόμενον certain. Cp. the detailed analysis presented by S. E. Loewenstamm, "Notes on the Origin of Some Biblical Figures of Speech," in: Studies in the Bible, Presented to M. H. Segal (Jerusalem 1964) 183-187 (Hebrew).
108. See, e.g., C. H. Toy, The Book of Proverbs, ICC (Edinburgh 1904); B. Gemser, Spruecher Salamos, HAT (Tuebingen 1963); W. McKane, Proverbs, OTL (Philadelphia 1970); H. Ringgren, Sprueche/Prediger, ATD (1962) ad loc.
109. Cp. 2 Sam. 17:9 MT: מִתְחָלָה וַתִּלֶּל עֵין קָרָא Mss. and Seb. read possibly adjusting the text to the prevailing idiom (Gen. 28:2, 3, 8, 10). - It further is reasonable that Prov. 10:6
110. It is not intrinsically different from the MT and that the clause there is understood as a partitive rather than as an all-inclusive direct object. In this Sam. goes with the Targumic tradition - ΤΟ: ἀποδυδώμενον καὶ ἄλλα τῷ κατάλλαλα εἰρήνα ἀποδιδόμενον. Both the MT masc. form ἀποδυδώμενον and the Sam. fem. form ἀποδιδόντα are pragmatically synonymous with ἀποδυδώμενον. W. F. Albright's suggestion that MT ἀποδιδόμενον actually is a misread τοῦ ἄριστον (JBL LXXIII [1944] 213) which also is found in the forms τοῦ ἄριστον, τοῦ ἄριστον, τὸ ἄριστον, τὸ ἄριστον (W. v. Soden, Orientalia XXII [1954] 343) makes the synonymy of this noun with ἀποδιδόμενον certain. Cp. the detailed analysis presented by S. E. Loewenstamm, "Notes on the Origin of Some Biblical Figures of Speech," in: Studies in the Bible, Presented to M. H. Segal (Jerusalem 1964) 183-187 (Hebrew).
should be understood or should be actually read הֶבְלוֹן, with G. Beer, BH; Gemser, op. cit.; Toy, op. cit. ad loc.; I. L. Seeligmann, SVT I (1953) 164 who correctly compares Jer. 51:51; Ps. 44:16; 69:8, Job 9:24; against McKane, op. cit. and R. B. Y. Scott, Proverbs/Ecclesiastes, AB (New York 1965) ad loc. who translate the phrase 'speech' or 'mouth of the wicked.' Scott further renders - 'uncovers' instead of the correct rendition 'conceals' (McKane). The assumed interchange of הֶבְלוֹן would help in understanding the difficult ΠΤΡ in Prov. 8:3 MT: שֵׁם רָע הַיָּדוֹ to mean 'outside the city.' For McKane and R. B. Y. Scott, (Gen. 33:18); cf. Jeremiah (Deut. 32:49; 34:1) and similar idioms. A good Ug. parallel would be present in 2 Aqht V:6-7 (CTA 17 V:6-7): יֹתְב.בַּצ. גּ. תֵּת גְדוּר. dbgrn (cp. also 1 Kings 22:10 and R-S Parallels I,46).

111. Box - Oesterley apud R. H. Charles, Apocrypha, etc., 321.
113. An assumed interchange of על人脸识别 may be of some help in recovering the 'original' reading of CD III,4 (ed. Rabin, 11): בְּנַגְדֵּן לֵבָל. This reading may be compared with the MT of CD IX,14: יִשְׁרָאֵל וְהַשֵּׁמֶשׁ בְּנַגְדֵּן לֵבָל. It is further possible that in CD IX,9-10 (ed. Rabin, 45-46) should be understood as כְּלַי, both meaning 'according to the judges' instruction.'
114. Cp. further Hos. 2:17(19). - The assumed association by the translator of Jer. 4:1 with Zech. 9:7 does not militate against the assumption that the LXX to Jer. 4:1 contains a doublet, as implied by J. Ziegler, ib. The instance must be judged against the background of other interchanges between על - על such as are discussed in examples 38-41, 43-45, and especially the MT doublet in Ex. 14:2 (ex. 46). Beitraghe zur Jeremias Septuaginta (Goettingen 1958) 90.
116. M. Dahood, ib., failed to take these facts into account in his comment on the passage.
117. Sam., some MT Mss., printed editions, and seb. read יָכָה which reading also is reflected in the Latin and Syriac renditions.
119. The component pi = 'house' occurs once more in Ez. 30:17 in the
Egyptian nom. loc. ΝΑΒΩΣ LXX: Bov Βαστον.

120. In Gen. 32:31, 32 the LXX do not transcribe but rather translate Εὐδος (του) θεού. This is an adequate rendition of the Hebrew. The critical note in BH ' אליאל' is gratuitous. In Jud. 8:8, 9, 17; 1 Kings 12:25 the LXX transliterate φανουηλ.

121. Thus understood, ΝΑΒΩΣ would equal אליאל. The biblical traditions about Peni(u)el indeed exhibit striking similarities with those pertaining to Bethel (Gen. 28:11-19). There are two traditions constitute an inclusio-like frame for the Jacob - Esau confrontations, one preceding Jacob's flight before his brother, the other signaling his return to Canaan, and the re-encounter with Esau. At both locations the patriarch experienced a theophany which in each case culminated in a covenant between him and the deity, and in the change of his name to 'Israel' - Gen. 32:28-29 and 35:9-10, unless the latter passage is understood as a Peni'el insert into a Bethel tradition. If P(n)i'el is taken to be another 'bethel,' Jeroboam's I choice of this city as his capital after abandoning Shechem is more readily explained (1 Kings 12:25).

122. Cp. Jer. 35:10 and with ib. v.18 יִלּוּ שֶׁמֶשׁ עַל נַחַל יְרוּם אֲרֵבֵרֶס אֵת כָל שִׁירַת אֲאָרֵבֵרֶס אֵת כָל מִשְׁמָרֵהֶן אֵת כָל אֶפְשַׁר דָּעָת אֲנַחַת.

123. The complementary techniques of 'stylistic conflation' and 'break-up pattern' are discussed in the publications listed in note 60.


125. Such a reductionist tendency possibly may be observed also in the LXX rendition of Jer. 1:17. See my analysis of this case: "An Apparent Redundant MT Reading - Jer. 1:17," Textus VIII (1973) 160-163. - The shorter Greek text obviously will be accorded preference by scholars who tend to identify 'short' with 'pristine,' and 'long' or 'fuller' with 'expansionist.' See, e.g., E. Tov, RB LXXIX (1972) 195, and H. W. Juengling, "Ich mache dich zu einer ehernen Mauer," Biblica 54 (1973) 1-24 which came to my attention only after the completion of this paper. The tendency to delete as secondary what appears to be redundant phrases or words is a highly dubious procedure which violates the character of biblical writing. (Cp. J. Muilenburg, "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," SVT I (1953) 99.


127. Th. renders both Heb. terms uniformly κατ' ἀνατολάς. Sym. and Syh. translate in 10:19 ἀνατολική*. In the two other mentions of ἀνατολή with reference to 'gate' (47:8, 18; cp. further 48:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 18) the LXX too render ἀνατολάς.

128. Τ renders the two terms uniformly παραθύρον.

129. This case, and examples 5 and 8, were not listed by E. Tov, op.
cit., who presented a classification of 'amplifications' without aiming at an exhaustive listing of all instances.

130. Most commentators do not discuss the doublet. See, e.g., C. H. Cornill, Das Buch Jeremia (Leipzig 1905); F. Giesebrecht, Das Buch Jeremia, GHAT (Gottingen 1907); P. Volz, Studien zum Text des Jeremia (Leipzig 1920); idem, Der Prophet Jeremia, KAT (Leipzig 1928); W. Rudolph, Jeremia, KAT (Tuebingen 1954); J. Bright, Jeremia, AB ad loc.


132. Another parallel pair which is based on the same synonyms is וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ (Jer. 16:19) and וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ (ib. 17:17, 18; 51:2).

133. In 31:1 Ziegler relegates to the apparatus the prevalent reading וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ and records in the main text the B-S-A-106'-46 rendition וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ.

134. The same double phrase turns up in the MT, LXX and TJ of Joel 4:1.

135. Cornill, op. cit., 497 deletes וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ together with וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ in 50:4, 20 "aus metrischen Gruenden," but retains the MT in 33:15, hardly sound methodological procedure. Volz, KAT, 423-425 takes 50:4, 20 to be parts of more comprehensive 'glosses,' and does not apply himself to the above textual problem. Rudolph, op. cit., follows the MT in all three instances.

136. Jer. 33:14-26 is the most extensive consecutive MT unit which is omitted in the LXX.

137. None of the commentators cited remarks on this case.

138. It is immaterial for the present discussion whether the hif'il or the qal יְרַמֶּשֶׁן is read here.


140. Cp. further Ps. 61:5 וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ and the parallel idiom Gen. 19:8 וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ for which Ug. rb.bzl. uses (Krt: 159 = CT A 14 111:159) may be compared.

141. Also other cases of presumed textual doublets, in fact, may be stylistic transition doublets, as, e.g., 2 Kings 11:13a - רְעֻתֶל וַעֲשׂי compared with vv.4, 6, 11 and vv.13b, 17 רְעֻתֶל וַעֲשׂי; ib. 11:19 רְעֻתֶל וַעֲשׂי cp. with vv.4, 6, 11 רְעֻתֶל וַעֲשׂי and with vv.14, 18, 20 רְעֻתֶל וַעֲשׂי. Further: ib. 10:6a רָצוּ וְרָצוּ אֵלֶּה בְּכָל אֲבוּרֵכָה compared with vv.1, 2, 3, 6b וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ and v.7 רָצוּ וְרָצוּ שֶׁלֶם אֵלֶּה ... וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ ... וְרָצוּ וְרָצוּ. See S. Talmon, Textus I, 167.


143. The same feature may be observed in Ug. literature. See M. Dahood’s remarks in R-S Parallels, 79-80.


145. We use the term somewhat differently from M. Dahood, ib., 80-81.


149. See the selection of publications in this field given by D. N. Freedman, ib.


151. For the pair yyn // ṣkr cp. Is. 5:22; 24:9; 29:9; 56:12; Prov. 20:1; 31:4; Ug. 601:3-4, 16. Cp. further M. Dahood, *R-S Parallels II*, 248 (p. 209) where additional biblical examples are listed.

152. For the inverted couple ṣkr // yyn cp. Is. 5:11; Prov. 31:6 and in Ug. 2 Aqht I:31-32; II:5-6; 19-20 (CTA 17 I:31-32; II:5-6, 19-20). For additional biblical examples consult M. Dahood, ib. II, 543 (p. 351).

153. The Greek translators derived ἐνάντια from r’h = 'see': LXX: φάσμα - φάντασμα Sym.: εν ὀρασε. As against this, the Tν rendition - ἀνάστημα - implies that the translator associated ἐνάντια with 'food,' possibly connecting the term with 2 Sam. 12:17 MT: יְהוָה אֵשׁ אָמִיתָךְ; תב: ולִלְכָּל תְּפַלְלָה לשון לא. אֵלֶם = 'pleasant, tasty,' most probably is a free addition. In a review of A. L. Oppenheim, *Assyrian Dictionary* vol. XVI (1962), S. R. Driver posited the existence of a root r’h II = rwh. The interchange of r’h/rwh also can be observed in Is. 34:5 MT: יְהוָה בָּשַׂם מַעְרֵב as against LXX: οὕτως δὲ εὐφοριά = LXX: οὕτως δὲ εὐφορία = Tν: מַעְרֵב סָיִנַּה כַּי יְהוָה בָּשַׂם. Ps. 60:5 MT: יְהוָה מִשׁמֶנֶת מַעְרֵב כָּהֵמָת מַעְרֵב כָּהֵמָת = Tν: מַעְרֵב סָיִנַּה כַּי יְהוָה בָּשַׂם. The same phenomenon appears to underlie the employment of r’h in synonymous parallelism with ṣb, as in Ps. 16:11; 91:16; Job 10:15 and Is. 53:11. For a discussion of this latter verse see: I.L. Seeligmann, "ΔΕΙ = ΑΙ ΑΥΤΩΙ ΦΩΣ," Gershom G. Scholem Jubilee Volume (Jerusalem 1958) pp. lff. (Hebrew). Additional examples of the same interchange may be found in Ps. 69:33 'וַיְהִי עַל כָּל אָדָם מְעַלְדוֹת תַּהְדִּיק for 'the humble drank and rejoiced' (since wine proverbially makes the heart glad - Ps. 104:15), when compared with Ps. 22:7 וַיֵּלֶד כָּל אָדָם מְעַלְדוֹת תַּהְדִּיק. See also Prov. 23:31; Job 20:17 where מַעְרֵב also parallels מַעְרֵב in the preceding verse; Eccl. 2:1 - מַעְרֵב מְעַלְדוֹת יָדֵי מַעְרֵב - and possibly also Job 33:21 MT: יְהוָה בָּשַׂם מַעְרֵב for 'his flesh withered because of lack of moisture (mem privativum) and the marrow (?) of his bones was not moistened' (i.e., they dried up), bearing in mind the reference to food in the preceding verse. - D. Winton Tomas, *VT XII* (1962) 599-600, proposed to read rwh for 'w in Prov. 31:4b in parallelism with ṣb in the first colon. - the assumed interchange of r’h/rwh caused a mistranslation in the Greek to 1 Macc. 6:34 - καὶ τότε ἐλέησαν ἐξελεηθήναν (= ἀδρα) ἄμοι σταφυλίκης καὶ μόρῳ in order to induce them to go into battle, which surely goes back to a Hebrew Vorlage מַעְרֵב מְעַלְדוֹת מְעַלְדוֹת מַעְרֵב that = 'they made them drunk with the blood of grapes,' i.e. with wine (cp. 3 Macc. 5:1-2). Thus correctly A. Kahane, *The Book of 1 Maccabees*, in: *The Apocrypha*, etc.
vol. II, p. 88 ad loc. Grimm, Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch (1853) refers to Aelian, De Animal XXIII,8 for proof that spiritous liquors were given (my italics) to elephants in order to excite them. In the case under review (1 Macc. 6:34), though, the liquor only "was shown to them, for had they drunk of it they would have got out of control."

154. O' L' - 233-456 403' 770 Syh. Syl Th. Hi. read + διὰ τὸ σκέρα κατεσθήσαν adjusting the Greek text to the Hebrew. Ms. 538 has simply τὸ σκέρα for τὸ δὲνου.

155. A clear case of conflation of the transliteration - σκέρα with the translation - μέθη.

156. The pair qbr // spd in this order parallels bkh // qbr in Job 27:15 and in Ug. 62:16-27 (CTA 6 I:16-17); 1 Aqht:111, 126, 140, 146 (CTA 19 III:111, 126, 140, 146), since bkh and spd are employed in parallelism and as interchangeable synonyms, either in the A-B or the B-A pattern, in biblical (Gen. 23:2; 2 Sam. 1:12; 3:31-32; Is. 24:16; 27:31; Joel 2:12; Eccles. 3:4; Esth. 4:3) and in Ug. literature (1 Aqht:171-172, 183 = CTA 19 IV:171-172, 183). See S. Gevirtz, Patterns, etc., 71-75; Dahood, R-S Parallels, 143, no. II,106).

157. The LXX do not render the word in either of the three occurrences. J. Bright, op. cit., records the omission only for vv.8 and 10. ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτῆς is added in all three instances in a number of Lucanian manuscripts which, though, have also in v.7 the sequence of MT v.8 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας. O, λ and Syh. exhibit the MT order. In vv.8 and 10, O-233 and Q adjust the Greek to the MT by adding ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτῆς in the appropriate positions, but do not supply the phrase in v.7. For α', 8, the addition can be established only in v.10.

158. The recurring a-b-c sequences in vv.7 and 10 form an inclusio frame for the a-c-b sequence of v.8. Vv.7-10 are thereby set apart as a small unit within the wider setting of vv.6-12 (cp. Bright, op. cit., 26).

159. To the best of my knowledge this possibility was not been considered in the study of chiasm and inversion. Cp. also examples 69-70 and further Joel 1:7, 12 יִתְנָה נַעַר (negative) - 2:22 יִתְנָה נַעַר (positive); Hag. 1:10 יִתְנָה נַעַר + תְּנוּר + השלים מִלְיָם (negative) - Zech. 8:12 נ廣告 מִלְיָם (positive).

160. For 'ק // 'bn cp. 2 Sam. 5:11, and my remarks on the assumed doublet in Textus IV (1964) 121; Is. 60:17; Hab. 2:19. The same simple sequence of the nouns is present in Ex. 7:19; 1 Ki. 5:32; 2 Ki. 19:18; 22:6; Is. 37:19; Ez. 20:32; Zech. 5:4; 1 Chr. 22:14; for Ug. parallels see 'нт III:19-20; IV:58-59 (CTA 3 III:19-20; IV:58-69); 1001 rev:13, and M. Dahood, R-S Parallels, 302; II, 44.

161. Cp. further Ez. 26:12; Eccl. 10:9; 1 Chr. 22:15; 2 Chr. 34:10 and my remarks on this last example in Textus I (1960) 182-184. The instance is not listed by M. Dahood in R-S Parallels, 100; II, 9. For a Ug. parallel cp. 52:66 (CTA 22:66).

162. For the sequence yyn // ¥ṣr cp. example no. 61.

163. The retention of the adjectives gdl // rb in the order in which they are employed in Ez. 17:17 accompanied by an inversion of order of the
nouns qhl // ḫyl. Thus a distant chiastic relation between Ez. 17:17 and 38:15 is achieved.


165. Ignoring the obvious distant chiasm and following the LXX, J. Hempel (BH) gratuitously adjusts the order of the components in this verse to Deut. 7:5 by transposing yldl and ytl n'/y'd.


167. The term ydl by itself is widely employed in biblical literature, e.g., 2 Sam. 22:19 = Ps. 18:19; Jer. 18:17; Ob. 12-13; Job 21:30.

168. ḫdl echoes ḫdl of Deut. 32:35. Cp. further:
Jer. 25:12 ḥdl ... ḥdl... ḥdl
25:14 ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl
51:52 ḥdl... ḥdl
51:54 ḥdl... ḥdl
Jer. 32:18 ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl is derived from Ex. 20:5; 34:7 ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl (cp. Num. 14:17; Deut. 5:9).
1 Sam. 2:20 4QSam = LXX ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl
2:21 ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl


170. The sequence ḥdl (yd) of Deut. 32:35-36 is maintained in Ez. 7:7, 12 ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl ḥdl.


172. The phenomenon of inclusio was discerned frequently in the Book of Psalms by M. Dahood in his commentary (AB, vol. I-III, index s.v. inclusio). The concept and the term Ringkomposition generated in the study of classical literature, especially the Greek epic. See W. A. A. van Otterlo, "De Ringkompositie als Opbouwprincipe in de epische Gedichten van Homerus," Verhandl. der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 51, no. 1 (Amsterdam 1940) 1-95 (I am indebted to Dr. E. Tov for bringing this work to my attention); idem, "Untersuchung ueber Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition," Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 6, nos. 1-4 (Amsterdam 1943) 131-176 (with a bibliographical survey of the study of the Ringkomposition).


174. The term was introduced into the study of biblical literature by C. Kuhl, "Die Wiederaufnahme - ein literarkritisches Prinzip?", ZAW 64 (1952) 1-11, who thus rendered in German H. Wiener's English term 'resumptive repetition' (The Composition of Judges II 11 to 1 Kings II 46 [London 1929] 2). The German term had been previously used in classical studies. Cp. e.g., van Otterlo, "Untersuchungen." - The literary phenomenon thus defined already had been discerned in some specific cases by medieval Jewish commentators as will be shown in a separate publication.
175. דִּיָּמְו was thus understood by medieval Jewish commentators, e.g., Rashi, Kimhi, Levi ben Gershom, Isaiah of Trani. Similarly דִּיָּמְו. The passage containing the phrase is lacking in LXX, but was restored in O + L where הַדְּמָשׁ הָם appears to reflect the same interpretation. This is rejected by H. P. Smith, Samuel, ICC (Edinburgh 1912) 174, who renders the phrase 'on two conditions.' Cp. also S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text etc. of Samuel (Oxford 1913) 152-153; M. H. Segal, Samuel (Jerusalem 1956) 153 (Hebrew), et al. R. Kittel's emendation דִּיָּמְו (BH) is altogether unwarranted, nor can A. B. Ehrlich's proposed reading דִּיָּמְו (Randglossen II, 233), or N. H. Tur-Sinai's reconstruction, suggested with some hesitation, דִּיָּמְו - 'you are ashamed...' (שֵׁא יָמְרוּ שֶׁא הָאָדָם כְּשֶׁ יְשַׁרְּוֻ אתַּלְתֵּיכֶם) be recommended.

176. Cp., e.g., Gen. 4:2 //2b; 3b //4a; 4b //5a. The inverted sequence obtains, e.g., in Ps. 29:10a//b; 1 Sam. 14:25//26. An interesting example of a textual doublet which reflects this principle may be found in 2 Sam. 8:14 כֹּל אֲלֵהֶם כֹּל אֲלֵהֶם כֹּל אֲלֵהֶם כֹּל אֲלֵהֶם for which see S. Talmon, Textus I, 177.


178. The term occurs again in the Book of Daniel 8:20 where the sequence 'Media and Persia' prevails (5:28; contrast 6:9, 13, 16: כִּי יָד֖וּ הַמִּדְּרָה הָאֲרָדָנָּיִּים אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּה אֲרָבָּ.


181. The Targums concur with the MT throughout.

182. Neither of the chiasms involved has attracted the attention of commentators.

183. The hexaplaric recension exhibits the inverted sequence.

184. S. Gevirtz, Patterns, 77-78, 95.

185. This arrangement which is based on the recognition of the underlying inclusio pattern differs considerably from the one proposed int. alii. by S. E. Loewenstamm, "On the Chiastic Structure in the Bible," in: E. Auerbach Volume, Publication of the Israel Bible Society, vol. I (1955) 27-30 (Hebrew).


187. The interdependence of Ezekiel's vision of the future temple, especially of 40:1 - 43:12, often has been noted. See most recently S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, op. cit.
188. For an analysis of the overall use of this formula in the Book of Jeremiah, vide supra, p. 68.

189. This addition usually is explained as a widening of the promise to include in it also the northern tribes.

190. See the list given in C. D. Ginsburg's edition (London 1926) ad loc.

191. This conclusion is buttressed by the fact that the haftarah for the second day of the New Year festival begins with Jer. 31:2.

192. Pace J. Bright, Jeremiah AB, 280.

193. Ib.


195. P. Volz, Jeremia, 279.

196. P. Volz, Der Text, etc., 194.

197. See W. Rudolph, Jeremia, 131.

198. A. W. Streane, Jeremiah, 186.


200. H. Cornill, Jeremia, 329. He is followed by Giesebrecht, Duhm, Peake and others. See P. Volz, Jeremia, 238.

201. See commentaries ad loc.


203. P. Volz, Der Text, etc., 227.

204. For some further examples of inclusio with inverted parallelism see Jer. 8:4-11; Ez. 12:25-28; 40:1ff.-43:12, and the discussion of this case in S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, op. cit.

205. See Textus I, 175, 177; IV, 115; Scripta Hierosolymitana VII, 175.

206. According to the Massoretic tradition, the word "is to be written but not read." It is not rendered in T⁹ and in the Luc. revision.

207. The LXX have no equivalent for MT: πῶς ἔσται. Ms B+ and the Hexapl. revision add (with asterisk) τῷ ρήματὶ τούτω. L: + καὶ περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου.


209. It may be conjectured that in this instance the present second hemistich was accidentally transferred from its previous position after the present third. A restitution of the assumed original sequence would restore an inclusio pattern based on inverted parallels.

210. By translating περὶ ὑμῶν = מִיַּדְעֵי, the LXX make Aaron and Moses the object of the statement, referring it back to v.2. Thus v.27b is not any more a mere repetition of v.27a in which God is the object.

211. Sam.: דֹּתנַה for MT: דֹּתנָה is of no consequence.
212. For a similar ellipsis of an expectable verb after the question cp. Is. 6:11; Ps. 6:4 and 90:13.


214. Observe the chiastic structure and cp. v.23.

215. Cp. v.17, MT: יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל לָא נִקְרָא, Sam.: לָא נִקְרָא יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל.

216. Against the Massoretic system which has a major divider after יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל.

217. On the vocalization נָה (א') instead of נָה (א) see S. Talmon, "The Three Scrolls of the Law that were found in the Temple Court," Textus II (1962) 14-17. This variation cannot serve as a criterion for deciding on the relative antiquity of the two parallels.

218. Vide, e.g., J. Wellhausen, Der Text der Buecher Samuelis (Goettingen 1872) 141; Smith, Samuel, ICC, 242-243; Driver, Samuel, 218; Segal, Samuel, 218.

219. Further instances of partially preserved doublets may be found, e.g., in Ex. 23:2; 1 Kings 10:28; Ps. 10:9; 2 Chr. 1:17.

220. See Cross - Freedman, "2 Sam. 22 - Ps. 18," ad loc.

221. The word 'bn is either a gloss or a variant reading for qyr. See S. Talmon, Textus IV, 121.


224. These considerations apply to some degree also to inner-massoretic inversion variants in parallel traditions that stem from chronologically different linguistic strata. In a discussion of inversion variants in Kings - Chronicles or Historiographies - Psalms, etc., the factor of changing syntactical norms must be taken into account. Cp., e.g., A. Kropat, Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik, BZAW 16 (Berlin, 1901); A. Hurwitz, The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew (Jerusalem 1972, Hebrew), and the bibliography listed there; idem, "Diachronic Chiasm in Biblical Hebrew," in: The Bible and the History of Israel (Jerusalem, 1972) 248-255 (Hebrew).

225. Cp., e.g., Is. 37:32 MT: בַּעַל הָעָלָם וָאֵל; Isא: בַּעַל הָעָלָם וָאֵל, possibly influenced by 2:3.

226. MT stands here in a chiastic relation to the preceding verse whereas Isא presents the same sequence in both instances.

227. Cp. further Is. 52:7 MT: בַּעַל הָעָלָם וָאֵל; Isא: בַּעַל הָעָלָם וָאֵל, possibly influenced by 2:3.

228. It should be stressed that in contrast to Isא which altogether diverges from the MT in many instances, Isב may be considered a proto-massoretic manuscript which rarely differs from the MT, as is well known.

229. Cp. further Is. 63:9 MT: בַּעַל הָעָלָם; Isא: בַּעַל הָעָלָם.

230. Cp. 2 Kings 18:27 MT: ...

232. Isa presents two readings of this phrase which are distinguished from each other only by some minor spelling variants.


236. Jeremias, 44.


239. Unless one assumes the unlikely position that παχύα renders here, and only here, דּוֹרָשׁ which in all other instances is translated דּוֹרָשׁתָּה, דּוֹרָשׁוֹת, etc.

240. ϕως is an erroneous translation of *wr II which refers here to some kind of herbage, as in 2 Kings 4:39. The Greek translator also had difficulties with sh which he somehow identified with *shrym - midday. Modern translations follow the LXX slavishly: RSV: 'sunshine'; NEB: 'summer sun'; ZB: 'Sonnenlichte'; SB: 'lumière.'

241. The expression may be compared with Prov. 19:12 ולֶשֶׁל לעל שֶׁל יַעֲשֵׂה and Deut. 32:1 כְּשֵׁלֶל，则 קְשֵׁל כְּשֵׁל - 'like fine rain upon the grass and like showers on young plants' (NEB). There these idioms follow upon references to מִם and ת. (כְּשֵׁל)ל עֹלֶה should be understood as an elliptic expression signifying 'dew upon herbage' that falls at the end of the rain season or in the summer. Thus correctly RSV: 'dew of herbage.' Translations such as NEB: 'sparkling light'; ZB: 'Tau der Lichter'; SB: 'rosée lumineuse,' are far off the mark.

242. An inscription in ancient Hebrew characters from Tell Arad - כְּשֵׁל ל ד ל כ (2) תבישו (1) - published by Y. Aharoni - R. Amiran, BIES N.S. XXVII (1963) 229-230, makes it plausible that in Is. 18:4 reference is made to the name of the summer-harvest month. Cp. further Jer. 4:11 where the term שָּׁטֶל is connected with the threshing season. - Tos. Ta'anit 1:7 (ed. Zuckermandel, 215 ll. 16-17; ed. Lieberman, 325, ll. 35-36) refers to the summer season by the term שָׁטֶל which follows there upon רָעַש and רָעָש.

243. Numerous variants in the biblical scrolls from Qumran were explained to have arisen in this manner, just as variants in Bible quotations in rabbinic literature often were taken to have resulted from citation by heart. See, e.g., H. L. Strack, Prolegomena Critica in V.T. (Leipzig 1873) 60, and the discussion of the matter in V. Apatowitzer, Das Schriftwort in der Rabbinischen Literatur (photographic reprint New York 1970) 21ff.

244. See W. Bacher, Die exegetische Terminologie der Juedischen Traditionsliteratur I (Leipzig 1899) 136-137; II (Leipzig 1905) 144.

245. Sifre Bamidbar 9:6 (ed. Friedmann, 17b, 1. 13); 15:33 (ib., 33b, 1. 28); 17:9 (ib., 49b, 1. 7); also Bab. Tal. B.B. 119b; Jer. Tal. R.H. 58b ad Ps. 144:14; Gen. Rabba 33(1) ad Ps. 36:7, et al.

246. Num. 17:2 where Elazar is mentioned before Moses is considered
by R. Joshijah an inverted verse - (Sifre Bamidbar, 49b 1. 7). For further examples consult Bacher, ib.

247. See S. Talmon, Textus IV, 125ff.

248. Bacher renders srs by 'castriren = castrate' (op. cit. I, 136). The Hebrew term is better translated 'invertieren' or 'transponieren' (op. cit. II, 144). Cp. M. Jastrow, Dictionary of Talmud Babli, etc., II (New York 1943); E. Ben Jehuda, Thesaurus, etc., VIII (Jerusalem 1940); A. Kohut, Aruch Completum VI (New York 1955) s.v. srs. - The verb srs and the noun srys are not extant in biblical Hebrew. The biblical noun srys is an Akk. loanword — 愀果 — which designates predominantly officials at foreign courts. In this connotation the term is employed in an Aramaic inscription (Donner-Roellig no. 224 1.5), and should be rendered there: 'einer von meinen Beamten' rather than 'Eunuchen.'

249. See supra, examples 65, 69, 70 and note 159.

250. See J. Licht, The Thanksgiving Scroll (Jerusalem 1957) 207 (Hebrew). Licht draws attention to the similar imagery in 1QH III, 30-33.

251. The phrase ΠΚηΟ ΤΟ ΠΓΤUTC (1QH XVII, 12) refers not only to Ex. 34:7 MT: ΠΚΙυΠΤ Vß/Bl "py Kt£D, paraphrased in 1QH: [เหยา*เหาย] ΠΝβΓΠ (ib.), but also to the mention of Deut. 32:22 in the next line.

252. This interpretation of Qumran socio-historical ideology will be further developed elsewhere. For the present, see S. Talmon, "Qumran und das Alte Testament," Frankfurter Universitaetsreden Heft 12 (Frankfurt am Main 1972) 84-100.


254. The very term 'canon' in reference to the collection of the O.T. books requires further clarification which would do full justice to rabbinic pronouncements on this issue. A provocative, rather untraditional approach to the problem may be found in J. A. Sanders, Torah and Canon (Philadelphia 1972); idem, "Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon," McCormick Quarterly XXI (1968) 1-15 where recent discussions of the matter are listed.

255. The issue was dealt with by E. E. Urbach, "When did Prophecy Cease?" Tarbiz XVII (1946) 1-11 (Hebrew).

256. The question whether 11QPs a should be considered a copy of the biblical Book of Psalms, as is maintained by most scholars and foremost by its editor J. A. Sanders, or whether it rather should be viewed as a liturgical collection of psalms, as reasoned by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, Textus V (1966), and S. Talmon, ib., 11 ff., requires further analysis.

257. My thanks are due to Dr. E. Tov for some valuable comments and suggestions.
Palestinian Manuscripts
1947-1972

J. A. Sanders

The spring of 1972 marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the discovery of the Qumran manuscripts. 1947 was the beginning of a period of more than fifteen years during which ancient manuscript materials have been recovered along the west littoral of the Jordan Fault as far north as the Wadi ed-Daliyeh and as far south as Masada. Publication of the manuscripts continues apace in widely scattered periodicals and titles.

The response to my "Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1967" (JBL 86 [1967] 431-44) was very gratifying and indicates the continued need, there expressed, for a readily available listing of the loci of the editiones principes, and in some instances the editiones principales, of the materials so far published. The bibliography by B. Jongeling (A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958-1969 [1971]) brings the earlier work of William LaSor up to date and is very useful. Indeed, when it first appeared I thought I should not have to update my much leaner listing. But students working with me on the scrolls have made clear the continuing need of a simple list of where the photographs and responsible transcriptions have been published, or those available since the beginning.

The format here is basically that of the earlier list; the only change is that of reversing the order of Caves 4 and 11, so that now they appear in numerical order.

In the near future a good bit of material will have been published. J. T. Milik's 4Q Aramaic Enoch materials, The Books of Enoch (see below under I.A.c.2.), are in page proof at Oxford (though not in the DJD series). Milik has submitted articles on 4QMelch to JJS and on 4QMelchAR to RB, both of which are scheduled to appear in forthcoming issues of those journals. Milik's definitive edition of all the Cave 4 materials assigned to him is also at the publisher's in Oxford and will probably constitute the next two volumes of the DJD series: these will include all of the Qumran Cave 4 materials we would call apocrypha or pseudepigrapha, that is, non-biblical.
Jewish literature known before Qumran, and all the Qumran sectarian literature not already published in DJD 5 (or, possibly, to be published in Jean Starcky's lot) along with miscellaneous materials including the "Son of God" fragment. John Strugnell's work is progressing well and will cover two volumes in the DJD series: these are essentially the hymnic materials, including 4QHodayot and similar literature, plus some miscellaneous fragments including a paraphrase document with long quotations from the Pentateuch. Materials assigned to J. Starcky are all Aramaic, non-biblical and/or non-recognizable literature, and will constitute one DJD volume. F. M. Cross, Jr., and Msgr. P. W. Skehan are charged with all the 4Q biblical literature: there will be some three volume of these. Cross has about 70 mss of Pentateuchal and prophetic (except Isaiah and one ms of the Twelve) books and plans to publish the Joshua, Judges and Samuels fragments first (see below I.A.c.l.). Skehan has the paleo-Hebrew and LXX fragments of the Pentateuch, all of the Isaiah materials, as well as Proverbs, Psalms and others of the Writings; Skehan also has one ms of the Twelve Prophets.

I wish to express gratitude to Msgr. Skehan, as well as to Fr. J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., and Frank Moore Cross, for reading this manuscript in draft and for several valuable suggestions for improvement in it.

Contents

I. Manuscripts

A. Wadi Qumran
   a. Cave 1
   b. Caves 2-3, 5-10
   c. Cave 4
      1. Biblical
      2. Apocryphal
      3. Pesharim
      4. Sectarian

B. Wadi Murabbaʻat
C. Wadi ed-Daliyeh
D. Khirbet Mird
E. Nahal Ḥever, Se’elim and Mishmar
F. Masada

II. Study Aids
Abbreviations of Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALUOS</td>
<td>Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASOR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJD</td>
<td>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPS</td>
<td>J. A. Sanders, <em>The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll</em> (Cornell 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSJ</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>Journal of Semitic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTC</td>
<td>Journal for Theology and Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>New American Bible (St. Anthony Guild edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Oudtestamentische Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Revue de Qumran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBF</td>
<td>Studii Biblici Franciscani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDS</td>
<td><em>Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea</em>, <em>Smithsonian Exhibit Catalogue, American Schools of Oriental Research</em> 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThLZ</td>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDPV</td>
<td>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIAR</td>
<td>Albright Institute of Archaeological Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap</td>
<td>Apocryphon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar</td>
<td>Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>Berachot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Damascus Document (from Cairo Genizah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DibHam</td>
<td>Words of the Luminaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hodayot (Thanksgiving Hymns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen</td>
<td>Enoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hev</td>
<td>Nahal Hever Caves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JerNouv</td>
<td>New Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jub</td>
<td>Jubilees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>War Scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melch</td>
<td>Melchizedeq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mess</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord</td>
<td>Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pesher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paleo</td>
<td>paleo-Hebrew script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pBless</td>
<td>Patriarchal Blessings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyl</td>
<td>Phylactery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrNab</td>
<td>Prayer of Nabonidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrLit</td>
<td>Liturgical Prayers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Manuscripts

#### A. Wadi Qumran

##### a. Cave 1

- **lQIs**
  - 1QS 1QpHab

- **lQS**

- **lQpHab**

- **lQIs**
  - 1QM 1QH

- **1QM**
  - Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War* ... (1962).

- **1QH**

1QSa Sb DM etc.


1QapGen


J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran* Cave 1 (1971); cf. 1Q20 in *DJD* 1.

CD


1QDan\(a, b\) \(lQNoah\)


b. Caves 2-3, 5-10


c. Cave 4

1. Biblical

4QEx\(a\)

F. M. Cross, *ALQ* 184-85: transliteration only.

4QEx\(c\)


4QpaleoEx\(m\)


4QEx\(f\)

F. M. Cross in *SWDS* 14, 23.

4QLXXLeva


4QSamb F. M. Cross, JBL 74 (1955) 147-72.

4QSama,b,c F. M. Cross, NAB (1970) text notes.


4QJerb F. M. Cross, ALQ 187 (transliteration).


4QPa-q All pre-Masoretic Psalter materials, published and unpublished, are catalogued and indexed in DSPS 143-55.


4QPsq J. T. Milik, Biblica 38 (1957) 245-55.

4QPs89 J. T. Milik, RB 73 (1966) 94-106.


2. Apocryphal


Palestinian Manuscripts

4QJub^f (etc.) J. T. Milik, RB 73 (1966) 94-104.
4QPrNab ar J. T. Milik, RB 63 (1956) 4-7-415.
4QpsDan ar^a-c
(4QTob ar^a-d hebr^a J. T. Milik, RB 73 (1966) 522. A list, only, of extant materials.)

3. Pesharim

All of the following 4Q materials published by Allegro are included in DJD 5 with the exception of 4QPBriss; on the other hand, DJD 5 includes 15 mss not published before. Extreme caution is advised in use of DJD 5. Two publications are necessary companions to it: J. Strugnell, RQ No. 26 (1970) 163-276, and J. A. Fitzmyer, CBQ 31 (1969) 59-71 (a bibliographic aid).

4QpIs^a (4Q161) J. M. Allegro, JBL 75 (1956) 174-87: Document III; DJD 5, 11-15, Pls. IV-V.
4QpIs^b-d (4Q162-64) J. M. Allegro, JBL 77 (1958) 215-21; DJD 5, 15-28, Pls. VI-IX.
4QpIs^e (4Q165) DJD 5, 28-30, Pl. IX.
4QpHos^b (4Q166) J. M. Allegro, JBL 75 (1956) 89-95; DJD 5, 32-36, Pl. X, formerly 4QHos^a.
4QpMic? (4Q168) DJD 5, 36, Pl. XII.
4QpZeph (4Q170) DJD 5, 42, Pl. XIV.
4QpSa (4Q171) J. M. Allegro, PEQ 86 (1954) 69-75, Pl. XVIII.
(formerly 4QpPs37) J. M. Allegro, JBL 75 (1956) 89-95, Pls. 3-4.
J. M. Allegro, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* Pls. 48 and 50 (86-87); *DJD* 5, 42-49.

H. Stegemann, *RQ* No. 14 (1963) 235-70 (Stegemann's article sorts it all out.)


4QpPs60 (4Q171) *DJD* 5, 49-50, Pl. XVII.

4QpPssb (4Q173)

(4Q172)

*DJD* 5, 50-51, Pl. XVIII (apparently pesharim on unidentified biblical texts).

4. Sectarian

4QFlorilegium

(4Q174)


4QPBless (?)

pGen49


4QTestimonia

(4Q175)

J. M. Allegro, *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-87: Document IV:

4QMab(b-e)


pap4QMe,f


4QS1 39-40

(4QSirSabb)


4QDibHam


4QOrd (4Q159)

J. M. Allegro, *JSS* 6 (1961) 71-73; *DJD* 5, 6-9, Pl. II.

4QWiles (Harlot)

(4Q184)

J. M. Allegro, *PEQ* 96 (1964) 53-55; *DJD* 5, 82-85, Pl. XXVIII.

4QMess ar


pap4QFrLit M. Baillet, RB 71 (1964) 354-55, 360-65: liturgical prayers close to Allegro's 4Q Prayers.

4QPssJosh P. A. Spijkerman, SBF 12 (1961-62) 325 (photograph only).

4QTanhumim (4Q175) DJD 5, 60-67, Pls. XXII-XXIII.

4QCatenaa,b DJD 5, 67-75, 80-81, Pls. XXIV-XXV and XXVII. (4Q177, 182)

4QLamentations DJD 5, 75-77, Pl. XXVI. (4Q179)

4Q--- (4Q178, 183, 185) DJD 5, 74-75, 81-82, 85-87, Pls. XXV, XXVI, XXIX-XXX.


4QPhyla-d K. G. Kuhn, Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran, 1957.

4QPa 4QPhyl I J. T. Milik, RB 73 (1966) 94-106.


4Q Halakaha J. T. Milik in DJD 3 (1962) 300.

4Q *Amrana-d J. T. Milik, RB 79 (1972) 77-97, Pl. 1.

d. Cave II

1. Biblical


11Q TgJob J. Van der Ploeg and A. S. van der Woude, Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumran (1971).
11QPs


11QPsb

J. van der Ploeg, *RB* 74 (1967) 408-12.

11QPsAp


XQPhyl 1-4

Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (1969), from *Eretz Israel* IX.

2. Apocryphal

11QJub

A. S. van der Woude in *Tradition und Glaube* (Kuhn Fest., 1971) 140-46 and Pl. VIII. Also see above under 11QPsAp - except that in the case of the Qumran Psalter PsAp means only psalms not in the MT-150 Psalter, nothing more.

3. Sectarian

11QMelch


11QTemple

Y. Yadin, *BA* 30 (1967) 135-39; *NDBA* 139-48; *IEF* 21 (1971) 6-8 and Plate 1 (photograph, transcription and apparatus for col. 64, lines 6-13); *RB* 79 (1972) 98-99 transcription of col. 57, lines 17-19).

11QBer


11QJernouvar

B. Wadi Murabba'at  

C. Wadi ed-Daliyeh  

D. Khirbet Mird  
papMird A  

Mird Acts cpa  

papMird 1-100 arab  

E. Nahal Ḥever, Se'elim and Mishmar  
HeverXII gr  

5-6Hever Ps 15-16  

pap5-6Hever 1-15  
*Ibid.*, 40-52 (Bar Kokhba letters in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek; papyrus except 1, which is on wood).

pap?5-6Hever A-C  

pap?Hever aram  

34Se'elim 1A-B, 2  

pap34Se'elim 1-8 gr  

pap1Mishmar gr  

pap1Mishmar  

F. Masada  
Y. Yadin, *IEJ* 15 (1965) 1-120 (also published separately under title Masada): preliminary


II. Study Aids


A. M. Habermann, *Megillot midbar Yehudah* (1959), and E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran 2* (1971), provide vocalized texts of the major documents from Caves 1 and 4; and Habermann has a limited concordance.
Ch. Burchard, Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer, I (1957) and II (1965) have been supplemented by H. Stegemann in ZDPV 83 (1967) 95-101.

W. S. LaSor, Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1957 (1958).


F. M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, ed. G. E. Wright (Anchorbook 1965) 170-264, is the standard work on Hebrew and Aramaic palaeography from earliest times through the Second Jewish Revolt.

H. Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament 1 (1962), 2 (1966) is very helpful to NT students as well as NT Abstracts from Weston College.

(Extreme caution must be used in consulting the apparati to the Isaiah and Psalms Fascicles [Nos. 7 and 11] of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.)
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