

## The Contribution of the Different Groups of Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls to Exegesis

Emanuel Tov\*

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew text of the Bible was known mainly from the *medieval* manuscripts of MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch(SP). Other sources are the medieval copies of the LXX, Peshitta, Targumim, and Vulgate. An inductive approach to the scrolls should start with the data that were available before the scrolls were found in 1947. If we were to start the analysis immediately with a description of the scrolls themselves, we would not be able to sense the impact of the immense revolution created by the new finds. Further, the human mind works from the known to the unknown by linking new data to data already known. We have to first analyze in detail MT, SP, and the LXX, since otherwise we cannot point out the closeness between a scroll and, for example, the LXX. We have no alternative but to proceed in this way, not only because the LXX

---

\* prof., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, dept. of the Old Testament

was known before the scrolls, but also because the LXX is so much better known than a few very fragmentary scrolls. In this analysis, we will start with the scrolls themselves. When proceeding in this way we constantly think at two levels about the ancient and medieval sources. On the one hand, we compare the newly discovered ancient MT-like scrolls with the medieval MT, while on the other we know that these ancient scrolls were the forerunners of MT and that we actually need to compare the latter with the former.

A graphic presentation of selected scrolls accompanies our background description. These samples take the medieval MT as our point of reference, not only because it is the best-known text, but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. Our procedure involves a merely didactic device, and does not necessarily involve the centrality of that version. A variant is any detail differing from MT. In our samples of scrolls, black denotes identity to MT, while red, blue, green, and pink denote different types of variation from MT. The main idea behind the presentation is the gradual moving away from black to multi-colored texts. It should be stressed that the indication of these colors is subjective although this subjectivity probably does not exceed 10 percent of the material. The purpose of these samples is to indicate graphically the relation between texts. The typological presentation is the focus of this study and we do not suggest

that the groups of texts developed in the way depicted here. Our main purpose is to elucidate the nature of the different groups.

## 1. Forerunners of the medieval MT found at Judean Desert sites other than Qumran

Quite unexpectedly, the forerunners of MT, named proto-Masoretic were already extant at the Judean Desert sites. In the centuries around the turn of the era, MT had no vowels, accents, or verse division, but the consonantal text with its paragraph divisions already circulated. From the beginning of the finds of the scrolls, it was known that proto-Masoretic scrolls were found at Qumran, but it was not until the last decennium that it became clear that the medieval MT in its purest form was not found at Qumran, but at the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran, namely Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣe'elim, and Masada.<sup>1)</sup> In fact, these sites contain no texts other than MT.

The study of these scrolls focuses on determining the amount of agreement between them and the medieval MT.

---

1) You can see Sample files at [www.iktinos.org/Canon&Culture](http://www.iktinos.org/Canon&Culture). This group comprises the following texts: Masada [Genesis, Leviticus (2), Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, Psalms (2)], Wadi Sdeir (Genesis), Naḥal Ṣe'elim (Numbers), Naḥal Ḥever [Numbers (2), Deuteronomy, Psalms], and Murabba'at (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets).

The first step in such a procedure would be a detailed comparison of these scrolls with the most complete manuscript of the Ben-Asher tradition, codex L. Likewise, the Minor Prophets Scroll from Murabba'at(MurXII from c. 115 CE)<sup>2)</sup> and 5/6HevPs, a beautiful scroll from c. 115 CE(sample 1), exactly reflect the medieval text.<sup>3)</sup>

The virtual lack of deviation of these scrolls from the medieval text indicates that they belong to the exact same tradition as the medieval MT manuscripts.<sup>4)</sup> If the scrolls deviate at all from L, their deviations are similar in nature and number to the differences among the medieval MT manuscripts themselves.<sup>5)</sup> In our terminology, the scrolls from the

---

2) According to the statistics of Young, "Stabilization," this scroll deviates 17 times from codex L in 3774 words(one variant in 222 words), together with 26 differences in orthography. Similar statistics for this scroll(0.9% in words and 0.5% in orthography) are provided by M. G. Abegg, Jr., "1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>: A Rematch," *The Bible as Book-The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002) 221-228(223). These statistics stand in striking contrast to those for the Qumran scrolls(see below).

3) This text differs three times from MT in 605 words, in 15:3 involving 4 words(one variant in 201.7 words).

4) Young, "Stabilization" provides statistics that highlight the high level of agreement between the medieval manuscripts of MT and the Masada manuscripts as opposed to a lower level of such agreement with the proto-MT scrolls from Qumran.

5) Some medieval manuscripts are almost identical to one another in their consonantal text, such as L and the Aleppo Codex, while other codices from Leningrad and elsewhere are more widely divergent from these two choice manuscripts.

sites other than Qumran belong to the “inner circle” of proto-rabbinic texts.<sup>6)</sup> This inner circle contained the consonantal framework of MT one thousand years or more before the time of the Masorah codices.

The first stage in the presentation of the Judean Desert texts involves a demonstration that several texts from antiquity reflect the very same text as MT, a text that the public considers to be “the text of the Bible.” Sample 1 reflects a text that is completely identical to MT.

The biblical quotations in rabbinic literature reflect the medieval MT, but before 1947 no one could have guessed that one day we would actually find ancient scrolls identical to codex L.

Moving away from MT, known from all Hebrew editions and modern translations, we now turn to the proto-Masoretic scrolls from Qumran that are one step removed from MT.

## 2. Proto-Masoretic Qumran scrolls

A large group of Qumran scrolls is very close to MT, close enough to be considered part of the same family. One of these, 4QGen<sup>b</sup>(sample 2),<sup>7)</sup> with no variation from codex

---

6) See my paper, “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues,”(The Ancient Synagogue: From Its Origins until 200 C.E. an International Conference at Lund University, 2001. 10. 14-17.); B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm eds., ConBNT 39 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), 237–259.

L, is similar in nature to those from the other Judean Desert sites, while 4QGen<sup>g8)</sup>(sample 3) and 4QProv<sup>b9)</sup> are very close to MT.<sup>10)</sup> At the same time, most proto-Masoretic texts differ more widely from codex L, while they always agree with L against greatly deviating texts such as those mentioned below, for example, the LXX.<sup>11)</sup>

- 
- 7) 4QGen<sup>b</sup> contains no variants in 361 words.
  - 8) The preserved fragments of 4QGen<sup>g</sup> contain 3 differences in 145 words (one variant in 48 words) and 9 orthographic variants. The color codes used from here onwards indicate linguistic variations(blue), orthographic variations(green), and all other variations(green).
  - 9) 4QProv<sup>b</sup> displays 2 differences in 125 words(one variant in 62.5 words).
  - 10) Young, "Stabilization," 373 shows that in the case of the Minor Prophets scrolls from cave 4 at Qumran, the divergence from MT is between one variant per 6.4 words and one per 41 words(mainly around 20 words), to be contrasted with the lack of deviation in six small Murabba'at fragments and one variant in 222 words in the Minor Prophets scroll. Likewise, in Leviticus, the Qumran manuscripts range between one variant in 4.5 to one in 50 words, as opposed to MasLev<sup>b</sup> with no variants(ibid., 374). The latter scroll is of equal size to some of the Qumran scrolls, so that the statistics are meaningful. These statistics are supported by additional tabulations for Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms, in each case contrasted with scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert(ibid., 375-378). Young's statistics are less meaningful in Psalms, since all the Qumran Psalms scrolls are probably liturgical as opposed to the non-liturgical character of the Psalms scrolls from Masada and Naḥal Ḥever.
  - 11) The fifty-seven texts of the MT family comprise 52 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus in the Torah(24 of the 46 texts) and 44 percent in the other books(33 of the 75 texts). These percentages are quite significant, and they are telling regarding the preferences of the Qumran community, but they are remote from the other sites in the Judean Desert, where all the texts belong to the inner circle of the medieval

Among the longer scrolls belonging to this group is 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> (sample 4). The number of variations between 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and codex L is more substantial than those in group 1, but clearly the two reflect the same family.<sup>12)</sup>

The combined differences between MT and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> tabulated for all the preserved fragments can also be expressed in terms of different groups of details,<sup>13)</sup> green for orthography and red for the other differences, in the same proportions as those in a single column in sample 4.

A summary of the deviations of 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> from MT in the entire scroll<sup>14)</sup> (sample 5)

Orthography	107
Addition of conjunctive waw	16

---

MT.

- 12) Col. XXI presented in sample 4(48:17–49:15) involves 10 content variations, 5 variations in orthography, and one in language. The close relation between this scroll and MT was noticed by B. J. Roberts, “The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân(1QIs<sup>b</sup>),” *BJRL* 42 (1959), 132–144; D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, OBO 50/3 (Fribourg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), cii–cxvi; G. Garbini, “1QIsa<sup>b</sup> et le texte d’Isaïe,” *Hen* 6 (1984), 17–21.
- 13) Thus M. Cohen, “*b’ydy’b bdbr qdwsbt bnwsh l’wtywtyw whyqwert bkst,*” *Deoth* 47 (1978), 83–101; U. Simon, ed., *The Bible and Us* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1979), 42–69. See also *TCHB*, 31–33.
- 14) In our system, blue denotes linguistic differences, but only when such differences are characteristic of the scribe. Since this feature cannot be determined for this scroll without an overall analysis, some of the differences indicated with red may have to be blue.

Lack of conjunctive waw	13
Article	4
Differences in letters	10
Missing letters	5
Differences in number	14
Differences in pronouns <sup>15)</sup>	6
Different grammatical forms	24
Different prepositions	9
Different words	11
Minuses of words	5
Pluses of words	6
Different sequence	4

Likewise, 4QJer<sup>a</sup> and 4QJer<sup>c</sup> are both firm proto-Masoretic texts, but further removed from the medieval MT than 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>.

The presence of a moderate number of deviations from MT in the proto-Masoretic texts at Qumran and not in the other Judean Desert texts shows that the Qumran scrolls are one stage removed from the “inner cycle” texts represented in these other sites.

### 3. Texts differing from MT mainly in orthography and morphology

---

15) Some of these categories are undoubtedly linguistic, but we only classify variations as linguistic that are proven to characterize the scribe or period of the scribe, such as the lengthened pronominal suffixes(category 3) or the addition of the article in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and other texts.

Moving a small step away from the medieval MT, we now turn to the least meaningful type of deviations, viz., in orthography(spelling). Orthography is the realization in writing of the spoken word and, accordingly, specific words may be written in different ways.<sup>16)</sup> In Hebrew, such differences mainly refer to *defective* as opposed to *full(plene)* orthography, but they also include phonetic spellings.

A great deal of the aforementioned variations between the texts within the MT family(groups 1 and 2) referred to matters of spelling. The longest text that displays these features is 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> exemplified in sample 6, covering the first column of that scroll. This column contains no less than 47 orthographic deviations from MT(green), 19 deviations in linguistic details, mainly morphology(blue), and 26 differences in other details(red). As mentioned above, the distinction between the various categories is subjective. The graphic picture of this column is one of total deviation from MT. However, when realizing that the scribe inserted most of the green and blue details himself, it is possible that his source did not differ so much from MT. When removing these elements, the result-

---

16) In fact, many words are written in different ways within the same language, at different periods, or in concurrent dialects without any difference in meaning. For example, many English words are spelled differently in Great Britain(e.g., *favour*, *specialise*) and in the United States(*favor*, *specialize*) without difference in meaning. Similarly, in Hebrew, there is no difference between לֵא, *l'* and לֵא', *lu'*, nor between שְׂמִרִים, *shmirym* and שְׂמִרִים, *shmirym*.

ing text, with differences from MT indicated in red only (sample 7), shows the text that *may* have been used by the scribe of this scroll. The differences pertain to small details in content, such as the addition or omission of a conjunction. That text, with its 26 differences in red, differs more from MT than the texts in groups 1 and 2, so that seemingly we are confronted with a different type of text. However, many, if not most of the red details ought to be ascribed to the freedom of this scribe. Alongside his freedom in matters of orthography and morphology, he changed small details in the text, mainly in small contextual and linguistic harmonizations. As a result, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> probably was copied from a text close to MT.

In the case of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, the evidence is actually complex since scribal differences between the two halves of that scroll point to different features in these two segments. Scribe B (cols. XXVIII-LXIV) has a fuller orthography and has more outspoken morphological preferences than scribe A (cols. I-XXVII), and he left out several small sections by mistake. Thus in col. L, from scribe B (sample 8), the number of linguistic deviations from MT is larger than that in col. I, while in col. LI, also from scribe B (sample 9), the number of orthographic differences is much higher than in col. I.<sup>17)</sup>

The features of this scribal school are also visible in over-

---

17) Col. I: red 26, blue 19, green 47; col. L: red 42, blue 34, green 52; col. LI: red 51, blue 22; green 97.

lapping sections(sample 10) written by similar scribes, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> cols. XVIII-XIX//4QIsa<sup>c</sup> frgs. 9ii, 11, 12i, 52(Isa 23:8-24:15).<sup>18)</sup> In this column, the two scribes agree 20 times against MT in their fuller orthography, and three times in linguistic variations. At the same time, they disagree among each other 14 times in matters of orthography, and twice in linguistic variations. The details are summarized in sample 10(lead text: 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>) in which the orthographic divergences from MT common to 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> are indicated with a regular font, while differences between the two manuscripts are indicated in a smaller font. In this sample, content differences(in red) are not indicated.<sup>19)</sup>

#### 4. Scrolls written in the paleo-Hebrew script

Moving away in a different direction from the medieval MT, we encounter scrolls written in a special script. The scrolls described so far are written in the regular Hebrew script, also named Aramaic or square. They form the majority of the biblical scrolls. However, 11-12 scrolls are written in

---

18) P. W. Skehan and E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*, DJD XV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 55-56.

19) The closeness between two other Qumran scribes writing in the same practice is also visible in two parallel texts of the Community Rule(1QS X 4-12//4QS<sup>d</sup>(4Q258; Col. IX 1-13). Although there are differences in matters of orthography and morphology, more often than not the two agree.

the ancient Hebrew or paleo-Hebrew script.<sup>20)</sup> Contentswise, these scrolls do not form a special group.

## 5. “Pre-Samaritan” scrolls and the Samaritan Pentateuch

The deviations from MT discussed so far pertain to small inner-Masoretic variations and major differences in orthography and morphology. All these differences are not important contentswise. Moving further away from MT, we now turn to a group of texts that inserted content changes (red) in the underlying text. In this group, we can trace MT or a similar text as the origin of the texts discussed here, while in the next groups we are less certain. The colors indicated in the texts are mainly red for content changes, but there is also some green and blue for orthographic and linguistic differences.

The group discussed here, one of the surprises of the Qumran discoveries, involves a small number of texts that are amazingly close to the medieval SP, which supposedly had ancient origins. This ancient origin has now been confirmed because of the almost identity of SP to a group of Qumran texts. These texts are therefore named pre-Samaritan and their major representatives are 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup>, secondarily also 4QLev<sup>d</sup>. All these texts together with the SP are named the “SP group.” Col. I of

---

20) See Tov, *TCHB*, 103-106.

4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, shown in sample 12, shows a few small changes from MT in red, green, and blue,<sup>21)</sup> while major changes vis-à-vis MT involving several lines of text, are indicated in cols. V(sample 13) and XXXVIII(sample 14). These changes involve the addition of verses on the basis of other contexts, added at a relatively late stage in the development of Hebrew Scripture.<sup>22)</sup> Thus, in col. V in sample 13, in Exod 9:1-5, Moses is told to approach Pharaoh and to inform him of the plague of pestilence. However, the text does not specify that Moses indeed performed this command. The Qumran scroll(first lines of col. V) adds several lines of text after Exod 9:5 specifying exactly what Moses did. This goal was reached by repeating the text of 9:1-5 in a slightly altered version. The same addition is found in SP. Similar additions were

---

21) The orthography of the earlier text was changed in small details in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> to a more user-friendly form that facilitated the reading of unvocalized texts. Further, difficult linguistic forms were eliminated and the text was internally harmonized(the same words were used in the immediate and sometimes remote contexts).

22) The editing involved is meant to impart a more perfect and internally consistent structure to the text. The editing is inconsistent, that is, certain details were changed while others that are similar in nature were left untouched. The editor was attentive to what he considered to be imperfections within and between units. What disturbed him especially was the incongruence-according to a formalistic view of Scripture-of details within and between specific stories. In order to reduce such incongruence, details were repeated or added. In this regard, special attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially by God, which was added to the text when the reviser was able to add the details from a similar context.

made to the story of all the ten plagues in Exodus 7-11; see col. V 28-32(9:19b SP, before the plague of hail) also in sample 13. Col. XXXVIII 1-2(Exod 32:10b SP) in sample 14 adds a segment to Moses' speech from the parallel section in Deut 9:13.<sup>23)</sup>

The texts in samples 12-14 displayed the relation between 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and MT in three colors. Since the Qumran scrolls are compared with MT, they do not show their closeness to SP, which is shown by the comparison of the scrolls with SP in samples 15-17.<sup>24)</sup> These samples show that the Qumran scroll reflects the same text as the SP, including the large editorial additions. Most of the text of the scroll is now black, with a sprinkling of orthographic, linguistic and other differences from SP. Thus the large editorial additions in red of the scroll to MT disappear when it is compared with the SP.

Somewhat more complex are samples 18-20, displaying the text of another pre-Samaritan text, 4QNum<sup>b</sup>. This scroll displays the same type of large and small deviations from MT as 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>(Num 20:13b=Deut 3:23-27; Num

---

23) By the same token, 'the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran and the SP added many sections in Exodus and Numbers that are parallel to Moses,' summarizing speech in Deuteronomy 1-3.

24) The comparison is based on the edition of A. Tal, "The Samaritan Pentateuch, Edited According to MS 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue," (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1994).

21:11a-12b=Deut 2:19, 17-19; Num 21:11b=Deut 2:9; Num 21:12b=Deut 2:17-19; Num 21:20b=Deut 2:24-25; Num 27:23b=Deut 3:21). In all these long pluses, 4QNum<sup>b</sup> agrees with the SP, as indicated in samples 21-23 in which the scroll is compared with SP. However, the analysis of this scroll is more complicated since some of its readings deviating from MT are shared with the LXX, especially in small harmonizing changes, as indicated in the next category. In samples 21-23, these agreements are indicated in italics.

## 6. Texts close to the presumed Hebrew source of the LXX

With each new category, we move further away from MT. The LXX differs much from MT, and one of the great surprises of the Qumran caves was the discovery of Hebrew scrolls that are very close to the LXX, translated between 250 and 100 BCE.

Although no text was found at Qumran that is identical or almost identical to the presumed Hebrew source of the LXX, a few<sup>25)</sup> Hebrew texts are very close to that translation: 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> bear a strong resemblance to the LXX in characteristic details, with regard both to the arrangement of the verses and to their shorter text.<sup>26)</sup> Also close to the LXX, though

---

25) The four texts that are close to the LXX comprise 4.5 percent of the Qumran biblical texts of the Torah (2 texts) and 3 percent of the other books (2 texts).

not to the same extent, are 4QLev<sup>d</sup>(also close to SP), 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>(sample 24), and secondarily also 4QSam<sup>a</sup>(close to the main tradition of the LXX and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>; samples 26-27 and 28-29).<sup>27)</sup> Several agreements with the LXX are also found in 4QNum<sup>b</sup>(samples 21-23 indicate extra-Masoretic agreements of that scroll with the SP that are shared with the LXX).

Sample 24 presents the disagreements of 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> with MT together with its agreements with the LXX. 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> and the LXX contain a few extra lines beyond MT at the end of the Song of Moses(Deut 32:43).<sup>28)</sup> It seems that MT removed these expressions of polytheistic beliefs. The Qumran scroll and the LXX thus agree in very important

26) See *TCHB*, 319–327.

27) For an analysis, see my study “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX,” G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 11-47; Revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible-Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999), 285-300; F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, “A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>(4Q51),” *DSD* 13 (2006), 46-60, describe this scroll as follows: “4QSam<sup>a</sup> stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek...”, 54.

28) The polytheistic content of the scroll and the LXX has all the marks of originality, as similar references to the pantheon of gods are found elsewhere in the Bible, and often in earlier West Semitic literature, for example, the cuneiform texts found at Ugarit, in present-day Syria, dating to around 1200 BCE.

details.

Samples 26-29 show the differences between MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, almost all in matters of content (red). A mere glance at this column shows to what extent these samples differ from the types of divergence in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (samples 6-9), which pertain mainly to orthography and language. Many of the differences in red pertain to significantly divergent literary strata in the book. Samples 26-27 display the relation between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and MT, while samples 28-29 show the same discrepancies, this time with an indication in italics of scroll readings agreeing with the LXX.

## 7. “Independent” (non-aligned) sources

The last group of texts, and the most difficult to evaluate, consists of the texts that differ most from MT, viz., “independent” or “non-aligned” sources, that is, scrolls that are not close to MT, SP, or the LXX. In some cases, the relation is determined mainly on the basis of statistical data when the independent scrolls agree sometimes with MT against the other texts in small details, and sometimes with SP and/or the LXX against the remainder. However, the most manifestly non-aligned texts are those that contain (groups of) readings that diverge significantly from the other texts in major content features, such as the sequence differences in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> (sample 30). The point at which the sequence deviates

from MT is indicated with a single line in pink, but one could also present in pink the remainder of the context in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>(sample 31) or in MT. As for the background of this scroll, according to the sequence of MT, the Israelites did not erect an altar immediately upon traversing the Jordan, as instructed in Deuteronomy 27, but only after several activities connected with the conquest had taken place, in 8:30-35. On the other hand, in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> this altar was built immediately after the crossing of the Jordan, recorded in the beginning of the document(recorded by Ulrich as “8:34-35; X; 5:2-7”).

4QSam<sup>a</sup>, closely related to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, reflects independent features as well. 4QReworked Pentateuch(4QRP =4Q158, 4Q364-367), differing more from MT than the other Qumran texts(samples 32-33), is a truly independent text. This composition, published as non-biblical(DJD XIII), and reclassified as a Bible text,<sup>29)</sup> exhibits long stretches of uninterrupted Scripture text such as found in either MT or the SP group.<sup>30)</sup> At the same time, this text is independent. This

---

29) See my paper, “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” J. Zsengeller, ed., *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2008).

30) The pre-Samaritan text is clearly the underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364, and possibly so in the case of 4Q365[see H. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, DJD XIII (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 192-196]. A. Kim, “The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a-b, 9a-b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii),” *Textus* 21 (2002), 45-69 claims that 4Q365 is not close to SP.

text rearranges some Torah pericopes, and it contains a small number of extensive exegetical additions. In these pluses, 4QRP typologically resembles the Hebrew compositions behind the Greek 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel. Sample 32 shows how 4QRP<sup>c</sup> frg. 12a-b displays several small variations in orthography and content, while sample 33 shows a large addition in frg. 23. This addition lists non-biblical festivals after Lev 24:2. Another such large addition is 4Q365 frg. 6a ii and 6c 1-7(“Song of Miriam”) before Exod 15:22.<sup>31)</sup> There are not many such truly independent texts at Qumran.

Within the framework of “independent” biblical texts, we now turn to three subgroups that differ much from MT and the other biblical texts. If these texts are considered biblical, some of them should probably be presented as mostly red or pink.<sup>32)</sup> However, in my view, most likely these are not Scripture texts in the usual sense of the word, and therefore should not be presented together with the other texts. This aspect of my presentation is more subjective than the other groups.

---

31) Frg. 23 may have belonged to a different manuscript from 4Q365, close to the Temple Scroll, and is sometimes named 4Q365a. For a discussion, see E. Tov and S. White, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, DJD XIII, 292-295. Such a solution may not be invoked in the case of frg. 6, and therefore the problem remains in that case.

32) Indeed, all these texts are listed everywhere as being biblical, and have been given names of biblical texts.

## 7.1. Excerpted texts

The common denominator of excerpted texts is that they present large or small segments of the biblical text in a sequence different from MT.<sup>33)</sup> Some excerpted texts were probably made for liturgical purposes(*tefillin*, some manuscripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy), while other texts were written for sundry literary purposes[4QCant<sup>a,b</sup>, 4QTestimonia (4Q175)]. If the characterization of these scrolls as excerpted and abbreviated texts is correct, their major omissions and transpositions should be disregarded in the text-critical analysis, but other deviations from MT may be taken into consideration, for example in the case of the *tefillin*.<sup>34)</sup>

Samples 34-35 display the deviations of 4QCant<sup>b</sup> from MT in small details(sample 34) as well as its long omissions. 4QCant<sup>a</sup> presents a similar text.<sup>35)</sup> The long omissions referred

---

33) For an analysis, see my study "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1995), 581-600.

34) See D. Nakman, "The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions," *Catbedra* 112 (2004), 19-44 (Heb.); D. Rothstein, "From Bible to Murabba'at: Studies in the Literary, Scribal and Textual Features of Phylacteries and Mezuzot in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism," unpub. Ph. D. Dissertation (Univ. of California, 1992).

35) E. Ulrich describes these texts as earlier than or parallel with MT: "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls and the Biblical Text," L. H. Schiffman et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery-Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration

to in the headers of the fragments are indicated in pink in the text. Sample 35 presents a single line in pink, while sample 36 presents the remainder of the context in pink without indicating the smaller differences. In this scroll, Cant 3:6-8 and 4:4-7 are lacking. However, we believe that this text represents an ancient excerpted text, so that it should probably not be discussed here.

## 7.2. Liturgical texts

Another subgroup contains non-aligned texts that are “liturgical,” such as 4QExod<sup>d</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>j<sup>n</sup></sup>, and most Psalm scrolls from caves 4 and 11. The question of whether several of the psalm scrolls from Qumran reflect a biblical text, parallel to MT but deviating from it, or liturgical anthologies has preoccupied scholars for some time. Sample 37 records a segment of 4QPs<sup>a</sup>, one of the independent Psalters from Qumran. The unusual sequence of Psalm 38 followed by Psalm 71 is indicated with a single pink line. The full extent of deviation of Psalm 71 is indicated with pink without entering into detail regarding the smaller differences (sample 38). If this is a regular Psalms manuscript, as suggested by Flint,<sup>36)</sup>

---

Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 51-59, esp. 57-58.

36) P. W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll & the Book of Psalms*, STDJ 17 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).

both its small and large deviations should be taken into consideration. On the other hand, if this Psalter, as well as most other Qumran Psalters, is taken as a liturgical collection, at least the large deviations should not be presented within this framework.<sup>37)</sup>

### 7.3. Rewritten Bible compositions

These compositions are of limited relevance in the textual analysis because of the uncertainty regarding the text that lay before the author, especially because of the author's tendencies. They are most certainly no biblical texts. 11QT<sup>a</sup> elaborates on the biblical text and often abbreviates it. Sample 39 shows that the great majority of the words in 11QT<sup>a</sup> LIII 2-8 present Deut 12:20-25 of MT, with several inversions and omissions of phrases occurring twice in MT(e.g. vv 21, 22 in Deuteronomy). The sky-blue color in sample 39 indicates the elements in 11QT<sup>a</sup> that are parallel to MT, though not necessarily identical to them. Sample 40 shows the many

---

37) Thus, the following scholars reacting on the nature of the Psalms scroll from cave 11: S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 5 (1966), 11-21; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966), 22-33; P. W. Skehan, "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *CBQ* 35 (1973), 195-205; M. Haran, "11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms," M. Brettler and M. Fishbane, eds., *Minhab le-Nabum-Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nabum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*, JSOTSup 154 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193-201.

differences between 11QT<sup>a</sup> and MT, mainly in orthography and language. The differences in red in that sample do not pertain to textual analysis since they involve either stylistic changes (inversions, shortening, addition of routine phrases) or the author's tendencies (change from third to first person singular with regard to God).

## 8. Epilogue

It is the purpose of our analysis to offer a graphic and didactic presentation of the differences between the various groups of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in their relation to MT, SP, and other sources. Our samples took the medieval MT as our point of reference, not only because this is the best-known text, but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. In our scroll samples, black denotes identity to MT, while red, blue, green, and pink denote different types of deviations from MT. The main idea behind the presentation is to indicate the typology of the gradual moving away from the black of MT to multi-colored texts. This is a didactic device that in the first place graphically depicts the relationship between the extant textual sources. I also believe that this exercise in method more or less resembles what happened in reality. Many texts gradually moved away from the ancestor of the MT. However, the process of the development of the biblical text was more complex, since

several preserved texts preceded MT and some were parallel to it. Our analysis is no more objective than others, but by graphically indicating the relationship between texts we hope to have succeeded in providing a better picture of the complicated web of relations between the texts.

<주요어>

70인역, 페쉬타, 타르굼, 벌게이트, 마소라, 사마리아 오경, 사해 사본

<Key Words>

LXX, Peshitta, Targumin, Vulgate, MT, SP, Dead Sea Scrolls

## References

- Abegg, Jr., M. G., "1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>: A Rematch," *The Bible as Book-The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2002.
- Barthélemy, D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, OBO 50/3, Fribourg/Göttingen:Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck& Ruprecht, 1992.
- Cross, F. M. and Saley, R. J., "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>(4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006).
- Flint, P. W., *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll & the Book of Psalms*, STDJ 17, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Garbini, G., "1QIsa<sup>b</sup> et le texte d'Isaïe," *Hen* 6 (1984).
- Goshen-Gottstein, M. H., "The Psalms Scroll(11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966).
- Haran, M., "11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms," M. Brettler and M. Fishbane, eds., *Minhab le-Nabum-Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nabum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*, JSOTSup 154, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Kim, A., "The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a-b, 9a-b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii)," *Textus* 21 (2002).
- Nakman, D., "The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the Tefillin from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions," *Cathedra* 112 (2004).
- Roberts, B. J., "The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân(1QIs<sup>b</sup>)," *BJRL* 42

- (1959).
- Rothstein, D., "From Bible to Murabba'at: Studies in the Literary, Scribal and Textual Features of Phylacteries and Mezuzot in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism," unpub. Ph. D. Dissertation, Univ. of California, 1992.
- Schiffman, L. H. et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery-Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25 (1997)*, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
- Simon, U., ed., *The Bible and Us*, Tel Aviv: Devir, 1979.
- Skehan, P. W., "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *CBQ* 35 (1973).
- Skehan, P. W. and Ulrich, E., *Qumran Cave 4. X: The Prophets, DJD XV*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Tal, A., "The Samaritan Pentateuch, Edited According to MS 6(C) of the Shekhem Synagogue," Tel Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1994.
- Talmon, S., "Pisqah Be'emsea' Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 5 (1966).
- Tov, E., "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1995).
- Tov, E., "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," Brooke, G. J. and Lindars, B., eds., *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings*, Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Tov, E., "The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and

E. Tov ■ The Contribution of the Different Groups of Biblical Dead Sea  
Scrolls to Exegesis 37

4QReworked Pentateuch,” J. Zsengeller, ed., *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2008.

Tov, E., “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues,” B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm, eds., *ConBNT 39*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003.

<초록>

## 성서 사해 사본의 다양한 그룹이 성서 주석에 미친 공헌

임마누엘 토브

(히브리대학교 교수, 구약학)

사해 두루마리 발견 이전에, 히브리 성서 본문은 주로 마소라와 사마리아 오경을 통해 알려졌다. 다른 사본 자료들은 70인역, 페쉬타, 타르굼, 벌게이트 역본들을 꼽을 수 있다. 사해 사본에 대해 귀납법적인 접근을 시도할 때, 우리는 사해 사본이 1947년에 발견되기 전에 존재했던 자료들과 함께 이런 접근을 시도해야 한다. 만약 우리가 사해 사본의 표현을 곧바로 분석하려한다면, 우리는 이 새롭게 발견된 사본에 담긴 엄청난 혁신적 영향을 감지할 수 없을 것이다. 더욱이 인간의 지각은 새 자료를 기존 자료에 연결시켜 기존의 것에서 새 것으로 방향을 옮겨나간다. 우리는 마소라, 사마리아 오경, 70인역을 먼저 구체적으로 분석해야 한다. 왜냐하면 그렇게 하지 않을 때 우리는 한 두루마리와 70인역 사이의 유사성을 나타낼 수 없을 것이기 때문이다. 우리는 이러한 방식 외에 다른 대안이 없다. 왜냐하면 70인역은 사해 사본 이전에 존재했으며 매우 파편화된 두루마리 사본들보다 훨씬 더 잘 알려져 있기 때문이다. 우리는 이와 같은 분석을 통해 사해 사본 연구를 시작할 것이다. 이런 방식을 계속해 나갈 때 우리는 고대 사본들에 대한 두 가지 차원을 계속해서 생각하게 된다. 한편으로 우리는 두루마리 모양을 한 새롭게 발견된 고대 마소

라 사본과 후대 마소라를 비교하면서도, 다른 한편으로 이런 고대 사본 두루마리들이 마소라 사본의 이전 형태였으며, 후자의 것을 전자의 것과 비교할 필요가 있음을 깨닫게 된다.

선별된 사해 사본을 보여주는 견본 사진들은 배경 설명을 수반한다([www.iktinos.org/C&C](http://www.iktinos.org/C&C)). 이 견본 사진들에는 중세 마소라를 소개하고 있는데, 그 이유는 이 사본이 가장 잘 알려진 사본이며 사본 비평에서 수용되고 있는 본문이기 때문이다. 우리의 연구 목적은 이 사본에 대해 무언가를 설명하는 데 있을 뿐, 그 사본이 중심적인 것임을 말하려는 데 있지 않다. 마소라 사본에서 차이를 드러내는 어떤 변형이 있다. 여기서 제시되는 사본의 견본들에서 검은 부분은 마소라를 나타내는 반면, 빨간 색, 푸른 색, 녹색 그리고 분홍 색 부분은 마소라의 다양한 변이 형태를 나타내 준다. 이 견본 사진 이면에 있는 주요 논점은 검은 부분에서 다양한 색깔의 본문들로 점차 이동하고 있다는 점이다. 이 색깔들의 표시가 주관적인 것임은 강조되어야 하겠지만 이 주관성은 자료의 10퍼센트를 넘지 않을 것이다. 이 견본의 목적은 사본 간의 관계를 사실적으로 알려주는 데 있다. 우리의 주요 목적은 아래의 계층들의 특징을 설명하는 데 있다. (1) 콤파 외의 유다 광야에서 발견된 중세 마소라의 이전 형태들 (2) 원시 마소라 콤파 두루마리 (3) 주로 철자와 어형에 있어서 마소라와 다른 본문 (4) 고대 히브리 사본에 기록된 두루마리들 (5) 사마리아 사본 이전의 것과 사마리아 오경 (6) 70인경의 히브리 자료로 추정되는 것과 유사한 본문 (7) 독자적인 자료들.

<Abstract>

## The Contribution of the Different Groups of Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls to Exegesis

Prof. E. Tov

(The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew text of the Bible was known mainly from the medieval manuscripts of MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch(SP). Other sources are the medieval copies of the LXX, Peshitta, Targumin, and Vulgate. An inductive approach to the scrolls should start with the data that were available before the scrolls were found in 1947. If we were to start the analysis immediately with a description of the scrolls themselves, we would not be able to sense the impact of the immense revolution created by the new finds. Further, the human mind works from the known to the unknown by linking new data to data already known. We have to first analyze in detail MT, SP, and the LXX, since otherwise we cannot point out the closeness between a scroll and, for example, the LXX. We have no alternative but to proceed in this way, not only because the LXX

was known before the scrolls, but also because the LXX is so much better known than a few very fragmentary scrolls. In this analysis, we will start with the scrolls themselves. When proceeding in this way we constantly think at two levels about the ancient and medieval sources. On the one hand, we compare the newly discovered ancient MT-like scrolls with the medieval MT, while on the other we know that these ancient scrolls were the forerunners of MT and that we actually need to compare the latter with the former.

A graphic presentation of selected scrolls accompanies our background description. These samples take the medieval MT as our point of reference, not only because it is the best-known text, but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. Our procedure involves a merely didactic device, and does not necessarily involve the centrality of that version. A variant is any detail differing from MT. In our samples of scrolls, black denotes identity to MT, while red, blue, green, and pink denote different types of variation from MT. The main idea behind the presentation is the gradual moving away from black to multi-colored texts. It should be stressed that the indication of these colors is subjective although this subjective probably does not exceed 10 percent of the material. The purpose of these sample is to indicate graphically the relation between texts. The typological presentation is the focus of this study and we do not suggest

that the groups of texts developed in the way depicted here. Our main purpose is to elucidate the nature of the following groups. (1) Forerunners of the medieval MT found at Judean Dessert sites other than Qumran; (2) Proto-Masoretic Qumran scrolls; (3) Text differing from MT mainly in orthography and morphology; (4) Scrolls written in the paleo-Hebrew script; (5) “Pre-Samaritan” scrolls and the Samaritan Pentateuch; (6) Text close to the presumed Hebrew source of the LXX; (7) “Independent”(non-aligned) sources.