

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### RECORDING THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS IN THE TEXT EDITIONS OF HEBREW SCRIPTURE

The very first editions of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls were published shortly after their discovery: 1QIsa<sup>a1</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b2</sup>. Subsequent single-volume editions included that of 11QpaleoLev<sup>a3</sup>, but for most Qumran texts the *editio princeps* was in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Judah)* series: DJD I (Qumran cave 1); II (Murabba'at); III (minor caves of Qumran); IV (11QPs<sup>a</sup>), IX, XII, XIV–XVII (all: Qumran cave 4); XXIII (Qumran cave 11). Very few editions were published elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were published in various additional editions.<sup>5</sup>

The texts found at other sites in the Judean Desert (Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Še'elim, Naḥal Hever, and Murabba'at)<sup>6</sup> were also published in DJD, while the Masada texts were published in the Masada series.<sup>7</sup>

At a second stage, the details of the Qumran biblical scrolls were quoted in the various text editions of the Hebrew Bible. As a rule, the Qumran text was quoted directly from the mentioned text editions, and only rarely did the editors of the text editions submit the manuscripts to a new reading. The partial reproduction of details from the scrolls was meant to represent only details that differed from MT. Thus, the only details in the ancient scrolls that were recorded in these text editions were those differing from the medieval text. At the same time, in one recent edition the complete text of the scrolls was quoted in full.<sup>8</sup> Since the recording of textual data is usually centered around the medieval

---

<sup>1</sup> Burrows, *Isaiah*. In due course, this edition was replaced by Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*.

<sup>2</sup> Sukenik, *'wsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*; English version: *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Magnes, 1955). The DJD edition of the Isaiah scrolls from cave 1 is in preparation (DJD XXXII).

<sup>3</sup> D. N. Freedman and K. A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985).

<sup>4</sup> See chapter 10\*, n. 5.

<sup>5</sup> See chapter 10\*, n. 6.

<sup>6</sup> For the first three sites, see the texts published by P. W. Flint, M. Morgenstern, and C. Murphy in DJD XXXVIII. For the last site, see the texts published by J. T. Milik in DJD II.

<sup>7</sup> S. Talmon in *Masada VI*, 1–149.

<sup>8</sup> *Biblia Qumranica*, 2004 (see below).

MT, deviations from it, even if antedating that text by as much as 1200 years, were mentioned only in critical apparatuses.<sup>9</sup> This focus on the medieval text will probably remain the standard in most modern editions. These editions are the focus of this chapter.

1. The first edition to include readings from a scroll was *BH*, which in its third edition (1951) devoted a special apparatus to the Isaiah scrolls from Qumran, at first in a separate fascicle, and subsequently under the text in a third apparatus. In this apparatus, most variants from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, and 1QpHab were included, while “peculiarities of purely orthographical or grammatical interest” were excluded.<sup>10</sup>

2. *BHS* contained far fewer variants than *BH*. The editor of Isaiah in *BHS* adduced only the most significant variants, among them readings preferred to MT and readings agreeing with other sources, especially the LXX. All these variants were included in a single apparatus in *BHS*, as compared with three apparatuses in *BH*.

The explanation on p. L of the “General Introduction” to *BHS* does not sufficiently explain which scrolls are covered by the edition. However, this lack of clarity can now be resolved with the aid of the machine-readable version of that apparatus in the *SESB* computer program<sup>11</sup> allowing for advanced searches.<sup>12</sup> It appears that *BHS* includes readings from two Deuteronomy scrolls (4QDeut<sup>b</sup><sup>q</sup>), 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, 4QPs<sup>b</sup>, and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>.<sup>13</sup> Coverage of 4QPs<sup>b</sup> in Psalms 91–118 (see e.g. Ps 102:18, 20) is mentioned on p. L of the “General Introduction,” but the unspecified references in the apparatus of other Psalms to a Qumran manuscript actually pertain to the large 11QPs<sup>a</sup> scroll that is not mentioned in the Introduction. On p. L, reference is also made to quotations from 1QapGen (there is actually only one instance, Gen 14:1), and to 1QM (also one instance, Ps 35:3). On the whole, the treatment of the scrolls in *BHS* is far from satisfactory, which is disappointing in view of the fact that the coverage of the medieval Masoretic manuscripts is rather extensive. In actual fact, by the time *BHS*

<sup>9</sup> While in text editions of the scrolls the readings of MT and other sources appear in an apparatus to the text (note especially the recording in *DJD*), the situation is reversed in textual editions of the Hebrew Bible, with the readings from the scrolls appearing in the apparatus.

<sup>10</sup> “General Introduction,” XXXIX.

<sup>11</sup> In the electronic apparatus, left-hand brackets have systematically been replaced with right-hand brackets, e.g. 1 Sam 10:25 (⌈⌋ should be ⌋⌈). See also 10:4, 14:50.

<sup>12</sup> *Stuttgarter Elektronische Studienbibel* (ed. C. Hardmeier, E. Talstra, and B. Salzmann; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap, 2004).

<sup>13</sup> While a note in the introduction to the edition (p. L) leads us to believe that all *DJD* volumes from vol. I onwards are covered, this is actually not the case, as the coverage is limited to the aforementioned scrolls.

was published, many additional scrolls had been published and Qumran scholarship had reached a greater sophistication than is visible in the edition.

3. A more extensive coverage of the scrolls was announced for the edition of the *HUB*.<sup>14</sup> This coverage was described as “practically complete,”<sup>15</sup> covering not only the scrolls from cave 1, but also the *pesharim* and quotations in non-biblical compositions (see p. 33), excluding the cave 4 scrolls that remained unpublished at that time. Phonological and morphological deviations from MT were included.<sup>16</sup>

4. The coverage of the scrolls is more comprehensive and progressively better in each subsequent edition of the *HUB*.<sup>17</sup> When published editions of scrolls or just photographs were available, they were included in the recording of the scrolls. Thus, coverage of the scrolls is exhaustive in the Jeremiah and Ezekiel editions of the *HUB*,<sup>18</sup> but this is not the case in the earlier edition of Isaiah, in which only some of the cave 4 scrolls were recorded on the basis of an examination of photographs and the originals.<sup>19</sup> Following the description in the introductions,<sup>20</sup> coverage of all the details of the manuscripts is complete, including all scribal and most orthographic features, but “reflections of a completely different orthographical and morphological system” as in the case of 2QJer (spellings such as כִּיָּא and כִּיָּה and forms such as הַיָּאָה) have not been recorded.<sup>21</sup>

Differences in the recording of sense units (open and closed sections) between the scrolls and MT are recorded in app. II of the *HUB*, such as the addition of a section in 4QJer<sup>a</sup> after Jer 7:29. On the other hand, differences in the length of these intervals (open/closed sections) are not denoted in Isaiah and Jeremiah, while in Ezekiel they are recorded in great detail (pp. xlix–lxi).

<sup>14</sup> M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965).

<sup>15</sup> P. 33. According to Goshen-Gottstein, the *Sample Edition*, in the chapters covered by it (Isaiah 2, 5, 11, 51), represented the first complete collation of the scrolls, being more complete than that of the third edition of *BH*.

<sup>16</sup> Thus p. 33 of the introduction to the *Sample Edition*. However, some orthographic deviations of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> have not been recorded (Isa 51:12-14).

<sup>17</sup> *HUB, Isaiah*; C. Rabin, S. Talmon, and E. Tov, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and S. Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> See the Introduction to Jeremiah, xxviii; Ezekiel, xxix.

<sup>19</sup> *HUB, Isaiah*, Introduction, § 57 (p. xxxvii). Parry–Qimron, *Isaiah* was not yet available at that time.

<sup>20</sup> *HUB, Isaiah*, xxxvi; Jeremiah, xxix; Ezekiel, xxviii.

<sup>21</sup> *HUB, Jeremiah*, Introduction, n. 75: “1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> were treated similarly in the Isaiah volume.”

The description and recording of variations in sense units in the non-biblical scrolls from Qumran is complete in the Ezekiel edition,<sup>22</sup> while lacking in the editions of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

5. Readings from the scrolls have also been included in so-called eclectic editions, both in the reconstructed original text and in the apparatus.<sup>23</sup> These editions provide merely a selection of variants from the scrolls in the apparatus, although a full recording of such variants could be accommodated within their system. Of the available eclectic editions,<sup>24</sup> only those of Genesis by R. Hendel and of Hosea by P. G. Borbone allow us to examine the coverage of the scrolls, which, in our view, is insufficient. In the text edition of Hosea, some readings from Qumran scrolls have been adopted in the critical text (Hos 2:8-13; 8:6) and in the apparatus,<sup>25</sup> but the importance of that material for the reconstructed original text is not summarized, in contrast to the presence of a detailed summary for each of the medieval manuscripts (pp. 183–227). Likewise, in Hendel's critically reconstructed *Urtext*, the relation of the Qumran fragments to this text is not discussed.<sup>26</sup> However, the reconstructed text and the apparatus do include readings from the scrolls. Thus, in MT in Gen 1:9 the command "let the water under the heaven be gathered into one place, so that dry land may appear"<sup>27</sup> is followed by an short account of its implementation ("and so it was [ייהי] [כִּן]). Hendel's edition, however, contains a full account of the implementation ("and the water under the heaven was gathered into one place, and dry land appeared)<sup>28</sup> following a plus in 4QGen<sup>k</sup> frg. 1<sup>29</sup> and the LXX.

6. The texts from the Judean Desert are covered in full by *BHQ* (see, e.g., the full coverage of the Canticles scrolls from Qumran),<sup>30</sup> including

<sup>22</sup> See *HUB, Ezekiel*, Introduction, xxix–xxx.

<sup>23</sup> For the system, see the introduction to the *OHB*: "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition."

<sup>24</sup> See chapter 18\*, n. 47.

<sup>25</sup> The major Qumran manuscripts were not yet available to Borbone (see p. 65).

<sup>26</sup> In Hendel's insightful analysis of the critically reconstructed edition, detailed attention is given to MT, LXX and SP, but the relation of the Qumran fragments to this reconstructed *Urtext* is not reviewed.

<sup>27</sup> יִקוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל מְקוֹם אֶחָד וְתִרְאֶה הַיַּבֶּשֶׁת.

<sup>28</sup> [יִקוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל מְקוֹמָם] וְתִרְאֶה הַיַּבֶּשֶׁת [שֶׁ]. The first preserved word is preceded by a wide margin (intercolumnar margin or the margin at the beginning of a sheet).

<sup>29</sup> The minute fragment consists of a few letters of two words without any context, and their identification as the plus to MT rather than the command of MT itself is not at all certain. For the data, see J. R. Davila, *DJD* XII, 76.

<sup>30</sup> The edition states that it records all variations, including orthographic and morphological differences, such as אָקוּם in 4QCant<sup>a</sup> for אָקוּמָה of MT in Cant 3:2, and אַחַבְנָה

both significant readings, possibly preferable to MT and/or the LXX, and those that are secondary. The latter type of readings does not contribute towards the reconstruction of the original text of Hebrew Scripture, but illustrates the process of textual transmission. Thus, the full recording includes such misspellings as *התנאה* in 4QCant<sup>b</sup> (MT 2:13 *התנאה*), *בשקתי* (MT 3:1 *בקשתי*), described in the apparatus as “metathesis,” *אבאי* (MT 4:8 *תבואי*), described as “err-graph,” and Aramaic forms such as *הטללים* (MT 2:17 *הצללים*) and *בשמין* (MT 4:10 *בשמים*). At the same time, deviations from MT in sense division do not receive attention,<sup>31</sup> while the same internal differences in Masoretic manuscripts are recorded in great detail.<sup>32</sup> On the whole, due to the extensive coverage of the scrolls in *BHQ*, this edition can be used profitably as a source of information for the scrolls. At the same time, the reader is overwhelmed with the large amount of information on secondary readings in the scrolls.<sup>33</sup> Since *BHQ* provides value judgments on these readings, that edition could have differentiated graphically between a stratum of possibly valuable readings and a second stratum of clearly secondary readings. From reading the apparatus, one gets the impression that the greater part of the readings belong to this second stratum.

Textual evaluations in *BHQ* are very conservative when compared with earlier editions in the *BH* series.<sup>34</sup>

7. The *Biblia Qumranica* is a different type of edition, recording the complete texts found in the Judean Desert together with the evidence of the other textual witnesses in parallel columns. In the words of the editors, “[t]he *Biblia Qumranica* responds to a paradigm shift in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible ... scholars now recognize the textual

---

for *אהבם* of MT in 3:5. However, the following variants are missing: *הראני* for *הראני* in 4QCant<sup>b</sup> (Cant 2:14) and *ירושלים* for *ירושלם* in 4QCant<sup>a</sup> (Cant 3:10).

<sup>31</sup> They are not mentioned in the “General Introduction,” XIV. For example, Cant 3:8 has a closed section in *BHQ*, but that edition does not contain a note about the lack of an interval in 4QCant<sup>a</sup>; Cant 4:3 has an interval in 4QCant<sup>b</sup> (open section), but this fact is not mentioned in *BHQ* which has no interval at that point.

<sup>32</sup> *BHQ* includes only variants in sense divisions that are significant for “translation and exegesis” (see “General Introduction,” XIII). On the other hand, a complete table of such intervals in the collated Tiberian manuscripts is included in the introduction to each biblical book.

<sup>33</sup> The data include secondary readings that are relevant only for exegesis and transmission history. In the words of the “General Introduction,” “The editors intend that, so far as possible, the apparatus will include all cases of variation in these witnesses that meet two general criteria for inclusion. First, such a variation is judged to be text-critically significant. ... Second, it is judged to be potentially significant for translation or exegesis” (p. XIII).

<sup>34</sup> For examples, see chapter 18\*, § 3.

witnesses of a given biblical book to be literary works in their own right. ... an *Urtext* can no longer be identified" (p. ix). This description may be somewhat exaggerated, but *Biblia Qumranica* definitely provides the tools for further analysis of the newly found Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek scrolls, in the wider context of other textual witnesses, with MT (*BHS*) appearing in the first column and the LXX in the last one. The texts from the Judean Desert are copied from the published editions, with the exception of a few new readings by the editors (lists of such differences are provided in the edition itself). Typographical arrangements display the differences between the various columns—indicated in small gray text boxes—with great clarity. This way of exhibiting the differences involves editorial judgment concerning what is considered a difference, plus, and minus element, not only regarding Hebrew texts but also with reference to the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Hever. In the latter case, the deviations of that scroll from the OG translation as represented by a modern edition of the LXX (the Göttingen Septuagint)<sup>35</sup> are represented with the same typographical layout. Thus, the reader learns more quickly and easily than in other editions about the differences between the Judean Desert texts and the other texts, including matters of orthography. However, this edition is meant to provide only a fragmentary picture of the biblical text, as its coverage does not go beyond that of the contents of the scrolls. As a result, the use of this edition for studying the running biblical text is limited.

8. An edition combining the various scattered Qumran fragments into a fragmented running text is being planned by E. Ulrich,<sup>36</sup> but in the meantime, its English counterpart is available.<sup>37</sup> This edition translates precisely the contents of all the scrolls into English, as if they were one running text. The editors suggest that *The Dead Sea Scrolls Scriptures* "may be a more historically accurate title for this volume" (p. vii). Be that as it may, the editors realize that the scrolls came from different localities, some of them having been penned at Qumran itself (see p. xvi), but the edition nevertheless creates the impression that the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls presents a coherent corpus named *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

---

<sup>35</sup> J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate academiae litterarum gottingensis editum*, XII (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

<sup>36</sup> E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Bible*, forthcoming. The nature of this edition resembles that of the English version to be described below.

<sup>37</sup> M. Abegg, Jr., P. Flint, E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible, The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

*Bible* (name of the book).<sup>38</sup> Hopefully, this collection will not be used or quoted from in such a way that it appears that the Qumran community wrote or used the collection of Hebrew Scripture as presented in this volume.

The reader gets a clear impression of the fragmentary nature of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, since the biblical text is presented in a fragmentary way. Thus Jer 10:10 is presented in translation in the same fragmentary form as found in 4QJer<sup>a</sup> (= MT), while a footnote denotes that this verse is lacking in 4QJer<sup>b</sup> (= LXX).<sup>39</sup> In Isaiah, the running text is that of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (see p. 269) which has been preserved in its entirety, while a footnote at the beginning of each chapter denotes which parallel fragments have been preserved for that chapter in other scrolls. For example, in chapter 23, the footnote refers to the preserved verses from 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> which are quoted in the apparatus. In the notes themselves, individual readings from that scroll are listed, such as “to make ... tremble” in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> (להרניו) in Isa 23:11 as opposed to “he has made ... tremble” in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>a</sup>, MT, and LXX (הרניו). The notes in this edition guide the reader in understanding which details are relevant to the textual and literary criticism of Hebrew Scripture. Thus in Gen 1:9, the *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* quotes the long addition of 4QGen<sup>k</sup> as part of the running text of the edition: “[And the waters under the heavens gathered to their gatherings] and the d[ry land] appeared.”

It is impossible to represent in English subtle differences between MT and a scroll in several grammatical categories, spelling (defective/plene), alternative forms (הוא/הואה, שם/שמה), final letters/ nonfinal letters, scribal corrections, etc. These details are neither translated nor mentioned in the notes.

9. All the biblical manuscripts have been recorded electronically by M. Abegg based on existing standard editions, covering all the texts from the Judean Desert.<sup>40</sup> In this database, each word is accompanied by a morphological analysis, enabling searches on words and grammatical categories. In addition, on the basis of this material a printed concordance, similar to the earlier one,<sup>41</sup> will be published.

At this stage, all the editions referred to remain incomplete, and therefore presently *DJD* may well be the preferred source for the study

<sup>38</sup> Details written in the introduction tend to be forgotten if the name of the collection instructs the reader to think otherwise.

<sup>39</sup> In fact, the footnote refers to 4QJer<sup>a</sup> which represents a misprint.

<sup>40</sup> To be released in 2007 as a module within the Accordance computer program.

<sup>41</sup> M. G. Abegg, Jr., with J. E. Bowley and E. M. Cook, in consultation with E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance I. The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003).

of the biblical scrolls. However, after the publication of the *Qumran Bible* by E. Ulrich the situation may be different. By the same token, with the completion of the computerized databases, and with the added function of electronic searches on words and grammatical categories, the situation may again be different. It should also be kept in mind that different sets of data are required for different types of examinations. The full recording of the data as in *BHQ* and the *HUB* may suffice for text-critical studies, but for linguistic research the complete text of the scroll must be constantly examined.

As a rule, the *DJD* editions do not contain value judgments (“original” reading, “secondary” reading, mistake, etc.),<sup>42</sup> while *BHQ* contains such judgments, rendering it perhaps more user-friendly to some readers. Judging from the only published fascicles of *BHQ* to date, that edition is rather precise, and may well be used as a shortcut leading to *DJD*. Other users may not be interested in such value judgments. Only *DJD* and *Biblia Qumranica* record the Qumran readings in their full contexts, while *BHQ* and the *HUB* present a fragmented picture of individual readings.

---

<sup>42</sup> Editions by F. M. Cross in *DJD* XIV and XVII form an exception.