

the Hebrew Tetragrammaton. The evidence suggests that this had become the practice of Christian scribes perhaps as early as the beginning of the 2d century. Curiously, the surrogates for the Tetragrammaton have been abbreviated by the writing of their first and last letters only and are marked as abbreviations by a horizontal stroke above the word. Thus, for example, the word for "Lord" is written $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ and for God $\overline{TH\bar{S}}$. These two so-called *nomina sacra*, later to be joined by thirteen other sacred words, appear also in the earliest copies of the NT, including its quotations from the Greek OT. The practice, therefore, in very early times was consistently followed throughout the Greek Bible.

A conjecture is that the forms $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ and $\overline{TH\bar{S}}$ were first created by non-Jewish Christian scribes who in their copying the LXX text found no traditional reason to preserve the Tetragrammaton. In all probability it was problematic for gentile scribes to write the Tetragrammaton since they did not know Hebrew. If this is correct, the contracted surrogates $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ and $\overline{TH\bar{S}}$ were perhaps considered analogous to the vowelless Hebrew Divine Name, and were certainly much easier to write.

Once the practice of writing the Tetragrammaton into copies of the Greek OT was abandoned and replaced by the practice of writing $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ and $\overline{TH\bar{S}}$, a similar development no doubt took place in regard to the quotations of the Greek OT found in the NT. There too the Tetragrammaton was replaced by the surrogates $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ and $\overline{TH\bar{S}}$. In the passing of time, the original significance of the surrogates was lost to the gentile Church. Other contracted words which had no connection with the Tetragrammaton were added to the list of *nomina sacra*, and eventually even $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ and $\overline{TH\bar{S}}$ came to be used in passages where the Tetragrammaton had never stood.

It is possible that some confusion ensued from the abandonment of the Tetragrammaton in the NT, although the significance of this confusion can only be conjectured. In all probability it became difficult to know whether $\overline{K\bar{S}}$ referred to the Lord God or the Lord Jesus Christ. That this issue played a role in the later Trinitarian debates, however, is unknown.

Bibliography

- Barthélemy, D. 1953. Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante. *RB* 60: 18–29.
- . 1963. *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégral du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète*. Leiden.
- Dunand, F. 1966. *Papyrus grec bibliques (Papyrus F. Inv. 266) Volumina de la Genèse et du Deutéronome*. Cairo.
- Howard, G. 1971. The Oldest Greek Text of Deuteronomy. *HUCA* 42: 125–31.
- . 1977. The Tetragram and the New Testament. *JBL* 96: 63–83.
- . 1978. The Name of God in the New Testament. *BAR* 4: 12–14, 56.
- . 1987. *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text*. Macon, GA.
- Paap, A. H. R. E. 1959. *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.* Leiden.
- Pietersma, A. 1984. Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint. Pp. 85–101 in *De Septuaginta*, ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox. Toronto.

Skehan, P. W. 1957. The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism. Pp. 148–60 in *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956*. Leiden.

———. 1980. The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint. *BIOSCS* 13: 14–44.

Traube, L. 1907. *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung*. Munich.

Waddell, W. G. 1944. The Tetragrammaton in the LXX. *JTS* 45: 158–61.

GEORGE HOWARD

TETRARCH [Gk *tetrarcheō*; *tetrarchēs*]. See PALESTINE, ADMINISTRATION OF (ROMAN).

TETTER. See LEPROSY.

TEXTS. Articles on texts, other than the biblical texts, may be found under EBLA TEXTS; HITTITE TEXTS AND LITERATURE; MARI (TEXTS); NAG HAMMADI CODICES; UGARIT (TEXTS AND LITERATURE); and WADI MURABBAT (TEXTS). See also LETTERS; and EPIGRAPHY, TRANSJORDANIAN.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM. The name given to the critical study of ancient manuscripts and versions of texts, for the purpose of ascertaining a correct reading of the text. Textual criticism has been applied to both the Hebrew Bible and the Christian New Testament.

OLD TESTAMENT

The goal of OT textual criticism is to analyze and evaluate the data representing the text of the Hebrew Bible and to trace in broad outline the history of this text. For that purpose it collects the relevant data from the Hebrew sources and reconstructs them from the ancient translations (versions). At the same time it examines these data critically by comparing them with parallel material in the MT (see E.3 below). For general summaries and descriptions of OT textual criticism, see Deist 1978; Klein 1974; McCarter 1986; Roberts 1951; Weingreen 1982; and Würthwein 1979).

- A. Introduction
 1. Nature and Goals of Textual Criticism
 2. Need for and Importance of Textual Criticism
 3. History of Investigation
- B. Textual Witnesses
 1. The Proto-Masoretic Texts and the MT
 2. Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch
 3. The Qumran Texts
 4. Additional Hebrew Sources
 5. Ancient Versions
 - a. Text-Critical Use of Versions
 - b. The Septuagint (LXX)
 - c. Peshitta
 - d. The Targums
 - e. The Vulgate

- C. Textual History
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Relationship between Textual Witnesses
 - 3. Research Before 1947
 - 4. More Recent Research
- D. Copying and Transmission of the Text
 - 1. Sources of Information
 - 2. Outward Form
 - 3. *Matres Lectionis*
 - 4. The Background of Textual Variations
- E. The Procedure of Textual Criticism
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Collation and Conjectural Reconstruction of Hebrew Variants
 - 3. Evaluation of Readings
 - 4. Conjectures
- F. Textual and Literary Criticism

A. Introduction

1. Nature and Goals of Textual Criticism. At some point scholars have to form an opinion on the question of whether or not there once existed an (one) original textual form ("Ur-text") or several pristine forms of the biblical books; if either of these questions is answered in the positive, one then has to express an opinion regarding the nature of that (or those) original text(s). To determine one's position with regard to that text is important not only for abstract scholarly purposes, but also for obtaining clarity regarding the very nature of the textual procedure (described in section E below).

The majority opinion holds that there once existed an Ur-text, although often the implications of such an assumption have not been thoroughly considered. Given the present state of knowledge, the assumption of an Ur-text is the most logical one, especially because the alternative (multiple "original" text forms) cannot be substantiated. The existence of synonymous readings or cases in which the original reading cannot be determined does not undermine the correctness of this supposition as much as it reflects our own inability to reconstruct the original text. The reconstruction of elements in the assumed Ur-text thus remains one of the aims of the textual critic, even if it is virtually impossible to determine what stage in the development of a given biblical book should be called the Ur-text.

Since literary (or "higher") criticism deals, inter alia, with the literary growth of the books, and since textual (often wrongly called "lower") criticism deals with the transmission of that finished text, we may consider the Ur-text broadly to be the finished literary product which stood at the beginning of the stage of textual transmission; textual criticism thus aims for the reconstruction of that text. (For complications deriving from this definition, see section F.) Several scholars, for example Greenberg (1978) and Talmon (*CHB* 1: 162), do not accept the assumption of an Ur-text, but rather think in terms of several parallel pristine texts.

The nature of OT textual criticism is best seen by comparing it with that of other works of literature. Such a comparison shows that the textual criticism of the OT has its own character in the following respects:

(a) In contrast to the textual criticism applied to many

other works of literature, that pertaining to the OT does not seek to reconstruct the original form of the *complete* text of the biblical books, much less to determine the *ipsissima verba* of the authors of these books (the same holds true for the criticism of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, works which supposedly went through a similar literary history). The most that could be achieved would be to reconstruct *elements* of the Ur-text. Some scholars define the aim of textual criticism in a seemingly more modest way, referring to the OT text current in a particular period (usually the 4th or 3d century B.C.). The recovery of that stage of the text would represent a more realistic goal than recovering the end product of the literary growth. However, this definition in fact is not more modest, since at that period the biblical text was current in different forms which cannot be reconstructed. Adherents of the "oral tradition" theory are compelled to work with a broader definition of the goals of OT textual criticism, because in their view the books of the OT never existed in one original text but only in various oral formulations (see Nyberg 1935; van der Ploeg 1947).

(b) It is often thought that textual criticism aims to produce "eclectic" editions of the texts studied, that is, editions that attempt to reconstruct the original text of the composition through a selection of readings from various sources. For theoretical as well as practical reasons this cannot be the task of OT textual criticism, because not all scholars agree that at one time there existed an original text of a biblical book; and even if such had existed, practical problems make its reconstruction difficult (see further B.5.a below).

Because of these problems, most of the existing critical editions of the OT are not eclectic but "diplomatic"; that is, they reproduce a particular form of the *textus receptus* ("received text") of the OT as the base text, while recording divergent readings (or "variants") from Hebrew and non-Hebrew sources in an accompanying critical apparatus. In contrast, most modern translations of the OT are by nature eclectic: while adhering basically to the MT, they often replace some MT readings with parallel ones from the versions (mainly the LXX) and the Qumran scrolls.

2. Need for and Importance of Textual Criticism. The realization that the OT must be examined text-critically is relatively new. It has come about slowly through the discovery of new sources and through an increase in critical awareness. Meanwhile the necessity of a text-critical analysis of the OT should be justified not only on the basis of historical considerations but also in view of the internal differences between the various sources of the OT text.

a. Internal Differences between Editions and MSS. Except in the case of photographic reproductions of the same text, no two printed editions of the Hebrew Bible are identical. The differences among them generally have to do with minimal, even minute, details of the text (single consonants, vowel signs, accents, text arrangement, numbering of verses, division into chapters and verses, Masoretic notes). In a few cases, however, they concern entire words (e.g., some editions of Prov 8:16 read *sedeq*, "righteousness," but others *'āres*, "earth"). Older printed editions contain several misprints, and this is even true of many modern editions. Thus, some printings of the much-used 1852 Letteris edition read *mošet* (a nonexistent word)

instead of *mošeh* (Moses) in Num 11:30, and *šālahtā* (wrong spelling of "you sent") instead of *šālahtā* ("you sent") in Jer 29:25. Even the most "accurate" edition, the 1984 printing of *BHS*, contains several misprints and inaccuracies.

Disregarding these printing errors, most variations between the printed editions go back to differences in the mss on which they are based. With the exception of the chapter and verse divisions, which are not found in them, these mss differ from each other in the same manner as the printed editions referred to above. To be exact, the differences between the Masoretic mss (see B.1 below) are small, while older sources such as the Qumran scrolls often display major variations among themselves (see D.4 below).

b. Differences between Inner-Masoretic Parallel Texts.

In parallel versions of one biblical source—such as 2 Samuel 22 and Psalm 18, Psalms 14 and 53, and in large sections of the books of Samuel–Kings and 1–2 Chronicles (see Vannutelli 1931–34; Bendavid 1972)—it is possible to notice many textual differences representing variants that originated in an early stage of the history of the text. These textual variations, distinct from redactional, linguistic, and stylistic changes, give a good idea of the relationship between the texts in a very early stage of the transmission (for examples, see section D below). It is exactly these parallel biblical passages that have prompted the development of OT textual criticism precisely because they necessitated the comparison of texts.

3. History of Investigation. Not only the comparison of parallel texts in the OT but also the differences among the Masoretic mss and the independent analytical examination of the MT led very early to the conclusion that the biblical text is corrupt in a number of places. This conclusion provoked many theological and philological discussions in the 17th and 18th centuries about the authority of MT as well as that of the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sam. Pent.).

The first rather complete analyses of the OT text are those of J. Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicae de hebraei graecique textus sinceritate* (1633, 1660), and L. Cappellus, *Critica sacra* (1650, 1675–78). After the middle of the 17th century there appeared a great many treatises on the OT text, though it should be noted that in this and the following century the borderline between textual criticism and theology is often vague. Scholars at that time involved in the critical study of the OT text included Buxtorf, Hottinger, Morinus, Cappellus, Spinoza, Richard Simon, Houbigant, Kennicott, and de Rossi. The works of these scholars have been described in detail by Rosenmüller (1797), Keil (1859), and Barthélemy (1982: 1–63). Of the many names that could be mentioned from the 19th century, de Lagarde, Perles, Cornill, and Wellhausen are noteworthy because of their remarkable insights into textual criticism.

In many areas of OT textual criticism it is often best to start with older works, since in textual criticism (called an art by some and a science by others) an intuitive grasp of the issues underlying divergent texts is just as important as recently discovered data: Wellhausen (in his 1871 commentary on Samuel), König (1893), and Steuernagel (1912: 19–85) in particular all exhibited that kind of intuition. At the same time, the modern description of OT textual criticism will differ significantly from earlier dis-

cussions because of the relevance of the newly discovered Qumran scrolls to almost every aspect of textual criticism.

B. Textual Witnesses

There are many witnesses to the biblical text, both in Hebrew and in other languages. Of these, the Hebrew sources are the easiest to analyze, while those in the other ancient languages must first be retranslated into Hebrew. (The relation between these witnesses is discussed below in C.2.) For obvious reasons the analysis proceeds from the Hebrew sources (especially the MT) since, as the "received text" within Judaism and Christianity, it is the primary object of scholarly attention. Even though our discussion begins with this "received" text, it is important to remember that the MT is not intrinsically "better" than the other texts.

Until the middle of the 20th century the earliest witness to the Hebrew text was the so-called Nash papyrus from the 1st or 2d century A.D. (actually a liturgical text), containing a combined version of the Exodus and Deuteronomy texts of the Decalog. But textual research underwent very significant changes with the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. This new material now must occupy the center of modern descriptions of the biblical text.

1. The Proto-Masoretic Texts and the MT. The MT of the Hebrew Bible, so named because of the subsequent addition of the Masorah to the consonantal framework, does not in fact exist in any one source and may never have existed as one textual unit. Rather, different manifestations of that textual form are known, so that it would be more correct to speak of a group of "Masoretic Texts." Like most of the witnesses to be discussed below, the content of the MT cannot be characterized in general terms, so that one must be content with describing the MT as a "text." This text was perpetuated by influential circles in Judaism (the Pharisees?); some scholars believed they also partly created this text, although there is little evidence in favor of this. Socioreligious reasons thus made the MT the most significant of the biblical texts. See MASORETIC TEXT.

The MT resulted from a combination of five elements: (1) the consonantal text; (2) certain para-textual elements; (3) the Masorah itself; (4) a vocalization scheme; and (5) cantillation signs (each is discussed below). The word "Masorah" generally refers to the latter four elements; however, in the technical sense of the word "Masorah" refers only to one of the elements, a specific type of apparatus written around the text (B.1.d below).

a. The Masoretes. The Masorah was prepared in the period between A.D. 500 and 1000 by succeeding generations of scribes who occupied themselves with the transmission of the biblical text. Little is known of the background of these Masoretes. In their composition of the Masorah, they built on the work of earlier generations of *sōpērīm*, which literally means "scribes," but has also been reinterpreted as "men who occupied themselves with counting [*spr*]" the letters and words of the consonantal text of Scripture (b. *Qidd.* 30a). According to tradition, the copying of the Pentateuch started with Ezra, who is called a *sōpēr mähār* ("fast writer") in Ezra 7:6 and is considered the *sōpēr* par excellence in rabbinic tradition.

The Masoretes not only transmitted the consonantal

text, but also devised vocalization and accent systems for it. Their labor had both technical and creative aspects; technical insofar as it concerned the mechanics of copying and counting letters, words, and verses; creative insofar as it concerned the invention of a scheme for recording vocalization and accents. While doing this, the Masoretes also formed mechanisms to assure that special care would be exercised in the transmission of the text; the word "Masorah" in its technical sense refers only to these latter mechanisms. See MASORETES.

b. The Consonantal Text. The received consonantal text preceded the one that includes the vocalization and accents. Both of these circulated in many slightly deviating forms, and were finally stabilized only with the advent of the printed Rabbinic Bible toward the end of the 15th century (see B.1.g below). However, earlier forms of the MT come close to such a stabilization. The earliest attestations of the consonantal framework of the MT—found in many, but not all, Qumran texts—date to around 250 B.C. Their resemblance (especially 1QIsa^b) to the medieval form of the MT is striking, showing how accurate the transmission of the MT was through the ages. These earliest attestations are called "proto-Masoretic" since their consonantal framework formed the basis for the later Masoretic mss.

Although most of the preserved biblical texts reflect the MT, we also know of several sources current before A.D. 70 that reflect substantial deviations from the MT: these include the LXX, the proto-Samaritan sources, the Sam. Pent., and various Qumran scrolls. Afterward, the MT became virtually the sole witness to the biblical text, challenged only by the continual use of the Sam. Pent. and the LXX. Furthermore, the biblical quotations preserved in Talmudic literature and in the *piyyûtim* (liturgical hymns) generally reflect the MT, although sometimes they deviate from it in details. These differences were examined in great detail by Aptowitzer (1906–15), and especially due to the influence of Kahle (see C.3 below) their significance and number have generally been exaggerated (since the majority of the quotations actually agree with MT).

The ensemble of the Masoretic mss constitutes a distinct group, even though no single extant mss is entirely identical with any other. The work of copying, certainly in earlier times, always created variations between the basic text and the copy. Furthermore, though the consonantal text was already consolidated in the 1st and 2d centuries A.D., all the mss from that period onward differ from each other in numerous details, more so in the early centuries than in the medieval period.

In the description of the development of the consonantal text underlying the MT, three periods can be distinguished, although they cannot be clearly demarcated due to insufficient information. The first period ended with the destruction of the Second Temple. The proto-Masoretic mss of this period, mainly from Qumran (150 B.C.–68 A.D.) and Masada (until 73 A.D.), comprise a tightly closed group, almost identical in content with the medieval sources. At this early period one may still find differences between the various sources in words and phrases, discernible, for example, from a comparison of 1QIsa^b and other Qumran texts or medieval sources. Talmudic and later rabbinic literature have preserved other early variants. Still

other early variants are found in the Masoretic *madinḥaʿe* and *maʿarbaʿe* readings (see B.1.d below) and in the Masoretic handbook *Minḥat Shay*.

The second period begins with the destruction of the Second Temple and ends in the 8th century, most of the evidence coming from the beginning and toward the end of the period. The scrolls from Wādī Murabbaʿat and Naḥal Ḥever in the Judean desert (antedating 132–35 A.D.) are the best witnesses for the beginning of the period. Most of these sources (such as the Minor Prophets scroll from Wādī Murabbaʿat) are virtually identical with the medieval ones, although there are differences in small details. Non-Hebrew sources from this period include the Greek translations by Kaige-Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus, the Aramaic Targums, and the Vulgate (on all these, see B.5 below). From the end of this period come the earliest documents from the Cairo Genizah.

The third period begins in the 8th century and continues until the 12th century. The earliest dated Masoretic mss proper are from the 9th century, and are characterized by the introduction of vocalization, cantillation signs, and the Masorah. The consonantal texts of the individual codices are virtually identical.

At the end of the first stage of the development of the MT a conscious attempt was made not to insert any more changes in the text and to transmit the text as precisely as possible. However, since a variety of texts already existed within the proto-Masoretic group, the presence of textual variants could not be avoided, so the idea of textual uniformity remained an abstract ideal. The variants current in this first period as well as in the second one are mainly from earlier textual traditions and often can still be found in non-Masoretic sources such as the LXX and Qumran texts.

In contrast, the vocalized "Masoretic" mss of the third period preserved only a few variants deriving from earlier periods. Almost all variants from this period resulted from errors stemming from the frequent copying of mss in the Middle Ages. A good description of the typical characteristics of medieval mss is given by Goshen-Gottstein (1975). For the text-critical study of these mss it is important to remember that they are not to be regarded as one single source, as is often assumed in scholarship. Every individual ms must be compared separately with non-Masoretic sources, and in that way some mss (those denoted as 30, 93, 96, 150 by Kennicott) will be recognized as containing more substantial variants than others. Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that the medieval mss are to be subdivided into independent geographical groups (Italy, Germany, France, Spain), of which the group from Spain contains more ancient variants than others (Cohen 1973). Nevertheless, the consonantal text of no single ms is significantly of greater importance than that of any other one. The variants in the medieval (12th century and later) mss were collected by B. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus I-II* (Oxford, 1776–80), and J. B. de Rossi, *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti I-IV* (Parma, 1784–88; repr. Amsterdam, 1969). A summary edition that includes the variants of these two collections was published in 1818 by J. C. Döderlein and J. H. Meisner. The more recent editions of C. D. Ginsburg (*The Twenty-four Sacred Books* . . . [London, 1896]), the BHS, and *The Hebrew*

University Bible (see E.2 below) also quote from older medieval mss.

c. Para-textual Elements. Once it became unacceptable to make any more changes to the biblical text, the earliest generations of the *sôpêrîm* directed their activities toward accurately recording all the peculiarities in their mss. These peculiarities attested early scribal practices also reflected in the Qumran scrolls and in Hellenistic scribal traditions. (For a detailed description of these elements, see Ginsburg 1897.) The most important practices were associated with the following six phenomena:

(1) **Paragraphs.** With painstaking care the Masoretes transmitted the division of the text into paragraphs (Heb *pārāšâ*, pl. *pārāšîyyôt*), which resembled the system now also attested in most Qumran texts. They distinguished between small textual units separated from each other by open spaces between verses within the line (*pārāšâ sētûmâ*, "closed section," indicated with the letter *samek*), and larger textual units separated from each other by spaces that leave the whole remaining line blank (*pārāšâ pētûhâ*, "open section," indicated with the letter *pe*). The Masoretes also indirectly indicated versification (with the *silluq* accent), following an ancient tradition indicated (by spaces) in a few Qumran texts (1QLev, 4QDan a,c) and in several Greek texts such as 8HevXII. (The actual *numbering* of the verses was accomplished only in the 13th century.)

(2) **Inverted Nuns.** The original purpose of these signs (found mainly before and after Num 10:35–36) was to indicate that the passage does not belong in the present context (cf. *Sipre* 84 on Num 10:35). In the Masoretic tradition these signs developed into that of inverted *nuns*, but originally they had the form of a sigma [Ⲛ] and an antisigma [Ⲛ̄], also found in 11QpaleoLev, 1QS, 1QM, and in the writings of the Alexandrian textual critics indicating elements that did not belong to the text. These are the forerunners of our modern parentheses.

(3) **Puncta Extraordinaria.** Supralinear (occasionally in combination with infralinear) points are found in fifteen places in the OT (e.g., Gen 33:4; Ps 27:13). While these points originated from scribal notations indicating that the elements thus highlighted should be deleted (a convention used in many Qumran texts), within the Masoretic corpus these symbols were reappropriated to indicate doubtful letters (cf. Butin 1906 and Talmon [in the 1969 reprint of Butin 1906] *apud* Butin and the explanation in *ʿAbot R. Nat.*, version A, 34). Similar signs are found in Hellenistic texts (cf. Lieberman 1962: 43–46).

(4) **Suspended Letters (Litterae Suspensae).** In the mss some letters are intentionally placed higher than those around them (i.e., "superscripted" between surrounding letters). A good example is the suspended *nun* in Judg 18:30, where the text with the *nun* is read *mnšh* (Manasseh) or without the *nun* as *mšh* (Moses). As in the Qumran texts, the suspended letters indicate later additions, which nevertheless were transmitted as such in the MT.

(5) **Special Letters.** The special form of some letters directs the reader's attention to details that were important for the Masoretes, such as the middle letter or word in a book. For a *littera minuscula* see Gen 2:4; for a *littera majuscula*, see Lev 13:33. In other instances imperfectly written letters are indicated especially.

(6) **Tiqqûnê sôpêrîm (Emendations of the Scribes).** This

phenomenon is not a para-textual element per se but rather is part of the *Masorah parva*. The term refers to words (18 or 11 depending on the sources; the oldest source is the *Mekilta* on Exod 15:7) that tradition says were changed by the *sôpêrîm*; e.g., "my wickedness" (Num 11:15 MT) replaced an original reading "your wickedness." All supposed emendations concern minor changes in words that the *sôpêrîm* deemed inappropriate for God or (in one instance) Moses (Num 12:12). In some sources these corrections are called *kinnûyê sôpêrîm* ("euphemisms of the scribes"), implying that the *sôpêrîm* had a different understanding of these words without, however, changing the text itself. See also SCRIBAL EMENDATIONS; BIBLE, EUPHEMISM AND DYSPEMISM IN THE. Many details in the list of *tiqqûnîm* are dubious. Nevertheless, it is considered likely that theological alterations have been made in the text (see D.4 below), even though the specific *tiqqûnê sôpêrîm* which have been transmitted may not give the best examples of this process (see McCarthy 1981).

d. The Masorah. The desire of the Masoretes to transmit the text as precisely as possible is manifested in a corpus of literature which was especially designed for this purpose (see Leiman 1974). These mechanisms actually developed far beyond the original intent into collections of notes written not only alongside the text but also in separate volumes of detailed observations on the biblical text (especially observations about orthography, since the scribes were most likely to err in these details).

The *Masorah* (literally, "transmission" or "tradition") in the narrow sense of the word is an apparatus of references and remarks written around the text about (especially orthographic) details in the biblical text. It was composed to facilitate the accurate transmission of the text. The best-known and most influential *Masorah* is the Tiberian (see Yeivin 1980). See also MASORAH.

The *Masorah parva* (or "smaller *Masorah*"), written in the margins between columns, contains observations about the number of times a word (or phrase) occurs in a given spelling in a biblical book or in the OT as a whole. The remarks pertain only to the orthography of words whose spelling deviates from the rules devised by the Masoretes themselves. The notes constituting the *Masorah parva* are often inconsistent or inaccurate. This results from the fact that it was initially transmitted alongside of its companion biblical manuscript, and consequently several forms of the *Masorah* circulated, each accompanying its own manuscript (subsequently, *Masorah* could be transcribed onto the margins of mss to which they originally did not apply).

Three groups of notations associated with the *Masorah parva* are especially important. The first group of notations designates words that should be read (*qêrê*) instead of the ones written (*kêtib*) in the text; for example, in Jer 2:24, *napšô* (K) should be read *napšâ* (Q). Earlier mss indicated the presence of a Qere by a sign in the margin (a vertical line resembling a final *nun*); in later mss the Qere was indicated by the letter *qop* (for Qere). In most mss and printed editions the consonantal text of the *Kethib* is pointed with the vowels of the Qere, while the marginal Qere itself remains unvocalized. In some cases whole words were "written but not read" (*kêtib wêlâ' qêrê*) and others "read but not written" (*qêrê wêlâ' kêtib*). See KETHIB AND QERE.

The Qere words can be subdivided in different ways, but it should be remembered that most Qere words differ only in one letter from the corresponding Kethib. The classification and analysis of Gordis (1971) is the best modern introduction to the problem of the Kethib and Qere. Opinions vary about whether the Qere represents a Masoretic "correction," a textual variant, or something else. The Masoretes themselves seem to have regarded the Qere as a correction of the Kethib, and therefore in their reading the Kethib was to be ignored. In line with this tradition, some modern scholars maintain that all Qere words were indeed intended as a correction of the Kethib. For the following reasons, however, this seems doubtful: (1) some (types of) words that constitute the Qere word in one verse are the Kethib word in other verses; (2) every category of Qere words contains instances that are not "corrected" elsewhere; and (3) in some passages the Qere words are grammatically impossible or contextually awkward, and therefore hardly constitute "improvements." Gordis' statistics show that as a rule, the Qere and Kethib are equal in value and that the Kethib sometimes offers a better reading than the Qere. For that reason, other scholars believe that all the Qere words were originally textual variants—differing in one or two consonants—that subsequently came to be regarded as corrections since they had been written in the margin. Gordis offers a middle course between these two views by suggesting two stages in the development of the Qere. Initially, the Qere was intended as a correction, particularly to discourage blasphemy, such as the *Qere perpetuum* (the constant Qere) of the written Tetragrammaton (YHWH) to be read as *ʾādōnāy*. Subsequently, the already existing system of incorporating corrections as marginal notes was also used to preserve for posterity deviant/variant readings. Still later, all these marginal notes came to be (mis)understood as corrections. Recently, Barr (1981) suggested that the Qere words originated in the "reading tradition" because there is never more than one Qere word.

The second group of notations associated with the *Masorah parva* is indicated by the notation *šēbīrīn*, followed by an almost identical word (e.g., *mmnw/mmnh* in Judg 11:34). The *šēbīrīn* notations closely resemble those of the Qere; indeed, various words indicated as Qere in some mss are indicated as *šēbīrīn* in others. The term is an abbreviation of *šēbīrīn wēmaʿīn*, i.e., "one might think" (*sbr*) that x should be read instead of y, but that is a "wrong assumption" (*maʿīn*).

Third, the *Masorah parva* mentions some 250 consonantal variants between Palestinian (*maʿarbāʿē*, or "western") and Babylonian (*mādināʿē*, or "eastern") readings.

The *Masorah magna* (or "larger Masorah"), written in the spaces above and beneath columns (and sometimes in the margins), mentions the exact verses the *Masorah parva* refers to.

e. Vocalization. Vocalization and accents were added to the consonantal text of MT at a relatively late stage. This additional layer of information is known only from the MT, but is similar to the tradition of reading the Sam. Pent. During the Middle Ages the Samaritans developed a system of vocalization, but the mss of the Sam. Pent. remain without systematic vocalization. The problems which in the MT were addressed by the added vocalization

were solved 1,000 years earlier in a different way in the scrolls written in the "Qumran system" of spelling, where an extremely full spelling facilitated the vocalized reading.

The purpose of vocalization was to solidify the reading of the text in a fixed written form on the basis of the oral tradition which had been stable in antiquity (note the large amount of agreement between the content of the Masoretic vocalization and the text presupposed by the LXX). As with all other forms of reading (vocalization), the Masoretic system reflects the exegesis of the Masoretes, although the greater part of it is based on earlier traditions.

The modern editions reproduce (with internal differences) the *textus receptus* both of the consonants and of the vocalization. This is also true of most mss, but recent findings and studies have shown that this *textus receptus* is only one of many systems. (For the history of vocalization and the different systems, see MASORETIC ACCENTS.)

(1) The Tiberian Vocalization. Of the various vocalization systems, the Tiberian has become the most widely accepted. More and more details of the other systems (Palestinian, Babylonian) are becoming known through the discovery of such mss, especially from the Cairo Geniza (a storeroom for sacred writings) discovered at the end of the last century, and from Yemenite mss preserved through the ages by the Yemenite community. The differences between these systems pertain to pronunciation, the graphic form of the vowel markers, and the conception of basic linguistic entities such as the *matres lectionis* and the *šēwā*. The Tiberian vocalization found in mss dating from A.D. 850 to 1100 is of greater importance for the reconstruction of the vocalization systems than those of the later mss, since the earlier sources (the Aleppo codex; codex Leningrad B 19a; the Cairo manuscript of the Prophets; British Museum Or. 4445; Sassoon 507, 1053; and various mss from the collection of Firkowitch in Leningrad) indicate the original systems of the Masoretes (sometimes inserted by them), while the later sources have been contaminated in the course of the transmission.

In the circles that occupied themselves with the vocalization of the biblical text from the 8th to the 10th century A.D. in Tiberias, the most prominent families were those of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. The Ben-Asher system was later accepted universally, while that of Ben-Naphtali came into disuse. It is not known whether any of the transmitted mss offer a purely Ben-Naphtali tradition; hence not all details about this system of vocalization are known, even though one learns much from the "variants" between it and Ben-Asher (see Lipschütz 1965).

In the Ben-Asher family, the most developed system is that devised by the last grammarian of that family, Aharon ben-Moshe ben-Asher (ca. 925). It was once assumed that the Second Rabbinic Bible contained the text of Ben-Asher, although now it seems that this edition contained an eclectic text from various mss (see Penkower 1982) and that in the preparation of this text the editor was often guided by his own grammatical rules (e.g., with respect to the *metheg*, the sign for secondary emphasis). Most scholars today believe that codex Leningrad B 19a (A.D. 1009) is the best complete representative of the Ben-Asher text; hence the *Biblia Hebraica* (BHK) and *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) are based on this codex. Many, however, have recognized that the Aleppo codex is the most authentic rep-

representative of the Ben-Asher tradition, because this codex was vocalized and supplied with Masorah by Aharon ben-Moshe himself. The fame of this manuscript must be attributed largely to Maimonides, who declared it to be the authoritative text of the Bible. Kept for centuries by the Jewish congregation of Aleppo (Syria), this ms was thought to have been lost in a fire in 1948; in fact, only the pentateuchal portion was lost while the other books were saved. A facsimile edition of the surviving part of the Aleppo codex was published by Goshen-Gottstein in 1976; its vocalization is described in detail by Yeivin (1968). This codex is the basis for the edition of the *Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP)*.

(2) The Character of the Masoretic Vocalization. Transcriptions of biblical texts in the second column of the Hexapla and in Jerome's Bible commentaries often present traditions that differ from the Masoretic vocalization devised much later. Because of these data, several scholars (esp. Kahle 1959: 149–88) have contended that the Masoretic vocalization reflects a late artificial system created by the Masoretes themselves, who rejected earlier systems. Kahle based his view especially on the double pronunciation of the letters *b, g, d, k, p, t*, and the form of the suffix of the second-person masculine singular personal pronoun (in the Masoretic tradition this is *-ĕkā*, but in the earlier sources it is *-āk*). However, the Qumran texts have confirmed the antiquity of the Masoretic pronunciation, not only with respect to this pronominal suffix but also in other details (see esp. Ben-Hayyim 1954).

f. Cantillation Signs (Accents). See MASORETIC ACCENTS.

g. Printed Editions. Many scholars believe that the most ideal edition would be one based on a single manuscript, since it would consequently be a faithful representation of one existing system. Such editions have appeared only recently, however (see below). In the past, editors composed their respective texts from a variety of mss that they deemed suitable, rarely mentioning their sources for the individual elements of the text. Moreover, they allowed their own grammatical ideas to influence the text. Even though the differences between the printed editions are minor, these small variations are important for the grammatical analysis of the text.

The first printed edition of the complete text appeared in 1488 in Soncino, a small city in the vicinity of Milan. Particularly important for the advance in biblical research have been the so-called polyglots, multilingual editions that give the text of the Bible in parallel columns in Hebrew (MT and Sam. Pent.), Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Latin, and Arabic, accompanied by Latin translations and introduced by grammars and lexicons. The first is the Complutensian Polyglot (1514–17), prepared by Cardinal Ximenes in Alcalá (Latin: Complutum). The second was published in Antwerp (1569–72), the third in Paris (1629–45), and the fourth, the most extensive, in London (1654–57), edited by B. Walton and E. Castell.

The so-called Rabbinic Bibles have proved to be of great importance for the history of the printed text. These editions contain in parallel columns the MT and Aramaic Targums, along with various rabbinic commentaries. The earliest editions of the Rabbinic Bible were printed in Venice by Daniel Bomberg, the first (1516–17) edited by

Felix Pratensis and the second (1524–25) by Jacob Ben-Hayyim, based on various Spanish mss (see Penkower 1982). The latter edition differs from the former in the addition of the *Masorah parva* and *Masorah magna*. Probably because of this Masoretic apparatus, subsequent generations regarded this edition as the *textus receptus* of the Hebrew Bible. For that reason by far the majority of the editions of the Bible (with the exception of some modern editions) derive from the text of Ben-Hayyim. They differ only as to where they remove errors, where they introduce new ones, or where they add details from other mss that the editor deemed important.

In the course of the centuries, hundreds of editions of the Hebrew Bible have appeared, of which the most important are those of J. Buxtorf (1611), Athias (1661), Leusden (1667), Jablonski (1699), Van der Hooght (1705), Michaelis (1720), Hahn (1831), Rosenmüller (1834), Letteris (1852), and Koren (1965–66).

Since the end of the 19th century, scholars have been aware of the need for more accurate editions based on critical principles. Baer and Delitzsch tried to reconstruct the Ben-Asher text on the basis of (among others) Ben-Asher's grammatical treatise *Diqdūqqê hattē'āmīm* (published by Baer and Strack in 1879). Ginsburg hoped to reconstruct the Ben-Asher tradition on the basis of his thorough knowledge of the Masorah. His analysis of the Masorah prompted him to make the Second Rabbinic Bible the basis of his 1894 edition, to which he added a critical apparatus containing variants from various mss and printed editions. A few modern editions are based on single sources: Snaith's 1958 edition is based on BM Or. 2375, 2626–28; Dothan's 1975–76 edition and the *BHS* are based on the codex Leningrad; and the *HUBP* edition is based on the Aleppo codex. (For these latter two editions, see E.2 below.)

In recent years the complete text has been made available in machine-readable (computer) form. Several computer texts, based primarily on the *BHS* and/or the codex Leningrad B19A, contain all components of the biblical text as well as a detailed morphological analysis. (For bibliographical details, see *Centre: Informatique et Bible. Bible Data Bank, List of Data and Services* [Maredsous, Belgium: 1981].)

2. Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Among the early attestations of the biblical text, the so-called proto-Samaritan sources hold an important place. These sources contain early nonsectarian texts (see B.2.c below), on one of which was based the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sam. Pent.). In its present form, the Sam. Pent. contains a clearly sectarian text. However, when its thin sectarian layer is removed, together with that of the Samaritan phonetic features, the resulting text probably did not differ much from the texts we now label "proto-Samaritan." Because of this relationship, the proto-Samaritan sources should be discussed first; however, the fragmentary state of their preservation in contrast to the full evidence relating to the Sam. Pent. leads us first to consider the latter. (For a more complete survey of editions and translations of the Sam. Pent., as well as the history of scholarly study on it, see SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.)

a. Origin and Background of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Sam. Pent. contains the sacred writings of the

Samaritans, presently a community of a few hundred members living mainly on Mount Gerizim (near Shechem, modern Nablus) and in Holon (near Tel Aviv). These sacred writings contain only the Pentateuch, while a Samaritan version of Joshua (see Gaster 1908) is also known.

Opinions vary about the origin of the community (see Purvis 1968). The Samaritans themselves believe that the origin of their community goes back to the time of Eli (11th century B.C.), when the "Jews" withdrew from Shechem to establish a new cult in Shiloh, which was later brought to Jerusalem. According to this conception, the Jews split off from the Samaritans, not the other way around. A different view is reflected in 2 Kgs 17:24–34, according to which the Samaritans were not originally Jews, but pagans brought to Samaria by the Assyrians after the fall of Samaria in the 8th century B.C. In accordance with this tradition, in the Talmud the Samaritans were indeed named Kythians (cf. 2 Kgs 17:24).

b. The Character of the Sam. Pent. The textual character of the Sam. Pent. is usually studied by comparing its readings with the MT (Waltke 1970), and since the list by Castellus in the London polyglot (vol. 6, 1657) a figure of 6,000 such differences is usually cited. This detail has to be reexamined now on the basis of modern critical editions.

Study of the proto-Samaritan texts has facilitated the separation of early elements in the Sam. Pent. from elements subsequently added by the Samaritans. The details of this distinction are subject to further research, but the distinction itself is probably correct. It had been surmised by recent generations of scholars that the Sam. Pent. consists of two different layers, but the exact nature of these layers could be studied only with the aid of the new finds. It has now been clarified that the second layer is thin and that if this layer is "peeled off" the proto-Samaritan base text becomes visible.

(1) Early (proto-Samaritan) Elements in the Sam. Pent.

(a) Harmonizing Alterations. The Sam. Pent. contains various kinds of harmonizing alterations, especially additions (to one passage on the basis of another one) that, by definition, are secondary. These alterations appear inconsistently (i.e., features which have been harmonized in one place have been left in others). The Sam. Pent. was not sensitive to differences between parallel laws within the Pentateuch, which, as a rule, have remained intact, while differences between parallel narrative accounts, especially in the speeches in the first chapters of Deuteronomy and their "sources," were closely scrutinized.

The most frequent type of harmonizing alterations happens when one of two differing parallel verses in the Sam. Pent. is adapted to the other (for the editorial principles, see Tigay 1985: 53–96; Tov 1985). Thus, in the MT the Fourth Commandment in Exod 20:8 begins with *zākôr* ("remember") and in Deut 5:12 with *šāmôr* ("observe"), but the Sam. Pent. reads *šāmôr* in both verses. As a rule, however, the Sam. Pent. puts both parallel verses (or parallel details) after each other in the earlier of the two texts. Thus the parallel verses from Deut 1:9–18 are added in Exodus (after 18:24 and within v 25), resulting in a double account of the story of Moses' appointing of the judges. For similar additions, see Num 10:10 (= Deut 1:6–7) and 12:16 (= Deut 1:20–23). In this way the nature of the

book of Deuteronomy as a "repetition of the law" (*mišneh tôrah* in Jewish sources) has been reinforced, since on a strictly formal level Deuteronomy can only "repeat" something if it is also found verbatim in an earlier book.

Another kind of harmonizing change concerns the addition of details in the Sam. Pent. with which the reader should actually be familiar, even though they are not explicitly mentioned in the Bible. In Exod 14:12, for example, the Israelites murmur against Moses after he has led them through the Red Sea: "Is not this what we said to you in Egypt, 'Let us alone and let us serve the Egyptians?'" This complaint is not mentioned earlier in the MT; but the Sam. Pent. inserts this quote in an earlier verse (Exod 6:9). Another illustration is Gen 31:11–13, where Jacob relates a dream not mentioned in any earlier verses in the MT; in the Sam. Pent., however, the account of this dream is added after 30:36.

The characteristic style of biblical narrative is to relate commands in great detail but their execution only briefly. In the Sam. Pent., however, the execution of such commands is often elaborately narrated by repeating the details of the command. For example, in the first chapters of Exodus God gives Moses and Aaron commands whose execution is briefly mentioned in the MT; the Sam. Pent., however, describes their execution in detail after Exod 7:18, 29; 8:19; 9:5, 19.

(b) Linguistic Corrections. Probably most of the linguistic corrections of the Sam. Pent. were already found in the proto-Samaritan sources (see, e.g., 4QpaleoExm). These corrections pertain to the removal of "unusual" forms (such as *naḥnû*, corrected in Gen 42:11 to *ʾanaḥnû*; *wēluwyat hāʾāreš* in Gen 1:24 instead of *wēhayētō ʾereš*), and to the correction of syntactical incongruities such as singular/plural, masculine/feminine (Gen 9:29; 13:6).

(c) Content. It cannot be determined how many of the content variants of the Sam. Pent. were already found in the early sources. Probably most of these variants (which cannot be characterized in any way) were archaic. Among other things, they contain a remarkable number of synonymous variants.

(2) New Elements. (a) Sectarian Changes. The views of the Samaritans differed from those of the Jews in a number of important details, only one of which is known to have been inserted in their biblical text. This concerns the most important doctrinal difference between the Jews and the Samaritans: the central place of worship (Jerusalem for the Jews, Mount Gerizim for the Samaritans). To reinforce this belief the Samaritans added a commandment to the Decalog (after Exod 20:14 and Deut 5:18) that secured the centrality of Mount Gerizim in the cult. This commandment is composed of a series of biblical pericopes that mention such a central cult in Shechem (Deut 11:29a; 27:2b, 3a, 4–7; 11:30 [in this sequence]). The addition of this material as the Tenth Commandment was made possible by changing the First Commandment into an introductory clause.

Closely connected with this addition are various alterations in Deuteronomy where the characteristic expression "the place which the Lord your God will choose" is changed to "the place which the Lord your God has chosen" (e.g., Deut 12:10, 11). From the Samaritan perspective, Shechem was already the chosen place in the time of

Abraham, whereas from the historical perspective of Deuteronomy, the choice of God's place (Jerusalem) yet lay in the future, after the conquest of the land and the election of David.

(b) **Phonological Changes.** Some of the phonological features of the Sam. Pent. have been inserted by the Samaritans themselves, as is visible from their agreement with those of the known Samaritan literature. This is true especially of the gutturals, which differ distinctly from those of the MT (see esp. Ben-Hayyim 1956–79; Macuch 1969). Thus in Gen 49:7 the Sam. Pent. reads *wehebratam* instead of MT's *we'ebratam*.

(3) **Orthography.** The use of *matres lectionis* (see D.3 below) in the Sam. Pent. differs in several respects from their use in MT. Macuch (1969: 3–9) and Cohen (1976) have shown that it is an oversimplification to say that the orthography of the Sam. Pent. is "fuller" than that of MT: in some word categories MT is fuller than the Sam. Pent., while in other ones the reverse is true. It cannot be determined with certainty how many of these orthographic peculiarities were introduced by the Samaritans, since the proto-Samaritan texts are not consistent in this matter either.

c. **Proto-Samaritan Texts.** An important group of early texts unearthed at Qumran have been classified as "proto-Samaritan." That name may be somewhat misleading since these particular Qumran mss are neither Samaritan (*pace* Baillet 1971) nor sectarian in any way. This term is used, like in other cases (cf. "proto-Theodotion," "proto-Lucian"), to designate a group of texts, on one of which the Sam. Pent. seems to have been based.

The prominent characteristic which these texts have in common is the occurrence of major harmonizing elements such as evidenced in the Sam. Pent. (see above). There are large harmonizing additions from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers (and in one case, vice versa), well attested in 4QpaleoExm (Sanderson 1986), 4Q158, 4Q364* (both biblical "paraphrases"), 4QNumb* (see Cross 1961: 186), 4QDeutn*, and 4Q175 (Test) [*denotes texts still unpublished].

All these texts form a typologically similar group, related in character yet sometimes different in content. As for differences, the texts (except for 4QpaleoExm) are written in square Hebrew characters. Also, they lack the distinctive phonetic features of the Sam. Pent. As for similarities, they share the Sam. Pent.'s linguistic simplifications, its harmonizations in minor matters, as well as its noncharacteristic readings, although differing in many details in these areas. The spelling of 4QpaleoExm is fuller than that of the Sam. Pent., while that of the other texts is not. They are not sectarian in any way. Moreover, they contain various readings not known from other sources. At the same time, these proto-Samaritan texts share a sufficient amount of significant details with the Sam. Pent. to demonstrate the close relationship with that text. In the same way as the proto-Samaritan texts relate to each other, the Sam. Pent. is akin to all of them, although that text is a bit remote from them because of its subsequent ideological and phonetic developments.

3. **The Qumran Texts.** In contrast to the two aforementioned groups of witnesses of the biblical text—the (proto-) Masoretic and the (proto-) Samaritan—the texts

found at Qumran do not present any one homogeneous group of texts, but a collection of different texts, including proto-Masoretic and proto-Samaritan texts. The texts found at Qumran give an insight into the textual situation in Palestine as a whole from the mid-3d century B.C. until 68 A.D., although it is not known whether the selection and nature of the texts found at Qumran is in any way representative of that period. For overviews of the scrolls and their bearings on OT textual criticism, see Skehan 1971; 1975a; 1975b; Vermes 1977).

a. **Background.** Many of the Qumran texts discovered in the middle of the 20th century constitute a major source of information for the history of the biblical text, with regard to the history of transmission of the text (see D below), the relation between the biblical witnesses (see C.2 below), and the specific content of the mss themselves. The latter issue is discussed here. (For background information on the Qumran texts, see DEAD SEA SCROLLS.) Many of the texts so far remain unpublished, but all of them have been described and the most important ones have been published either entirely or partially. This makes it possible to obtain a good idea of the importance and relevance of the new sources. (See Fitzmyer 1977 for bibliography, and Skehan (*DBSup* 9: 805–28) and Tov 1988 for full surveys.)

The scope of the documents differs from text to text. The large Isaiah Scroll from Cave 1 (1QIsa) contains all 66 chapters of the book, but only small fragments of other books have usually been preserved. Separate scrolls are usually identified on the basis of perceived different scripts, but this may be misleading since large scrolls were often written by more than one scribe, so that the total number of scrolls represented by the fragments is smaller than generally assumed.

With the exception of Esther and Nehemiah (but Ezra-Nehemiah form one book), fragments or complete scrolls have been found of all the books of the OT. In addition, fragments of some apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books (in Heb or Aram), which thus far were known only in Gk or other translations, have been unearthed. This situation may be indicative of an open-ended canonical conception, but since the background of the finds of the documents in Qumran has not been clarified, reliable information on the canonical conceptions of the Qumran community can be obtained only from their various sectarian writings.

Based on archaeological considerations, the period of settlement of the Qumran community is from approximately 150 B.C. (or somewhat later) to A.D. 68. However, paleographic analysis suggests that the oldest Qumran texts were written before that time. Presumably the settlers of the Qumran community brought with them some earlier scrolls; furthermore, if scrolls were indeed copied at Qumran, they had to be copied from texts imported from outside. The oldest scrolls are ascribed to the middle and end of the 3d century B.C.: Freedman (1962: 93) attributes 4QExodf to 250 B.C. and Cross (1955) ascribes 4QSam to the second half of the 3d century B.C. and 4QJer^a to 200 B.C.

b. **Textual Character.** The Qumran texts come from 11 caves. Presently it cannot be determined whether the scrolls differ textually from cave to cave. Most of the scrolls whose contents differ from MT (and which thus are im-

portant for the reconstruction of the textual history) were found in Caves 4 and 11. This may or may not be coincidental. The biblical text from Qumran is best described in relation to the MT and other sources known before the discoveries in Qumran. The Qumran texts reflect a textual variety, the background of which is not clear (see below).

(1) Most texts from Caves 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 (and many of Cave 4) are virtually identical with the consonantal framework of the MT, barring occasional variants, especially minor orthographic differences. This group also contains all the paleo-Hebrew texts (except for 1QpaleoLev and 4QpaleoExm). In view of the early date of these scrolls, their text tradition is usually called "proto-Masoretic."

(2) Other texts, though representing the basic tradition of the MT, display a different approach to the text. These scrolls are written in a very special orthography and language, and contain a relatively large number of secondary readings (i.e., readings that eliminate grammatical and contextual difficulties). This orthography and language has not been attested in sources outside the Qumran community (although a few agreements with pronunciations in the Samaritan tradition have been recognized), but this absence of documentation may be due to the paucity of our sources. In the meantime this system of language, orthography, and scribal habits should thus be called the "Qumran system," but the imprecision of this term should be noted. Some of the special features of this "Qumran system" are the spellings *ky*², *zw*²/*zw*²*t*/*z*²*wt*, *lw*², *kwh*, *mwšh*, and forms such as *m²wdh*/*mw²dh*/*mwdh*; lengthened independent pronouns such as *hw²h*, *hy²h*, *tmh*; words serving in the MT as "pausal" verbal forms such as (*w*)*yqtwlw*; lengthened future forms such as *qtwlh*; and lengthened pronominal suffixes for second and third persons plural (e.g., *mlkmh*, *mlkkmh*, etc.). (For a description of the linguistic background, see Kutscher 1974 and Qimron 1986, and for the distribution of these features in the Qumran scrolls, see Tov 1986; 1988.) These texts also reflect various scribal phenomena not found in other Qumran scrolls, and according to Tov (1986; 1988) they were produced by a Qumran scribal school.

(3) Some texts exhibit great similarity with two non-Masoretic witnesses: the LXX and the Sam. Pent. The sources that are akin to the Sam. Pent. (the so-called "proto-Samaritan" texts) have been described above. Furthermore, 4QJer^{b,d} are closely akin to the LXX, which in Jeremiah reflects a Hebrew text that is one-seventh shorter than the MT and with different arrangement of verses, pericopes, and chapters; in both these respects the LXX resembles the Qumran text. Several other texts, especially 4QSam^a, likewise contain some or many readings also reflected in the LXX, but none of them is as close to the LXX as 4QJer^{b,d}.

(4) Several scrolls are "independent" in relation to the MT, LXX, and Sam. Pent. A large scroll such as 11QpaleoLev (see Tov 1979) often agrees with the MT over against other textual witnesses, but it also disagrees with the MT. Likewise, it also agrees often with the LXX, with which it also disagrees (the same also applies to its relation with the Sam. Pent.). At the same time, it contains many independent readings, that is, readings not found in other sources (see D.4 below).

c. The Origin of the Qumran Scrolls. For the evaluation of the textual variety at Qumran and of some of the individual scrolls, one would like to know more about the origin of the Qumran scrolls. In the past most scholars have regarded the Qumran scrolls (both biblical and non-biblical) as the scrolls of the Qumran sect, implying that these scrolls have been written at Qumran by the scribes of the Qumran community. In these descriptions the collection of scrolls has frequently been portrayed as the "library of Qumran," without the nature of this library ever being appropriately described. Likewise, the discovery in Qumran of what has been called the "scriptorium" has reassured many scholars that the Qumran scrolls were indeed written there. On the other hand, scholars have known that at least the most ancient texts could not have been written at Qumran, since they precede the time of the sect's settlement. This fact, however, has not significantly influenced the account of the scrolls' origin. In any case, the fact that most scholars attributed the Qumran scrolls to the Qumran sect aroused opposition among a few scholars, who, referring mostly to the archaeological finds, denied this claim altogether. These scholars claimed that all of the scrolls found at Qumran were brought there from somewhere else, perhaps from the Temple library (see Rengstorf 1960; Kutscher 1974: 89–95; and Golb 1980). Del Medico (1957) thought that the Qumran caves contained an ancient *genizah* (depository of books) brought from outside.

The aforementioned views were mostly based on the archaeological evidence, while a different view has been proposed by Tov (1986; 1988), based on the distribution of orthography and language in the Qumran scrolls. He noted that the sectarian compositions are written almost exclusively in the Qumran system and that furthermore, no sectarian writings are written in anything but this orthography. These findings led to the conclusion that the Qumran community wrote their own sectarian writings in this special orthography and language, probably at Qumran. Furthermore, all the scrolls written in this system reflect a distinct (Qumran) scribal school recognizable by several scribal habits (the use of scribal marks and of initial-medial letters in final position, and the writing of the divine name in paleo-Hebrew characters). These characteristics are not found in the other scrolls. On the basis of this evidence he suggested that the scrolls written in the "Qumran system" were written by the Qumran community, while the other ones were brought from outside.

4. Additional Hebrew Sources. Mere fragments of passages found in the Bible (some dating as early as the First Temple period) have been preserved. Two small silver scrolls (amulets?) from Keteph Hinnom in Jerusalem, dating from the 7th century B.C., contain (with differences) the priestly blessing (Num 6:24–26). The Nash papyrus from the 1st or 2d century A.D. contains the Decalog according to the text of both Exodus and Deuteronomy. There is also the Severus scroll of the Pentateuch which, according to rabbinic tradition, was brought by the Romans to "the synagogue of Severus" in Rome after the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) and which contains orthographic differences from MT, and the "Pentateuch of Rabbi Meir," quoted by Talmudic traditions as having been copied from the Severus scroll. There were also various texts now lost

and mentioned in Talmudic literature, such as Codex Hilleli, Codex Zambuki, and Codex Yerushalmi (see Ginsburg 1897: 410–37).

5. Ancient Versions. a. Text-Critical Use of Versions. The textual criticism of the OT aims at tracing all early attestations of the biblical text. It is not enough to search for such readings in Hebrew sources because non-Hebrew sources, particularly ancient translations (the Versions), also contain many data. These data are used in the text-critical analysis of the OT, but by definition they cannot be used in the language of the translations, since the aim is to discover deviating Hebrew text traditions. The textual critic must thus analyze those portions where the ancient translations deviate from the MT in order to determine whether or not they might reflect original Hebrew variants. Such elements are then retranslated (retroverted) into the assumed Hebrew-Aramaic original, in order that these retranslated elements, together with extant Hebrew sources, can be used in the text-critical analysis.

Until recently, OT textual criticism has paid much attention to the Versions. This interest was justified because the oldest Heb mss were dated to the Middle Ages while some of the mss of the LXX, Peshitta, and Vulgate date from the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. (some fragmentary papyri of the LXX go back as far as the 2d century B.C.). This situation has now changed because the Hebrew scrolls from the Judean desert/Dead Sea are not only considerably older than these but often also more important. Therefore text-critical interest will in the future be focused more on Hebrew sources than on the Versions, even though text-critically the LXX will always remain of great importance. The importance of the other Versions for textual criticism is diminishing, although occasionally they contain significant readings. At the same time, these Versions remain important as witnesses to ancient *exegesis*.

Text-critical analysis here reconstructs elements in the Hebrew text—the *Vorlage*—on which the translation may have been based. Scholars are divided about the possibilities and methodology of this procedure. There are no firm, systematic criteria for such a reconstruction of the text, but important aspects of the procedure followed have been described, mainly in reference to the LXX, by Margolis (1907), Goshen-Gottstein (1963), Barr (1968; 1979) and Tov (1978a). These methodological analyses can also be applied to the other Versions.

This analysis is based on the recognized differences between the MT and the various ancient translations. When such a detail differs from the MT one need not immediately assume that its *Vorlage* differed from MT. Such differences are also caused, even in larger measure, by other factors, such as exegesis, translation technique, and corruptions in the transmission of the text of the Versions. Intimate knowledge of these areas is a *conditio sine qua non* for the text-critical use of the Versions. If analysis leads to the conclusion that a particular deviation from MT is not caused by one of the above-mentioned factors, one may assume that the translation is based on a Hebrew consonantal text that differed from the MT.

Often such a text can be reconstructed on the basis of our knowledge of the translation technique and vocabulary, accessible through modern concordances and other tools. The following is a good illustration. The LXX of

Deut 31:1 reads, “and Moses finished speaking” (*kai syntelesen Mōusēs lalōn*) instead of MT “and Moses went and spoke” (*wayyēlek mōšeh wayyēdabbēr*). The deviating translation in the LXX must have been caused by the presence of a variant since no exegesis can be detected in this detail. According to the information presented by the concordances, the Gk verb *synteleeō* (“finish”) usually represents Heb *klh* (“finish”); thus it may be assumed that here the Heb *Vorlage* of the LXX read *wayyēkal* instead of *wayyēlek* (i.e., metathesis of the last two consonants). The reconstruction of this variant is supported by an identical variant in a Heb Qumran scroll (1Q5, frag. 13,2) and the similar expression in the MT of Deut 32:45.

Very few elements in the Versions can be retranslated with absolute certainty to specific Heb variants. In general, it is uncertain whether a deviation in a translation is due to a Heb variant or, for example, is the result of a free translation or of exegesis (in choosing from the various possibilities, familiarity with the nature of the translation of the individual books is very important).

But even if it is certain that a detail in the version can be translated back to a particular Heb variant, this does not mean that such a variant reading actually existed in a Heb source; it is possible that the translator misread a detail in his *Vorlage*, so that the variant existed only in his mind. Thus the LXX of 1 Sam 21:8 wrongly calls Doeg *ho Syros*, words that can be retranslated to *ha'ārammī*, “the Aramean,” instead of *hā'ādōmī*, “the Edomite” in MT (and in other OT references to Doeg). It is impossible to say whether the *Vorlage* of the Gk translation actually read *h'rmī* or if the translator wrongly read *h'dmī* as *h'rmī*. In either case it is customary to say that the LXX reflects a “variant” *h'rmī*, even though this reading may never have existed in a Hebrew text.

Because of the different approaches in the reconstruction of the *Vorlagen* of the Versions, many divergences in the Versions are retranslated as Heb variants by some, while others regard them as stemming from translation technique, exegesis, etc. Furthermore, in the retranslation of the divergences into Heb, the possible reconstructions can be numerous.

b. The Septuagint (LXX). The quality of the Greek translation contained in the LXX varies from book to book, ranging from slavishly literal (e.g., Psalms and some early revisions now included in the LXX canon such as the “LXX” of 2 Kings [4 Kingdoms in the LXX] and Ecclesiastes) to loose paraphrases (Isaiah, Proverbs, Esther, Job, Daniel). The analysis of this quality is crucial for the text-critical analysis of the LXX, for it helps us to ascertain whether an individual variation between the MT and the LXX is due to free translation (i.e., an idiosyncrasy of the translator) or to a Heb variant (i.e., an idiosyncrasy of the *Vorlage*).

The LXX reflects a large number of Heb variants in all the books of the OT; in fact, among the Versions, the LXX is by far the most important source for textual criticism. Together with the Qumran scrolls and the Sam. Pent., it constitutes the most important non-Masoretic witness, especially for Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Particularly important are those sections in which the LXX reflects a text which is *recensionally* different from MT. In such sections the LXX usually

represents a stage in the development of a biblical book that preceded the stage reflected in the MT. This holds especially for the LXX of Jeremiah, the shorter LXX version of 1 Samuel 17–18, and the chronological framework of the LXX in 1–2 Kings. (The text-critical use of the LXX in biblical research is discussed in Tov 1981b. For bibliography, see Brock 1973.) See also SEPTUAGINT.

c. Peshitta. The quality of the Peshitta (Syriac translation) varies from book to book, ranging from fairly accurate to paraphrastic. The Heb *Vorlage* of the Peshitta was more or less identical with MT. The Peshitta offers fewer variants than the LXX, but more than the Targums and the Vulgate. (On the text-critical use of the Peshitta, see especially Goshen-Gottstein 1960; Weitzman 1985). See VERSIONS, ANCIENT (SYRIAC VERSIONS).

d. The Targums. The quality of the translation of the Aramaic Targums varies from Targum to Targum and from book to book (see especially Komlosh 1973). As a rule, the Targums from Palestine are more paraphrastic in character than the Babylonian ones. The more literal translations of 11Q¹J¹ and 4Q¹Lev, though found in Palestine, are an exception to this rule. The relation between the various Targums as well as their origins are elaborately discussed in modern research (Grossfeld 1972–77). See TARGUM, TARGUMIM.

The Targums usually reflect the MT; deviations from it are based mainly on exegetical traditions, not on deviating texts. An exception must be made for 11Q¹J¹, which contains interesting variants and which possibly lacks some verses of the MT (42:12–17), a fact which would be significant for the literary criticism of the book. It may perhaps be assumed that other Targums in an earlier stage of their development also contained more variants than in their present form. *Targum Onqelos* as a rule contains more variants than the Palestinian Targums. (For a discussion and reconstruction of these variants, see Sperber 1973; Komlosh 1973.)

e. The Vulgate. Though occasionally reflecting variants (see Marks 1956; Nowack 1875; Kedar-Kopfstein 1968; 1969), this Latin translation almost always reproduces MT. See VULGATE.

C. Textual History

1. Introduction. The history of the text (referring mainly to MT) since the 2d century A.D. onward is known in broad lines. But the history of the text before that time is in a sense prehistory about which we can only guess, even though many texts are now known. Theories about the history of the text were current already before the discovery of the Qumran texts, in other words, before one could have an idea of what ancient biblical scrolls looked like and before one knew about the textual multiplicity reflected in the Qumran finds. In many respects these theories are now outdated. Nevertheless, they are discussed here because of their influence on the development of the research and in particular on the terminology used.

2. Relationship between Textual Witnesses. The most important textual witnesses to the OT are MT, with Heb *Vorlage* of the LXX (here simply designated as LXX), "independent" Qumran texts and those written in the "Qumran" orthography and language, the proto-Samaritan sources, and the Sam. Pent. All other sources (such as

the Peshitta, Vulgate, Targums, the Heb texts from Nahal Hever, Wādī Murabba'at, Masada, and many Qumran texts) are less significant for the history of the OT text since they are virtually identical with MT.

During the last three centuries the idea has arisen that the MT, the Sam. Pent., and the LXX represent the three main text types for the Pentateuch (the term comes from Kahle 1915: 436, who speaks of "*drei Haupttypen des Pentateuchtextes*"). This view has been greatly influenced by the coincidence that the MT, Sam. Pent., and LXX have been preserved for posterity respectively as the sacred writings of the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian communities. Another influence was the analogy with the tripartite division of NT and LXX mss. This viewpoint developed gradually (before Kahle, the term "recension" was mainly used; after Kahle, "text type"), but the question was never raised whether these three sources indeed represented different recensions or text types, that is, texts that typologically differ from each other. Only the recent research done in America has tried to define the typological differences among these texts.

The problem with this approach has been expounded by Talmon (*CHB* 1: 159–99) and Tov (1978b; 1982a). According to Tov, the MT, Sam. Pent., and LXX should be regarded as three ancient texts, not as recensions or text types. The complex of relationships among these texts is no different from the relationships among all early textual witnesses. The relationship between the LXX and MT is similar to that of any early source to another one (including recensional differences), but the relationship between the Sam. Pent. and the other two is somewhat more complicated since it (and proto-Samaritan texts) does reflect a number of typologically characteristic peculiarities.

3. Research Before 1947. Various aspects of the history of the text have been discussed by scholars. However, all of these descriptions illustrate only certain aspects of the textual history, and none provides an overall description. In 1915 Kahle gave the first comprehensive description of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible. Prior to that there were only summary remarks and descriptions of the history of the text, of which the two most significant are those of Rosenmüller (1797) and de Lagarde (1863). In 1797 Rosenmüller had maintained that all the MT mss belong to "one recension," which differs from the "recension" of the LXX (at that time the term "recension" was often used in the neutral meaning of "text").

In contrast, the brief theoretical remarks of de Lagarde (1863: 3–4) have until now been of great importance for the reconstruction of the textual history. He believed that all Masoretic mss had certain characteristics in common (especially the *puncta extraordinaria*), so specific that all mss would go back to "a single copy" (*ein einziges Exemplar*). This one copy he also regarded as "one recension" (the "Palestinian recension") that differed from the "Egyptian recension" (LXX), so that terminological confusion was unavoidable. According to de Lagarde, the text from which both recensions derive (the Ur-text) can be reconstructed by way of an eclectic procedure. De Lagarde himself was unable to translate his theoretical arguments into practical applications, but subsequent generations have carried forward this line of argumentation in what became known as the "Ur-text theory." It should be men-

tioned that in general more has been ascribed to de Lagarde than he himself had postulated. Another source of inaccuracy is the confusion in modern literature between the views of Rosenmüller specifically on the MT and de Lagarde generally on the text of the OT.

Kahle's views were especially influenced by the text traditions differing from the MT that were known in his time: divergent biblical quotations in rabbinic literature, the fragments from the Cairo Geniza, and the various Gk and Aramaic traditions. Guided by these multiple text traditions, Kahle sketched the history of the text as follows. Originally there was not one text of the Hebrew Bible (thus de Lagarde), but a plurality of what Kahle called *Vulgärtexte* ("vulgar" texts). His model for this description was the development of the Aramaic Targums, which, having come into existence as independent translations, were circulated in various forms. This multiplicity of text traditions disappeared during the first two centuries A.D., after the MT (ca. A.D. 100) had been "created" out of the recension of one of the *Vulgärtexte* into an accurate, official text which dislodged all other traditions. In this respect Kahle's description is directly opposed to that of de Lagarde: according to de Lagarde, the history of the text began with one text which split into various texts, whereas for Kahle the history of the text began with a plurality of text types out of which later one text subsequently emerged.

Kahle was correct in his assessment of some aspects of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible, but on several significant points his views need revision. First, the textual variants on which Kahle's theories are based, like the variants in the rabbinic sources, are of much less significance than Kahle thought they were. Kahle was often impressed by lists of variants, whereas an accurate description of their nature should have led him to other conclusions. Second, the MT was not created in the 1st or 2d century A.D., but it existed already before that time as one of many texts (cf. the proto-Masoretic Qumran scrolls). Third, Kahle's description of the contrast between *Vulgärtexte* and an official text is inaccurate and insufficiently elaborated. (Also, for criticism of Kahle's description of the MT, LXX, and Sam. Pent. as the three "main types" of the text of the Pentateuch, see below.)

Less well known than Kahle's theories are the following analyses, which further developed certain of his insights. A. Sperber (1940) further elaborated the difference between one official biblical text and many *Vulgärtexte*. He described especially the nature of these vulgar texts, in which group he also included the Sam. Pent. and the MT of Chronicles. On the analogy of the development of the Homeric writings, S. Lieberman (1962: 20–27) introduced a qualitative distinction between three kinds of mss: *phaulōtera*, "poor copies," in the possession of unschooled villagers; *koinōtera*, or *vulgata*, the "generally accepted text," in the possession of city people, used especially for study purposes (e.g., in schools); and *ekribōmena*, "accurate copies," in the possession of people connected with the temple. Building on Lieberman, Greenberg (1956) suggested that at the time of the Hasmoneans two text types were in circulation: the fuller, unofficial type (such as the Sam. Pent.) and the shorter, official type (the MT).

Beginning with the 1950s, a new approach to the history of the text became current in American biblical scholar-

ship. A theory of "local recensions/text types/families" was set forth in broad lines by Albright (1955) and worked out by Cross (1975a; 1975b). This theory reduces the multiplicity of textual witnesses to three text types: one current in Palestine (inter alia, the Sam. Pent., the MT of Chronicles, several Qumran scrolls), one in Babylonia (the MT), and one in Egypt (the LXX). These text types can be described in general terms; for instance, "the Palestinian family is characterized by conflation, glosses, synoptic additions, and other evidences of intense scribal activity, and can be defined as 'expansionistic'" (Cross 1975a: 283). The characteristics of the Babylonian and Egyptian text types are described in the same general way.

This theory has its critics (Talmon, *CHB* 1: 193–98; Tov 1982a). One of its weaknesses is the lack of evidence supporting the description of the characteristics. Moreover, the terminology needs closer definition (see Gooding 1976). The Qumran scrolls show that the boundaries between the three groups are not always clear. For example, how can one explain the close relationship between 4QJer^{b,d} (found in Palestine) and the *Vorlage* of the LXX (Egypt)? How can it be determined that MT is Babylonian and that (not only the translation but also) the *Vorlage* of the LXX is Egyptian? Serious questions are also raised by the fact that scrolls of all three supposed text types were found side by side at Qumran. Notwithstanding these objections, a central feature of the theory of local text traditions can be evaluated positively—there were undoubtedly geographical and social differences among the various text traditions. Only such an assumption can explain how altogether different forms of the text, in particular recensional differences (see F below), have been preserved, even after the MT had become the only text to be used by the central group in Judaism. At the same time, it is not possible to make precise statements about the nature of these local traditions.

4. More Recent Research. The description of the textual history is necessarily brief, because our knowledge on this subject is very limited. Each of the descriptions and theories described in the previous paragraphs refers to merely one aspect, and all of them are usually very dogmatic. There is no single "textual theory" which explains all aspects of the textual development, so that we will have to content ourselves with partial descriptions of limited phenomena.

The first question arising is the chronological framework for the description. It is relatively easy to recognize the end of the 1st century A.D. as the limit of the period of textual development, since the biblical text did not change much after that period. At that time the texts were well fixed in their respective socioreligious environments, and they did not continue to develop anymore. On the other hand, the beginning of the period of textual development is not well demarcated. It would have been natural to assume that the textual development started upon the completion of the literary compositions, since from that time onward they were frequently copied. However, as noted below (see F), limited copying began even before that time.

In the OT itself there is some evidence that portions of books were written prior to the completion of the full literary unit. Also, editing and revisional activity, as evi-

denced in most of the biblical books, took place on the basis of previously written compositions. The editors-revisers of the biblical books thus served as both authors and copyists. This applies also to the author of the book of Chronicles.

At a certain point the literary unit was completed, but this process could be repeated several times: sometimes a certain readership accepted a form of the book which at the time was considered final, and it was distributed as such on a limited scale. However, at a later point someone else could prepare a "revised" edition intended to replace the previous one. That edition was also accepted by some in due course, but it could not totally replace its forerunner, which remained in use in places that were remote either sociologically or geographically. In this way the earlier editions were available to the LXX translators in Egypt as well as to those who deposited 4QJer^{b,d} in the Qumran caves.

Independent of the procedure of copying, each of the biblical books at a given moment received an authoritative (canonical) status. This process had much impact on the copying and transmission procedures of the biblical text.

The finalized literary product which incorporated the last recognizable literary editing of the book should be considered the "Ur-text" (archetypal copy) of the biblical books, elements of which textual criticism attempts to reconstruct. This formulation, which necessarily remains conjectural, thus agrees with the views of de Lagarde, though not in all details.

The period of textual unity reflected in the copies which we named the "Ur-text" was short, and possibly never existed, since at the same time there also circulated additional copies of the biblical books incorporating remnants of previous literary stages. This relative textual unity was disturbed in the next generations, when copyists inserted changes in the text in different quantities. This textual diversity was also created by the changes pertaining to the biblical text in spelling, the writing of final letters, and probably also the dissolution of the *scriptio continua*. An abundance of textual errors likewise disturbed the initial textual unity.

Many copyists took liberty to insert changes in the text, and in this way they continued the approach of the last layer of composing and editing the biblical books. Some scholars even speak of a transitional stage of composition-copying. Even though many of these changes pertain to matters of content, a qualitative and quantitative distinction should be made between the intervention of the authors-editors prior to the authoritative status of the biblical books and that of the later copyists, who allowed themselves less freedom than their predecessors.

From the outset all copyists may have approached the text freely, but possibly already then there were copyists who consciously refrained from inserting changes in the text. In any event, the earliest available textual evidence, the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran dating from the 3d century B.C., already displays such an approach. It is hard to know whether these texts represent an approach of earlier generations or a secondary stage; in any event, even these texts at times reflect scribal intervention of some kind.

The available textual evidence does not enable any pre-

cision in dating, but the Qumran finds allow for some statements on the last three centuries B.C. until 68 A.D. In that period we note different textual developments in the various biblical books—if the evidence does not distort the picture—and the various groups in Judaism approached the biblical text differently. The Qumran finds show that this period is characterized by textual variety. The views of Kahle (see C.3 above) referred to a situation like this, with one major difference: in his description the textual variety existed in the initial stage of the textual development, while according to our analysis it was created at a second stage.

Textual variety was characteristic of Palestine as a whole, but apparently in temple circles only one text or group of texts was used, namely the proto-Masoretic texts. The Qumran finds show the different texts which were current in Palestine in the Second Temple period: the texts written in the "Qumran" orthography, proto-Masoretic and proto-Samaritan texts, scrolls closely related to the LXX (4QJer^{b,d}), and texts that are not related to any of the above. Because of the latter group of texts, the number of the texts current in Palestine was virtually unlimited.

This textual variety has been described in the past in terms of closeness to sources known before the Qumran finds. This way of describing the scrolls reflects a custom that resulted from the accidental situation that for centuries scholars were aware of the LXX and the medieval mss of the MT and the Sam. Pent., but not of earlier texts. Because of this unusual situation, scholars were accustomed to describing the data in a reverse order. This irregularity can now be corrected, enabling one to understand how the medieval MT developed from the earlier proto-Masoretic texts and how the Sam. Pent. was based on one of the so-called proto-Masoretic texts.

The textual variety characterizing the biblical books as a whole did not exist for all of them to the same extent. This resulted from the accidental nature of the textual transmission: scribes inserted their changes (expansions, omissions, orthography, etc.)—inconsistently—in some of the biblical books only, so that a certain textual development known from one biblical book should not necessarily have existed in all of the books.

Within this textual variety we note two different approaches to the biblical text, which gave rise to both "vulgar" texts (in use by the public at large) and all the other, "nonvulgar" texts. The latter were conservative in nature, and they were created and used by specific groups. The present evidence does not allow for a distinction between three groups, as suggested by Lieberman (1962), even though the assumption itself is logical. It is hard to know in which circles the different texts were created and used. Probably the vulgar texts were never used for liturgical purposes, but this cannot be ascertained for the Qumran sect. Between the nonvulgar texts, the proto-Masoretic texts stand out since they had a special, possibly exclusive, status in the central group of Judaism.

Vulgar texts are known from different places in Palestine. Their copyists took liberty to insert in them all kinds of changes and corrections as well as to innovate the spelling, often drastically, as witnessed in many of the Qumran scrolls. Typical representatives of this group are the texts produced by the Qumran school of scribes. These

texts are usually written carelessly, and they contain many corrections and erasures. From a textual point of view their secondary nature is visible in the changes in orthography and language as well as in contextual changes. Apparently also the Severus scroll and the "Pentateuch of Rabbi Meir" contained a similar crop of secondary readings, especially in phonetic details. To this group belong also the proto-Samaritan texts and the Sam. Pent. The latter texts are not written carelessly, and their spelling does not resemble that of the Qumran school of scribes, but their scribes allowed themselves much freedom in editorial interventions. The harmonizing additions as well as the linguistic and contextual corrections are clearly secondary, a feature which characterizes the vulgar texts as well.

The so-called vulgar texts contain many secondary readings in comparison with the nonvulgar texts, but at the same time they also contain some readings which are preferable to the ones in the MT and other nonvulgar texts. Such readings simply happened to be preserved in vulgar sources.

The nonvulgar texts can also be named "precise" or "conservative," but these terms may be misleading since these texts differ from each other. These internal differences reflect the textual diversity in the Second Temple period, and all of them reflect elements of the so-called original text which have been changed in the other texts. It is hard to say which text is closer to the so-called Ur-text; if a personal impression may be allowed here, it seems that often the LXX is closer to that text than the MT.

Of the nonvulgar texts one is best acquainted with the proto-Masoretic texts, from which the MT developed in the Middle Ages. However, in spite of the great care taken in the copying of these texts, they too were corrected (see the emendations of the scribes and other corrections mentioned in D.4.b below) and they too were corrupted from time to time; see especially the text of Samuel. Another such text is the LXX. In one case the *Vorlage* of one of its books has been preserved coincidentally in a Qumran scroll (4QJer^b).

The vulgar and nonvulgar texts described here were current in Palestine in the last three centuries B.C. and in the first two centuries A.D. The coincidental nature of the preserved textual sources does not enable us to know which sort of text was more frequent. However, if the Qumran scrolls display a trustworthy picture, it appears that from the 3d century B.C. onward, proto-Masoretic texts were more frequent than the other ones. This situation derives from the strength and influence of the central stream of Judaism, through whose influence these texts were copied and distributed. It is not clear whether beyond the mere copying there was a conscious effort of unifying the texts which would have reduced the number of internal differences. Such a presumed procedure could have been learned from the story about the three scrolls found in the Azarah (see *J. Tāʿan*. 4:2, 68a [cf. Talmon 1962]).

After several centuries of textual diversity we note a period of textual unity at the end of the first century A.D. caused not by intrinsic factors related to the textual transmission, but by political and socioreligious events and developments. By the end of the 1st century A.D. the LXX had been accepted by Christianity and abandoned by the

Jews. Copies of Sam. Pent. were available, but in the meantime that sect had become an independent religion, so that their texts were considered Samaritan, not Jewish anymore. The Qumran sect, which had preserved a multitude of texts, did not exist after the destruction of the temple. Therefore the sole texts that existed in this period were the ones that were copied and distributed by the central group in Judaism. For example, the texts from the Bar-Kokhba period found at Naḥal Hever and Wādī Murabbaʿat contain solely the MT. This situation gave rise to the wrong conclusion that the MT had "ousted" the other texts, but such a description reminds one of a cultural struggle of modern times and not of the real background, viz. the political and socioreligious factors at work in this period (cf. Albrektson 1978).

It should be remembered that all descriptions such as the preceding depend on the accidental nature of the textual evidence. Even the nature of the books in the MT and LXX has been determined to a great extent by coincidence. The situation that 1–2 Samuel in the MT is relatively corrupt derives from the fact that such a copy has been included in the archetype of the MT, and not from the approach of the scribes to that book or from its textual vicissitudes. Likewise, the discovery of textually important data in some of the books of the LXX and scrolls such as 4QJer^b may be coincidental, so that similar developments may have taken place in other books as well.

D. Copying and Transmission of the Text

Many external facts are now known about the copying and transmission of the text from one generation to the next. These data are interesting in their own right, but they also help us to understand the background of certain textual mishaps.

1. Sources of Information. The texts from the Judean desert (mid-3d century B.C. to beginning 2d century A.D.) provide an excellent picture of a cross-section of the biblical texts on the basis of which the copying and transmission of the texts through the centuries can now be portrayed. Since some of these texts were written in Qumran and others in different places in Palestine, the copying conventions evident in the Qumran scrolls are generally accepted as representative of what was customary at that time.

The post-Talmudic tractate *Sopherim* (ed. M. Higger [New York 1937; repr. Jerusalem 1970]), which gives detailed instructions for writing biblical scrolls according to the Halakah, provides further information on this process. Many of the instructions in this tractate represent old traditions, so that the material can be used in spite of its 9th-century date. In the following some of the central details in that copying and transmission are recorded.

2. Outward Form. For many centuries the biblical books were written on scrolls (Hebrew *mēgillā*, pl. *mēgillōt*), composed of individual sheets of leather (vellum) and at an earlier, undocumented stage, of papyrus. This is amply illustrated by the documents from the Judean desert (for the later periods, see the documents collected by Sirat 1985). Only in the post-Talmudic period did the codex, introduced by the Christians for their holy writings, also come to be used for the Hebrew Scriptures. Even today

TEXTUAL CRITICISM (OT)

scrolls are still used in the synagogue for the reading of parts of the Bible.

Each scroll contained one biblical book, but a few Qumran scrolls contained more than one pentateuchal book and the Minor Prophets scroll from Wādī Murabbaʿat encompassed all the Minor Prophets. Some scrolls contained mere selections: 4QDeutq probably contained only Deuteronomy 32, and likewise some of the psalm scrolls contained a mere choice of psalms.

The text in the scrolls was written in columns, whose size varied from one scroll to the next. Some texts were more consistent regarding the column size than others, but within each individual sheet usually a consistent pattern was followed (for details see Tov 1988). These columns were usually lined and the letters were written beneath the lines. Most scrolls contained columns of approximately 20 lines, with exceptions on either side. For example, most of the scrolls containing one of the Five Scrolls had very small columns (7–13 lines). The script in which the Bible was originally written (the [paleo-] Hebrew script) was developed from the Canaanite script. Even when this script was no longer used, and new texts were written in the so-called Aramaic or square script, some of the pentateuchal scrolls could still be written in the old script. This is also the case with one Qumran scroll of Job and some as-yet-unidentified texts from Qumran and Masada. The transition from the Hebrew script to the square script took place in the 5th century B.C. (tradition ascribes this change to Ezra).

Two formal features of scrolls, attested in the Qumran scrolls, are also reflected in some way or another in the later MT: (1) The text is divided into sense units (paragraphs, sections). Not only is the system used in most Qumran scrolls similar to that of the MT, but the two also agree to a great extent with regard to the position of the paragraphs. (2) Scribal marks are used to indicate letters to be erased, corrections made, and other matters which are not always clear (see 1QIsa).

Certain formal features of the printed MT were not part of the older scribal practices: (1) In the ancient biblical scrolls the words presumably were not separated by spaces—they were written in the so-called *scriptio continua*, as can still be seen in the later tefillin and mezuzahs from Qumran and Masada. However, no such biblical texts have been preserved, and the main argument for the assumption of *scriptio continua* is that later texts often resolve word divisions wrongly. All Qumran texts use spaces between the words, and in a few exceptional cases dot dividers are used. (2) The scrolls from the desert of Judea contain neither vocalization nor accents. (3) The division into verses and chapters in the Hebrew mss was not made until the Middle Ages. (4) The letters *m*, *n*, *s*, *p*, and *k* have two forms in the Aramaic script, one of which is used at the end of a word. Several Qumran scrolls represent a transitional stage in which both forms of the letter are often used interchangeably (initial-medial forms of the letters sometimes are used in the final position).

The Qumran scrolls clarify various aspects of the procedure of copying (see especially Martin 1958) which also explains various types of errors: (1) The graphic similarity between several single letters or combinations of letters—ligatures—explains mistakes made with consonants. (2) The correction habits (adding elements between the

lines or in the margin, crossing out, erasing, placing dots above or under the letters) created cramped and crowded texts which facilitated misunderstandings and misreadings. (3) The published scrolls contain extremely few examples of glosses, so often appealed to in biblical scholarship. If these were ever used, they must have been created at an earlier stage of the textual transmission.

3. *Matres Lectionis*. *Matres lectionis* (literally, “mothers of reading”) are the letters ^ʾ*alep*, *he*, *waw*, and *yod* added to the basic forms of Hebrew words to facilitate their reading. In principle the *matres lectionis* thus serve a function that in the MT was later taken over by the vocalization.

The textual witnesses differ considerably in their use of *matres lectionis*, and individual witnesses are not always internally consistent. This situation is the result of the development of Hebrew orthography. At first Hebrew did not use *matres lectionis*, but later these were added in several places to the basic form of the words: *yod* for “i” and “e,” *waw* for “u” and “o,” and ^ʾ*alep* for “a,” “i,” “e,” and “o” (see Cross and Freedman 1952). The increasing use of *matres lectionis* is reflected in the various kinds of biblical texts; older texts make less use of them than more recent ones.

Spellings without a *mater lectionis* are called “defective”; those with a *mater* are called “full” (*plene*). The orthography of the MT to a certain degree exhibits defective spelling, therefore the last copying stage represented in the MT reflects a relatively early stage of the evolution of the biblical text (between the 4th and 2d centuries B.C., according to Freedman 1962). However, it is wrong to generalize about the books of the MT, since every book is different (see especially Andersen and Forbes 1986). The later biblical books (Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles) reflect a fuller orthography than the earlier ones (e.g., the spelling of the name David as *dwd* in Samuel and Kings, but *duyḏ* in Chronicles). Among the earlier books, the Pentateuch (esp. Exodus and Leviticus) and Kings present the most conservative system of spelling. Within individual books different spellings are found side by side (e.g., Ezek 32:23 *kbrtyh*, v 25 *kbrth*, v 26 *kbrutyh*). (For examples of the inconsistencies in the Masoretic spelling, see especially Sperber 1966: 556–74; Barr 1989.) On the other hand, beyond the characteristics of each book, certain words consistently reflect an established spelling (*nʾm*, *ybʾ*, *ʾbwt*).

4. The Background of Textual Variations. There are literally thousands of differences regarding spelling, vocalization, verse division, etc., between parallel texts within the MT, within the early biblical texts (proto-MT compared with the Qumran scrolls and the proto-Samaritan texts), and within the later mss of the MT. Usually all these different readings are compared with the MT and deviations from the MT are called “variants,” without any pejorative implication that they are intrinsically inferior. A distinction is made between unintentional variants created in the course of the copying of the text and other variants, some of which reflect intentional alterations (while still others reflect a shifting linguistic reality).

a. Unintentional Variants. Unintentional variants (for the most part mistakes) crept into the text for various reasons connected with the copying of texts: the transition from the Hebrew to the Aramaic script, the interpretation of the *scriptio continua* when the words were finally sepa-

rated, the misunderstanding and interchange of letters and words by the copyists, and finally various types of oversight by the copyists. In simple terms, all variants are either different words (sometimes resulting merely from one different consonant), omissions or additions of details, or transpositions of elements. Among these, the following phenomena should be mentioned separately:

The confusion of consonants. Errors result from the fact that some consonants closely resemble others, especially *t/ʔ* and *y/s* in the Hebrew script, *y/w*, *b/m/k* in the square (Aramaic) script, and *d/r* in both. Also, ligatures such as *nw* could be confused with final *m*, and *ʕ* or *ʕw* could be confused with *š*. This confusion is recognizable not only between different mss of the same text, but even within parallel texts in the MT itself (e.g., Gen 10:4 Dodanim = 1 Chr 1:7 Rodanim; Gen 10:3 Riphath = 1 Chr 1:3 Diphath).

Dittography. Errors could result from the erroneous repetition of letters or words (e.g., Jer 51:3 *ydrk ydrk*; cf. the Qere, *ydrk*).

Haplography. Errors could also stem from the skipping of one or two (almost) identical letters or words (e.g., the erroneous omission of *btwh* in Isa 26:3 in 1QIs^a before *btlw* in v 4; the correct reading is found in the MT).

Homoeoteleuton. Similarly, errors crept in due to the erroneous omission of a group of words with the same ending, caused when the eye of the copyist jumped directly from one word (or group of words) to another, identical word (or group) later in the text (e.g., the omission of Isa 40:7b–8a in 1QIs^a; in this case the omitted text was subsequently reinserted at the end of the line, above the line and in the margin).

Metathesis. Errors could also result from the transposition of letters (e.g., 2 Sam 23:31 *hbrhmy*, the Barhumite = 1 Chr 11:33 *hbhrumy*, the Baharumite). On the basis of parallel texts, the latter reading can be established as the correct name of the city (Bahurim).

Doublet (conflate reading). The mistaken juxtaposition of two or more parallel readings in the text itself, with or without grammatical connection, could lead to erroneous readings (see the textual witnesses in Isa 37:9; 41:20; Jer 52:34 = 2 Kgs 25:30). See Talmon 1960.

Different word division. Some differences between two textual traditions derive from the time when the words were resolved from the *scriptio continua* (cf. the Kethib and Qere forms in 2 Sam 5:2; Ezek 42:9; Job 38:12).

Many examples of these scribal phenomena have been collected by Sperber (1966: 476–90) and Delitzsch (1920) from different mss of one text, from the MT compared with the Sam. Pent., from the Kethib words compared with the Qere forms, and from inner-Masoretic parallel texts.

b. Other Variants. While many of the variants in biblical mss were created by unconscious scribal procedures such as described above, other readings were intentionally inserted into the text. Of these, there is a large group of linguistically different forms indicating that the linguistic reality of the copyist was different from that of the original text and that the text was changed accordingly. This is visible especially in the Sam. Pent. and the Qumran scribal school, as well as in the text of Chronicles when compared with the earlier books. In this latter case, the author of Chronicles allowed himself the linguistic changes which were also made by copyists. Relevant examples for 1QIs^a

are the change of the rare *yhkw* to *yʔyrw* in 13:10 and of the hapax *šwbl* to *šwlyk* in 47:2.

More penetrating changes concerned the content of the text, especially in the realm of theology. The Sam. Pent. and the LXX (possibly independently) record in Gen 2:2 that God stopped his work on the *sixth* day (and not on the *seventh* day as in the MT), thus removing a theological problem from the text. The “corrections of the scribes” (see above) show that this procedure must have continued until relatively late periods. Changes of this kind have often been recognized within the MT itself (see Ginsburg 1897: 399–404) in the tendency of Samuel to alter the component “Baal” in personal names. Thus Gideon’s second name, Jerubbaal, occurs 14 times in Judges and in 1 Sam 12:11, but was changed to “Jerubbosheth” in the MT of 2 Sam 11:21, where the LXX still has the old form “Jerubbaal.” The name of Saul’s fourth son was twice written “Eshbaal” in 1 Chronicles, but in 2 Samuel it was changed 12 times to “Ishbosheth.”

E. The Procedure of Textual Criticism

1. Introduction. OT textual criticism covers two areas. The first, the analysis of the biblical text as found in Hebrew mss and as reflected in the ancient versions, may be called textual criticism proper, while the second area, conjectural criticism, is to be regarded as an appendix to textual criticism (see E.4 below). The task of textual criticism proper is further subdivided into two stages, the first involving the collation (collection) of existing Hebrew variants and the reconstruction of other variants from the ancient translations, and the second dealing with the evaluation of these variants.

2. Collation and Conjectural Reconstruction of Hebrew Variants. The evaluation of the textual witnesses can begin only after all the relevant data have been collected. For this purpose, variants have been collected and described in various kinds of monographs. Most of the information on these variants is found in monographs which are devoted solely to this issue, but much information can also be found in special apparatuses in ICC and BKAT.

In addition, one often turns to a modern critical edition of the Hebrew Bible that contains a selection of these variants. The modern editions are *BHK*, *BHS*, and the still incomplete *HUB* (see M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Isaiah I–II*, Jerusalem, 1975–81). These critical editions reflect a mixture of objective and subjective factors, the latter manifested in the idiosyncratic process of selecting which data to incorporate and how to present them. Thus, *BHK* and *BHS* merely provide a selection of textual data and are often inaccurate. Much important data is excluded and much that is insignificant has been included; especially the treatment of the Versions leaves much to be desired (*BHS* is often more careful in its judgments than *BHK*, but on the other hand the selection of *BHK* often provides a better basis for further study than *BHS*). (For a critical evaluation of *BHK*, see especially Orlinsky 1961.)

The *HUB* avoids conjectures (emendations) and its selection of data is much more complete than *BHK* or *BHS*. In four different apparatuses this (still incomplete) edition simply includes variants (a) from the Versions; (b) from the rabbinic literature and the scrolls from the Judean

desert; (c) of consonants from medieval mss; and (d) of vocalization and accentuation from those mss.

3. Evaluation of Readings. After all the variants are collected from the Heb sources and reconstructed from the Versions, they must be evaluated. This evaluation is performed through comparison with the *textus receptus* (MT), without implying that the MT is the best text. In fact, all Heb readings in principle are of equal value and this applies also to reconstructed variants, provided the reconstruction is trustworthy.

The purpose of this comparison is to determine whether one of the transmitted readings can make a better claim of representing the "original" text (as defined in the introduction above) than the others. Because of the lack of convincing arguments, such a determination is often impossible. In some cases two variant readings are regarded as "synonymous" (see Talmon 1961), and in yet other cases the evidence for deciding the "original reading" is insufficient. However, the inability to decide in such instances does not undermine the correctness of the procedure itself.

The readings are compared on the basis of their intrinsic value. This analysis is based on subjective considerations that are used as a guide to evaluate the reading "in its context" when that "context" is taken in the broadest sense of the word. Thus, a discussion of the "context" of a given Heb word leads to a complete exegesis of the passage as well as to an analysis of the language and style of the OT as a whole and the specific scriptural unit under investigation. Ideally one tries to determine the one reading from which all the other(s) would have derived, or the reading which best explains the direction in which the other readings developed. That reading is considered the "best" or "original" reading.

In view of the subjectivity of the evaluation of the readings, some have tried to draw up rules, external (relating to the textual witnesses) and internal (relating to the intrinsic value of the reading) that would seemingly make this evaluation more objective (see, e.g., Klein 1974: 69–84; Payne 1974; Thompson, *IDBSup*, 886–91; Barthélemy et al. 1979; for an analysis of the earlier discussions see Tov 1982b). *Internal rules* pertain to such issues as preferring the shorter reading (*lectio brevior*) to a longer one, and a "more difficult" reading (*lectio difficilior*) to easier ones. But these internal rules are abstractly formulated, they apply only to a small number of instances, and their use is so subjectively determined that the evaluation still remains a subjective procedure (see Albrektson 1981; Tov 1982b). *External rules* refer to such matters as the relative and absolute date of the textual witnesses, their geographical backgrounds, the weight given to the testimony of the majority, and the preference of MT, but all these criteria are fraught with assumptions and do little to eliminate the subjective aspect of the enterprise. Common sense coupled with the occasional use of an internal rule remains our main guide.

4. Conjectures. Conjectural criticism (emendation) concerns itself with the correction of the biblical text, utilized when neither the Hebrew mss nor the ancient translations offer a "satisfactory" reading of the "original" text in a given instance. The coincidental nature of the textual data preserved justifies judicious emendation: since only a

(small?) fraction of the textual witnesses have been preserved, it is possible to appeal to the unpreserved remainder by way of conjecture, basing this on known textual procedures such as interchanges of similar letters. Conjectural criticism is one of the most subjective parts of biblical study because there are no objective criteria for determining the incorrectness of the transmitted readings or for suggesting conjectures. Conjectural criticism actually stems mainly from exegesis and is only secondarily linked to text-critical criteria, for conjectures are initially proposed on the basis of what the critic feels the text "ought" to say, and only subsequently must they be acceptable on the text-critical level. Most conjectures derive from a certain understanding of the context, but some are based on linguistic presuppositions concerning biblical Hebrew, cognate languages (especially Ugaritic), and on metrical considerations. Most of these linguistic conjectures are questionable (for criticisms on grammatical conjectures, see Sperber 1966: 49–104).

A well-known example of a contextual conjecture is in Amos 6:12 where, instead of MT *ʾim yahārōš babbēqārīm* ("does one plow in the mornings" [?]), Michaelis in 1772 emended it to read *ʾim yehārōš bebāqār yām* ("does one plow the sea with oxen" [lit. "is the sea plowed by oxen"]). The MT is unintelligible without the conjecture (accepted by RSV), which makes perfect sense and creates better parallelism than the MT, even though it is not supported by a single manuscript.

Various editions (especially *BHK* and *BHS*) and commentaries include conjectures, and given the inherent subjectivity involved it is not surprising that these have generated much criticism.

F. Textual and Literary Criticism

The biblical books each developed to the stage at which they were considered finished literary products, and textual criticism concerns itself with charting developments from that point on. The reconstruction of all developments prior to that point is the concern of literary criticism. However, since some form of written transmission must have occurred during the stage of the literary growth, sharp distinctions between the two cannot always be drawn. Much can be inferred from the way in which late biblical revisions were based on earlier texts; also the story in Jeremiah 36 suggests that *portions* of what would later be incorporated in a biblical book were written and circulated prior to the completion of the complete literary product we now possess.

Scholars have pointed out that some of these earlier (partial) formulations of the biblical books have been preserved in the textual witnesses. These remnants of earlier literary stages (preceding the one reflected in MT) are thus relevant to *literary* rather than to *textual* criticism since they pertain to the literary growth and not to the textual transmission of the book in question. Most of the evidence relates to data preserved in the LXX and in two of the Qumran scrolls, in both cases textual witnesses which because of their physical and/or religious remoteness from mainstream Judaism were used at a time when the MT prevailed elsewhere. The examples have been collected by Tov (1981b: 293–311). For example, the MT of Isa 38:21–22 witnesses to a later stage in the development of the

story of Hezekiah's sickness, as is evident from 1QIs^a and the parallel in 2 Kings 20, which attest to an earlier stage (see Zakovitch 1985). The LXX of Jeremiah and 4QJer^b attest to an earlier editorial stage of the book, differing from the later edition (attested by MT) both in length and in sequence of verses and chapters (see Tov 1981a). The short text of the LXX of Josh 20:1–6 reflects an earlier and shorter stage of the law on the cities of refuge than the MT, which witnesses to a subsequent editorial stage wherein the law was reformulated with respect to Deuteronomy 19 (see Rofé 1983). Likewise, the much shorter text of the story of David and Goliath in the LXX reflects an earlier stage of that story than does the MT (see Lust and Tov in Barthélemy et al. 1986). According to Tov (1981b: 307–11), this sort of textual evidence should not be evaluated with the usual text-critical procedures.

Bibliography

- Albrektson, B. 1978. Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible. *VTSup* 29: 49–65.
- . 1981. Difficilior Lectio Probabilior—A Rule of Textual Criticism and Its Use in OT Studies. *OTS* 21: 5–18.
- Albright, W. F. 1955. New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible. *BASOR* 140: 27–33.
- Andersen, F. I., and Forbes, A. D. 1986. *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible*. BibOr 41. Rome.
- Aptowitzer, V. 1906–15. *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur*. 4 vols. Vienna (repr. 1970).
- Baillet, M. 1971. Le texte samaritain de l'Exode dans les manuscrits de Qumran. Pp. 363–81 in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, ed. A. Caquot and M. Philonenko. Paris.
- Barr, J. 1968. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT*. Oxford.
- . 1979. The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations. *NAWG* 1: 279–325.
- . 1981. A New Look at Kethib-Qere. *OTS* 21: 19–37.
- . 1989. *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*. The Schweich Lectures. Oxford.
- Barthélemy, D. 1982. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. OBO 50. Fribourg and Göttingen.
- Barthélemy, D., et al. 1979. *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew OT Text Project*. 2d edition. Vol. 1–4. New York.
- . 1986. *The Story of David and Goliath*. OBO 73. Göttingen.
- Bendavid, A. 1972. *Parallels in the Bible*. Jerusalem.
- Ben-Hayyim, Z. 1954. *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language*. Madrid and Barcelona.
- . 1956–79. *The Literary and Oral Traditions of Hebrew and Aramaic among the Samaritans*. 5 vols. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- Brock, S. P., et al. 1973. *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*. Leiden.
- Butin, R. 1906. *The Ten Nequdoth of the Torah*. Baltimore (repr. 1969).
- Cohen, M. 1973. *Orthographic Systems in Ancient Massorah Codices*. Ph.D. diss. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- . 1976. The Orthography of the Samaritan Pentateuch. *Beth Miqra* 64: 54–70; 66: 361–91 (in Hebrew).
- Cross, F. M. 1955. The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran. *JBL* 74: 147–72.
- . 1961. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. 2d edition. New York (repr. 1980).
- . 1975a. The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text. Pp. 278–92 in *QHBT*.
- . 1975b. The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts. Pp. 306–20 in *QHBT*.
- Cross, F. M., and Freedman, D. N. 1952. *Early Hebrew Orthography*. AOS 36. New Haven.
- Deist, F. 1978. *Towards the Text of the OT*. Pretoria.
- . 1988. *Witnesses to the Old Testament*. Pretoria.
- Delitzsch, F. 1920. *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament*. Berlin and Leipzig.
- Del Medico, H. E. 1957. *L'Enigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Paris.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 1977. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools for Study*. 2d edition. Missoula, MT.
- Freedman, D. N. 1962. The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls. A Study in Orthography. *Textus* 2: 87–102.
- Gaster, M. 1908. Das Buch Josua in hebraisch-samaritanischer Rezension. *MDMG* 62: 209–79, 494–549.
- Ginsburg, C. D. 1897. *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. London. Repr. NY, 1966.
- Golb, N. 1980. The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124: 1–24.
- Gooding, D. W. 1976. An Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the OT. *JSS* 21: 15–25.
- Gordis, R. 1971. *The Biblical Text in the Making*. 2d edition. New York.
- Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. 1957. The History of the Bible Text and Comparative Semitics. *VT* 7: 195–201.
- . 1960. Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta. *SchrHier* 3: 26–60.
- . 1963. Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism—The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint. *Textus* 3: 130–58.
- . 1975. Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition. Pp. 42–89 in *QHBT*.
- . 1983. The Textual Criticism of the OT: Rise, Decline, Rebirth. *JBL* 102: 365–99.
- Greenberg, M. 1956. The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible in the Light of the Biblical Materials from Qumran. *JAOS* 76: 157–67.
- . 1978. The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text. *VTSup* 29: 131–48.
- Grossfeld, B. 1972–77. *A Bibliography of Targum Literature*. 2 vols. Cincinnati and New York.
- Kahle, P. E. 1915. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Penta-teuchtextes. *TSK* 38: 399–439.
- . 1959. *The Cairo Geniza*. 2d edition. Oxford.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, B. 1968. *The Vulgate as a Translation*. Ph.D. diss. Jerusalem.
- . 1969. Textual Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah. *Textus* 7: 36–58.
- Keil, C. F. 1859. *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*. 2d edition. Frankfurt.
- Klein, R. W. 1974. *Textual Criticism of the OT*. Philadelphia.
- Komlosh, Y. 1973. *The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations*. Tel Aviv (in Hebrew).
- König, E. 1893. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Bonn.
- Kutscher, E. Y. 1974. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*. Leiden.
- Lagarde, P. A. de. 1863. *Anmerkungen zur griechischen übersetzung der Proverbien*. Leipzig.
- Leiman, S. Z., ed. 1974. *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible*. New York.

- Lieberman, S. 1962. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. 2d edition. New York.
- Lipschütz, L. 1965. *Publications of the HUB Project*. Jerusalem.
- McCarter, P. K. 1986. *Textual Criticism—Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Philadelphia.
- McCarthy, C. 1981. *The Tiqqune Sopherim*. OBO 36. Freiburg and Göttingen.
- Macuch, R. 1969. *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch*. Berlin.
- Margolis, M. L. 1907. Studien im griechischen alten Testament. *ZAW* 27: 212–70.
- Marks, J. H. 1956. *Der textkritische Wert des Psalterium Hieronymi juxta Hebraeos*. Winterthur.
- Martin, M. 1958. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Louvain.
- Nowack, W. 1875. *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik*. Göttingen.
- Nyberg, H. S. 1935. *Studien zum Hoseabuche*. Uppsala.
- Orlinsky, H. M. 1961. The Textual Criticism of the OT. Pp. 113–32 in *BANE*.
- Owen, H. 1774. *Critica Sacra*. London.
- Payne, D. F. 1974. OT Textual Criticism: Its Principles and Practice. *TynBul* 25: 99–112.
- Penkower, J. S. 1982. *Jacob ben Hayyim and the Rise of the Biblia Rabbinica*. Diss. Jerusalem.
- Purvis, J. D. 1968. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. HSM 2. Cambridge, MA.
- Qimron, E. 1986. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS 29. Atlanta.
- Rengstorff, K. H. 1960. *Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Totem Meer*. Stuttgart.
- Roberts, B. J. 1951. *The OT Text and Versions*. Cardiff.
- Rofé, A. 1983. Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated by Joshua 20. Pp. 137–50 in *Isaac Leo Seeligmann Volume*, ed. A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- Rosenmüller, E. F. C. 1797. *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*. Vol. 1. Göttingen.
- Sanderson, J. E. 1986. *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*. HSS 30. Atlanta.
- Sirat, C. 1985. *Les papyrus en caractères hébraïques trouvés en Egypte*. Paris.
- Skehan, P. W. 1955. Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran. *JBL* 74: 182–87.
- . 1971. The Scrolls and the Old Testament Text. Pp. 99–112 in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield. New York.
- . 1975a. The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism. Pp. 212–25 in *QHBT*.
- . 1975b. The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament. Pp. 264–77 in *QHBT*.
- Sperber, A. 1940. New Testament and Septuagint. *JBL* 59: 193–293.
- . 1966. *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden.
- . 1973. *The Targums and the Hebrew Bible*. Vol. 4B of *The Bible in Aramaic*. Leiden.
- Steuernagel, C. 1912. *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Tübingen.
- Talmon, S. 1960. Double Readings in the Massoretic Text. *Textus* 1: 144–95.
- . 1961. Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the OT. *ScrHier* 8: 335–83.
- . 1962. The Three Scrolls of the Law That Were Found in the Temple Court. *Textus* 4: 14–27.
- . 1975. Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts. Pp. 226–63 in *QHBT*.
- Tigay, J. H., ed. 1985. *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia.
- Tov, E. 1978a. The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of the Vorlage of the LXX. *CBQ* 40: 29–36.
- . 1978b. The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX. *JSOT* 7: 53–68.
- . 1979. The Textual Character of the Leviticus Scroll from Qumran Cave 11. *Shnaton* 3: 238–44 (in Hebrew).
- . 1981a. Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah. Pp. 145–67 in *Le livre de Jérémie*, ed. P.-M. Bogaert. BETL 54. Louvain.
- . 1981b. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*. Jerusalem.
- . 1982a. A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls. *HUCA* 53: 11–27.
- . 1982b. Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings—The Limitations of Textual Rules. *HTR* 75: 429–48.
- . 1985. The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts. *JSOT* 31: 3–29.
- . 1986. The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls. *Textus* 13: 31–57.
- . 1988. Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism. *JJS* 39: 5–37.
- . 1989. *The Textual Criticism of the Bible, an Introduction*. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- Van der Ploeg, J. 1947. Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la transmission du texte de l'Ancien Testament. *RB* 54: 5–41.
- Vannutelli, P. 1931–34. *Libri synoptici Veteris Testamenti*. 2 vols. Rome.
- Vermes, G. 1977. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London.
- Waltke, B. K. 1970. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the OT. Pp. 212–39 in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. Payne. Waco, TX.
- Weingreen, J. 1982. *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford.
- Weitzman, M. P. 1985. The Peshitta Psalter and Its Hebrew Vorlage. *VT* 35: 341–54.
- Würthwein, E. 1979. *The Text of the OT*. 2d edition. Grand Rapids.
- Yeivin, I. 1968. *The Aleppo Codex of the Bible*. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- . 1980. *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*. Missoula, MT.
- Zakovitch, Y. 1985. Assimilation in Biblical Narratives. Pp. 175–96 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia.

EMANUEL TOV

NEW TESTAMENT

NT textual criticism is the study of the transmission of the NT texts from their presumed autographs through all of their ms representations. Though its primary objective is to reconstruct the original or earliest form of the text of the NT books, it is concerned also with intermediate and larger forms of the text and, indeed, with all aspects of textual transmission and its history, including localized or geographically limited forms of the text, and ideologically or theologically biased textual formulation. While NT textual criticism has its "scientific" or empirical and objective aspects, including statistical analyses and quantitative measures, it is also very much an "art," requiring subjective judgments and qualitative decisions based on expert knowledge of the general textual transmission process and