The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls

Edited by Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin De Troyer, and Shani Tzoref

V&R

Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

Edited by
Jan Christian Gertz, Dietrich-Alex Koch,
Matthias Köckert, Hermut Löhr,
Joachim Schaper, and Christopher Tuckett

Volume 239

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls

Edited by
Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange,
Kristin De Troyer, and Shani Tzoref

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

In memory of Hanan Eshel ז"ל

Contents

Part 4:
The Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Law and Life

Introduction

The purpose of the seminar "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible" was to explore the importance of the former for the understanding of the latter. Until recently, the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls was considered to be of only secondary importance for the understanding of the Hebrew Bible, as it was presumed that most non-biblical texts that are attested by the manuscripts from the Qumran library are copies of texts that were composed after the biblical books were written. For this reason, the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for biblical scholar-ship was limited to the spheres of the textual and interpretative histories of the Hebrew Bible. It is hence not surprising that extensive research has been done in these two areas, which has shed new light both on how the text of the biblical books developed and how these biblical books were interpreted in ancient Judaism.

Since the last decade of the last millennium, however, a new consensus has developed among students of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The non-biblical scrolls from Qum-ran are no longer understood as the literary product of the people living at Qumran alone, but rather as having been collected by them. This means that only some of the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls attest to texts that were actually composed by the Essenes and are hence sectarian in character. The lion's share of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls were only collected in Qumran but not composed by the Essenes. As a consequence of this new scholarly consensus, scholars began to recognize that some of the non-Essene texts from the Qumran library date back to a time when the late books of the Hebrew Bible were written and the later redactions of other biblical books were produced. At least some of the texts attested by the Qumran manuscripts are therefore part of the cultural and religious contexts in which the Hebrew Bible developed. These texts are of similar if not greater importance for the understanding of the Hebrew Bible than, e.g., the textual finds from Ugarit or ancient Egyptian and ancient Mesopotamian literature.

The SBL seminar "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible" responded to this paradigm shift with a series of five meetings in total. The first four meetings addressed individual aspects of this overall theme, focusing on a hermeneutical question (Cambridge 2003), on the importance of the pre-Maccabean texts from the Qumran library for the understanding of the Hebrew Bible (Groningen 2004), on the question of prophecy and the

Dead Sea Scrolls (Edinburgh 2006), and on the Qumran legal texts (Vienna 2007). The proceedings of these meetings were and will be published as

- *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation* (eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, with the assistance of Katie M. Goetz and Susan Bond; SBL Symposium Series 30; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).
- *Pre-Maccabean Literature from the Qumran Library and Its Importance for the Study of the Hebrew Bible* (eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, with the assistance of Lucas L. Schulte, and Eva Mrozek; *DSD* 13.3 [2006]).
- *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, with the assistance of Lucas L. Schulte; CBET 52; Leuven: Peeters, 2009).
- *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, with the assistance of James. S. Adcock; CBET 61; Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

The final meeting of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hebrew Bible seminar took place in Rome in 2009. As the summit of our seminar series, this last meeting did not highlight a particular aspect of how the Dead Sea Scrolls shed new light on the Hebrew Bible, but tried to address the issue in all its facets. For this purpose the two seminar chairs, Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, invited both junior and senior specialists from the fields of Hebrew Bible, Second Temple Judaism, Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinics to Rome. As always it was our policy to involve specialists from outside the field of Dead Sea Scrolls to join us in our work.

This volume of proceedings of the last meeting of the "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible" seminar is structured in four parts, dedicated to the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the textual history of the Hebrew Bible, for the understanding of individual biblical books, for the early interpretative history of the Hebrew Bible and for the understanding of Jewish life and law in the period when the late parts of the Hebrew Bible were written and the canon of the Hebrew Bible developed. While there is more to be said about the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the study of the Hebrew Bible, we hope that the present selection of articles provides the reader with a good impression of some key issues.

    The first part of the present proceedings asks about the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the study of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible (The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible). Five articles engage with general depictions of the textual history of the Hebrew

Bible in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and a further four are case studies. In an introductory survey, *Russell Fuller* ("Some Thoughts on How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Changed our Understanding of the Text of the Hebrew Bible and its History and the Practice of Textual Criticism") sketches the textcritical evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls and points the specialist and non-specialist alike to the main questions posed by this material. The following four papers provide two fundamentally different perspectives on the biblical manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Both Arie van der Kooij and Emanuel Tov locate the (proto)MT text at the Jerusalem temple and understand it as a carefully maintained textual tradition that stands opposed to the overall textual plurality of Second Temple Judaism. *Arie van der Kooij* ("Preservation and Promulgation: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible") argues that copies of Jewish Scriptures were archived at the Jerusalem temple where they were carefully preserved and transmitted under the supervision of the chief priests. These Jerusalemite exemplars are to be distinguished carefully from the texts displaying textual plurality attested elsewhere in the Second Temple period. The text(s) kept at the Jerusalem temple can be compared to the city editions of the Homeric epics and other classical Greek literature. MT is not the result of textual standardization but reflects this text with minor changes and therefore harks back to an official text kept in the temple and preserved with great care by the appropriate temple officials. *Emanuel Tov* ("The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Text") emphasizes the stichographic and textual identity of certain biblical scrolls from Qumran and all biblical manuscripts from the non-Qumran sites with MT. Based on the identification of such a (proto)masoretic manuscript group, Tov proposes that the text of MT developed in four stages. During the first stage, authors deposited copies of their literary works at the Jerusalem temple, which were maintained and copied there. These manuscripts can be described as the archetype of MT. Later (proto)MT copies were produced from this master copy or revised according to it. At this early stage, MT was a good text which knew textual and orthographic differences. The second stage of MT is characterized by a uniform picture. The (proto)MT manuscripts dating from between 250 B.C.E. and 135 C.E. comprise an inner circle of texts that agree precisely with codex L and a second circle of scrolls that are only very similar to it and reflect typologically a later stage of MT. The third stage of MT, between 135 C.E. and the eighth century C.E., is characterized by a relatively high degree of textual consistency. During the fourth stage, between the end of eighth century C.E. until the end of the Middle Ages, MT became almost completely standardized, due to the addition of the vocalization, accentuation and the Masorot.

Against Van der Kooij and Tov, Eugene Ulrich and Sidnie White Craw-

ford develop a different perspective on the textual history of the biblical
books in the Second Temple period, putting more emphasis on its plurality.
For *Eugene Ulrich* ("The Fundamental Importance of the Biblical Qumran
Scrolls"), MT is simply by chance the sole surviving witness of the Hebrew
Bible's Hebrew text after the two Jewish wars and is neither the Jerusalem
temple text nor the result of conscious textual standardization. As a uniform
text, MT thus represents only "period two" of the two-stage process of the
textual history of the Hebrew Bible. The Qumran scrolls show that "period
one" of this process was characterized by textual pluriformity and was the
time in which the biblical text was composed and in which it developed.
Sidnie White Crawford ("Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew
Bible: A New Proposal") wants to discard the labels MT, SP, and LXX for
the description of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible in the Second
Temple period as anachronistic. White Crawford identifies instead two
scribal traditions at work in the textual witnesses from the Second Temple
period as attested by the biblical manuscripts from Qumran as well as by
MT, SP, and LXX, namely a conservative and a revisionist scribal tradition.
Texts like 1QIsa[b], 4QJer[b,d], LXXJeremiah, and MTEsther are part of the
conservative scribal tradition, but texts like 1QIsa[a], 4QJer[a,c,e], MTJeremiah,
and LXXEsther belong to the revisionist scribal tradition. The conservative
and revisionist scribal traditions were at work in Judea at the same time and
are responsible for the multiplicity of texts we see at Qumran. Only after
the first century B.C.E., those texts that later became the Masoretic Text
gradually became dominant. Some of the books collected in the Masoretic
Text came from the conservative scribal tradition, e.g. the books of the
Torah, others from the revisionist scribal tradition, e.g. Jeremiah.

Four case studies illustrate what was argued in the papers of Fuller, van
der Kooij, Tov, Ulrich and White Crawford. The first two case studies are
concerned with various parts of the books of Samuel. *Julio Trebolle
Barrera* ("Textual and Literary Criticism on Passages Attested by 4QSam[a,b]
[1Sam 6:4-5 and 1 Sam 23:11-12]") compares the various textual witnesses
to 1 Sam 6:4-5 and 1 Sam 23:11-12 with one another in light of 4QSam[a,b].
The MT text of 1 Sam 6:4-5 is the result of a juxtaposition of two originally
independent readings and a gloss. In 1 Sam 23:11-12, Trebolle Barrera
observes the confluence of two oracular inquiries, whose juxtaposition has
produced different textual forms (4QSam[b], MT, the Vorlage of LXX, and
the Greek and Latin recensions). *Kristin De Troyer* ("Looking at Bathsheba
with Text-Critical Eyes") is also concerned with the text of 1-2 Samuel. She
finds evidence in the Antiochene text as well as in 4QSam[a] that the MT text
of 1-2 Samuel reworked 2 Sam 11-12. "The figure of Bathsheba and her
actions with regard to David and her begetting of Solomon are elaborations
from ingredients found in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles. The figure of the

Queen of Sheba has functioned as the source (or inspiration) for the invention and depiction of Bathsheba."[1]

The last two case studies of this section investigate the importance of the biblical quotations and allusions in Qumran manuscripts for the textual history of the Hebrew Bible. *Armin Lange* ("The Text of Jeremiah in the *War Scroll* from Qumran") analyzes the textual character of the Jeremiah quotations and allusions in the *War Scroll* from the Qumran library. He shows that in all cases of textual variation the *War Scroll* reads consistently with the consonantal text of MT. *Corrado Martone* ("Textual Fluidity as a Means of Sectarian Identity: Some Examples from the Qumran Literature") engages with the question of sectarian variant readings. He points to the fluidity of the text of biblical books in the Qumran library and identifies at least two sectarian variant readings that were inserted into a quotation of Hab 1:13 in 1QpHab V:8-12 and into a quotation of Ezek 44:15 in CD A 3:21–4:4.

The second part of our proceedings asks in how far the Dead Sea Scrolls help to better interpret individual biblical books. This question is of particular importance as some Dead Sea Scrolls attest to texts that were composed at a time when the later books of the Hebrew Bible were written. Again, our proceedings publish contributions that address more general questions and contributions that propose solutions for individual *cruces interpretum* with the help of the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Steven E. Fassberg* ("The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Language of Jewish Scriptures") opens a series of four general studies by way of a survey of the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls and its importance for the understanding of the languages in which the Jewish Scriptures were written. Fassberg shows that the Hebrew and Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls corroborate linguistic phenomena found in the post-exilic books of the Hebrew Bible and other contemporary corpora, and also reveal previously unknown grammatical forms and lexemes. With regard to Hebrew, the Dead Sea Scrolls corroborate the type of language known from the biblical books of the Second Temple period but demonstrate links with the language of Ben-Sira, the traditions of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and early Tannaitic Hebrew as well. The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls provide on the one hand additional evidence for a Standard Literary Jewish Aramaic and allow on the other hand a glimpse of early Palestinian Aramaic features. *Thomas Römer's* contribution ("Qumran and Biblical Scholarship") addresses the grey area between higher and lower criticism. The Qumran manuscripts show that the distinction between a scribe as a copyist and a redactor as a supposed "author" of a biblical book is anachro-

---

[1] Page 94 of the present volume.

nistic. The Dead Sea Scrolls demonstrate rather that scribes acted often as redactors of biblical books. The fact that most books of the Pentateuch in the Qumran library seem to be attested in separate copies leads Römer to regard the "fragment" hypothesis of how the Pentateuch developed as most likely. This opens the possibility that late scribes could have still reworked individual books of the Torah. Römer regards the Joshua manuscripts from Qumran and 4QapocrJosh[a] (4Q378) as supporting the hexateuch model, with the Book of Joshua being situated more in the context of the Torah than in that of the deuteronomistic history. The lack of Judg 6:7-10 in 4QJudg[a] (4Q49) points to the existence of a version of the Book of Judges in the Hellenistic period without one of its most prominent deuteronomistic passages. That some of the late MT-long texts in Joshua and Jeremiah are also characterized by deuteronomistic language could argue, in light of 4QJudg[a] (4Q49), for the existence of Deuteronomism in the Hellenistic period. 4QSam[a] (4Q51) indicates that Chronicles preserves evidence for a Hebrew text of Samuel preceding that of MT. The study of *Karin Finster-busch* ("The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Deuteronomistic Movement") discusses one of the questions raised by Römer's article in more detail. She asks how far deuteronomistic rhetoric in the Yahad literature from Qumran can be taken - as Odil Hannes Steck argued - as evidence for the existence of a deuteronomistic movement in the late Second Temple period. Finster-busch argues against the existence of such a deuteronomistic movement in the late Second Temple period. She casts the issue in terms of the reception of Deuteronomy and deuteronomistic traditions in CD 1:1-2:1; 20:28-30 and 1QS I:24b-II:1, showing instead that the Yahad literature is "distinctly marked by the stamp of Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic traditions."[2] *Esther G. Chazon* shows that the sectarian and non-sectarian liturgical collections from Qumran uncover missing links in a chain of development from the classical biblical blessing to the rabbinic liturgical benediction. The evidence points to a multi-stage evolutionary development that is not strictly linear. The (1) classical biblical blessing grew into a (2) formal opening in longer prayers of praise and thanksgiving, which led to the use of the blessing as (3a) an introduction to petitionary prayers and (3b) to the emergence of closing benedictions. Stages 3a and b are followed by the use of blessings as formal openings and closings in a liturgical practice of routine communal prayer. The formal, framing benediction which is well attested in the liturgical collections from Qumran points to (4) the rabbinic liturgical benediction and heralds the emerging practice of fixed communal prayer.

---

[2] Page 144 of the present volume.

The four general studies are followed by four case studies. Based on the example of the basic correlation of knowledge, nakedness and shame, *Michaela Bauks* ("Knowledge, Nakedness and Shame in the Primeval History of the Hebrew Bible and in Several Texts from the Judean Desert") shows that creation myths were used in contexts of national histories, of the establishment of political and/or religious hierarchies and of ethical or cultic regimes. Biblical and extrabiblical texts, like Genesis, the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of Jubilees* and others, seem to have the same apologetic interest in creation myths as Ancient Near Eastern texts, but with a sapiential intention. *Mika S. Pajunen* ("The Textual Connection between 4Q380 Fragment 1 and Psalm 106") argues that the psalm preserved in 4Q380 1 is a source employed in Psalm 106. Pajunen's discovery is of great importance as it shows that the biblical Psalms employed sources that were not later incorporated into any biblical canon.

The two last articles of the second part of our proceedings are dedicated to the Book of Daniel, i.e. to the book of the Hebrew Bible that was written almost contemporaneously with the Essene movement. *John J. Collins* ("The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls") surveys all Danielic material (including quotations and allusions) in the Dead Sea Scrolls with the exception of the Daniel manuscripts from Qumran. On the one hand the *Prayer of Nabonidus* illuminates the traditional story that underlies Daniel 4, and 4QGiants[b] does the same for Daniel 7. On the other hand the Pseudo-Daniel texts 4Q243–244 and 4Q245 are largely independent of the biblical book. The famous "Son of God"-text 4Q246 depends on the biblical book of Daniel and the *Four Kingdoms* text (4Q552–553) is a contemporizing exegesis of Daniel 2 or 7. *Bennie H. Reynolds III* ("Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Visions of the Book of Daniel in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls") shows that Daniel 10–12, the *Pseudo-Daniel* texts and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* make use of explicit descriptions in the form of sobriquets while the symbolic visions of Daniel 2, 4, 7–8 as well as the *Book of the Words of Noah*, 4QFourKingdoms[a–b] ar, the *Book of Giants* and the *Animal Apocalypse* employ symbolic categories. The semiotic systems underlying symbolic apocalypses indicate that they cannot have been intended to hide anything. But the opaque sobriquetical representations of *dramatis personae* in non-symbolic apocalypses appear to presume an audience limited to those with the requisite interpretative tools.

The third part of our proceedings explores the interpretative history of the biblical books as illuminated by the Dead Sea Scrolls. This question is of particular importance as it provides glimpses into the reception history of biblical books from a time when some of the books of the Hebrew Bible were still being written or reworked and into a time shortly after the last book of the Hebrew Bible was completed. The Dead Sea Scrolls thus dem-

onstrate the fluid transition from the making of the Hebrew Bible to its interpretation. The three general studies and the five case studies in this part of our proceedings are particularly interested in the various approaches to the Jewish Scriptures, such as exegetical methods and methodologies as well as reading strategies. *Vered Noam* ("Embryonic Legal Midrash in the Qumran Scrolls") offers new insights into such a spotlight, i.e., the existence of a fixed midrashic format in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls. This primal midrash deduced new laws from accepted scriptural concepts. The deduction was based on analogy. The law which is inferred may be a term or case described in the Torah, the rule of which is not fully explicated or a new law not even mentioned in Scriptures. In some cases these laws that were developed by way of midrash involve a polemic against the approach taken in rabbinic literature while in other cases Qumranic and rabbinic halakhah basically agree. The article by *Marcus Tso* ("The Uses of Scriptural Traditions at Qumran for the Construction of Ethics") asks about the role that scriptural traditions played in the construction of Qumranite ethics. Tso emphasizes that the Qumranites appropriated the Jewish Scriptures by using earlier rewritings, by creating commentaries, by alluding to scriptural references and by catchword association. In the case of more stable textual traditions, the Qumran community informed their ethics in ways that were often neither original nor unique to them. Textual traditions of greater fluidity and openness were used to support perspectives that were more distinctively sectarian. The study of *Matthias Weigold* ("Ancient Jewish Commentaries in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Multiple Interpretations as a Distinctive Feature?") proceeds to the realm of commentary literature. He argues that in rare cases the pesharim and the work of Aristobulus of Alexandria attest to multiple interpretations of the Jewish Scriptures even before Philo of Alexandria and the Rabbis. He also demonstrates, based on *1 Enoch* 106-107, that such a polyvalence of the Jewish Scriptures is not restricted to commentary literature but can also be found in the realm of paratextual literature. Textual polyvalence would thus not be a distinctive characteristic of commentary literature.

The five case studies in this section point the attention of the reader to individual interpretative problems of Jewish Scriptures that are addressed in various Dead Sea Scrolls. The first four case studies focus on various issues regarding the interpretation of the Pentateuch. *James Kugel* ("*Jubilees*, Philo and the Problem of Genesis") observes a disconnect between the Book of Genesis and the legal passages of the Torah. If the Torah is a *regula vitae* by which people steer their course in life why did it start with a narration of the creation of the world and the development of humankind? Kugel finds two different answers given to this question by Philo of Alexandria and *Jubilees* on the one hand and by a later redaction of *Jubilees* on

the other hand. The original author of *Jubilees* rewrote the text of Genesis to show that Israel was God's people independently of the Sinai covenant, as the patriarchs initiated on their own some of the things that would later become God's laws in the Torah. Genesis demonstrates thus the eternity of God's alliance with His people. Philo of Alexandria either directly or indirectly through other Alexandrian Jews learned about *Jubilees'* concept from Judeans visiting Alexandria. Philo also claims that the patriarchs' actions prefigured the laws given on Mt. Sinai. This is possible because for Philo the laws of Moses are copies of the laws of nature. Therefore Abraham was able to observe the laws of the Sinai covenant even before they were written. Different from the original text of *Jubilees* and from Philo, the *Jubilees'* interpolator turned the original message of Jubilees into a concept of divine law that existed from time immemorial in form of the heavenly tablets. The Torah had always been there, and Israel's ancestors had known and observed a good part of it long before Sinai. *Sarah Pearce* ("Philo and the *Temple Scroll* on the Prohibition of Single Testimony") engages with Philo as well. She studies his interpretation of the prohibition of single testimony in comparison with its interpretation in the *Temple Scroll*. That both Philo and the *Temple Scroll* associate the prohibition of single testimony with other laws dealing with false utterances and false testimony does not point to Philo's knowledge of the *Temple Scroll* but shows that he draws on similar interpretative traditions. *Lawrence H. Schiffman* ("Modification of Biblical Law in the *Temple Scroll*") continues the study of the *Temple Scroll's* reading of the Torah on a macro level. The *Temple Scroll* attests to an overarching *interpretation* of large parts of Pentateuchal law, which argues for a thoroughgoing reformation of the Temple, polity and much of the way of life of Judeans in the Hasmonean period. The result is a highly modified Torah-like text in which major changes were introduced into biblical legal principles and prescriptions. These modifications can be classified under the rubrics of modification of place, time, persons and the political order. *Michael Segal* ("Rewriting the Story of Dinah and Shechem: The Literary Development of *Jubilees* 30") directs our attention back to the *Book of Jubilees*. He finds a reworking in *Jubilees* 30 that is part of a larger redaction of the *Book of Jubilees*. The redaction added a chronological framework and legal passages to the book. In *Jubilees* 30, contradictions regarding Dinah's age as well as the different roles played by Jacob in the rewritten narrative and in the legal passages of this chapter confirm Segal's approach. Segal's work points to the possibility that even rewritings of Jewish Scriptures were rewritten in turn.

   Hanne von Weissenberg ("The Twelve Minor Prophets at Qumran and the Canonical Process: Amos as a 'Case Study'") provides a glimpse into the interpretative history of the prophetic books by using the Book of Amos

as a case study to demonstrate some ways in which authoritative source texts were used. In eschatological contexts, references to the Book of Amos are central for the messianic interpretations of the *Damascus Document* and of 4QFlorilegium. Similarly, the oracle of Amos 8:11 is used in the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* in a description of impending doom awaiting the wrongdoers and corrupt priests. On the textual level, the authoritative status of texts did not stop scribes from modifying their source texts according to their interpretative needs. In the *Damascus Document* (CD A 7:14–15), for instance, the "original" meaning of Amos 5:27 is turned virtually upside down.

The fourth part of our proceedings directs the attention of the reader to yet another important aspect of the overall question of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible. A large number of the texts attested in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls were composed in the late Second Temple period. That means they were written at a time when the canon of the Hebrew Bible evolved and the Masoretic Text began to become its dominant text. These Dead Sea Scrolls thus provide key information about the social structure, life and law of Judaism in a time that was of great importance for the development of the Hebrew Bible. The first two contributions inquire into the sociology of late Second Temple Judaism. *Jutta Jokiranta* ("Sociology of Jewish Life in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Seeking Steps Forward") studies three aspects of Qumran sectarianism: 1) the enterprise of having open-ended sobriquets in pesharim and other texts, 2) sectarian tensions as elements of antagonism, difference and separation, and 3) the fact that even in self-chosen isolation, membership in the Qumran movement produced virtuoso types of personalities that produced the culture that later would receive the admiration of other learned intellectuals. *Paul Heger* ("Did Enochians Exist? Answer to Boccaccini") engages with the question of the so-called Enochic Judaism which is prominently described by Gabrielle Boccaccini as an eschatological movement in Second Temple Judaism. Heger argues against the existence of an Enochic Judaism that marginalized the Torah. The author and readers of Jubilees and the Qumran writings as the closest contemporaries of the texts collected in *1 Enoch* perceived these texts as hortatory works complementing the Torah.

The next two studies by Hanna Tervanotko and Cecilia Wassen ask about the role of women in the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Hanna Tervanotko* ("'You Shall See': Rebecca's Farewell Address in 4Q364 3 ii 1-6") approaches this topic by means of an analysis of Rebecca's farewell address in 4Q364. She argues that 4Q364 3 ii 1-6 attests to a variation of Jacob's departure in Gen 28:1-5. In the 4Q364 version, Rebecca gives a farewell speech to the departing Jacob. That such a farewell address is attributed to a woman in Second Temple Jewish literature is exceptio-nal. 4Q364 3 ii 1-6 shows therefore that Jewish women had a more active role in the Second Temple

period than previously thought. This more active role of women is nuanced though by the study of *Cecilia Wassen* ("Marriage Laws in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Relation to the Broader Jewish Society"). She shows that the marital laws of the *Damascus Document* reflect the view of female sexuality of Jewish society as a whole. According to this view, which is reflected in the prohibition against a man marrying any woman who had sexual experience outside of marriage, a woman's sexuality should be closely guarded as the property of a man. But that *D* also gives evidence of the validity of women's testimony shows that women were considered reliable witnesses in Jewish society. The condemnation of polygyny and uncleniece marriages in the admonition of *D* points to the popularity of these particular marital unions in the late Second Temple Jewish society.

The last two studies of our proceedings engage with the question of law. *Lutz Doering* ("Jewish Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Issues for Consideration") surveys issues pertaining to Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He identifies four main areas of research: the relation of the Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Hebrew Bible, the relation of law to its practice and to its rhetoric, the various halakhic appraoches of the period and the questions of how concomitant halakhic differences developed. *Alexander Samely* ("Some Observations on the Literary Constitution of Legal and Ethical Discourse in Rabbinic and Qumran Texts") approaches the topic of law from a literary perspective in comparing the literary structures of both the *Temple Scroll* and *MMT* with the literary structures of Rabbinic literature. For the *Temple Scroll*, Samely finds only dissimilarities with Rabbinic literature in literary structure. Unlike Rabbinic literature, the *Temple Scroll* constitutes itself in the perspective of God speaking and promulgating law. It employs neither the conditional norm as the single most important way to thematically describe the world nor the dispute between different authorities. Unlike the *Temple Scroll*, *MMT* exhibits both similarities and dissimilarities to the literary structures of Rabbinic literature: While most of *MMT's* thematic units do not exhibit the grammar of explicit conditionals, many of them constitute effectively legal case schemata. *MMT* regularly uses a sentence structure that promotes the normative theme of the sentence to an initial, anticipating position. This format occurs occasionally also in rabbinic texts. *MMT* does not know a close thematic interdependency between adjacent case schemata as occasionally found in Rabbinic texts. Rabbinic texts using a first person perspective as framework are extremely rare. Unlike *MMT*, Rabbinic texts do not have headings and take no cognizance of their own existence as texts. Again unlike *MMT*, Rabbinic texts know no equivalent to the often quoted "you" in *MMT*.

Jerusalem/St. Andrews/Vienna, August 2011   The editors

Part 1:

The Dead Sea Scrolls and
the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible

Russell Fuller
University of San Diego

Some Thoughts on How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Changed Our Understanding of the Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its History and the Practice of Textual Criticism

We have to think in terms of both the so-called "biblical scrolls" as well as the non-biblical compositions among the Dead Sea Scrolls when considering the importance of this collection of ancient manuscripts for the study of the text of the Hebrew Bible and its history. The relevance and importance of the biblical scrolls is obvious. The Dead Sea Scrolls are the oldest biblical manuscripts in Hebrew dating from ca. 275 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.

There are approximately two hundred and thirty biblical scrolls. They provide thousands of variant readings, which must be evaluated by the textual critic, they are unavoidably important because of their language and antiquity.

If we expand our view beyond the Qumran manuscripts, then there are also additional biblical manuscripts from later time periods which are of great importance for the study of the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible and its transmission. For example, the biblical materials from Masada, the Wadi Murabba'at, and the Naḥal Ḥever to name a few. Most of the Masada biblical scrolls seem to be slightly later than the Qumran biblical scrolls and to reflect the so-called proto-Masoretic text type. The materials from Murabba'at come from the period of the Bar Kochba revolt (ca. 132–135 C.E.) and include the important scroll of the Twelve Minor Prophets which, like the Masada biblical scrolls, reflects a proto-Masoretic text type. In addition there is the important Greek scroll of the Twelve Minor Prophets from the Naḥal Ḥever. This manuscript is evidence of the revision of the older Greek translation of the Twelve based on a Hebrew text close to, but not identical to the consonantal Masoretic Text. These later biblical manuscripts from the Judean Desert are also exceedingly important in the study of the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible and the developing dominance of what eventually becomes the Masoretic Text.[1]

---

[1] See Emanuel Tov, "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *The Ancient Synagogue From Its Origins until 200 CE* (ed. Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003), 237–259.

Some of the biblical scrolls provide access to Hebrew forms of the biblical text close to or identical to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and some are antecedent to the Samaritan Pentateuch. Many of the biblical scrolls are ancestral to the medieval Masoretic Text. The biblical scrolls provide evidence of the literary development, successive literary editions, of some biblical compositions. They therefore provide evidence, which allows for the reconstruction of the history of the biblical text of at least some compositions.

The non-biblical scrolls are also frequently of importance for textual criticism as well. They enhance our knowledge and understanding of scribal practices, Hebrew and Aramaic paleography, Jewish beliefs and practices during the Second Temple period. A large number of the non-biblical scrolls are centered on scripture. Many of the non-biblical compositions are so imbued with scriptural language and ideas that they are evidence of the centrality of scripture in the thought of this Jewish sect. There are *pesharim* and commentaries, which cite the text of biblical compositions. There are rules, which cite scripture and other authoritative works. Because of their manifold focus on scripture, we are able to glean hundreds of biblical citations from the non-biblical compositions. These citations are even more useful for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible than are the citations in early church fathers or in rabbinic literature. They are in Hebrew and they are ancient. The citations reveal a similar fluidity to the form of the biblical text to that which is revealed by the biblical scrolls. Although the biblical citations are used in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible there is currently no standard set of criteria for identifying and utilizing the citations. This is an area in which discussion is needed. So, both for the citations of biblical books and for the evidence of the centrality of scripture for the sect, the non-biblical scrolls are also of relevance for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and for understanding the history of the biblical text.[2]

Both the biblical and the non-biblical scrolls provide a wealth of information on scribal practices and for the study of Hebrew paleography. We are light years beyond where we were before the discovery of the scrolls in both of these areas. It is not unreasonable to be able to date most Hebrew manuscripts to within plus or minus fifty years of their date of copying.

---

[2] See the following works on the identification of allusions and citations.
Esther Chazon, *Reworking the Bible, Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); Devorah Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apokrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling; CRINT1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990), 379–419. Especially pages 385 and 401 n. 84. Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006); Jeffery M. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *JBL* 127/2 (2008): 241–65.

The Dead Sea Scrolls provide linguistic data, which have expanded our knowledge of the Hebrew language of the Second Temple period.

The discovery and study of the Dead Sea Scrolls have enriched the ancient biblical materials available to the editors of critical editions of the Hebrew Bible. There are two critical edition projects of long standing, *Biblia Hebraica* and the *Hebrew University Bible*. Both of these are diplomatic editions based on the St. Petersburg Codex and the Aleppo Codex (where extant) respectively. Both make judicious use of readings from the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, according to their understanding of their relevance and importance. The HUB also makes limited use of biblical citations from non-biblical compositions from the Judean Desert (and rabbinic literature), although without defining criteria for the identification of citations. Recently, a new critical edition project has begun the goal of which is to produce an eclectic critical edition of the text of the Hebrew Bible. The Oxford Hebrew Bible project, led by Ronald Hendel, is motivated primarily by the recently completed publication of the biblical manuscripts from the Judean Desert. It intends to make maximum appropriate use of the Judean Desert manuscripts in the textual criticism and reconstruction of the text of the Hebrew Bible. This project is also explicitly historical in nature. The editors will reconstruct earlier literary editions of biblical compositions where warranted. Two other important projects should also be mentioned. The first, the *Biblia Qumranica* project, led by Armin Lange, is an ambitious project to produce a synoptic edition of the biblical materials from the Judean desert along side the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text.[3] The *Biblia Qumranica* could be thought of as a sort of "new Hexapla" in that it adopts the synoptic format to present the extant textual witnesses in parallel columns. The only volume currently available from this project is the Minor Prophets volume. In that edition, not only are the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text presented, but also the other extant textual witnesses in Hebrew and Greek. These include the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from the Naḥal Ḥever as well as the Qumran biblical manuscripts, the Minor Prophets scroll from Murabba'at, and a selection of pesharim, which contain citations from the Twelve. Since the *Biblia Qumranica* has adopted the synoptic format, it is probably the most user-friendly of textual tools for the textual critic or biblical scholar. Another convenient tool of interest to scholars is *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Variants* recently published by Eugene Ulrich.[4] This is a single volume edition of all the biblical

---

[3] *Biblia Qumranica*, vol. 3b: *Minor Prophets* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Kristin De Troyer; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

[4] *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Variants* (ed. Eugene Ulrich; VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

manuscripts published in the Discoveries in the Judean Desert series along with a listing of textual variants. The transcriptions are presented in biblical order for ease of consultation. This is a more affordable resource than either the Discoveries in the Judean Desert volumes or the Hebrew University Bible volumes that affords convenient access to the Qumran biblical manuscripts in a sort of critical edition.

The field of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has changed dramatically since the discovery and publication of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. It is sometimes difficult for specialists to keep up with all the developments in the study of this large collection of material. What does the field of textual criticism look like to a non-specialist? How does the conscientious, well trained scholar of the Hebrew Bible approach textual criticism now, when the publication and study of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls has changed the field so much?

1. Complexity

I will begin with textual criticism. Things are much more complicated than they used to be. We have approximately 230 biblical manuscripts from the Judean Desert, which provide at least partial witness to the text of every book in the Hebrew Bible with the well-known exception of Esther. These manuscripts are the earliest witnesses to the Hebrew text of biblical books. Because of their age and language, they are unavoidably important and they can be very difficult to work with.

With a few well-known exceptions, like 1QIsaiah[a], the majority of the scrolls are very fragmentary. This can make understanding their relationships to other textual witnesses difficult to parse and make it difficult to reconstruct readings. Scribal hands are not always easy to decipher. There are very many different scribal hands. Many letters are easily confused such as *yod/waw*, *dalet/resh*, *mem/bet/kaf*. Even experts can disagree on the reading of these texts, so what is the biblical scholar without expertise in working with the scrolls to do?

2. Variants

There is no shortage of variants. It is not always a simple task to decide the relative importance of the readings gleaned from the biblical scrolls. Not all variants are of equal importance for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. For example, for many biblical scholars orthographic variants are of

little consequence. In the production of critical editions orthography is one of the "accidentals" of the text. Spelling practices varied over time and so these differences are unimportant. Substantive readings are of importance in textual criticism. However, for other scholars the orthography of a scroll may point to its provenance and be indicative of textual affiliation.[5]

The relationships among textual witnesses are complex. We have forever left behind the days prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls when one only had to worry about a few major witnesses to the text: the MT, the LXX, the SP, the Nash Papyrus. Now we have over two hundred biblical manuscripts and in addition a great many biblical citations from non-biblical compositions, most of which are in Hebrew. We are striving to move beyond the concepts and terminology that were influenced by or grew out of the pre-Qumran era. This is a work in progress. There is a tendency toward two models, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Some scholars see the Masoretic Text as the end result of a chain of tradition, which may be traced back to manuscripts, which were copied by "conservative" scribes during the Second Temple period. That is to say, these "proto-Masoretic" manuscripts were carefully copied to high standards. Some scholars suggest that these manuscripts were the product of the scribes of the Jerusalem temple and that they are evidence of official copies of manuscripts, which are directly ancestral to the Masoretic Text.

Other scholars emphasize the fluid state of the text of biblical compositions in the Second temple period. There is evidence of successive literary editions of some biblical books, most famously Jeremiah. The texts ancestral to the Masoretic text, according to this view, were not in a privileged or central position vis a vis other copies of the biblical text. There was no official text, even in the Jerusalem temple.[6]

Clearly, for the non-specialist, the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and the history of the biblical text and the development of the canon have become very complex areas of study. I suspect that some biblical scholars shy away from these areas of study because of this complexity. The large amount of data, that is, the great number of biblical manuscripts available, the technical difficulties in the study of these areas, and the diversity of expert understandings of the important issues in the field, tends to make the non-specialist long for simpler days and perhaps to avoid textual criticism as much as possible.

---

[5] See for example the data presented in support of Tov's theory of scrolls written in the *Qumran Practice* in, Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

[6] See conveniently Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

As our knowledge and understanding increase, the complexity of the field also increases. This is as unavoidable as the second law of thermodynamics. I think that, as specialists, we need to do our best to make the field as accessible to non-specialists as possible. Perhaps our field is at a point where we need a standard introduction to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and their use in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, which is aimed at the scholar of the Hebrew Bible who is not a specialist in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Arie van der Kooij

Leiden University

Preservation and Promulgation

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible

1.

In her contribution dealing with theories in the field of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible,[1] White Crawford distinguishes between two scribal traditions, "the conservative scribal tradition," and "the revisionist scribal tradition". She does so in line with Ulrich and Tov. According to the former, "Second Temple scribes worked along two lines simultaneously. One line copied the text in front of them exactly, while the other, more creative line reworked the text for the purpose of exegesis". Tov too speaks of two basic approaches in the Second Temple period, one "free" and one "conservative". I agree with this picture, which is of course a rough one, but which nevertheless seems to do justice to the textual data. Instead of using the term "revisionist" I would prefer, however, the more neutral and general term "free," allowing for a wide range of types of copies, from a careful way up to a creative one by e.g. revising and reworking a given source.

The assumption of these two approaches evokes two related issues which are part of the current scholarly debate:

(A) Which texts found at Qumran and elsewhere do we consider reflecting the conservative approach of copying?

(B) What does the assumption of a conservative approach of copying mean to the theory of multiformity and fluidity of texts?

As to A, scholars (Tov and others) subscribe to the view that the texts of the conservative type belonged to the protoMT tradition, but White Crawford is criticizing this idea because, she argues, the two terms – "conservative" and "revisionist" – "allow us to discard any reference to M, S, and G." However, if the conservative type of text should not be linked with the protoMT text tradition, the question arises on which other grounds a given textform might be labeled "conservative." In her view, since MT texts of Jeremiah and Ezekiel represent longer, expanded editions, "it is not helpful to speak of a proto-Masoretic group or family at the beginning of the pro-

---

[1] Sidnie White Crawford, "The Contribution of the Non-Aligned Texts to Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: A New Proposal," in this volume (60-69).