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1. Background

Forty years (1947-1987) of discoveries and publications of texts have passed since the first documents were found by chance near the Dead Sea. These initial finds were followed by official archaeological expeditions to various places in the Judaean Desert between 1949 and 1965. The most northern spot in this area where biblical texts have been found is Qumran, the most southern Masada; and in between are Wadi Murabba'at (18 km. south of Qumran), Naḥal Ḥever (Wadi Khabra) and Naḥal Šeelim (Wadi Seiyal).¹

Forty years of research on the texts from the Judaean Desert area are documented in bibliographies by LaSor, Burchard, Yizhar, Jongeling, Fitzmyer and in the recent updating by Koester and Schürer-Vermes-Millar–Goodman.² A glance at these shows the interest aroused by the texts from the Judaean Desert.

Forty years of mixed feelings about the biblical texts have passed. At first there was much excitement about the ancient manuscripts, one thousand years older than any other biblical document known until that time—the

* An abridged version of this paper was read at the Symposium on the Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert at the Warburg Institute in London on 11 June 1987. The discussion following my paper helped me to clarify several issues. I am further grateful for the remarks made and new data provided by H. Stegemann (referred to as 'H.S.'), J. Strugnell, E. Ulrich ('E.U.') and G. Vermes on the present manuscript. The designation of the scrolls follows Fitzmyer (see n. 2) who also provides exact bibliographic references. Texts which have not been published in a final or preliminary form with accompanying photographs are designated with an asterisk.

¹ P. W. Skehan, 'Qumran and Old Testament Criticism', in Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu, BETL XLVI (Leuven 1978) 167 also mentions a Psalms fragment from Ein Geddi (?)

Nash papyrus\(^3\) is actually not a biblical text. At a second stage there was some, often much, disappointment, since scholars asked themselves what had been learned from the biblical texts that was not known beforehand. To find the Masoretic Text (MT) in the Judean Desert was not particularly exciting since that textual tradition was known from later sources as well, and it could be surmised that it had existed also in Palestine at the time of the Second Temple. The non-Masoretic texts, on the other hand, were a novelty. However, it was often claimed that most of them contain so many secondary readings in comparison with MT that they do not add much to our knowledge of the ‘original’ biblical text. Such evaluations were generally founded on 1QIs\(^a\),\(^4\) which too often served as a basis for the characterization of all the Qumran texts. Indeed, it is rightly claimed that the number of Qumran texts adding substantially to our knowledge of the presumed original biblical text is small when compared with the wealth of material from the Judean Desert. Furthermore, many of the Qumran scrolls contain unusual spellings as well as many secondary readings. The reason for the negative judgment on the value of the Qumran texts is thus understandable. At the same time, evidence pointing to a positive view of the scrolls necessitated by some of the important texts was often not readily available. Texts\(^5\) such as 4QDeut\(^q\), 4QJos\(^a,b*) 4QJud\(^a*) 4QSam\(^a\), and 4QJer\(^b\) were analyzed or described relatively late in the history of research, or are still unpublished, so their impact was felt only later, or not at all.

In the light of these varied reactions it is important to define what kind of information we are looking for in the newly found texts. In our view, judgment should not be influenced by the number of presumed original readings in the texts beyond MT. Our objectives should be much broader and refer to the overall contribution of the texts to the study of the OT, to our understanding of the transmission of the biblical text, to textual criticism in general and at times also to literary criticism. In all these areas the scrolls have indeed advanced textual scholarship more than any other discovery or theory in recent centuries. They have also enabled us better to understand the nature of the sources known before 1947, in the first place, MT, but also the Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX. Likewise, the scrolls have provided us with a wealth of new textual data. Accordingly, we should

---


\(^5\) For references to the publications of these texts, see Fitzmyer (n. 2). For the text of Joshua, see in the meantime R. G. Boling, *Joshua*, Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY 1982) 110 (the end of ch. 8 differs much from all other sources), and for the text of Judges, *id.*, *Judges*, Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY 1975) 40 (the fragment of Jud 6:3–13 lacks v. 7a and possibly even all of vv. 7–10).
still speak of the new texts using the same superlatives and show the same enthusiasm as when the scrolls were found.

The texts have thus taught us no longer to posit MT at the center of our textual thinking. If, in spite of this, they are still compared with MT, this merely represents a scholarly convention derived from the central status of that text in Judaism and the availability of good editions of MT. Obviously such comparisons with MT could be misleading, as for example when a proto-Samaritan text (see below) is compared with MT, while it should actually be compared with the Samaritan Pentateuch. However, if we are constantly aware of the limitations of this procedure, we should nevertheless be able to describe the textual status of the scrolls correctly, as has been done in the past by Cross, Talmon, Skehan and Ulrich.6

The finds from the Judaean Desert pertain to a long period from the middle of the third century B.C.E. until the beginning of the second century C.E. We must therefore find out to what extent these texts are characteristic of the whole of Palestine. Possibly they typify only the groups who left the scrolls to posterity, namely, the Qumran covenanters, the patriots of Masada, and the companions of Bar-Kokhba. In that case, we should realize that the scribal and textual traditions embedded in them may not be distinctive of other places as well. However, this concern is superfluous. It now seems likely that many, if not most, of the texts found in this region were copied in other parts of Palestine, so that most of them can be taken as Palestinian texts. More specifically it is likely that the scrolls found at Masada, in Nahal Hever and Wadi Murabba‘at were probably not copied there, although some could have been copied at Masada. The situation is different for Qumran, since at least some of the biblical texts were written locally, viz., those displaying the characteristic Qumran orthography and language, while others were copied elsewhere.7 In the light of this situation, most scrolls found in the Judaean Desert are relevant to our understanding of the state of the text of the Bible in Palestine as a whole from the third century B.C.E until the second century C.E.

Not all the evidence is available or accessible at this stage, but enough is known to evaluate the situation, although some of the statements will obviously have to be modified in the light of the full evidence.


2. Chronological framework

The archaeological framework for most finds is quite clear since various objects have been found in the caves together with the scrolls. The remains at Khirbet Qumran apparently point to the period between 150 B.C.E. and 68 C.E. although the upper limit is less certain. This applies also to the pottery found in the caves themselves which has much in common with the finds in Khirbet Qumran. While the terminus ad quem for the Qumran scrolls is thus 68 C.E.—for this purpose we disregard a short period of occupation of the ruins in 130 C.E.—the terminus a quo for the texts is, of course, earlier, as the Qumran settlers could have brought with them much older scrolls. This applies also to the pottery found in the caves themselves which has much in common with the finds in Khirbet Qumran. While the terminus ad quem for the Qumran scrolls is thus 68 C.E.—for this purpose we disregard a short period of occupation of the ruins in 130 C.E.—the terminus a quo for the texts is, of course, earlier, as the Qumran settlers could have brought with them much older scrolls.

For Masada the terminus ad quem is 73 C.E. and for Nahal Hever and Wadi Murabba’at 132–135 C.E. (the Bar Kokhba revolt). The terminus a quo for Wadi Murabba’at is 42–43 C.E., while for the other two loci no such terminus can be determined.

Even though the texts are ancient, most of them are far removed from the time of the original composition of the biblical books. However, supposedly two of the Daniel texts (4QDan⁶,⁶a), probably written between 125 and 100 B.C.E., are not more than sixty years removed from the date of composition of the book.

3. Nature of the collections of texts

Except for the Qumran finds, the Sitz im Leben of the collections of texts discovered in the Judaean Desert poses no special problems. The groups who left remains in Nahal Hever, Wadi Murabba’at and at Masada possessed, among other things, biblical texts. The location of most texts at Masada does not reveal much about the nature of the collection as a whole, but the Deuteronomy and Ezekiel scrolls were found under the floor of the synagogue in what must have been a genizah. All these documents, it should be remembered, reflect the proto-Masoretic text.

It is much more difficult to assess the nature of the collections of texts found in Qumran especially as they were situated in eleven different caves, in Hebrew (in two different scripts), Aramaic, and Greek. So far, no solid criteria have been suggested for distinguishing between the contents of the

---


9 The oldest texts are 4QExod⁶ ascribed to 250 B.C.E. by D. N. Freedman, 'The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography', Textus 2 (1962) 93; 4QSamb ascribed to the second half of the 3rd century B.C.E. and 4QJer* ascribed to 200 B.C.E. by F. M. Cross, 'The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran', JBL 74 (1955) 147–172; 4QXII* and 4QQoh⁶ (third century B.C.E. [see ibid.]). See also the detailed discussion (referring also to 4QPsa*) in the article by Cross mentioned in n. 69.

10 See R. de Vaux, DJD II (Oxford 1961) 47.
various caves, but some of the following data may be relevant. If our own
analysis of the Hebrew Qumran texts (see n. 7) is correct, most caves
contain both imported and locally written scrolls, while cave 3 holds mainly
local manuscripts. Three other caves (5, 6, 8) present a mixture of imported
biblical scrolls and sectarian non-biblical writings. Aramaic texts, on whose
origin we have not speculated, are yielded by most caves. Greek documents
were found only in caves 4 and 7, and the latter cave contained Greek texts
alone. Scrolls written in palæo-Hebrew were discovered in caves 1, 2, 4, 6, 11.
Well-preserved texts were unearthed only in caves 1 and 11. Hebrew
papyrus fragments (biblical and non-biblical) were extant in small quantities
in caves 1 and 9 and more copiously in caves 4 and 6. Tefillin and mezuzot
were retrieved in large numbers only from cave 4, while isolated ones were
contained in caves 1, 5 and 8. Only caves 1 and 3 held large numbers of jars
probably used for storing scrolls, although it is not known which scrolls
were stored in them. Most of the scribal marks were discovered in the
(large) texts from cave 1 (see section 4 [2]). Tabs of leather used as
fastenings for scrolls were found only in caves 4 and 8. 11 Finally, the
palæographical dates ascribed to the texts also provide no criteria for
distinguishing between the different caves. In conclusion, even when all
these data are taken into consideration, it remains difficult to distinguish
between the contents of the various caves (with the exception of cave 7
containing only Greek documents). The main problem remains the contents
of caves 1, 4, and 11, the major depositories of texts containing a variety of
languages, topics, scripts, and orthographical systems, and for the biblical
texts also a diversity of textual character.

Difficult though it is to distinguish between the caves, it is even harder to
decide on the nature of the overall collection, which again has repercussions
on the analysis of the individual texts. Several of the caves were used as
(temporary) dwellings, 12 so the suggestion that they served as some kind of
genizah (thus Del Medico 13) is not plausible. Nor is the view likely which
denies any connection between the texts and the Qumran community, or
suggests that the scrolls were brought there from somewhere else, perhaps
from the Temple library (thus Rengstorf, Kutscher, and Golb). 14 The
archaeological connections between the ruins and the caves (see n. 8) as well

12 For a detailed description, see J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of
Judea, SBT 26 (London 1959) 20–21. According to this description, most caves served as cells
for hermits who left their domestic utensils there. Caves 1 and 3, on the other hand, would only
have been used as hiding places.
13 H. E. Del Medico, l'Énigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte (Paris 1957) = The Riddle of
the Scrolls (London 1958). Against this possibility see especially R. de Vaux, DJD VI (Oxford
1972) 22, n. 1.
14 K. H. Rengstorf, Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer, Studia
Delitzschiana 5 (Stuttgart 1960); E. Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of
the Isaiah Scroll (IQtsa) (Leiden 1974) 89–95; N. Golb, 'The Problem of Origin and
as the geographical proximity between them (note especially cave 4) are simply too strong to dissociate them. Thus, the only possible explanation of the presence of the texts in the caves is that at a time of crisis the covenanter brought their scrolls there for safety, and that some of them lived there for a time.\(^\text{15}\) The collection of texts thus reflects the books possessed by the covenanter. Whether or not the complete collection, or the contents of only cave 4, should be called a ‘library’ is probably no more than a semantic question. If by ‘library’ is meant all the books which the community owned or stored, without any implication that they used them or agreed with their contents, the employment of that term is not problematic.\(^\text{16}\)

4. Provenance of the texts

The question of the provenance of the texts has already been mentioned briefly. Texts found in Wadi Murabba’at, Nahal Hever and at Masada were probably copied elsewhere, although some could have been written at Masada. As for the Qumran texts, if all the scrolls were not brought there by outsiders, as some scholars believe (see n. 14), at least some of them were imported, while others would have been written on the spot, possibly in the so-called scriptorium.\(^\text{17}\) However, with the exception of the article mentioned in n. 7, no criteria have been suggested for distinguishing between these two groups. The main criterion proposed in that article refers to a difference between two types of orthography and language. One group of texts—probably written in Qumran—is the product of a scribal school recognizable by several features, while the other group—of probably imported texts—lacks those characteristics. Beyond these criteria, already discussed in my article, four further distinguishing marks for isolating the works of the Qumran scribal school are advanced here. These five criteria

\(^{13}\) See n. 12. According to Milik, loc. cit. (n. 12), the palaeographical (late) date of some of the cave 4 scrolls indicates that the texts were stored there close to the time of the Roman attack.

\(^{16}\) The enormous number of MSS (biblical and non-biblical) found in Qumran (823 according to a count in 1985 [see H. Stegemann, 'Some Aspects of Eschatology in Texts from the Qumran Community and in the Teachings of Jesus', in Biblical Archaeology Today (Jerusalem 1985) 421, n. 4]) offers no clue for the solution of this problem. The actual number of MSS was even larger, as indicated by the number of leather fastenings of scrolls whose contents have not been preserved. See J. Carswell in DJD VI (Oxford 1977) 24.

\(^{17}\) The Qumran ostracon containing an abecedary and representing a scribal exercise may indicate that the scribes were trained on the spot. For a good photograph, see J. Allegro, The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London 1959) 183. This applies also to another writing exercise from cave 4: J. Naveh, ‘A Medical Document or a Writing Exercise? The So-Called 4Q Therapeia’, IEJ 36 (1986) 52–55. Other writing exercises, all containing at least part of the alphabet, have been found in Murabba’at, some on leather (Mur10B, 11), others on sherds (Mur73, 78–80).
have an accumulative force and allow us to determine the origin even of small fragments.

For our understanding of the concept of a scribal school it is important to stress that no differences are visible in the scribal conventions used in the writing of either biblical or non-biblical texts.

1. The first criterion refers to orthography and language. The sectarian writings of the Qumran community are written in the special ‘Qumran’ orthography and language (briefly described below, 6,1 and henceforth named ‘the Qumran system’). Thus the Qumran sect probably wrote only in this way.\(^{18}\) Whatever views one may have on the nature of this system of orthography and language, the fact remains that two (and not more) systems of writing are recognizable in the Qumran scrolls and that the sectarian compositions are written only in the so-called ‘Qumran system’. This conclusion has repercussions also for the biblical texts. It implies that such texts as 1QIls\(^{b}\) and 4QSam\(^{c}\), characterized by the same orthographical-linguistic system, were copied by the Qumran community as well, while the texts not written in this system were imported.\(^{19}\) In this context it should be pointed out that the only two scribes identified as writing more than one scroll were the copyists of sectarian compositions (see below, notes 72-75).

This description does not refer to Aramaic works. To the best of my knowledge, there are no demonstrably sectarian documents among them. It is possible, therefore, that all of them were imported.

2. With the exception of the ‘parenthesis’ in 11QpalæoLev, one instance of cancellation dots in 4QJer\(^{a}\) and the paragraphos in the Aramaic 4QTestLev\(^{a}\),\(^{20}\) as far as the Hebrew and Aramaic Qumran texts are concerned, scribal marks of any kind are found only in the Hebrew manuscripts written in the ‘Qumran system’, especially in the scrolls from cave 1.\(^{21}\) This applies to the signs similar to the letter x but much bigger, at

\(^{18}\) In his study of the scribal character of the major works of cave 1, M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Bibliothèque du Muséon 44 (Louvain 1958) 684, intuitively felt that 1QIls\(^{b}\) differed so much from the other texts that its copyist could not have belonged to the same scribal school as the one which produced the other texts studied by him. Indeed, these other texts are all written in the Qumran orthography and language, while 1QIls\(^{b}\) lacked these characteristics.

\(^{19}\) This assumption is supported by another. Palaeographers tell us that the earliest of the Qumran texts are biblical, see F. M. Cross, Jr., *Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea* (Clarendon, CA 1977) 5. See also n. 9 above. Indeed, it stands to reason that the early settlers would have brought with them biblical texts, while their sectarian compositions could have been written on the spot.

\(^{20}\) The editor of 2QDeut in *DJD* III (M. Baillet) noted an apostrophe after Deut 1:8, but this sign, not known from other texts, occurs at the edge of the fragment and its real nature is not at all clear. Note further the writing in red letters of two lines at the beginning of a new section in 2QPs (fragmentary) and 4QNum\(^{b}\) (see *DJD* III [Oxford 1962] 70), also known from Egyptian texts and the Deir Alla inscription.

\(^{21}\) Another exception refers to a text found outside Qumran, viz. MasSir (II 8,24; III 18), containing stylized forms of the 'paragraphos'.
the ends of lines or in the space between columns, appearing in 1QpHab, 1QH, 1QS, 1QIsa, 11QTempleb, and in a different way in 4QCatena(177) and 4QCryptic(186). A horizontal line with or without a curving line bending to the left, similar to the paragraphos in Greek (secular and biblical) and Aramaic documents (in Qumran: 4QTest(175), 4QTestLeva), is found in 1QIsa and many non-biblical texts. Likewise, dots cancelling letters figure in a similar list of sources. Other signs, not all of them comprehensible, are attested only in texts written in the 'Qumran system': 1QIsa, 1QS, 4QDibHam(504), 4QShirb(511). Especially remarkable is the resemblance between 1QIsa and 1QS in unusual scribal signs. By extension we should mention here also the habit of writing the divine name with four dots: 1QIsa (corrector), 4QSamc, 1QS, 4QTest(175), 4QTanh(176) as well as the writing of a 'colon' before the Tetragrammaton (in the Assyrian script) in 4Q364*.

Interestingly, only some of the texts written in the 'Qumran system' employ these scribal marks (especially the 'large' texts from cave 1). It is therefore possible that they reflect only a segment of the Qumran scribal school. This group seems to have been more conversant with the scribal habits of Hellenistic Egypt than the scribes outside Qumran. If the strange occurrences of an aleph at the ends of the lines in 1QpHab II 5.6 reflect x signs misunderstood as aleph (H.S.), we should probably consider this copy as the second generation of a scribal school.

3. The use of initial-medial letters in final position is another characteristic of the texts written in the 'Qumran system'. This applies to three scrolls studied in detail by Siegel (1QIsa, 4QTest(175), 11QPs), as well as to a

22 Rockefeller photograph 43.975 presented as plates 36* and 37* in Y. Yadin, The Temple Scroll (Jerusalem 1977; English ed., 1983), parallel to columns XIX–XX and XXI.

23 1QpHab, 1QMyst(27), 1QS, 1QIsa, 4QPs, 4QTest(175), 4Q502 (‘rituel de mariage’), 503 (daily prayers), 4QDibHam(504), 509 (PrFêtes), 512 (‘rituel de purification’).

24 1QIsa, 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, 1QpHab, 4QCatena(177) 1.15, 4Q365* (‘biblical paraphrase’), 11QTemple XLV 18. See also the aforementioned instance of such dots in 4QLeva.

25 Cf. the charts in M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery (New Haven 1950) XVI with plates V, VII, IX of 1QS.


27 It is not impossible that these texts reflect one of the periods of the activity of the Qumran scribal school as suggested by J. M. Oesch, 'The Division of Texts in the Qumran Manuscripts', Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A (Jerusalem 1982) 99–104. Oesch speaks about the period between 125 and 75 B.C.E.

long series of other texts. It would be simplistic to say that these do not distinguish well between final and initial-medial forms of letters, for there is a certain regularity in this non-distinction.

4. The best preserved texts are those written in the 'Qumran system', so that there may have been differences in the material used by the Qumranites and the people outside Qumran. Note especially cave 1, which provides us with long scrolls all of them written in the 'Qumran system': 1QIsa, 1QM, 1QH, 1QS, and 1QpHab. Other sectarian texts found in cave 1 have been preserved fragmentarily, but all the 'non-Qumranic' scrolls from this cave (except for 1QIsb) are scrappy. Is it a coincidence that the most extensively preserved texts from Qumran, including 11QTemple, the longest surviving scroll, are all written in the 'Qumran system'? Possibly some of the cave 1 texts were stored in the three jars containing scrolls according to the testimony of the Bedouin recorded by de Vaux. Since such an assumption would apply only to a few texts from cave 1 and since it does not explain the fate of 11QTemple, it is equally possible that the material on which the Qumran scrolls were written was more durable than that of the others. The same applies to the strings used for stitching the sheets composing the individual scrolls. The great majority of the strings preserved were in the texts written in the 'Qumran system' and they are thicker and whiter than the few found in the imported texts: 1QPs, 4QpaleoExm, 4QDeutq, 4QJer*, 4Q381. This list is not complete and this issue, too, must be examined in greater detail.

5. A further characteristic of the texts using the 'Qumran system' pertains to the writing of the divine names and , sometimes in conjunction with another divine name and together with their prefixes, in

---

29 The research was carried out on the basis of a list of reverse order forms prepared by the Israel Academy of the Hebrew Language (courtesy of E. Qimron) referring to all non-biblical scrolls published until 1975. Some texts contained only initial-medial forms in final position, while most of the mentioned scrolls contained a mixture of forms in final position. All these texts are written in the 'Qumran system': 1QH, 1QS, 1QM, 1QDibMos, 1Q25(?), 1QpHab, 1QpSopf, 4QFlor(174), 4QTanh(176), 4QCatena(177), 4QHosb, 4QPs, 4QIsb, 4QDib-Ham(504).


30a Unless, of course, some of these jars have disappeared at the time of their discovery (observation by F. M. Cross, Jr.).

31 Possibly skins were prepared in Qumran itself, and as suggested by de Vaux, op. cit. (n. 8) 79–82 such installations may have been preserved. Mrs E. Chazon pointed out to me that the scrolls brought from outside possibly suffered more as they had been exposed to harsher climatic elements.

32 1QIsa, 4Q185, 4QCryptic(186), 4QLamentation(501), 4QDib-Ham(504), 4QHosb, 4QPs, 5Q11 ('règle de la communauté'), 13 ('une règle de la secte'), 11QPs, 11QTemple.

33 E. M. Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran—A Pseudepigraphic Collection, HSS 28 (Atlanta, GA 1986).
palaeo-Hebrew characters\textsuperscript{34} in texts written in the Assyrian script. This practice is evidenced—often not consistently, and certainly not in all the works belonging to a certain group [note e.g., 4QpNah]—in the pesharim (1QpMic, 1QpZeph, 1QpHab, 4QPs\textsuperscript{a} [together with 4Q183\textsuperscript{35}], 4QPs\textsuperscript{a}) and other sectarian writings (1QH, 1QH\textsuperscript{b} [1Q35], 1QMyst[27], 4QAge-
Crea[180], 6QD [CD], 6QHymn[18]), and also in a few biblical texts
(2QEx\textsuperscript{b}, 4QIs\textsuperscript{3} \textsuperscript{36}) and a collection of biblical and non-biblical
Psalms (11QPs\textsuperscript{a}). Furthermore, this scribal practice is found in biblical texts for
which there is little or no orthographical evidence (because of their
fragmentary nature) for including them in this category: 1QPs\textsuperscript{b}, 3QLam,
3Q14 (an undetermined fragment) and 11QLev. The reason for this custom
has been described by Siegel as a desire to ‘insure that under no conditions
would the Name be erased’.\textsuperscript{37} In this regard, the Qumran scribal custom
reflects the spirit of the rabbinic law in yMegillah I,9 (71d) better than the
other texts (ibid., 166–167).

The foregoing analysis has shown that information of different sorts can
now be combined in order to determine the ‘Qumranic’ origin of a text:
orthography, the use of scribal marks, the use of initial-medial letters in a
final position, the writing of the divine names in palaeo-Hebrew characters,
and possibly also the material used. Some of the characteristics used as
criteria for distinguishing between the two groups refer to habits peculiar to
the Qumran scribes (the writing of the divine names?), but others are found
also outside Qumran (see notes 21 and 80 and note the puncta extra-
ordinaria and the writing of \(\text{\text{N}}\) with initial-medial \(\text{\text{m}}\) in Neh 2:13 in MT).
Nevertheless they help to differentiate between two types of texts found in
Qumran.

The evidence presented here points to the existence of a Qumran scribal
school, and not necessarily of the only Qumran scribal school. In principle it
would be possible that the compositions which, according to our thesis,
were imported were copied at Qumran but by a different group of scribes.
However, such an assumption is not in order since for other reasons also it
has to be admitted that the scrolls written prior to the settlement in Qumran
were brought there by the (first?) members. Besides, the Qumran scribes
needed imported prototypes for the copying of their own texts. Also, it does
not seem likely that they wrote in two different systems, as no sectarian

\textsuperscript{34} For a complete list of the evidence, see K. A. Mathews, ‘The Background of the
Palaeo-Hebrew Texts at Qumran’, in C. Meyers and M. O’Connor, eds., The Word of the Lord
Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Seputuagint’, Bulletin IOSCS 13
(1980) 14–44.

\textsuperscript{35} For the identity of the two texts, see J. Strugnell, ‘Notes en marge du volume V des
“Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan”’, RQ 7 (1970) 263 and plate III.

\textsuperscript{36} According to the detailed description of P. W. Skehan, ‘The Text of Isaias at Qumran’,
CBQ 17 (1955) 158–163, this scroll contains all the characteristics of the ‘Qumran system’.

\textsuperscript{37} See J.P. Siegel, op. cit. (n. 26) 169.
writings have been preserved in non-Qumranic spelling and language. But our main argument belongs to a different area. As will be stressed at the end of this paper, the approach to the biblical text differs from one group of texts to the next. The scrolls written in Qumran orthography and language display a tendency to modernize the spelling and language of the Bible, which is an indicator of a free approach to the biblical text. Other indicators of such an approach are the frequent contextual changes in these texts and the many mistakes and untidy corrections. If handwriting may be invoked as well, many of the scrolls written in the ‘Qumran system’ are written sloppily, not in the same handsome handwriting of most of the other scrolls. These other scrolls, presumably imported, do not as a rule reflect this free approach to the biblical text. The so-called proto-Masoretic manuscripts are conservative both in spelling and content, and this applies also to the other imported scrolls, except for the so-called proto-Samaritan texts. Without speculating on the origin of the two types of manuscripts, it is unlikely that two such different approaches could have been practised in the same locality, for they reflect a different socio-religious environment. It is not likely that one community would have created texts as different as these simultaneously or at different periods (note that scrolls of both groups are assigned to the whole period of settlement at Qumran). At the same time, having been created, the texts could have co-existed peacefully in Qumran, a topic to which we shall return later.

The combined criteria for recognizing the origin of the texts found in Qumran allow us to present a list of the scrolls belonging to both groups. When this is compared with the putative dates given to the texts on palaeographical grounds it appears that for the early period of scribal

38 On the basis of the halakhic writings of the Qumranites, Y. Zussman claimed (lecture of 24 June 1987) that they were stringent in their halakhic decisions. Since this approach is not visible in the copying of the biblical writings, it appears that the concept of the holiness of their transmission did not exist in the Qumran community (cf. also the careless writing of the mezuzot and tefillin, both of those written in the ‘Qumran system’ and the rest). On the other hand, this evidence should not be used against our claim that the special type of orthography and language is Qumranic, since all sectarian compositions are written in this system.

39 The following (still partial) list of biblical texts does not distinguish between different degrees of probability with which texts are assigned to one of the two groups. An earlier version of this list was published in the article quoted in n. 7.

Scrolls written in the Qumran orthography and language: 1QDeut, 1QIsa, 2QExa, 2QDeutb, 2QNum, 2QDeutbc, 2QJer, 3QLam, 4QDeutlm, 4QSamc, 4Qlsa, 4QHos, 4QPsacb,c,n, 4QOba, 4QLamab, 4QDanab, 11QLev. Biblical paraphrases: 4Q158, 4Q364, 4Q365, 4QPsf, 11QTemple, 11QPsab, 11QPsDes.

Biblical texts not written in the Qumran orthography: 1QGen, 1QEx, 1QpaleoLev, 1QpaleoNum, 1QDeut, 1QJud, 1QSam, 1Qlsa, 1QPsab, 1QPs44, 1QDanb, 2QGen, 2QpaleoLev, 2QNuma, 2QPs, 2QJob, 2QRuthab, 4QEx, 4QpaleoExlb, 4QDeutab, 4QJosab, 4QSamab, 4QIsa, 4QJerab, 4QEza, (see J. Lust, BETL 74 [1986] 90-100), 4QPsabc, 1QPs89, 4QpaleoJobab, 4QDanabc, 5QDeut, 5QLamb, 5QPs119, 6QpaleoGen, 6QpaleoLev, 6QKings, 6QCant, 6QDan, 8QGen, 8QPs, 11QpaleoLev, 11QEz. Biblical paraphrases: 4Q366, 4Q367.
activity represented by the Qumran texts (250–150 B.C.E. [pre-Hasmonaean or archaic]; see n. 69) only imported scrolls have been found at Qumran. These dates fit the archaeological evidence pointing to the middle of the second century B.C.E. (or somewhat earlier) as the beginning of the settlement at Qumran. The scrolls preceding that date are not written in the ‘Qumran system’, so these texts were probably brought by the (first) settlers. Other imported scrolls were probably brought to Qumran during the whole period of settlement, or else at one given time only. The palaeographical dates given to texts produced in the ‘Qumran system’ also fit this framework, since for other reasons all of them have been ascribed to the age of the Qumran settlement. Most of the biblical texts written in the ‘Qumran system’ are assigned to the period between 50 B.C.E. and 68 C.E. (one of them to the last years of the sect’s settlement, 50–68 C.E. [4QIs*c*][40]), and a few to an earlier stage (4QSam*c[100–75 B.C.E.], 1QIs*a[125–100 B.C.E.], 4QPs*a* and 4QQoh*a [both: 150 B.C.E.]).41 Likewise, most of the non-biblical texts written in the ‘Qumran system’ are dated between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E., and some to earlier periods ranging from 150 B.C.E. (4QDibHam*a) until 100–75 B.C.E.: 1QS, 4QM*d, 4Q499, 500, 502, 503, 504, 509.

5. External data on the biblical texts

The first issue to be treated is the question of which books have appeared in the Judaean Desert. Although the actual preservation of certain scrolls is coincidental, at least some minimal conclusions should be allowed. Excavations at Masada have produced texts of Exodus (?!),42 Leviticus (two copies), Deuteronomy, Ezekiel and Psalms;43 in Nahal ʿHever: Genesis, Numbers, and Psalms;44 and in Wadi Murabbaʿat: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets.45 The preponderance of Pentateuchal texts is noteworthy.

As for Qumran, in 1965 Skehan listed 172 different scrolls,46 and some

---

40 See Skehan, op. cit. (n. 6) 811.
41 For the Psalms scroll, see Skehan, ibid., 815. For the Qoheleth scroll, see J. Muilenburg, 'A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumran', BASOR 135 (1954) 20–28.
43 See Y. Yadin, Masada, Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand (Jerusalem–Tel Aviv–Haifa 1966) 168–189. The earlier account Masada, First Season of Excavations, 1963–1965 (Jerusalem 1965) 11 (Hebr.) = IEJ 15 (1965) 103 ff. (104) also mentions a scroll of Genesis, but this may well be the same text described as Jubilees on p. 179 of the book written in 1966.
44 See Fitzmyer (n. 2) 46.
45 DJD II (Oxford 1961).
of the Pentateuchal texts contain two books.\textsuperscript{47} In the article mentioned in n. 6, he listed and described all the texts of Isaiah and Psalms. Several scrolls probably contained only sections of books (4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} presumably only Deut 32 [note the empty column after that chapter and the small column block]; several scrolls held no more than an anthology of Psalms). The recognition of what constitutes a separate scroll is mainly based on an analysis of the handwriting. This reasoning, however, may lead to imprecise conclusions since fragments of the same book in a different handwriting could have belonged to the same scroll (in 1QH, for example, the change of hands took place in the middle of a column [XI]). The actual number of scrolls could therefore be slightly smaller. The updated numbers—according to Strugnell\textsuperscript{48}—of the biblical texts discovered in cave 4 only (including those written in palaeo-Hebrew) give a good impression of the overall proportions of the books:

Genesis 11 (1 includes Exodus: 4QGen–Ex\textsuperscript{b*}), Exodus 12 (one includes Genesis: 4QpaleoEx\textsuperscript{1*} [E.U.]), Leviticus 4, Numbers 2 (1 continues from Leviticus: 4Q Lev\textsuperscript{a–Num\textsuperscript{a*}}), Deuteronomy 16, Joshua 2, Judges 2, Samuel 3, Kings 1, Isaiah 17, Jeremiah 3, Ezekiel 3, Minor Prophets 7, Psalms 20, Job 3, Proverbs 2, Ruth 2, Song 3, Qoheleth 2, Lamentations 1, Daniel 5, Ezra 1, Chronicles 1. Excluded from this list are the biblical texts contained in mezuzot and tefillin, of which many have been found in the area.\textsuperscript{49}

All the books of the Hebrew canon are represented at Qumran with the exception of Esther. Little notice should be paid to that omission due to the size of the book. If only one small fragment remains of 1–2 Chronicles (4Q118*), it is not surprising that the much smaller book of Esther has not been found at all. Note also that no fragment of Nehemiah has been preserved (Ezra is represented at Qumran).

It is noteworthy that the biblical books have been preserved at Qumran in different quantities. From the aforementioned list of texts from cave 4 it appears that the three books most frequently represented are Deuteronomy (18 copies), Psalms (20 copies) and Isaiah (17 copies). All other books, except for Genesis (11 copies), have turned up in much smaller numbers. This proportion may well point to the Qumran covenanters as the owners of the scrolls, though not necessarily as their copyists, for in the sectarian writings of the Qumranites the books of Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms

\textsuperscript{47} The relevant evidence (see below) has not yet been published. In the meantime see Skehan, \textit{ibid.}, 265. According to J. Sanderson, four blank lines have been preserved before the text of 4QpaleoEx\textsuperscript{1*} as well as the last words of Genesis. The fragments of Mur\textsuperscript{1} probably reflect a scroll containing both Genesis and Exodus, and possibly also Numbers, but this evidence refers to a later period (note the long columns of 48–50 lines).

\textsuperscript{48} List prepared June 1987.

\textsuperscript{49} See especially \textit{DJD} VI (Oxford 1977).
are the most frequently quoted biblical books. Furthermore, the style of several sectarian prose works is based on Deuteronomy, that of many hymnic works on Psalms (taken as a 'prophetic' book [cf. 4QpPs]), and the prophecies of Isaiah played a prominent part in the thinking of the sect.

Closely connected with this issue is the question of canon. It is not clear whether the texts found at Qumran actually reflect the authoritative books (canon) of the people who deposited the scrolls, as suggested by several scholars. Since the excavations have unearthed not only biblical and sectarian works, but also 'apocryphal' books such as Tobit, Ben Sira, and the Epistle of Jeremiah as well as such 'Pseudepigrapha' as Jubilees, Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, scholars sometimes speak of an open-ended canon in which there was room for works which we would now call 'non-canonical'. This description would also apply to the finds at Masada where in addition to the biblical and (Qumran) sectarian works a Ben Sira scroll and a copy of Jubilees (?) has been discovered. However, so little is known about the circumstances surrounding the depositing of the scrolls in Qumran and Masada, that the evidence may be irrelevant and misleading. We therefore conclude that the evidence from the biblical scrolls on the authoritative books of the Qumran covenants and the patriots of Masada is very limited. It would be more relevant to examine the pesharim and the biblical citations in the sectarian writings such as the reference to Daniel in 4QFlor (E.U.).

As for biblical translations, Aramaic targums of Leviticus have been identified in cave 4 (4Q156 [nature uncertain]) and of Job in caves 4 and 11. The Greek Bible is represented by 8HevgrXII* and the following Qumran fragments, all of the Pentateuch: pap7QLXXEx, 4QLXXLeva, pap4QLXXLevb*, 4QLXXNum, 4QLXXDeut and probably also 7Q3-19. Aramaic was known at Qumran, as is evident both from the

51 E. G. Skehan, op. cit. (n. 6) 819.
52 For 4Q156 and 4Q157 (Job) see DJD VI (Oxford 1977); for details on 11QtgJob see Fitzmyer (n. 2) 36.
many Aramaic works found there and the influence of that language on the scribe of 1QIsa. Greek must have been familiar to the people who left the texts at Nahal Hever since other Greek documents were found there as well. As for Qumran, the finds of Greek documents in caves 4 and 7 render it likely that some were able to read these texts, but knowledge of that language among all the Qumranites cannot be assessed. It appears that all the Greek and Aramaic works found in Qumran have been 'imported'.

Qumran has yielded twelve biblical scrolls written in palaeo-Hebrew script: two copies of Genesis, two of Exodus, four of Leviticus, one of Numbers, two of Deuteronomy, and one of Job. Three other fragments from cave 4 contain non-biblical works and an unidentified palaeo-Hebrew work has been retrieved from Masada. The palaeo-Hebrew script was thus preserved for the writing of 'early' biblical books, among which the presence of Job is worth noting. Some scholars believe that the very use of this script reflects a revival of the Hebrew script, but this would imply the complicated assumption that these texts were copied from scrolls written in the Assyrian script. It is more likely to posit a continuous tradition of writing in the Hebrew script, even after the Assyrian script had been introduced.

Although the palaeo-Hebrew texts could have been produced at Qumran (thus Mathews [n. 34]; note the palaeo-Hebrew writing, although of a different nature, in 4QCryptic[186] written in the 'Qumran system' as well as the writing of the palaeo-Hebrew divine names [see n. 34]), it is more likely that together with other texts they were imported. Knowledge of palaeo-Hebrew does not imply that the Qumran scribes would also have written complete works in that script. Moreover, the orthography and linguistic structure of the palaeo-Hebrew scrolls as well as their scribal conventions differ completely from the texts written in the 'Qumran system'.

6. Contribution to biblical scholarship

The main areas in which the Qumran finds have enriched our knowledge are (I) the transmission of the biblical text, (II) the content of the newly-found texts, (III) textual variety among the manuscripts from the Judaean Desert, and (IV) the approach to the biblical text in Qumran and Palestine as a whole during the Second Temple period. These four areas are closely connected.
I. The transmission of the biblical text

The new texts provide a vast amount of technical data on the ancient scrolls and scribal conventions. Although several aspects of these issues have been discussed in the works of Kuhl, Martin, Oesch, Siegel and Stegemann (n. 59),58 major studies are still needed in an area which has been explored much less extensively than that of the textual status of the new discoveries. Study of the scribal habits is an integral part of the description of the transmission history of the biblical text. At the same time, it may enable us to establish connections between individual Qumran texts, biblical and non-biblical, between Jewish and non-Jewish scribal traditions, and to arrive at conclusions on matters of authorship and origin.

In the following, a few of these areas are singled out for comment, but in all of them much further research is necessary. Only in some of the aspects discussed below are differences visible between the texts copied by the covenanter and those brought from outside.

The ancient scrolls

a. Form of the scroll—it was clear from the very first finds that each biblical book (with the exclusion of some scrolls of the Pentateuch [see above] and the Minor Prophets [see MurXII]) was contained in an individual scroll. Systems of rolling the scrolls as well as many other external data concerning them have been discussed by Stegemann.59

b. Materials—After an initial study by Poole and Reed on the types of leather found in Qumran60 this field calls for further study. There may be some differences between the texts copied at Qumran and those imported (see above, section 4 [4]). Very few biblical papyrus fragments have been yielded by Qumran.61

c. Fastenings of the scrolls—J. Carswell62 identified four different systems of fastening the scrolls with leather straps (two of which are the most frequent), but since these fastenings were usually found separated from the scrolls we cannot apply the results of this research to the contents of the texts themselves.

58 C. Kuhl, 'Schreibereigentümlichkeiten—Bemerkungen zur Jesajarolle (DSIa)', VT 2 (1952) 307–333; Martin, op. cit. (n. 18); J. M. Oesch, Petucha und Setuma, Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des AT, OBO 27 (Freiburg–Göttingen 1979); id., op. cit. (n. 27); J. P. Siegel, op. cit. (n. 26).
61 Pap4QIsaś, 6QDeut, 6QKings, 6QPs78(?), 6QDan.
62 See n. 11.
d. Length of individual sheets—Sheets of leather combined into scrolls vary between 26 and 89 cm: 1QIs\(^b\) 26–45 cm, 1QIs\(^a\) 35–60 cm, 11QTemple 37–61 cm, 1QH 56–62 cm, MurXII 62 cm, 1QpHab 62–79 cm, 11QpaleoLev 63 cm, 1QM 70–89 cm, 11QPs\(^a\) 72–87 cm.

e. Methods used in combining sheets—The main system of combining sheets of leather was by sewing with strings: on the strings themselves, see above, section 4 [4]. The sheets of 8HevgrXII* were glued together with some kind of adhesive,\(^63\) as was the custom for papyrus scrolls (H.S.).

f. Number of columns per sheet and their measurements—From the ruled (half-)empty columns preserved at the end of 1QpHab, 11QpaleoLev, 11QPs\(^a\), and 11QTemple it is clear that before writing on the scrolls, scribes used to calculate the number of columns that would fit into each sheet as well as their measurements. In 1QIs\(^a\) and 11QTemple, the sheets contain either three or four columns, but in two cases in 1QIs\(^b\) two. 1QIs\(^b\) contains 2 and 4; 1QH 4; 1QM 3, 4, 6, 5; 11QPs\(^a\) 4, 5, 6; 1QpHab 6, 7; 1QS col 11 as well as the ‘patch’ in 4QDeut\(^n\) (‘All Souls’) contain only one col.

The width of the columns is described by Stegemann (n. 59) as varying between 6 and 20 cm.

In some texts, the size of the column block is relatively consistent. Most of the biblical scrolls studied average 20 lines, with exceptions on either side. The differences between the individual copies of the same biblical book show that except for the case of the Five Rolls the size of the column block probably did not depend on its content.

According to the present evidence, it appears to have been the custom of writing most of the copies of the Five Rolls in small column blocks: (6QCant has columns of 7 lines with an average of 37 spaces, 2QRuth\(^a\) has 8 lines of 36 spaces, 5QLam\(^a\) 7 lines of 42 spaces, 4QLam\(^a\) [‘Qumran system’] has 11 lines, and 4QCant\(^a\) 13 lines). On the other hand, 4QQoh\(^a\) [‘Qumran system’] contains 20 lines.

Another scroll of small dimensions contained probably only the poem in Deut 32: 4QDeut\(^d\) (with 11 lines of 21 spaces and of 15 spaces in the last column).

In addition, there were apparently other books, not of small dimensions, written in limited column blocks: 4QDeut\(^n\) (12 lines of 35–50 spaces), 5QDeut (15 lines of 86 spaces), and 4QPs\(^b\) (16–18 lines of 20–25 spaces). It is difficult to formulate rules at this stage,\(^64\) and even the sizes of these scrolls are not clear.

\(^{63}\) See the introduction by the present author to the publication of 8HevgrXII*, DJD VIII (in press).

\(^{64}\) According to the theory of A. Rofé, ‘The Composition of Deuteronomy 31 in Light of a Conjecture regarding the Interchange of Columns in the Biblical Text’, Shnaton 3 (1978) 59–76 (Hebr.) the shorter the book, the smaller the column size. This view seems indeed plausible in the light of the data provided by him, but fuller evidence relating to a larger number of scrolls such as those mentioned here does not substantiate his view.
Of the longer scrolls, note 11QPs a (25–26 lines of 45–50 spaces), 1QIs a (29–32 lines of 61 spaces), 1QIs b (35 lines of 51 spaces), and 11QpaleoLev (42 lines of 41–50 spaces [reconstructed]).

The size of the upper margin is usually smaller than that of the bottom margin (thus also Soferim II 3).

Another matter concerns the consistency within each text. Sometimes one rule is set for the complete scroll, while at others the data differ from one sheet to the next (e.g. 1QIs a, 1QS, 11QTemple, 8HevgrXII*). However, extreme differences between the sizes of the columns are not evidenced, as far as I know, and it is therefore doubtful whether the three fragments ascribed to 4QJer b 65 really belong to the same scroll. Fragm. 1 (ch. 9–10) has lines of 115–120 (130?) spaces, while fragments 2–3 (ch. 43 and 50) have lines of 60–65 spaces (these differences are more extreme than the external differences in 1QM and 4QLam a** running to 50 per cent). Their script is also dissimilar. While all three fragments clearly reflect the same textual character (similar to the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX), it is not clear that they belonged to the same scroll.

g. Ruling and other markings—Prior to the writing, most scrolls were ruled horizontally (indicating lines) and vertically (indicating the beginnings [and ends] of columns), usually with a sharp instrument, but also with ink (H.S.). 66 In the writing, the letters were hung from the horizontal lines, and in the later (?) texts they were written at a certain distance from that line. The ruling is not always neat with equal distances between the lines. In some texts single guide dots for the ruling (as in mediaeval codices) have been preserved at the ends of the last column of the sheet: 2QEccles, 4QpaleoEx m* (E.U.), 4QJer b** fragm. 2, 4QXII c*, MasSir col. V and in one case both at the beginning and end of the sheet: 4Q365* ('biblical paraphrase').

h. Patching—At times a segment of a scroll has been replaced with a patch stitched on it (pace Soferim II 10). In 4QpaleoEx m*, such a round patch was stitched on col. VIII displaying an orthography different from the remainder of the scroll (ךננ spelled defectively in the patch). 67 To 4QDeut m* ('All Souls') a similar patch has been applied (now detached). Consisting of a single sheet, this differs considerably from the scroll itself in column width and the number of lines. 68 A large cleft in the middle of a column in 4QJer c* was stitched before the actual writing, and similar tears in 1QIs a were stitched after the writing.

68 See the photograph in Cross, op. cit. (n. 19) 18.
Scribal conventions

a. Script—So far, study of the script has focused on matters of dating and similarity of individual letters. Palaeographical studies by Avigad and Cross⁶⁹ have enabled an absolute dating of the texts written in the Assyrian script, subdivided in different chronological groups. The dating of palaeo-Hebrew is much more difficult.⁷⁰ Another aspect of the writing which needs to be researched is whether on the basis of script and scribal habits individuals can be identified responsible for more than one scroll, biblical or not. So far little positive evidence has been suggested, but this may be due to lack of attention to this question. Possibly we may not be able to isolate such individuals and will have to content ourselves with locating schools of copyists, as suggested by Cross.⁷¹

In the literature, only two such individuals are mentioned: Allegro⁷² remarked that the scribe of 4QTest(175) also wrote 1QS. Cross (op. cit. [n. 69] 158) advanced a step further by showing that he also wrote a biblical scroll, 4QSam⁶, and Ulrich⁷³ demonstrated that this scribe corrected another text, 1QLs⁴. This conclusion is based on a palaeographical examination, the employment of final forms of letters, and the use of four dots for the divine name (this practice is found elsewhere only in 4QTanḥ[176]). M. Baillet attributed 2QJer to the same scribe.⁷⁴ Another scribe copied 11QTemple⁵ and 1QpHab.⁷⁵ All these scrolls are written in the 'Qumran system'.

b. Orthography—Study of the orthography of the texts illustrates important aspects of their transmission and at the same time it may shed light on matters of authorship. Together with the studies of the spelling of


⁷¹ See Cross, op. cit. (n. 69).

⁷² DJD V (Oxford 1968) 58.


MT (see Cohen, Andersen-Forbes and Barr\textsuperscript{79}), a detailed examination of 1QI\textsuperscript{8} has been made by Kutscher (see n. 14), and of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole by Qimron.\textsuperscript{77} In addition, a beginning has been made with computer-assisted research of the spelling.\textsuperscript{78}

According to my own findings (cf. n. 7), the Qumran texts, biblical and non-biblical, consist of two main groups: (1) those that display the ‘Qumran system’ of orthography and language; (2) those which do not and cannot be characterized in any way. The ‘Qumran’ language, partly parallelled by the Samaritan pronunciation,\textsuperscript{79} reflects an ancient stratum of the Hebrew language, but its exact status and distribution cannot be determined because of lack of evidence (it may well have been more frequently used than the parallel linguistic habits of MT). Nor do we know whether the ‘Qumran’ orthography was practised widely in Palestine.\textsuperscript{80}

The following are the main linguistic criteria typical of group 1 (see n. 39 for the texts assigned to both groups):

1. Lengthened independent pronouns: הנ妾, התמה, יהוה, יהוה;
2. lengthened pronominal suffixes for 2nd and 3rd persons plural, etc., מלקה, מלקמה;
3. words serving in MT as ‘pausal’ verbal forms, such as בקִּסְפָלָה, בקִּסְפָלָה;
4. lengthened future forms: יַעַקְפָלָה, יַעַקְפָלָה;
5. verbal forms with pronominal suffixes construed as בקִּסְפָלָה;
6. the form מַדְרֶדֶר, מַדְרֶדֶר for the 2nd person plural;
7. the forms מַדְרֶדֶר, מַדְרֶדֶר.

The orthographical features have been summarized in the works by Kutscher and Qimron (see notes 14 and 77). Of these the presence or absence of the following spellings may be considered the main criteria: בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת, בלת.

\textsuperscript{76} M. Cohen, "כֶּרָה תלומת השופטים של המוקדש בית המקדש ממיabic, ימי המקדש המודרנ, Ramat Gan 5740) 123–182; F. I. Andersen–A. D. Forbes, Spelling in the Hebrew Bible, Biblia et Orientalia 41 (Rome 1986); for the views of J. Barr, see the forthcoming publication of his Schweich Lectures for 1986.


\textsuperscript{78} See E. Tov–J. Cook, ‘A Computerized Data Base for the Qumran Biblical Scrolls with an Appendix on the Samaritan Pentateuch’, JNSL 12 (1984) 133–137. Many of the Qumran scrolls have already been encoded for this purpose by J. Cook.


\textsuperscript{80} See Tov (n. 7) and the literature quoted there. The lack of documents from this period written by unskilled scribes (which probably would have provided more parallels such as מֶשֶׁר and מְלוּכָה [Mur42] and מְלוּכָה [Mur47]) makes this orthography more unusual than it probably was in reality. Note also several qatalakah forms in MT itself, and even such ‘Qumran’ forms as Gen 41:21, קֵרָה, Ez 1:11, יַעְקִפָלָה, 13:20, מַדְרֶדֶר. Less relevant is the ‘Qumran’ orthography of some of the non-biblical texts of Masada since they probably derived from Qumran, as indicated by their sectarian content. See the ‘Apocryphon’ (?), ‘Sectarian fragment’ (?), and MasSirSabb all mentioned in IEJ 15 (1965) 105.
In each of the texts of group 1 a certain number of particular features appear; only rarely do all of them figure together in one text, such as 4QFlor(174). It is difficult to determine how many features should be expected to appear in a given text in order to claim its Qumranic nature. It should be noted, however, that besides a small or large number of particular Qumran features, all the documents classified as group 1 are written in a very full spelling. Among the above-mentioned criteria the spelling אֵל is the most common feature, whereas the lengthened pronominal suffixes are the least frequent.

For example, it is clear that 1QS is written in the ‘Qumran system’, even though it lacks forms of the type נְלֶכֶת, and the same holds for 1QM and 1QH in which forms such as נְלֶכֶת are found but not ones like נְלֶכֶת. The Qumran scribes, though working within a specific tradition, thus retained a certain individuality. This feature is also evident from a comparison of different Qumranic copies of the same sectarian composition (no overlapping Qumranic biblical texts are at present available).

Supralinear corrections which render the Qumran orthography even more ‘Qumranic’ than it was show that these texts reflect the work of a scribal school rather than individual habits. Thus the scribe of 4QSamc added at II 2 a supralinear aleph (א, נְלֶכֶת), and at I 5 a waw (ו, נְלֶכֶת). The scribe of 1QH appended the same supralinear aleph to א in three places, as well as a waw to נ (IV 30, 31). Likewise, in other sources (1QIsa, 1QpHab, 1IQps, 4QTest[175], and 1QTemple XLI 13) there are several forms like נְלֶכֶת with final mem in medial position. These reflect the adaptation of הָלָה (and similar words ending with the third person pronominal suffix) to the new system. Likewise, in 1QH II 22 נְלֶכֶת the kaph is a final letter, and this applies also to similar words in 1QIsa XII 15, XXXI 26.

In future research it must be determined whether the Qumran texts really display only two major types of orthography, as claimed by me, or more, as argued by Martin (official phonetic, phonetic, transitional phonetic and exclusively consonantal orthography [n. 18]). The aforementioned four additional criteria characterizing the Qumran scribal school (section 4) strengthen the view that the system here called ‘Qumranic’ in fact reflects one system only and not several sub-systems.

c. Correction systems—The newly found texts provide abundant examples of the systems used for correcting mistakes or revision. Additions of letters, words, series of words and complete sentences were written between

---

81 See the detailed analysis by J. P. Siegel, op. cit. (n. 28) 134 ff., esp. 135 (1IQps XIX 6 [smaller letter]: 142 (9 instances in 1QIsa; all in the second part, involving smaller added letters); 149 (addition of he in 4QTest[175] as ‘afterthought’). A published section of this dissertation refers to 1IQps XIX 6: ‘Final Mem in Medial Position and Medial Mem in Final Position in 1IQps—Some Observations’, RB 7 (1969) 125–130. See further 1QpHab XII 14.
the lines, sometimes continuing in the margin, horizontally as well as vertically alongside the text (1IQIsa XXX, XXXII, XXXIII), and even below the last line of the column, up-side down (4QJer.a8). Deletions were made by erasure with a sharp instrument or by dots (see section 4[2]) above or below the letters (or both), and rarely on both sides. Changes were made by first erasing the word or letter, and then writing on top of it, or crossing out the word with a horizontal line (1IQIsa XI 10, XVI 14; 4QDan7 fragment 14, 11.82).

d. Stichometric arrangement—Several poietical texts have been arranged stichometrically. Two main systems are visible, but their distribution and even the use of any system can only be studied after the publication of all texts.83 One (hemi)stich per line is written in 4QPsbi, IQPsia, 5QPsia, 11QPsia (the last three: Ps 119), and 4QDeut4 (Deut 32 [last column of the scroll, though not of the book]), and one stich per line with spaces between the hemistichs in 1QDeutb (Deut 32), 4QProvkl and two texts of Lam* from cave 4, 2QSir, MasSir, 5/6HevPs*, 8QPsib and MasPs*.84 In addition, MasPs* has ‘titles’ above the text of Ps 82–85, a custom not known previously from ancient texts.

e. Paragraphing—Beyond some differences between the individual scrolls, one system of paragraphing has been used in most texts, biblical and non-biblical. Main units are indicated by leaving the last line of the previous unit empty after the last word. Smaller breaks—subdivisions—are indicated by spaces of varying sizes in the middle of a line. In addition, in two palaeo-Hebrew texts, a large waw is written in the space between sections when the first word in the next section would have started with a waw (1QpaleoLev, 4QpaleoEx*): in these cases the next section now starts without the waw. Similar palaeo-Hebrew waws are found in two Psalm texts written in the Assyrian script (4QPsib [see n. 83] and 4QPsd*85) and once in 1QIsa (V 22 [use unclear]) and 1QS V 1 (beginning of a new paragraph).

f. Word division in the middle of words—Word division in the middle of words is found frequently in the palaeo-Hebrew texts as well as in tefillin and mezuzot, in the latter apparently because of economy of space. It is not found in texts written in the Assyrian script and is forbidden according to Saferim II 1.

83 For 4QDeut4, see P. W. Skehan, ‘A Fragment of the “Song of Moses”’ (Deut. 32) from Qumran', BASOR 136 (1954) 12–15; for 4QPsbi, see id., ‘A Psalm Manuscript from Qumran (4QPsbi), CBQ 26 (1964) 313–322. For the texts from Proverbs*, Lamentations* and 4QPsbi see id., op. cit. (n. 6) 815, 818.
84 See Y. Yadin, op. cit. (n. 43).
g. *Scriptio continua*—The Qumran texts are *not* written in the *scriptio continua* (such writing in *tefillin* and *mezuzot* [see n. 49]) is secondary as is clear from the use of final letters. Five palaeo-Hebrew texts (4QpaleoEx\[\text{E.U.}\], 4QpaleoEx\[\text{m*}\], 2QpaleoLev, 6QpaleoLev, 1IQpaleoLev) use dots as word dividers. It thus seems that the Qumran texts do not lend support to the view\(^{86}\) that the earliest biblical texts were written in the *scriptio continua*. However, the evidence may be misleading, since that stage in the history of the biblical texts probably preceded the Qumran texts.

It is unnecessary to emphasize that data such as described in this section not only illustrate aspects of the textual transmission, but also clarify specific textual problems such as those created by careless handwriting, resemblance of letters—some of them unknown before the finds of the Qumran texts—, misunderstood corrections and other factors. Furthermore, negative evidence should also be invoked: For example, the only additions to the text are corrections, either by the first or second hand, and therefore, to the best of my knowledge, there are no examples (or in the best case, extremely few) of explanatory *glosses* so often reconstructed for MT by biblical scholars. (On the other hand, the presumed phenomenon of glossing could have been earlier than the texts from the Judaean Desert). Furthermore, none of the scribes inserted between the lines or in the margin what we would call 'variant readings', nor did they write corrections in the margins. Therefore, the Qumran texts do *not* provide the background for the presumed origin of the Qere system. That must have originated elsewhere (in the Temple circles?).

II *The content of the newly found texts*

Obviously, the content of the newly found texts has received most attention in discussions of the discoveries. This is of concern to our study of the transmission even if details in the text agree exactly with MT (see below) or differ from MT 'only' in matters of orthography (see above). It is of greater interest if individual readings agree with sources known previously, mainly the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX, in the latter case enhancing the reliability of the reconstruction of Hebrew variants from the Greek translation. But the texts have provoked most interest when providing previously unknown readings, both when considered inferior to known readings and when superior to them. Examples of such readings are discussed in the official publications of the scrolls and in the subsequent literature. Some of these refer not only to the textual criticism of the Bible, but also to literary criticism (see n. 93).

\(^{86}\) This is the common view, on which see A. R. Millard, '“Scriptio Continua” in Early Hebrew: Ancient Practice or Modern Surmise?', *JSST* 15 (1970) 2–15, and J. Naveh, 'Word Division in West-Semitic Writing', *IEJ* 23 (1973) 206–208.
III Textual variety among the manuscripts from the Judaean Desert

All the texts found outside Qumran, that is, in Nahal Hever, Wadi Murabba'at and at Masada, are proto-Masoretic. Occasionally, they differ in orthography and in minute details of content, but one remains impressed by the basic identity of MT and a long text such as MurXII. Moreover, although this text was from the outset very close to MT, it also contains nine corrections towards MT (eight supra-linear additions and one erasure) and only one further correction away from MT. This textual unity refers to the period until 73 C.E. for Masada and 132–135 C.E. for Nahal Hever and Wadi Murabba'at.

As opposed to the textual unity in these three localities, Qumran presents a picture of textual variety in each cave as well as in all the caves together.

This variety is usually described in terms of proximity to texts known before the Qumran discoveries. This way of describing the Qumran texts is a mere convention derived from the accident that for several centuries scholars knew the mediaeval copies of MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX, but no earlier texts. Because of this somewhat unusual situation, the data are usually delineated in reverse order, so to speak. But when all the texts have been published, it will be possible to depict this relationship correctly. Already at this stage the proximity of the proto-Masoretic texts to the later MT should not be stressed, but rather that of MT to the earlier sources, not that of the proto-Samaritan witnesses to the later Samaritan Pentateuch but that of the latter to the former. In this way, it will be easier to understand how MT developed from earlier texts which we now call proto-Masoretic, and how the Samaritan Pentateuch was created from texts which we now name proto-Samaritan.

We now turn to a description of the recently discovered documents according to their textual character, and not according to the sequence of the biblical books. For the textual variety characterizing the complete collection did not necessarily exist for each individual book. The background of this situation has to do with the hazards of the textual transmission. That is, scribes who changed the nature of a given text (book) by expanding, shortening or rewriting, by changing the orthography or adding certain linguistic features, occupied themselves inconsistently with certain biblical books. For this reason a given textual development known from one book should not be posited for all biblical books in the same way.

Although no predictions regarding the contents of the Qumran caves could have been made, it was actually no surprise to find in them proto-Masoretic texts, but their frequency is remarkable. Many Qumran texts of which the earliest (4QExod\*) has been ascribed to 250 B.C.E. (see n. 9), are (almost) identical with MT. This group includes all the palaeo-Hebrew texts

---

87 For Wadi Murabba'at, see DJD II (Oxford 1961) and for Nahal Hever see the references in Fitzmyer (n. 2) 46.
except for 11QpaleoLev and 4QpaleoExm, as well as many others in the Assyrian script. Although all these are very close to MT, one of them reflects in addition what looks like—inconsistent—correction towards MT: 4QJeraa, ascribed by Cross to 200–175 B.C.E. Because of its length and proximity to MT, special mention should be made of IQIsb, dated to between 30 B.C.E. and 70 C.E.

The LXX translation was prepared in Egypt from Hebrew sources still unknown. It was therefore a pleasant surprise to find at Qumran Hebrew texts containing individual readings known from that translation. However, although many such texts agree occasionally with the LXX, only one is sufficiently close to the LXX to be considered related to the Hebrew Vorlage of that version. Like the LXX, 4QJerb is much shorter than MT and reflects a different sequence of verses and probably also of chapters. These differences between MT on the one hand and 4QJerb and the LXX on the other are considered recensional, as they reflect different stages of the development of the Hebrew book. Like several other texts, 5QDeut agrees a few times with the LXX against the other witnesses, and also with MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch against the other, but what makes this text special is that it contains four supralinear corrections agreeing with the LXX. However, because of its fragmentary nature it is not clear whether the complete scroll was indeed corrected towards the Hebrew text underlying the LXX. Likewise, 4QSama often agrees with the LXX, either with the main tradition or the Lucianic text. But it also often disagrees with those textual traditions. Furthermore, it contains many independent readings. It cannot in consequence be classified as closely related to the LXX. However,

---

88 For the palaeo-Hebrew texts, see n. 56. See further 1QGen, 1QEx, 1QDeutb, 1QJud, 1QSam, 1QIsa, 1QPsa,b, 1QPsa,c,d,e,f,g,i,j,k,l,n,q,r,s, 2QGen, 2QExa,b, 2QNuma, 2QPs, 2QJob, 2QRutha,b, 4QExodf, 4QDeuta,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,n,q,r,s, 4QSama, 4Qua,a,e, 4QPsb,c,d,f,g,r,s, 4QS9, 4QDan, 4QLama,b, 6QKings, 6QCan, 6QDan, 7QGen, 8QPs, 11QLev, 11QEzek.
89 Ibid. (n. 69) 137, lines 3, 5 and commentary.
90 See Cross, ibid., 179.
91 Other Hebrew texts were described as 'Septuagintal' as well, but in our view the evidence is too scanty: 2QDeut (see DJD III [Oxford 1962] 61); 4QEx (see F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies [New York 1961] 184; R. W. Klein, Textual Criticism of the Old Testament [Philadelphia 1974] 13–15); 4QDeut (P. W. Skehan, op. cit. [n. 83]). See further below.
92 For a preliminary publication, see J. G. Janzen, op. cit. (n. 65).
its exact relation to the LXX, as that of 4QSam, has yet to be determined after the full publication of the texts.

Another pleasant surprise in Qumran was a relatively large group of texts related to the Samaritan Pentateuch, written in the palaeo-Hebrew (4QpaleoExm*) and Assyrian script (the other sources). These texts are now named 'proto-Samaritan' as the sectarian Samaritan Pentateuch was presumably based on a non-sectarian text like these. In a way, the existence of these texts at Qumran advanced scholarship more than the find of proto-Masoretic texts, or of scrolls related to the LXX, since the proto-Masoretic texts are known from MT, and philological expertise would have guided us in reconstructing the latter from the LXX. But we would never have been able to recreate proto-Samaritan texts by removing the sectarian readings from the Samaritan Pentateuch. For the best preserved proto-Samaritan source, 4QpaleoExm*, differs also in other matters from the Samaritan Pentateuch. Its spelling is more full, and it lacks the other distinguishing mark of the Samaritan Pentateuch, viz., its Samaritan phonetic features. It shares with the Samaritan Pentateuch its linguistic simplifications, harmonizations in small matters, as well as non-characteristic readings, yet differs in many details in these areas. Moreover, it also contains various readings not known from other sources. This description applies also to the other proto-Samaritan sources. It had been surmised by recent generations of scholars that the Samaritan Pentateuch was composed of two different layers, but the exact nature of these two layers has only now been clarified. The second, 'Samaritan', layer is thin, and can be 'peeled off' rather easily.

Because of these differences between the proto-Samaritan sources and the Samaritan Pentateuch it should be stressed that the large harmonistic pluses and the additions from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers (and in one case: vice versa) suffice to prove the special character of the proto-Samaritan

96 There is no support for the view of M. Baillet that these proto-Samaritan texts as well as other Exodus scrolls containing occasional agreements with the Samaritan Pentateuch actually reflect Samaritan texts: 'Le texte samaritain de l’Exode dans les manuscrits de Qumran', in A. Caquot and M. Philonenko, eds., Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer (Paris 1971) 363–381. The known proto-Samaritan sources do not contain any sectarian readings. For the reasons why 4QpaleoExodm* could not have included the Samaritan Tenth Commandment, see P. W. Skehan, 'Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Masoretic Text', JBL 78 (1959) 22–23.

97 A photograph of col. XXXIX together with a transcription has been published by P. W. Skehan, 'Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran', JBL 74 (1955) 182–187. Columns I and II have been published without transcription in the article by P. W. Skehan mentioned in n. 6. The character of this scroll is discussed in detail by J. Sanderson, op. cit. (n. 67).

98 In the three published columns (see previous note), see especially the full spelling of anô and nômô, reminiscent of the full Qumran orthography. Note also an occasional agreement with the characteristic Qumran language (גראמ quoted by J. Sanderson, op. cit. [n. 67] 40). These spellings, however, are exceptional for the Exodus scroll. For small harmonizations of the Samaritan Pentateuch not found in the Exodus scroll, see in the published section 6:27, 30; 7:2 and for a linguistic simplification not shared with the scroll, see 7:4.
texts, even if in other details these texts often differ from the Samaritan Pentateuch. In 4QpaleoEx?*, these harmonistic features are well represented, especially in the explicit execution of the divine commands to Moses and Aaron telling them to warn Pharaoh before each plague. A second proto-Samaritan source, 4Q158 (‘biblical paraphrase’), has added, like the Samaritan Pentateuch, in the Sinai pericope in Exodus parts of the parallel account in Deut 5:24–31 as well as the divine command to install a prophet (Deut 18:18–22). This source also contains the performance of the command of Deut 5:30, a detail not shared with the other witnesses of the biblical text. These data are relevant in spite of the fact that 4Q158 is not a regular biblical text, but consists of a combination of biblical texts interspersed with midrashic exegesis. This applies also to another ‘biblical paraphrase’, 4Q364*, which also contains major harmonizing additions shared with the Sam. Pent. Likewise, reportedly also 4QNum*b holds major harmonizing pluses from Deuteronomy in Numbers, again shared with the Samaritan Pentateuch. The sequence of the scriptural passages in 4QTest(175) corresponds with the Samaritan Pentateuch. Finally, 4QDeut*n (‘All Souls’) adds, like the Samaritan Pentateuch, the text of Ex 20:11 after Deut 5:15. All these texts thus form a typologically similar group, related in character, yet sometimes different in content, distinguished mainly by harmonizing additions reflecting a free editorial approach. In the same way as these texts relate to each other, the Samaritan Pentateuch is akin to all of them, although that text is a little remote from them because of its subsequent ideological and phonetic developments.

The greatest surprise of the Qumran discoveries derives from texts not particularly close to any of the three sources mentioned, MT, LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch, but maintaining an independent status. Such texts may contain many agreements with MT, but at the same time they also significantly disagree with that source. The same applies to their relation with the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch. More importantly, they hold a significant number of readings not shared with the three sources. They are thus independent. This was realized only recently, when it was recognized that the textual variety in Qumran can no longer be described according to the pattern of the tripartite division of the textual witnesses customary

99 Published by J. Allegro in DJD V (Oxford 1968) on which see the detailed notes and additional reconstructions by J. Strugnell, op. cit. (n. 35). See also the detailed discussion of this text in my article ‘The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts’, JSOT 31 (1985) 3–29.

100 E.g. Jacob’s dream after Gen 30:36 (= 31:11–13). This text is to be published by J. Strugnell in collaboration with the present author. 4Q364* agrees in several details with 4Q158 against MT.

101 See F.M. Cross, op. cit. (n. 96) 186.

102 Ex 20:18 (= Deut 5:25–26; 18:18–19); Num 24:15–17; Deut 33:8–11; Jos 6:26. Also in the Samaritan Pentateuch the first two mentioned passages are added after Ex 20:18.
before 1947.\textsuperscript{103} According to the old-fashioned concepts with which most scholars still work, all the Qumran texts can somehow be fitted into that tripartite picture of the MT, LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch in the case of the Pentateuch and under a different name in the other books of the Bible. However, it has now been recognized that several texts do not fit within any such framework, and must consequently be taken as sources \textit{additional} to those known before. Of these we mention here 2QDeut\textsuperscript{c}, 4QDeut\textsuperscript{t,q}, 4QJosa\textsuperscript{a}, 4QSama\textsuperscript{a}, 5QKings, 11QpaleoLev.\textsuperscript{104}

It should be added in parenthesis that in determining the textual character of a writing, the palæo-Hebrew script apparently plays no special role. 4QpaleoEx\textsuperscript{m} is a proto-Samaritan text, 11QpaleoLev is independent, while all the others are proto-Masoretic.

Qumran thus displays a picture of textual variety in which many proto-Masoretic texts are found, several proto-Samaritan texts, a number of independent scrolls, and one text agreeing with the \textit{Vorlage} of the LXX. If the aforementioned description is correct, all of these have been imported to the community. Within this variety, one further group must be taken into consideration, viz., the texts written in the ‘Qumran system’. These comprise a separate class characterized by matters of orthography and language and not of content.

In a given biblical book any number of different texts such as described above could have existed. It is not impossible that some books developed with a greater textual diversity than others, but this cannot be determined to any further extent because of the fragmentary state of our knowledge.

\textbf{IV The approach to the biblical text in Qumran and Palestine as a whole during the Second Temple period}

We now turn to an analysis of the approach to the biblical text in the Second Temple period, paying special attention to differences between the various texts. The first part of this analysis focuses on the textual situation at Qumran covering the period from the middle of the third century B.C.E. until 68 C.E. At a second stage we turn to a discussion of the overall textual situation in that period in Palestine.


\textsuperscript{104} On the independent nature of the Leviticus scroll, see E. Tov, ‘The Textual Character of 11QPaleoLev’, \textit{Shnaton} 3 (Jerusalem–Tel Aviv 1978–9) 238–244 (Hebrew); K. A. Mathews, ‘The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) and the Text of the Hebrew Bible’, \textit{CBQ} 48 (1986) 171–207. On 4QDeut\textsuperscript{t} see the article by Skehan quoted in n. 83 and P.-M. Bogaert, ‘Les trois rédactions conservées et la forme originale de l’envoi du Cantique de Moïse (Dt 32, 43)’, in \textit{Das Deuteronomium—Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft}, BETL LXVIII (1985) 329–340. On 4QSama\textsuperscript{a}, see the statistics in E. Tov, \textit{op. cit.} (n. 95). On 4QJosa\textsuperscript{a} see n. 5. The statistics for the other texts mentioned here are provided in the article mentioned in the preceding note, pp. 21–22.
1. *Qumran*—Probably the majority of scholars take as their point of departure the assumption that all Qumran texts reflect the outlook of the Qumran community. In that case, the texts found there display breadth of mind in matters of canon and an acceptance of textual variety since the collections found there contain not only sectarian and biblical books, but also various extra-canonical works, now called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Furthermore, the caves provide biblical scrolls on leather as well as papyrus, in palaeo-Hebrew as well as the Assyrian script, and even in translation (Aramaic, Greek). However, the clearest evidence of their presumed open-mindedness would be the existence of many different texts such as described above. Some of these texts were written in Qumran, and others were imported and they show varying approaches to the biblical text.

Taking as our point of departure that these texts reflect the situation in the sect, we have to enquire into their *Sitz im Leben* within the Qumran community. On a practical level, openness to textual variety would appear in their simultaneous and indiscriminating use in daily life. After all, the sectarian were no Bible scholars and the known differences in content, orthography and textual approach may not have disturbed them. But it is equally possible that the Qumranites used the scrolls in different circumstances. In that case, they would have chosen a certain type of text during the official reading of the Bible, and another one for study purposes, both communal and individual. It is also possible (H.S.) that new members of the community brought with them their private scrolls which were stored in the ‘library’ of the community, without being used actively.

Alternatively, the various texts could correspond to different attitudes to the biblical text in the course of several generations, while in any given period scrolls of merely one textual character would be preferred. However, this assumption can be discarded as far as the distinction between local and imported scrolls is concerned since palaeographical considerations lead us to believe that both types of scrolls derived from the whole period of the sect’s settlement at Qumran.

All these reflections concerning the Qumranites’ openness to questions of canon and text are nevertheless mere speculation. After all, nothing is known of the circumstances surrounding the deposition of the texts. Further, we do not understand the character of the collections found in Qumran nor why they were placed there. More importantly in the present context, we do not really know whether all the texts found in Qumran were used actively by the community at one of the stages of its history. If most of the texts would have remained locked in a ‘library’, and if in their daily life the sectarian used only one group of texts, we cannot any longer speak of their openness to matters of canon and to textual diversity. In the creation of scrolls written in the ‘Qumran system’ much freedom is visible, but this is not the same as the acceptance of the variety of texts found in the Qumran caves.

If our theory distinguishing between the different origins of the Qumran
texts (n. 7) is incorrect, we know absolutely nothing of the background of the scrolls. If on the other hand it is realistic, we should at least be allowed to distinguish between the scrolls copied at Qumran and the imported scrolls. But this distinction does not allow us to determine the status of the imported texts in the community.

The only hint pointing to the Qumranites' approach to the imported and local texts would reside in their use of these texts in their own writings; but this topic illustrates only one aspect of the issue. It is a question which still needs to be studied in detail, but there seem at this stage to be indications that the Qumranites preferred to quote from the local scrolls written in the 'Qumran system'. This assumption derives from a parallel between 1QDeut\(^a\) and 11QTemple\(^{105}\) and possible parallels between 1QIs\(^a\) and 4QDibHam\(^a(504)\).\(^{106}\) Other relevant information may come from the quantitative relation between the scrolls written in the 'Qumran system' and the imported scrolls. According to the present state of knowledge, there were more imported than local scrolls in Qumran; but these data are merely provisional.\(^{107}\)

In short, not sufficient data exist to confirm the receptivity of the Qumran covenanters in matters of text and canon since we do not know their attitude towards the different texts found there.

2. Palestine—Even if the covenanters' approach to the texts discovered in Qumran cannot be determined, some minimal conclusion can be drawn from these finds concerning the state of the text in Palestine. Basing ourselves on the conclusion that some of the texts found in Qumran derive from elsewhere, we may deduce that Palestine was characterized by textual diversity. This diversity had not been documented earlier (although it could have been surmised before 1947) and in any event was more extensive than expected. This situation has to be taken into account in all subsequent discussions.

The proportion of the texts from Qumran may give some indication of the amount of acceptance of the various texts in Palestine; but once again we are left with questions. Does the large number of proto-Masoretic texts point to a wide acceptance of this textual tradition outside Qumran in the Second Temple period? The one place for which such an assumption is valid in the period before the destruction of the Temple is Masada, where all the biblical evidence (antedating 73 C.E.) reflects MT. Furthermore, how large

\(^{105}\) 1QDeut\(^a\) reads in Deut 13:5: אֶלֶךָ הַמִּצְרָיִם לְקַלְקָל לְאָשֶׁר הָעַבְדוּ תֵּבֹאָר. The same reading is reflected in 11QTemple LIV 14. Instead, MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch read ולְקַלְקָל at the end of the verse. In the analysis of these parallels as well as the ones mentioned in the next note, one should take into consideration that the palaeographical dates of these compositions do not allow for these conclusions. The parallels may thus refer to an earlier copy of the biblical texts.

\(^{106}\) Note the correspondence between 4QDibHam\(^a(504)\) and 1QIs\(^a\) in 48:17–18 in small details (brought to my attention by Mrs E. Chazon).

\(^{107}\) See the temporary list in n. 39.
was the group of proto-Samaritan texts and what was their geographical
distribution? Finally, were there in Palestine any other texts similar to those
written in the 'Qumran system'?

The three sources around which the textual discussions evolved before
1947 (MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX) are represented in the Qumran
discoveries and only now are we able to place them better in the overall
framework of the development of the text of the Bible (for a detailed
description, see the article quoted in n. 103). The Qumran discoveries have
taught us important details concerning these sources and the terminology
used for them. We now know that the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch and the
Vorlage of the LXX do not constitute the three pillars of the biblical text, or
main representatives of three imaginary textual recensions of that text, as
was claimed until then by most scholars. The myth of this tripartite division
of the textual witnesses now belongs to the past for the simple reason that in
each book of the Bible evidenced in Qumran we are now faced with many
more than three textual entities. Therefore, we should no longer try to fit
the Qumran texts into this imaginary framework, created because of the
coincidence that the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX were the only
preserved textual sources. In addition to these, we now know of various
independent texts, as well as texts written in the 'Qumran system'. The
magical number of three archetypal sources has thus been broken.

Broken, too, is the terminology used in scholarship for the textual
sources: the three 'main' entities have usually been named recensions or
text-types. However, in our view, a recension or text-type should contain
certain typological characteristics (e.g. such as short, long, full of glosses)
which can only be substantiated for the proto-Samaritan texts and the
Samaritan Pentateuch.108 In consequence, this terminology is inappropriate.
Instead, it is preferable to use an uncompromising term for the textual
witnesses: they should be called texts. Even if this suggestion sounds simple,
within the research it is a novelty.

The Qumran texts have thus brought about two changes in our
perception, one positing an almost endless number of texts for the
individual biblical books, and the other concerning the terminology used for
the textual witnesses (texts). However, this view should not lead us to forget
certain facts. The number of texts in the Second Temple period may have
been almost endless, but at the same time there were among this number
certain groups created by an approach common to several scribes. One such
group consists of the texts written in the 'Qumran system'; another is that of
the proto-Samaritan texts. These two groups are rather tight, even though
there are differences, minor and major, in orthography and content. The
closest group is that of the proto-Masoretic texts. Therefore, we should be
open to the idea that together with a number of unrelated texts, groups of

108 These typological features include harmonizing additions from Deuteronomy in
Exodus and Numbers as well as others 'secondary' readings.
texts have been created (of which three are known, but there may have been more) because of socio-religious and other reasons, as has often been stressed by Talmon. Because of this reason, certain among them were distributed more than others, as those behind them were more influential than the people behind the other texts (this formulation suggests that a large number of similar texts implies socio-religious reasons and not necessarily quality).

Because of the importance of the proto-Masoretic texts, serious thought has to be given to the possibility that other texts have been adapted to this textual tradition. So far, no texts of a different background have been found which have been adapted to MT. Corrections towards the form of MT as known from mediaeval texts in proto-Masoretic texts do not prove this procedure either, and in most cases these are mere corrections of mistakes even though 4QJêrt and MurXII also contain corrections of synonymous words which could point to a systematic correction procedure. Other texts sometimes agree with MT, but more frequently they bring the text into disagreement with it (4QSam, 11QPs, and especially 1QIs). It must therefore be concluded that most of these corrections have been made without regard to MT.

All the texts from other sites in the Judean Desert written before 73 C.E. (Masada) or 135 (Nahal Hever, Wadi Murabba'at) reflect a proto-Masoretic text. This situation is usually described in scholarship as the victory of MT (often, Masoretic recension or text type) over the other recensions or text types. However, caution is in order since this probably did not result from any of these reasons, but from a historical accident, as stressed by Albrektson. Most of the religious groups which had perpetuated the different biblical texts simply did not exist any more after the destruction of the Second Temple. The sole group possessing influence was that of the Pharisees. So the only texts to be expected after 70 C.E. are proto-Masoretic.

Beyond the textual variety reflected in the finds from the Judean Desert one recognizes two different approaches to the biblical text. A free approach to the text of the Bible is visible in the texts introducing the 'Qumran system' of orthography and language, as well as contextual changes. These texts were written in careless handwriting with many mistakes. It is similarly reflected in the proto-Samaritan texts allowing for extensive editorial rewriting. At the same time, as far as we can see, these texts did not allow for sectarian readings. At the other extreme is a conservative stand visible

109 See S. Talmon, op. cit. (n. 6) 198.
110 We should mention here also the aforementioned corrections in 5QDeut towards a Hebrew text reflected by the LXX.
112 The few sectarian readings in the biblical lemmas in 1QpHab should be disregarded in this regard, as the pesher itself is sectarian as well.
in the proto-Masoretic texts, in the one scroll close to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, 4QJerb (and others?), and the Qumran texts characterized as 'independent'. None of these texts displays major interventions in orthography, and hence is relatively defective, as MT. The conservatism of these texts is also seen in the relative absence of secondary readings such as described here. At the same time, the very differences between these sources do not undermine their description as conservative since the concept of a universally accepted text had not yet been created.