

Emanuel Tov

The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint – An Overview

The discovery in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls of single readings and fragments that are close to the LXX was an unexpected phenomenon that would be of major importance for several aspects of the text-critical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. The idea that we would ever get close to the Hebrew texts from which the Greek translation was rendered had never entered anyone's mind. Had scholars been asked where to look for such scrolls, they would have been divided between ancient Israel and Egypt.

1. Textual Outlook at the Time of the Discovery of the Qumran Scrolls

When the Qumran scrolls were found in 1947, scholars already had well-developed views about the transmission of the biblical texts. With the discovery of the first Qumran scrolls, these views, including the depiction of the relation between the textual witnesses, were not altered because it always takes time for the ramifications of new discoveries to be absorbed. Scholars continued to determine the place of the newly found scrolls within the framework of the tripartite division of the textual witnesses of the Torah that had been developed earlier. With regard to the Prophets and Hagiographa, some scholars thought in terms of a bipartite division, while others adhered also here to a tripartite division. Scholars also continued the approach of previous generations in characterizing many Qumran scrolls as recensions or text-types.

The assigning of individual Qumran texts to a particular text-type is reflected in the literature from the first volumes of the *DJD* series onwards, when most of the new scrolls were described as belonging to the "type" of SP (Sam. Pent.), while some scrolls were assigned to the "type" of the LXX or of SP.¹

¹ For example, in *DJD* III (1962) 61, 2QDeut^c was described as reflecting a textual tradition close to LXX and V. According to Milik, 5QDeut was systematically revised

2. The Hebrew Qumran Scrolls and the Reconstruction of the Vorlage of the LXX

The Qumran LXX scrolls and the Hebrew scrolls close to the LXX introduced spectacular new data to the text-critical analysis. At the same time, the Hebrew scrolls and individual readings were quietly and almost unobtrusively influential in another area. They provided welcome support for the correctness of an approach that had been an integral part of scholarship for more than three centuries, namely, the reconstruction of details in the *Vorlage* of the LXX by way of retroversion. Before the Qumran discoveries, elements in the LXX that differed from MT were reconstructed with the aid of intuition and parallel biblical passages, while some harmonizing pluses in the LXX could be reconstructed with aid of parallel evidence in SP. However, little external support was available for this procedure.

The masters in this area of reconstruction, from Cappellus (1650)² and Houbigant (1777),³ on to Wellhausen (1871)⁴ and more recent scholars, operated with such tools as grammars, lexica, and concordances, but actually their intuition remained their major source of inspiration. Guided by this intuition, the above-mentioned scholars, as well as many others, suggested many a retroversion for readings in the LXX that deviated from MT.

However, it was not until the discovery of the Qumran scrolls that it was recognized that the system of retroverting had been correct all along.

according to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX (*DJD* III, 170). For both, see below. Milik similarly described 5QKings as reflecting a mediating position between the recensions of MT and LXX (*DJD* III, 172). While these three short texts did not display a convincing level of agreement with the LXX, other texts showed surprising proximity to the LXX. The first such scroll to be considered close to LXX was the rather well preserved 4QSam^a. The approach to this scroll, which was quickly accepted in scholarship, was indicated by the name of a 1953 study by FRANK M. CROSS, "A New Qumran Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15–26. Similar claims were later made by Cross regarding 4QSam^b in "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 147–72, and in his monograph, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth, 1958), 133–40. Cross had remarkably good insights into the scrolls that he considered to be close to LXX and that were eventually accepted as such. The argumentation was completed when additional ("pre-Samaritan") texts that belonged to the "type" of SP were discovered at Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b.

² LUDOVICUS CAPPELLUS, *Critica Sacra sive de variis quae in sacris Veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex* (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650), 384–5; (Halle: Hendel, 1775–[1786]).

³ CHARLES F. HOUBIGANT, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (Frankfurt: Filium & Wenner, 1777).

⁴ JULIUS WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).

For example, readings that had been retroverted from LXX-Samuel without real support were now found in 4QSam^{a,b}, thus vindicating the procedure.⁵

3. Determining the Relation between the LXX and the Other Witnesses

When comparing the Qumran scrolls with the LXX and MT as well as other sources, both agreements and disagreements need to be analyzed. Further, in the analysis of the relationship between the LXX and a scroll, the textual character of all the witnesses has to be taken into consideration. Thus, if there is little textual variation between the various witnesses in a given book, as between the LXX and MT in Isaiah, both sources may relate in the same way to a Qumran scroll. Thus most scrolls of Isaiah and Ruth from cave 4 (see *DJD* XV [1997], XVI [2000]) agree with MT and the LXX almost equally. In addition, in the historical books, the relation between a scroll and the LXX must be analyzed separately for the majority tradition of the LXX and for LXX^{Luc}. Furthermore, many scholars claim that common errors (secondary readings) shared by the LXX and a scroll carry more weight than agreements in presumed original readings.

There is no generally accepted method of determining the relation between the scrolls and the other witnesses. Some North American scholars pay more attention to the comparative (primary/secondary) value of readings than others.⁶ Other scholars pay more attention to the mere counting of readings (the statistical method). The first generation of scholars to analyze this issue paid attention only to agreements, but subsequently disagreements were also taken into consideration.

In my own thinking, editorial differences carry more weight than other variants. I take agreements as well as disagreements and independent readings into consideration. Further, I realize that shared errors carry more weight than shared common readings, but nevertheless I do not rely much on this type of reasoning because of its subjective aspects.

⁵ This aspect was also stressed by FRANK M. CROSS–DONALD W. PARRY–RICHARD J. SALEY, *DJD* XVII (2005), 26.

⁶ FRANK M. CROSS & RICHARD J. SALEY, “A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a (4Q51),” *DSD* 13 (2006): 46–54; EUGENE ULRICH, *DJD* XVII, 253–4 (4QSam^a).

4. Qumran Scrolls Closely Related to the LXX

When analyzing the scrolls that are closely related to the LXX,⁷ we find different types of proximity. Most convincing are scrolls that agree with the LXX in the latter's features, either in editorial differences or a large percentage of meaningful variants. In all instances, disagreements with the LXX are also taken into consideration. In this analysis, we disregard occasional agreements with the LXX as well as statistical proximity to the LXX in insignificant details, both of which are analyzed below. We located seven scrolls that are close to the LXX, each of them in a different way.⁸ While 4QJer^b, when extant and reconstructed, is almost identical to the LXX, a few other scrolls are very close to that translation, sometimes in its characteristic features. Within this analysis, as an exercise in method, we ask ourselves whether the remains of these scrolls could have been rendered from the LXX.

(1) 4QJer^b agrees with the LXX in almost all details against MT+,⁹ including the LXX's characteristic editorial deviations from MT: shortness (both are significantly shorter than MT+, in the case of the LXX by one-sixth) and sequence (in the case of 4QJer^b, different sequence in 10:5–12).¹⁰ Tov, *DJD* XV (1997) 173 and Saley showed that the order of the verses in this fragmentary scroll cannot be reconstructed in any way other than that of the LXX*, i.e., 3, 4, 5a, 9, 5b, 11.¹¹ Vv 6–8, 10, lacking in 4QJer^b and the LXX*, have a uniform character: They extol the LORD of Israel, while the remaining verses deride the idols of the heathen. It is most likely that the doxology in these verses was added in MT (ed. II) as a counterbalance to mockery of the idols.

4QJer^b is very close to the LXX, but it should be remembered that only the ends of the long lines have been preserved. If this fragmentary status is disregarded, the LXX could have been rendered from the preserved frag-

⁷ For earlier brief descriptions, see EMANUEL TOV, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in id., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 285–300; FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "La Bible d'Alexandrie au miroir de Qumrân," *RevQ* 22 (2005): 253–68.

⁸ This number is higher than I recognized in the past: *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 148.

⁹ Exceptions are: פקדתי v 15] פקדתי MT LXX* (ἐπισκοπήσ αὐτῶν) and v 18 יושבי [ישב MT LXX (τοῦς κατοικοῦντας). Other differences between MT and LXX* derived from the translator's techniques.

¹⁰ See TOV, *TCHB*, ch. 7B1 and ARMIN LANGE, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, I: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 300–24.

¹¹ EMANUEL TOV, *DJD* XV (1997), 173 and RICHARD J. SALEY, "Reconstructing 4QJer^b According to the Text of the Old Greek," *DSD* 17 (2010): 1–12.

ment of 4QJer^b. In all other cases discussed below, such assumptions cannot be made since the scrolls are slightly distant from the LXX.

(2) 4QJer^d agrees with the major feature of the LXX (shortness) in the non-representation of the long names of MT. However, the scroll also differs from the LXX in seven details and although it is very close to that translation, it could not have been translated from it.

(3) 4QDeut^q agrees with the LXX against MT in the addition of two significant stichs in Deut 32:43 that give a polytheistic flavor to the song. The two also agree in four small details, and differ in three small details. The LXX could not have been translated from 4QDeut^q. Besides, the scroll probably contained only the song in Deuteronomy 32, while LXX-Deuteronomy was rendered from a complete text of that book.¹²

(4) 4QSam^a agrees often with the LXX against MT in significant readings while disagreeing with it in equally significant readings. This scroll is probably the most difficult one to assess:

- Agreements of 4QSam^a with the LXX and LXX^{Luc} need to be analyzed separately because LXX^{Luc} reflects the OG in 1 Samuel and 2Sam 1:1–11:1, while the remainder of 2 Samuel contains a revisional text, *kaige*-Th. In each segment, the scroll relates differently to the LXX.

- The significant agreements and disagreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX, as well as the many unique, seemingly contradictory, readings in the scroll, are in need of a special explanation.

Because of these complications, scholars described the closeness of the scroll to the LXX in different ways. Already in the first publication of a sizeable fragment of 4QSam^a, Cross recognized its proximity to the LXX, which he expressed in the name of his study (see n. 1). Polak likewise stresses the agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX.¹³ On the basis of the same material, Tov downplayed the number of agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX (LXX^B and LXX^{Luc}) by also taking disagreements between them into consideration.¹⁴ Without counting disagreements, Her-

¹² The double translation in one of the stichs in LXX could have been created at a later stage. Several scholars stressed the close relation between the LXX and this scroll: JEFFREY H. TIGAY, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 513–8; ALEXANDER ROFÉ, “The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.43)” in *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 47–54 (with bibliography).

¹³ FRANK H. POLAK, “Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam^a/LXX (with a Note on the Text of the Pentateuch),” in *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* (Manchester, 1990) (ed. G.J. Brooke & B. Lindars, S.S.F.; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 215–76.

¹⁴ EMANUEL TOV, “Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues,” in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna* (ed. E. Tov; Jerusalem: Academon, 1980), 45–67.

bert considered 4QSam^a to be only “half-Septuagintal,” but in his mind the link between the two texts remained strong.¹⁵

In determining the relation between 4QSam^a and the other sources, we take the following aspects into consideration:

- Shared secondary readings of 4QSam^a and the LXX mark the strong connection between them.¹⁶

- On the other hand, the two texts disagree often in extensive groups of variants. Some of these disagreements belong to the pattern 4QSam^a ≠ MT LXX, e.g. the long plus in 1 Samuel 11 in 4QSam^a.¹⁷ In other cases, 4QSam^a differs from all other texts in its unique readings and exegesis (4QSam^a ≠ LXX ≠ MT), e.g. in the Song of Hannah and in 1Sam 2:13–16. These unique readings consist of transmission errors and exegetical changes embedded in the scroll.¹⁸

- In 2Sam 11:1–24:25 (= *kaige*-Th), LXX^{Luc} (closely related to the OG), agrees often with 4QSam^a, while in 1 Samuel the scroll agrees more frequently with the LXX^B (= OG).¹⁹ The combined evidence for 4QSam^a is that this scroll always agrees with the OG representatives.²⁰

In sum, 4QSam^a is often very close to the OG (LXX and/or LXX^{Luc}) when disagreeing with MT,²¹ leading to the assumption that these two

¹⁵ EDWARD D. HERBERT, “4QSam^a and Its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatalogical Analysis,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. B.A. Taylor; SBLSCS 45; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 37–55 greatly stresses the agreements between the two texts in “secondary” readings. Taking his cue from P. KYLE MCCARTER, *I Samuel, II Samuel* (AB 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980, 1984), he recognizes a stronger link between 4QSam^a and LXX (LXX^B and LXX^{Luc}) than indicated by merely counting agreements and disagreements. In Herbert’s view, 4QSam^a is the earliest text among the sources available, leading to his further assumption that LXX branched off from that tradition. In his view, LXX^{Luc} has no special affinity to the scroll.

¹⁶ For example, note the extensive doublet in 1Sam 2:23–24 and the erroneous mention of Mephiboshet in 2Sam 4:1, 2, 12 instead of Ishboshet in MT in v 12 (together with the absence of a name in MT vv 1, 2). For additional examples of shared secondary readings, see POLAK, “Statistics,” 245.

¹⁷ See TOV, *TCHB*, ch. 7B10.

¹⁸ See DONALD W. PARRY, “The Textual Character of the Unique Readings of 4QSam^a (4Q51),” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 163–82.

¹⁹ See CROSS–PARRY–SALEY, *DJD* XVII (2000), 25.

²⁰ In the calculation of LANGE, *Handbuch*, 218, 4QSam^a agrees 143x with LXX in the OG sections (as opposed to 168 disagreements), and only 39x in 2Sam 11:1 onwards (= *kaige*-Th), as opposed to 104 disagreements in that section.

²¹ On the other hand, STEPHEN PISANO, S.J., *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57; Freiburg/Göttingen: University Press, 1984) downplayed the differences between these three witnesses, while maintaining the supremacy of MT.

sources were closely related at an early stage.²² At the same time, many new readings were created in both texts subsequent to their separation from one another.²³ Because of the complicated history of LXX-Samuel, the proximity between the two is not always easily visible. Like Cross-Parry-Saley, *DJD* XVII (2000) 25,²⁴ we list this text together with the others that are close to the LXX with the understanding that they were very close prior to their separation.²⁵

(5) 4QSam^b is closely related to the LXX, as was recognized by Cross in the first publication²⁶ and by Cross-Parry-Saley in the final publication (*DJD* XVII [2005] 222–3).²⁷ Counting “superior” readings in 4QSam^b, these authors find more such readings in the scroll than in the other sources. Besides, the scroll shares ten inferior readings with the OG (LXX^B and/or LXX^{Luc}). In my own analysis, I also found the scroll to be closer to the LXX than MT.²⁸ This conclusion is significant since 4QSam^b is one of the earliest Qumran scrolls (c. 250 BCE).²⁹

²² Chronicles is often close to this shared text (see LANGE, *Handbuch*, 218, n. 29) and Josephus may have used a Greek text close to 4QSam^a; see EUGENE ULRICH, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978) and LANGE, *Handbuch*, 218, n. 32).

²³ In spite of the many differences between the scroll, LXX and MT, they do not reflect different literary editions (thus EUGENE ULRICH, “A Qualitative Assessment of the Textual Profile of 4QSam^a,” in *Flores Florentino* [2007], 147–61 [160–1]) except for 1Sam 1–2 (MT, LXX, possibly 4QSam^a) and 16–18 (MT, LXX). Maintaining the supremacy of MT, PISANO, *Additions or Omission*, downplayed the differences between these three witnesses.

²⁴ CROSS-PARRY-SALEY, *DJD* XVII, 25: “... our early conclusion that 4QSam^a stands in the same general tradition as the Hebrew text upon which the Old Greek translation was based.” Similarly, CROSS-SALEY, “Statistical Analysis,” 54: “... 4QSam^a stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek.”

²⁵ At the same time, the overall value of 4QSam^a for biblical research as incorporating either a majority of valuable or interpretational readings still needs to be scrutinized. For valuable summarizing remarks, see PHILIPPE HUGO, “Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of the Recent Research,” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. P. Hugo & A. Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–19 (3).

²⁶ FRANK M. CROSS, “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran,” *JBL* 74 (1955): 147–72 (169–72).

²⁷ “These data strongly support the view that the Old Greek was translated, presumably in Alexandria, from a Hebrew manuscript that was closely affiliated with the Old Palestinian text, such as that preserved in this old Samuel manuscript” (*DJD* XVII, 223).

²⁸ Counting only cases of disagreement between LXX and MT, and not taking into consideration the other sources or the unique readings of the scroll, I found it to be much closer to the LXX than to MT. While the unique readings of 4QSam^b are not insignificant, they are far less numerous than the other two mentioned categories.

²⁹ See DAVID N. FREEDMAN, “The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls—A Study in Orthography,” *Textus* 2 (1962): 87–102; CROSS-PARRY-SALEY, *DJD* XVII, 220–1.

(6) 4QNum^b often agrees with the LXX, but it also disagrees much with that translation. The most telling examples of the relation between the two are several medium-sized harmonizing pluses that the scroll shares exclusively with the LXX.³⁰ At the same time, the first feature that comes to mind when characterizing this scroll is its great similarity to SP, especially in its major editorial pluses based on Deuteronomy (Num 20:13; 21:12, 22; 27:23). 4QNum^b should therefore be recorded as close to both SP and the LXX.

(7) 11QPs^a col. XXVIII is closely related to Psalm 151 the LXX of which it presents a longer version. Since the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX version has logical shortcomings in the flow of ideas, probably segments were removed editorially from the scroll. The background of this presumed shortening is probably related to an early version of this Psalm (= 11QPs^a col. XXVIII) that differed in key points from the depiction of David in 1 Samuel 16. This shortening would have involved the removal of David's praise of God from the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.³¹

I hesitantly add frg. 15 of 4QJosh^a to this list without including it in the statistics. This enigmatic fragment agrees with the LXX in two details and its reconstructed text lacks most of 8:11b–13, as does the LXX. This agreement pertains to editorial differences between the LXX and MT.

The following types of proximity to the LXX are disregarded in our analysis:

a. Occasional agreements with the LXX

From the beginning of the scroll publication, agreements of details in these scrolls with the LXX were recorded in the scholarly literature and the critical editions. However, several such agreements are irrelevant when the two agree in shared exegesis. In such cases, as appearing often in the large Isaiah scroll (see below), the two texts indeed agree while disagreeing with MT. However, such agreement is not indicative of a special relation between the two since the Greek translator and the scribe of the scroll sometimes reflect similar or identical exegesis of a text like in MT. This exegesis pertains especially to grammatical adaptations, such as changes in number and person.

³⁰ 22:11 = v 5; 23:3b MT] שפי וילך [MT שפי וילך 4 QNum^b LXX (καὶ παρέστη Βαλακ ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ καὶ Βαλααμ ἐπορεύθη ἐπερωθῆσαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπορεύθη εὐθεΐαν) = v 23a; 25:16 = v 10; 26:33 MT שמות] Q 4QNum^b ואלה שמות, LXX* (καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα) = 27:1; 32:30; 35:21 = vv 16, 17, 18; 36:1 = 27:2.

³¹ See JAMES A. SANDERS, *DJD* IV (1965), 54–64. On the other hand, MICHAEL SEGAL, “The Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version,” *Textus* 21 (2002): 139–58 considers the two versions to be parallel developments.

Other occasional agreements of a scroll with the LXX are relevant for the analysis of particular texts, and may often be very significant.³² However, given the fact of our incomplete knowledge of the ancient texts, this information does not advance our understanding of the relation between texts if no particular pattern of agreement between the two texts is visible. After all, we have access to only a small percentage of the ancient witnesses, and accordingly such agreements are not indicative of a special relation between sources in the web of relations between the LXX, M, SP, and the scrolls.

Accordingly, no special mention should be made of occasional agreements between a scroll and the LXX, but there are borderline cases. Thus, 4QDeut^h agrees in eight details with the LXX in Moses' blessing in Deut 33:8–11, often coinciding with 4QTestimonia (4Q175). At the same time, this scroll also disagrees eight times with the LXX when agreeing with MT or SP, and contains exclusive readings. Its assumed closeness to the LXX³³ therefore cannot be established. The occasional agreements of the LXX and 1QIsa^a are either misleading³⁴ or insignificant. This pertains also to the agreements between the LXX and 11QPs^a.³⁵

By the same token, most agreements between the LXX and non-biblical Qumran scrolls are occasional. Some occasional variants shared by the Temple Scroll and the LXX are of limited importance.³⁶ The apparatuses of the editions of Jubilees and all other parabiblical texts refer to many additional occasional agreements with the LXX. A special case is the biblical quotations in 4QTestimonia (4Q175).³⁷ The first quotation in that

³² Such occasional agreements are recorded in the *DJD* editions, the critical editions of the Bible, in the *CATSS* database, and in CORRADO MARTONE, "Qumran Readings in Agreement with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text. Part One, The Pentateuch," *Henoch* 27 (2005): 53–113; id., "... Part Two: Joshua–Judges," *Flores Florentino*, 141–5.

³³ JULIE A. DUNCAN, "New Readings for the 'Blessing of Moses' from Qumran," *JBL* 114 (1995): 273–90 (288) cautiously suggests proximity to the LXX.

³⁴ Thus JOSEPH ZIEGLER, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa^a)," *JBL* 78 (1959): 34–59 *contra* HARRY M. ORLINSKY, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," *JBL* 78 (1959): 26–33.

³⁵ These agreements are recorded by STAFFAN OLOFSSON, *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version* (ConBOT 57; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 176–92 ("Texts from Qumran and the Septuagint").

³⁶ Thus LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN, "The Septuagint and the Temple Scroll: Shared 'Halakhic' Variants," in *Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, 277–97 (292).

³⁷ See EMANUEL TOV, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in *Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, 11–47 (34–5); STEFAN BEYERLE, "Evidence of a Polymorphic Text: Towards the Text-History of Deuteronomy 33," *DSD* 5 (1998): 215–32.

scroll, from Exod 20:21, follows SP in its characteristic features,³⁸ while the third one is close to 4QDeut^h and the LXX. In the first place, 4Q175 is close to 4QDeut^h, which may have been the source for this scroll, and only secondarily to the LXX.

b. Statistical proximity to the LXX in insignificant details

The aforementioned list of scrolls that are close to the LXX does not include all scrolls that statistically have a greater number of agreements with the LXX than with the other sources. The reasoning behind this approach is that mere statistical information concerning small details may be misleading since most scrolls are extremely fragmentary. Often, agreements pertain to small, unimportant details, and if disagreements are also taken into consideration, the agreements do not carry much weight. This is the case with 4QExod^b³⁹ and 4QLev^d.⁴⁰ 4QSam^c agrees slightly more with LXX^{Luc} = OG in Samuel 14–15 than with the main tradition of the LXX, which in these chapters contain *kaige*-Th.⁴¹ However, lack of evidence warns us not to draw any conclusion concerning a close relation between LXX^{Luc} and 4QSam^c.

In addition, the following texts have been mentioned as being close to the LXX, but the evidence is not convincing:

³⁸ The nature of the first excerpt creates a somewhat unusual impression as it seems to quote from two pericopes in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:28–29, 18:18–19), but in fact it contains merely one text that, as in SP (Exod 20:21), is composed of two pericopes that occur in different places in MT. The same texts are juxtaposed in 4Q158 (4QRP^a), frg. 6.

³⁹ Pace FRANK M. CROSS, *DJD* XII (1994), 84: “4QExod^b is a collateral witness to the textual family which provided the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek translation.” However, the readings of this scroll are not characteristic of a trend of the LXX, with the possible exception of Exod 1:5 where the number of Jacob’s descendants is mentioned as seventy in MT+ (meant as a round number) and 75 in 4QGen–Exod^a 4QExod^b LXX*. The latter number is consistent with the names given in Gen 46:20 LXX (Ephraim, Menasseh, and grandsons Machir, Shuthelah, Tahan), but not with MT and the number in Gen 46:27 G. MT only mentions seventy descendants of Jacob (Gen 46:27; Exod 1:5; Deut 10:22). For an analysis, see WILLIAM H.C. PROPP, *Exodus 1–18* (Anchor Bible: New York/London, 1998), 121–3.

⁴⁰ 4QLev^d contains pluses to MT in Lev 17:3, 4. The plus in v 4, based on v 3, is shared with LXX SP. See KARL ELLIGER, *Leviticus* (HAT 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 219. The scroll reflects LXX in two additional details, while in two other details it agrees with SP MT. See further ESTHER ESHEL, “4QLev^d: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and *Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah*,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 1–13.

⁴¹ See the analysis in TOV, “Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues,” in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna* (ed. E. Tov; Jerusalem: Academon, 1980), 45–67 (58–61). Ulrich, on the other hand, stresses the links with the Lucianic tradition: “4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hay-yahad* (1QS),” *BASOR* 235 (1979): 1–25; id., *DJD* XVII (2005), 253–4.

– 5QDeut. Milik's contention that 5QDeut (chapters 7–9) has been revised four times according to a Hebrew text close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX would have been of special interest had the evidence been more conclusive.⁴² Indeed, two of the corrections agree with the LXX against MT (the addition of *ראיתה ואשר* in 7:15 and that of *בם* in 8:12). The third correction (8:19) is based on a reading that at best is dubious, while the fourth instance is probably irrelevant (9:2). At the same time, there are eight instances of disagreement between the LXX and 5QDeut and two agreements in minutiae. The sum of this evidence does not favor the assumption that this text has been corrected towards a Hebrew source close to the LXX.⁴³ In fact, no Qumran manuscript has as yet been identified in which corrections clearly tend towards either the LXX or MT.⁴⁴

– 2QDeut^c is described as follows by Baillet: "Le texte se rapproche de la LXX et de la Vulgate."⁴⁵ However, this fragment, of which a mere twelve words have been preserved in whole or in part, shows no close relation to either the LXX or SP.⁴⁶

5. Internal Relation between the Scrolls Showing Affinity with the LXX

There is insufficient evidence for speculating on a special relationship between the texts that are close to the LXX. This issue can best be analyzed by contrasting these texts with the MT-group and the SP-group among the Qumran texts. Both groups are internally coherent, while texts that resemble the LXX do not form a close-knit textual family. They represent individual scrolls that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated. Since the *Vorlage* of each biblical book in the the LXX was a single biblical scroll and not a family or recension, the recognition of Hebrew scrolls that were close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX does not contribute to our understanding of the development of the Hebrew text. The seven Hebrew Qumran texts that are close to the LXX comprise 5.75 percent of the 121 Qumran biblical texts that are large enough to enable analysis of their textual features.

⁴² *DJD* III (1962), 169–71.

⁴³ LANGE, *Handbuch*, 103 accepts Milik's description.

⁴⁴ See my study "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found in Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls – Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant & U. Rapaport; Leiden/Jerusalem 1992), 299–314.

⁴⁵ *DJD* III (1962), 61.

⁴⁶ This text, written in the QSP, agrees more with MT against LXX than vice versa.

6. A Septuagintal Text-type?

The description of the character of the texts that are close to the LXX in the various Scripture books shows that they share only a limited number of features; therefore, it would be inappropriate to speak of a Septuagintal text-type, Septuagintal features, or the like. Nevertheless, so-called Septuagintal features are often mentioned in the literature, not on the basis of any evidence, but of general perceptions about the transmission of the biblical text as described below.

In the literature prior to 1947, the textual witnesses were usually described as being divided into three groups around MT, SP, and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. These units were often named recensions or text-types. This terminology continued to be used, albeit less frequently, in the later literature. One often meets the term “Septuagintal” as a description of a Qumran scroll or readings in a scroll that agree with the LXX. However, this terminology is misleading since the LXX is neither a text-type nor a recension. The assumption of a Septuagintal text-type is unrealistic as there are almost no text-types in the realm of the Hebrew Bible and because the *Vorlagen* of the various books of the LXX have very few features in common. The Greek *translations* share certain characteristics, but their reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlagen* do not share such features. The main element shared by the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the books of the LXX is that they were chosen to be rendered into Greek.

In view of the different backgrounds of the translations included in the LXX, it would be unexpected for the books of the LXX to have textual features in common. The Hebrew Scripture books were translated into Greek at different times and in different places (Alexandria, Palestine, and possibly elsewhere). When reviewing the nature of the Greek Scripture collection, we are struck by its heterogeneous character, which is most visible in the post-Pentateuchal books.

Textual features characterize the activity of the scribes who copied the scrolls or their background. Such features involve tendencies to shorten or expand, to add explanatory remarks, and to change or harmonize details. From among these various tendencies, we recognize only a large number of harmonizing pluses in the *Vorlage* of the Greek Torah.⁴⁷ We recognize

⁴⁷ These pluses are similar to those of the SP-group, but are less familiar to those scholars who continue to believe that this feature is typical of the SP-group only. In fact, LXX reflects more contextual harmonizations than SP, often twice as many. In Numbers, these features are shared with 4QNum^b against all other witnesses, and in Deuteronomy they are often shared with either MT or SP, but are more frequently exclusive to the LXX. For the data, see RONALD S. HENDEL, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); EMANUEL TOV, “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy,” in *Hebrew Text, Greek*

no other features that the *Vorlagen* of the Greek books have in common. The quality of the text (superior or inferior readings) is not a textual feature, which prevents us from stating that superior readings are typical of the LXX. By the same token, the fact that the LXX relatively frequently reflects a literary stage in the development of a composition different from that of MT does not render these details “Septuagintal.” The shortness of the LXX in 1 Samuel 16–18, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, ascribed to their early literary form, creates the impression of a common phenomenon. However, this is a very small group of books and they do not share textual features.

In sum, there is no evidence for a Septuagintal text-type or for characteristic textual features of the LXX.

7. Qumran Hebrew Scrolls Close to the LXX and the Origin of That Translation

Traditionally, the translation of Hebrew Scripture into Greek has been ascribed to Alexandria, making the LXX into an Alexandrian version. This assumption is based on some Egyptian-Greek features of the language and the Epistle of Aristeas that relates the story of the sending of Hebrew scrolls by the High Priest Eleazar from Jerusalem to Alexandria. However, there is a growing understanding that several, possibly most, post-Pentateuchal books were produced in Palestine.⁴⁸ In the wake of that understanding, the Hebrew copies from which the books of the LXX were rendered were once found in Egypt in the case of the Torah and some additional books, and in Palestine in other post-Pentateuchal books. These original copies have not been discovered, but a few that are close to the Hebrew base of the LXX have been found. The discovery in Palestine of Hebrew scrolls close to the LXX has not provided an answer to the ques-

Texts and Qumran, 271–82 (Deuteronomy); GILLES DORIVAL, *La Bible d’Alexandrie, Vol 4: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 42–3; KYONG-RAE KIM, *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994, 311 (the complete Torah). See also MARTIN RÖSEL, “Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buche Numeri,” in *La double transmission du texte biblique. Hommage à A. Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman & C. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25–40 (29–39). Against the traditional number of 1900 agreements between LXX and SP, Kim counts merely 535 instances, 348 of which are harmonizations. Altogether, Kim located 1441 harmonizations in LXX-Torah.

⁴⁸ See EMANUEL TOV, “Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations,” in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7 2008* (ed. W. Kraus & M. Karrer; WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 3–22.

tion of the origin of the LXX. However, we are no longer surprised to find such scrolls in Palestine, since probably several of the LXX books were translated there.

8. Parallels between the Hebrew and Greek Scrolls Found at Qumran

The Hebrew and Greek Qumran scrolls share important characteristics. The status of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert runs parallel to that of the Hebrew manuscripts from the same area. The Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran reflect a variety of textual forms, among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of Naḥal Hever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabbaʿat, and Naḥal S□eʿelim, as well as the earlier site of Masada, reflect exclusively the proto-Masoretic texts (also named proto-rabbinic texts) later to be contained in MT (to be precise, the texts from the sites other than Qumran are closer to the medieval text than the Qumran proto-Masoretic texts).⁴⁹ Similarly, at least some of the Greek Torah texts from Qumran probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8HevXII gr reflects a later Jewish revision deriving from proto-rabbinic Jewish circles. Thus, both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level and that was not tied down to MT, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles that adhered only to the proto-rabbinic (proto-Masoretic) text in Hebrew and the Jewish revisions of the the LXX towards that Hebrew text. The differences between the texts and sites derive partly from their differing chronological backgrounds, but more so from their socio-religious backgrounds.⁵⁰

The LXX texts found at Qumran are not related in any way to the specific texts of the Hebrew Bible found there. For example, the Greek Torah texts show no relation to Hebrew Torah texts found there. Likewise, there are no Greek texts closely related to 4QSam^a. The only closeness between Hebrew and Greek texts found in the Judean Desert is between the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Hever and the Murabbaʿat scroll of the Minor Prophets, since both reflect MT.

Finally, a word is in order regarding the scrolls, the LXX, and the modern Bible translations. Readings from both the Qumran biblical scrolls and

⁴⁹ See EMANUEL TOV, "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in id., *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*, 171–88; IAN YOUNG, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?" *DSD* 9 (2002): 364–90.

⁵⁰ See my study "The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert," *NovT* 43 (2001): 1–11.

the LXX found their place into the modern Bible translations. Before 1947, many the LXX readings had been accepted in the modern Bible translations, from the *KJV* (1611) onwards. Within that eclectic climate, it was expected that readings from the scrolls would also find a place in these translations. Since their discovery, readings from the scrolls have joined the LXX in competing with MT in modern Bible translations. Never was it more crowded in Bible translations.

In sum, the discovery in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls of single readings and fragments that are close to the LXX was an unexpected phenomenon that would be of major importance for several aspects of the text-critical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. We analyzed the question of whether these scrolls changed the textual outlook of earlier generations. In our view, the discovery of the Hebrew Qumran scrolls provided much-needed support for the procedure of reconstructing the *Vorlage* of the LXX. There is no generally accepted method for determining the relation between the LXX and the other witnesses. Some scholars pay more attention to the comparative (primary/secondary) value of readings than others. Some scholars pay more attention to the mere counting of agreements. In the center of our analysis is a list of seven Qumran scrolls that are closely related to the LXX. We suggest that there was no internal relation between these scrolls. In our view, the Qumran scrolls that were close to the LXX did not form a close-knit textual family and a Septuagintal text-type never existed. An analysis of the Qumran Hebrew scrolls close to the LXX has some repercussions for understanding the origin of that translation. Finally, we suggest that the Hebrew and Greek scrolls found in the Judean Desert in the various Judean Desert sites reflect similar features.