

THE HISTORY OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT IN  
THE LIGHT OF DISCOVERIES IN THE  
JUDAEAN DESERT

FRANK MOORE CROSS, JR.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE publication in January, 1953, of fragments of an unknown recension of the Greek Bible gave the first unambiguous warnings of a revolution to come in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>1</sup> Earlier the publication of the great Isaiah scroll of Qumrân, Cave I (1Q Isa<sup>a</sup>), and later of the second fragmentary roll of Isaiah (1Q Isa<sup>b</sup>), created noise and excitement,<sup>2</sup> but none of the major text-critical schools was forced to shift significant ground. Champions of the *Hebraica veritas* who had increasingly dominated the field, especially in Europe, noted the close affinities of the scrolls with the traditional text. The failure of 1Q Isa<sup>a</sup> to produce a significant number of superior readings despite its antiquity embarrassed lingering survivors of the great critical tradition of the nineteenth century, and delighted biblical exegetes and historians who wished to ply their trade without entering the miasmal precincts of text-critical labors. Despite some attention paid to its occasional affinities with the Old Greek,<sup>3</sup> most scholars, whether prompted by traditionalist prejudice or sheer inertia,

<sup>1</sup>D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," RB 60 (1953), 18-29. Cf. F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân*, rev. ed. (New York, 1961), pp. 28f., n.35 (bibliography), and pp. 174f., n.19 [hereafter abbreviated ALQ<sup>2</sup>]. In 1963, Barthélemy published transcriptions of the new recension as well as an analysis of its place in the textual history of the Septuagint: *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète* (Leiden, 1963) [hereafter, DA]. See also B. Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," IEJ 12 (1962), 201-07, and Pl. 32B.

<sup>2</sup>Selected items of bibliography can be found in ALQ<sup>2</sup>, pp. 177f., n.21. To these should be added M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran*, pp. vii-xv; pp. 51-85; and Textus III (1963), 130-58; H. M. Orlinsky, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," in *The Bible and Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright (New York, 1961), pp. 113-32.

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, the distinguished textual scholar, J. Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1Q 15<sup>a</sup>)," JBL 78 (1959), 34-59.

0.6.2

57.02/Leiman/Bib 5031

were pleased to label the text vulgar or even sectarian, avoiding thereby a serious reexamination of their text-critical theories.

The recension published by Barthélemy proved to be an extraordinary document. It is a revision of the Old Greek text, revised on the basis of a forerunner of the traditional Hebrew text extant in Palestine toward the middle of the first century of the Christian era. The Recension itself dates probably from the second half of the first century.<sup>4</sup> It should be noted, however, that the *Vorlage* of the Greek text is by no means identical with the surviving *textus receptus*, but may be called Proto-Massoretic, since it differs even more decidedly with the Old Palestinian Hebrew text. In the Minor Prophets, the recension of Barthélemy has been identified with the text used by Origen in the seventh column of the Hexapla, so-called Quinta. That it had wide circulation is suggested by the evidence that it was available to Origen in at least two editions,<sup>5</sup> and survives in the quotations of Justin Martyr's Dialogue and elsewhere.<sup>6</sup> More important, Barthélemy has been able to establish that his recension was the common base of later recensions of the Greek Bible, above all Aquila.<sup>7</sup>

Barthélemy's most significant contribution, perhaps, is the identification of this Greek recension outside the Minor Prophets elsewhere in the Greek Bible. Building on the basis of H. St. John Thackeray's analysis of the Greek style of the Books of Reigns,<sup>8</sup> i.e., Samuel and Kings, he has been able to demonstrate that the sections of Samuel and Kings assigned by Thackeray to "Proto-Theodotion" actually are identical in style with the Recension. The sections in question are 2 Samuel 11:2-1 Kgs. 2:11 (Thackeray's  $\beta\gamma$ ) and 1 Kgs. 22-2 Kgs. 25 ( $\gamma\delta$ ). Thus it

<sup>4</sup>The Greek scripts and Palaeo-Hebrew inserts in "R" (i.e., the Recension of Barthélemy) point to a date about the middle of the first century of our era, or, perhaps better, the second half of the century. See DA, pp. 167f., and C. H. Roberts *apud* P. Kahle, "Problems of the Septuagint," *Studia Patristica*, ed. Aland and Cross, I (1957), 332.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," *Studia Patristica*, I, 350.

<sup>6</sup>See DA, pp. 228-45 for discussion of other relations of the Recension; Cf. D. Katz, *op. cit.* (note 5), 345-53.

<sup>7</sup>DA, pp. 246-70.

<sup>8</sup>The Septuagint and Jewish Worship [Schweich Lectures 1920] (London, 1921).

became clear that the Old Greek or Septuagint in these sections has been replaced by the later recension. Other books and sections of the received Greek Bible may belong to this recensional group, appropriately labeled by Barthélemy the *Groupe καίε*.<sup>9</sup> Ruth and Lamentations are good candidates.<sup>10</sup> Daniel, traditionally assigned to Theodotion, and correctly recognized by a number of scholars as "Proto-Theodotion," seems clearly to belong to the *καίε* Recension. Other Theodotonic materials show clear affinities with the Recension and belong at least to the same family.<sup>11</sup>

The *καίε* Recension is of decisive bearing on the debate over Septuagint origins. It brings a qualified victory to the Lagarde school, despite Paul Kahle's protestations to the contrary.<sup>12</sup> There is no doubt that this Greek text was an early Jewish attempt to revise the standard Septuagint into conformity with a Proto-Massoretic Hebrew text, just as Aquila represents a sequent attempt to revise this revision in the direction of the official Rabbinic or Massoretic text which had been established by his day. We see, then, a series of attempts to bring the Greek Bible into conformity with a *changing* Hebrew textual tradition.<sup>13</sup> On the

<sup>9</sup>DA, pp. 33-47; pp. 91-143.

<sup>10</sup>The case of Judges is not established by Barthélemy, and insufficient data is presented for Canticles, et al. Much labor is needed to test most of the suggested instances of the *καίε* Recension. In the case of the Book of Reigns, Barthélemy's careful study, the data presented below, as well as a dissertation of my student Father D. Shenkel, which goes well beyond Barthélemy in dealing with the recensions in 1 and 2 Kings, put the identification beyond doubt.

<sup>11</sup>E.g., the additions to Old Greek Job, the "Theodotonic" material in Psalms, including "Quinta," etc. Cf. Barthélemy, DA, pp. 41-47. On the "Proto-Theodotonic" text of Daniel, see J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* [ICC] (Edinburgh, 1927), pp. 46-50; J. Ziegler, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* [Göttingen Septuaginta] (Göttingen, 1954), p. 28, n. 1 and pp. 61f. Barthélemy's thesis that the *καίε* Recension is to be identified with Theodotion must remain *sub judice*. The evidence to equate Theodotion with Jonathan ben Uzziel is highly speculative, and little is actually solved by reassigning the designation "Theodotion." In Samuel-Kings we must still deal, as Barthélemy recognizes, with two "Palestinian recensions" (at least), in the Minor Prophets with both the Sixth Column and Quinta, with Theodotion in the Pentateuch, and so on. Until the character of "late" Theodotion is fully analyzed, perhaps it is better to retain more traditional designations, "Proto-Theodotion", and "Theodotion" rather than shifting with Barthélemy to what may be termed "Theodotion" and "Post-Theodotion."

<sup>12</sup>P. Kahle, "Die im August 1952 entdeckte Lederrolle mit dem griechischen Text der kleinen Propheten . . ." TLZ 79 (1954), coll. 81-94; Cross, ALQ<sup>3</sup>, p. 171, n.13; Barthélemy, DA, p. 266.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. ALQ<sup>3</sup>, p. 174 and n.19.

one hand these data firmly support evidence, already overwhelmingly clear, that an *Urtext* exists behind the Christian recensions of the Septuagint. On the other hand it also vindicates those who had argued that the special readings of Justin were early, and lends the support of analogy to those who claimed that the "Lucianic" readings of Josephus' biblical quotations were early.<sup>14</sup>

Later in the same year that the first fragments of the Barthélemy text were published, the writer published pieces of a Hebrew manuscript of Samuel from Cave IV, Qumrân (4QSam<sup>a</sup>).<sup>15</sup> Later purchases added a very large number of fragments to the manuscript, and now it is probably the most important as well as the most extensively preserved of some one hundred biblical manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrân. The text was of a type markedly distinct from the traditional Hebrew text of Samuel, but closely related to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint. There could be no confusion. A text having integrity though widely at variance with the *textus receptus* had come to hand. This text was the herald of a series of non-Massoretic texts, some from Cave IV which have had only preliminary publication, some like the Deuteronomy manuscript from Cave V (5Q1) which have been fully published.<sup>16</sup>

In 1954 Monsignor Skehan published a fragment of the "Song of Moses" which followed the Septuagint text against a defective Massoretic tradition.<sup>17</sup>

In 1955 appeared the writer's study of a third-century B.C. manuscript of Samuel (4QSam<sup>b</sup>). The character of one group of its fragments was summarized as follows:

4Q agrees with LXX against MT thirteen times; 4Q agrees with

<sup>14</sup> Paul Kahle is thus justified in his fulminations against Rahlfs' treatment of the Proto-Lucianic problem. It is ironic, however, that Kahle himself then argued (1947) that the biblical quotations from the historical books in Josephus had later been brought into conformity with the Lucianic text by Christian scribes! (The Cairo Geniza [London, 1947], pp. 150-56).

<sup>15</sup> F. M. Cross, "A New Qumrân Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (Dec., 1953), 15-26; cf. corrections of misprints in F. M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," JBL 74 (1955), 165, n.40.

<sup>16</sup> M. Baillet, J. T. Milik et R. de Vaux, Les "petites grottes" de Qumrân, DJD III (Oxford, 1962).

<sup>17</sup> P. W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumrân," BASOR 136 (Dec., 1954), 12-15; cf. ALQ<sup>2</sup>, pp. 182-84.

MT against LXX four times. Such statistics do not indicate the full value of this archaic text. Its affinities with the tradition to which the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek belongs is most important, and cannot be neglected in developing new methods and evaluations in future critical studies of the text of Samuel. Nevertheless, the most extraordinary characteristic of the text of 4QSam<sup>b</sup> is the high proportion of the original readings which it preserves, whether it be in agreement with the Greek, or in agreement with the MT, or against both in its several unique readings.<sup>18</sup>

In the same year, in fact in the same issue of the Journal of Biblical Literature,<sup>19</sup> Monsignor Skehan published parts of an Exodus manuscript written in a late Palaeo-Hebrew script, probably of the second century B.C. The character of the text is Samaritan, or rather that Palestinian type of text selected by the Samaritan community and surviving alone in it. It may be designated Proto-Samaritan to distinguish it from the specifically Samaritan text-type which underwent further recension.

Thanks to new data from Qumrân and elsewhere, we can correct a false assumption which has long plagued textual study of the Samaritan recension, namely, the view that the text stems from a Samaritan rupture of the fifth or fourth century B.C. As early as 1941, W. F. Albright had recognized that the script of the Samaritan Bible branched off from the Palaeo-Hebrew script not earlier than the first century B.C.<sup>20</sup> The study of the Palaeo-Hebrew script of Qumrân, of the Palaeo-Hebrew script found on an unpublished sealing of a Samaritan governor of the mid-fourth century B.C. as well as on coins and stamps of the fourth to the second century B.C., wholly support this dating. Similarly orthographic evidence, evidence from language, and indeed the character of the text itself confirm it.<sup>21</sup>

In 1958, the writer published his first attempt to deal in a systematic if provisional way with the variety of textual types

<sup>18</sup> F. M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," JBL 74 (1955), 147-72.

<sup>19</sup> P. W. Skehan, "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumrân," JBL 74 (1955), 182-87.

<sup>20</sup> From the Stone Age to Christianity (Baltimore, 1941, 1946<sup>2</sup>), p. 336, n.12.

<sup>21</sup> See the writer's remarks in, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in The Bible and the Ancient Near East, p. 189, n.4, and in the Harvard dissertation of my student James Purvis dealing with the Samaritan schism (1962).

found among the biblical manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrân.<sup>22</sup> It had become clear that at Qumrân we had penetrated to an era when local texts prevailed, and, so far as the Qumrân community was concerned, before the promulgation of an authoritative recension. The evidence for textual families for the time being is restricted largely to the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets, and the Book of Jeremiah. Study has been directed first of all to those books whose texts are dramatic in their variety, and whose Greek versions are relatively trustworthy. Isaiah's textual variations between the Hebrew and Greek are narrow in range, and, unhappily, the Septuagint is notoriously paraphrastic.<sup>23</sup> The Minor Prophets exhibit slightly more variety, and ample material is available for their analysis, but full attention has not been directed upon their exemplars from Cave IV, Qumrân, and the same is so by and large for the Hagiographa. The Psalter is an exception, and while its text at Qumrân is close to that of the *textus receptus*, the Scroll of Psalms from Cave XI shortly to be published will be of considerable interest.<sup>24</sup> If the so-called 11Q Ps<sup>a</sup> is indeed a Psalter, despite its bizarre order and noncanonical compositions, mostly of the Hellenistic era, then we must argue that one Psalms collection closed at the end of the Persian period (the canonical collection), and that another remained open well into the Greek period (11Q), but was rejected by the Rabbis. This is not to mention the extensive fragments of Psalms manuscripts from Cave IV, to be published shortly by P. W. Skehan.

In the Pentateuch three types of text are present. Some texts, especially that of Genesis, are closely allied with the *textus re-*

<sup>22</sup> ALQ<sup>2</sup>, pp. 168-94. Other general studies include M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible . . .," JAOS 76 (1956), 161-93; H. M. Orlinsky, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, pp. 113-32. The most provocative single study was Albright's brief "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," BASOR 140 (1955), 27-33.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. P. W. Skehan, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumrân," CBQ 8 (1955), 38-43; and "Some Textual Problems in Isaiah," CBQ 22 (1960), 47-55. References to Orlinsky's series of detailed studies can be found in the article cited in n.22. See also E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll [Hebrew]* (Jerusalem, 1959).

<sup>24</sup> See, provisionally, J. A. Sanders, "The Scroll of Psalms (11Q Pss) from Cave II: A Preliminary Report," BASOR 165 (Feb., 1962), 11-15; "Ps. 151 in 11Q Pss," ZAW 75 (1963), 73-86; "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11Q Ps<sup>a</sup>," ZAW 76 (1964), 57-75.

*ceptus*; others reflect close relations with the Samaritan, or properly, with the Palestinian text; a third group is closely affiliated with a text of the type which underlies the Septuagint.<sup>25</sup> A text of Numbers (4Q Num<sup>b</sup>) shows unusual characteristics.<sup>26</sup> It regularly follows Samaritan readings, including the long additions from Deuteronomy introduced into the text of Numbers in Proto-Samaritan tradition. On the other hand, when the Masoretic and Samaritan texts agree against the pre-Hexaplaric Greek text (i.e., the Septuagint), this text of Numbers usually agrees with the Old Greek, and it almost never sides with MT against both the Samaritan and Septuagint. It is evidently an early type of Palestinian text which somehow survived.<sup>27</sup>

The Samuel manuscripts from Cave IV are all at wide variance with Massoretic tradition, all with ties to the tradition used in the Septuagint translation. For reasons to be discussed below, we believe them all to belong to the Palestinian textual tradition.

In the case of Jeremiah, one manuscript of three from Cave IV follows the short tradition familiar from the Septuagint. Two represent the type of the traditional text.<sup>28</sup>

#### I. THE RABBINIC RECENSION OF THE BIBLE.

With the publication of the biblical documents from Murabba'at in 1961,<sup>29</sup> Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Isaiah, and above all, the great Hebrew Minor Prophets scroll, there can no longer be any reason to doubt that by the beginning of the second century A.D. an authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible had been promul-

<sup>25</sup> Some readings from an Exodus scroll (4Q Ex<sup>a</sup>) together with a photograph of a fragment from it are published in ALQ<sup>2</sup>, p. 184, n.31; see also the Plate opposite p. 141.

<sup>26</sup> On 4Q Num<sup>a</sup>, see already ALQ<sup>2</sup>, p. 186 and n.36.

<sup>27</sup> Against the text's having arisen by a simple crossing of MSS of Palestinian and Egyptian types stands the evidence of occasional agreement with LXX minuses and occasional omission of LXX pluses, as well as a sprinkling of so-called Proto-Lucanic readings (i.e., 4Q Num<sup>b</sup>-GL vs. MT-(3BA0)).

<sup>28</sup> A sample of the text of the shorter recension is published in ALQ<sup>2</sup>, p. 157, n.38 (4Q Jer<sup>b</sup>). One of my students, Mr. J. G. Janzen, has shown in a forthcoming Harvard dissertation that a large portion of the pluses of MT in Jeremiah and on expansionist tendencies of the type familiar for example in the Samaritan Pentateuch. On the contrary, the short text represented at Qumrân and in the Septuagint is exceedingly well preserved.

<sup>29</sup> P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, et R. de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'at*, DJD II (Oxford, 1961), 75-85 (Pls. XIX-XXIV), and 181-205 (Pls. LVI-LXXIII).

gated,<sup>30</sup> the archetype of the Massoretic manuscripts of the Middle Ages. The entire text of the Minor Prophets scroll reveals only five or six real variants, neglecting minor orthographic variation, interchange of *ʾ* and *ʿ*, and the like. The astonishing fact is that even the minor textual variants which mark the text of Aquila, the Targum, and the Vulgate are largely absent, and it is clear that these versions preserve some genuine survivals of readings which predate the official recension, since in each case older materials were used alongside the newer standard text.<sup>31</sup> Medieval variants are for the most part merely orthographic or secondary, a witness to subsequent development of variant readings which for a number of reasons may coincide with older witnesses.<sup>32</sup> In effect we have found at Murabbaʿât texts which testify to an archetypal recension as the ancestor of all Medieval Hebrew biblical manuscripts. The character of textual variation in Qumrân texts, where manuscripts belong to different textual families, differs *toto caelo* from the variation exhibited in the biblical texts of Murabbaʿât stemming from the circles of Bar Kokhba.

Thanks to the existence at Qumrân of a variety of textual traditions as well as to the evidence of the Greek recensions, we are able to describe somewhat the process by which the official text came into existence. The establishment of the official text followed a pattern unusual in the textual history of ancient documents. Unlike the recensional activity in Alexandria which produced an elegant if artificial and eclectic text of Homer,<sup>33</sup> and quite unlike

<sup>30</sup> To this material will be added other fragments from the Nahal Hever (Wâdi Habrâ). See provisionally Y. Yadin, *Yediot* 25 (1961), 49-64, and esp. Pl. 32:2. Cf. Y. Aharoni, "The Caves of the Nahal Hever," *Atiqot* 3 (1961), 148-75; Y. Yadin, "New Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *BA* 24 (1961), 34-50; and J. T. Milik, "Deux documents inédits du Désert de Juda. . .," *Biblica* 38 (1957), 255-64. The new discoveries at Masada may enable us to push back the existence of the Rabbinic recension, if not its official promulgation, to before A.D. 73. See below.

<sup>31</sup> Compare the writer's remarks in *ALQ*<sup>2</sup>, p. 170, n.13.

<sup>32</sup> See, for example, Aptowitz, *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur* (Sitzungsber. der kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-Hist. Klasse Bd. 153:6 [1906]; 160:7 [1908]), and H. L. Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vetus Testamentum hebraicum* (Leipzig, 1873). Cf. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Text and Language in Bible and Qumrân*, pp. x-xii.

<sup>33</sup> Compare S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1950), pp. 20-27; S. Talmon, "The Three Scrolls of the Law That Were Found in the Temple Court," *Textus* II (1962), 19-27.

the recensional activity which produced the Hexaplaric recension of the Septuagint or the conflate *textus receptus* of the New Testament, the Rabbinic scholars and scribes proceeded neither by wholesale revision and emendation nor by eclectic or conflating recensional procedures. They selected a single local textual tradition, which may be called the Proto-Massoretic text, a text which had been in existence in rough homogeneity for some time. Evidence for this text-type appears in our sources for the Pentateuch first at Qumrân. In Samuel and Kings it first influences the Septuagint text in the second of the major Jewish recensions, the *καίγε* or Proto-Theodotonic Recension, made about the middle of the first century A.D. It must be noted, however, that the Proto-Massoretic tradition at Qumrân and underlying the *καίγε* Recension of Samuel-Kings is not identical with the official text now known from the era between the two Jewish Revolts, and from Aquila. Some recensional activity was involved. A single orthographic tradition, in part archaizing to pre- or non-Maccabaeian spelling practices, was systematically imposed. Remarkably, the old Palestinian Palaeo-Hebrew script, as well as the Palestinian text-type preserved in it, was rejected. This rejection cannot be termed anti-Samaritan. The Palaeo-Hebrew script was the national Hebrew script of the Maccabees and was at home among the Essenes of Qumrân. It was the script nostalgically revived in both Jewish revolts against Rome. For a reason we shall expound later, the Rabbis chose a textual tradition of a specific kind never found in pure type in Palaeo-Hebrew, and hence, reluctantly, we suspect, chose the Late Herodian book-hand as the official character. This hand, already an archaizing character in the era of Bar Kokhba, was preserved through many centuries with remarkably slight evolutionary change.

As we have remarked, the Rabbinic text is normally short, not conflate or expansionist in the Pentateuch and Samuel. To be sure, there are secondary expansions in the Pentateuch, but by and large it is a superb, disciplined text. On the contrary, the text of Samuel is remarkably defective, and its shortness is the result of a long history of losses by haplography, the commonest error by far in a text which has not undergone systematic recensional activity, or which has not become mixed by infection from a

different textual tradition. Some indisputable evidence can be marshalled of revision and suppression of dramatically corrupt readings in the case of Samuel.<sup>34</sup> At all events, the Rabbinic recension stands in clear contrast to the full texts of the Palestinian and Old Greek traditions. The Proto-Massoretic text of the Pentateuch never passed through the centuries of reworking, revision, and expansion which characterized the development of the Proto-Samaritan tradition; it stood aloof from both this circle of tradition and that of the fuller Egyptian text. In the case of Samuel, it is difficult to understand the selection of the Proto-Massoretic tradition in view of the excellence of the Old Palestinian text-type, available at least at Qumrân.

We shall be speaking later of the local origin of the *textus receptus* and shall argue that its tradition, at least for the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, is the local text of Babylon which emerged in the fourth to second centuries B.C. Anticipating some of the conclusions of the following sections, however, we wish to deal now with the difficult problem of the occasion and date of the promulgation or, if one prefers, the fixing of the official text.

A *terminus ad quem* of c. A.D. 100 is well established by the manuscripts taken into the desert by the remnants of Bar Kokhba's forces. A *terminus a quo* is more difficult to fix. Rabbinic reflections of the recensional activity are late, and must be controlled by external data.<sup>35</sup> There exists at Qumrân no evidence whatever of true recensional activity. Earlier, scholars pointed to the late Isaiah Scroll (1Q Isa<sup>b</sup>) as evidence of a gradual trend toward the Massoretic text. There is no justification whatever for such a view. A text of Deuteronomy from Cave V dating to the early second century B.C. was systematically corrected in the Early Herodian period by a manuscript of Septuagintal type, so that every correction carried the text away from the Proto-Massoretic tradition.<sup>35</sup> In general, the date of a roll from Cave IV, Qumrân, tells us nothing of what we may expect of its textual character. These data would naturally lead one to propose that the main thrust of recensional activity on

<sup>34</sup> See for example, ALQ<sup>2</sup>, p. 191, n.45.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the studies listed in n.33, to which should be added S. Talmon, JJS 2 (1951), 149 f.

<sup>36</sup> 3Q1, 1-11) III, 169-71; Pl. xxxvi.

the part of the Rabbis must date from between the Jewish Revolts, or in any case no earlier than the era of Hillel, at the beginning of the first century A.D. Unfortunately, we cannot be sure that members of the Essene community, whether living in the desert or in the villages, were not sealed off from contact with Pharisaic Judaism after about 140 B.C.<sup>36</sup> Before this time, when the Essenes and Pharisees merge back into the Hasidic movement, there can be no question of their texts being aloof from putative recensional activity. The separation of the non-Massoretic Samaritan text in the same era points in the same direction.

On *a priori* grounds, we should expect the publication of an official text, and thereby the establishment of the distinction between official and *koina* traditions, to have taken place in one of three critical periods. One era would be the late Maccabean Age, when expulsions from Parthia and a Zionist revival brought floods of Jews from Babylon, Syria, and Egypt back to Jerusalem, and when, owing to the wholesale destruction of biblical texts in the Epiphanian persecution, scribal activity must have been stimulated. Thus, by the beginning of Hasmonaean times, we should suppose (1) that different local texts had immigrated to Judah, no doubt causing such confusion as we find reflected in the library of Qumrân, and (2) that scribal activity was urgent, both because of rival textual traditions and the great loss of Palestinian texts. A second era would be that of the interval between the Jewish Revolts, when both Hebrew and Greek evidence affirms that the official text was regnant. A third period would be that of the great schools of Hillel and Shammai. By Hillel's time, the theological and hermeneutic principles requiring a stable text had come into being.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, Hillel's Babylonian origins could provide a reason for the unexpected Rabbinic rejection of the Palestinian in favor of the Babylonian text as the basis of the recension.

The first era must be rejected, and the likelihood is that,

<sup>36</sup> For the writer's detailed arguments for this date, see ALQ<sup>2</sup>, pp. 109-60, and the literature cited therein. To this should now be added R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (London, 1961), esp. pp. 86-94.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, esp. p. 472; Barthélemy, *DA*, pp. 3-21; and the judicious statements of S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, pp. 47-68.

while first recensional activities may have begun as early as Hillel, effective promulgation of the official text and the demise of rival texts date to the era between the Revolts, in the days of Aqiba. This is the easiest way to deal with the evidence from Qumrân. More impressive, we know that late apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works stemming from Jewish circles in Palestine still exhibit a variety of biblical texts in works composed as late as the first century A.D. The New Testament reflects a variety of Hebrew and Greek biblical traditions. The *καίγε* Recension, based on a Proto-Massoretic text, gives evidence on the one hand that in the mid-first century the Old Palestinian text had been displaced in some Jewish circles. On the other hand, it shows equally that the official or Massoretic text had not yet come into being, or at least was not used in the Pharisaic school that produced the recension. Finally, as we shall be able to show in the next section, the Proto-Lucianic revision of the Septuagint of Samuel, a recension of the Septuagint revised to conform with a Palestinian text of the second or first century B.C., was still used by Josephus in his *Antiquities*, first composed about A.D. 93-94.

## 2. PROTO-LUCIANIC IN SAMUEL AND THE TEXT OF SAMUEL USED BY THE CHRONICLER AND JOSEPHUS.

In studying the text of 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>, I have been forced to note a series of readings in which the Hebrew of 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> reflects the so-called Lucianic recension preserved in the Greek minuscules *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*, and the Itala. In other words, 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> stands with LXX<sup>L</sup> against MT and LXX<sup>B</sup>. These are proper Proto-Lucianic readings in a *Hebrew* text of the first century B.C., four centuries before the Syrian Father to whom the recension is attributed. In 1 Sam. 1-2 Sam. 11:1, the text of 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> (and 4Q Sam<sup>b</sup>) follows closely the readings of the family LXX<sup>B</sup>, especially when LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>L</sup> agree against MT. There are also a sprinkling of indisputable Proto-Lucianic readings when 4Q Sam stands with LXX<sup>L</sup> against MT and LXX<sup>B</sup>, and even a rare instance when 4Q Sam and Josephus stand together against all other traditions. A few illustrations follow:

### 1. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 1 Sam. 5:9

גתה | גתה B | προς γεθ b' | προς γεθθαιους *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*

### 2. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 1 Sam. 5:10

ארוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל | την κιβωτον του θεου  
B | την κιβωτον του θεου ηηλ *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*

### 3. 4Q Sam<sup>b</sup>: 1 Sam. 23:13

וְעַל שָׂאוֹל הָגַד כִּי נִמְלֵט [לְשָׂאוֹל] לְכִי נִמְלֵט | και τω σαουα απη-  
γγελη οτι διασεσωσται B | (απηγγελη) τω σαουα οτι δια-  
σεσωσται *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* &

### 4. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 1 Sam. 28:1

וְעַל כִּמְחַנֵּה אֶתְּהָ וְהַנְּשִׁיךְ [לְמַ] לְחַמָּה יִזְרַעֲהָ [ה] | εις πολεμου  
σου και ανδρες σου & | εις τον πολεμον εις ρεγαν (Lat.  
RELLA). <CPEFA/PEAA < IECPAEAA. Jos. vi,325.  
IECPAEAA for יזרעאל appears elsewhere in Josephus.

### 5. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 3:28

וְעַל מַדְמֵי אַחֲנֵר [וְדַם] אַחֲנֵר | απο των αιματων Αβεννηρ B | αιμα  
Αβεννηρ *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* Thdt.

### 6. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 5:11<sup>37a</sup>

וְעַל וְחַרְשֵׁי אֲבֵן קִיר | και τεκτονας λιθων B | και  
τεκτονας τοιχου λιθων (conflate!) b | וְחַרְשֵׁי קִיר 1 Chr.  
14:1 | και τεκτονας τοιχου *oc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* &

Moreover, in sections where Chronicles overlaps with Samuel in this section 1 Sam. 1-2 Sam. 11:1,<sup>38</sup> the text of Chronicles normally agrees with 4Q and LXX<sup>B</sup> against MT.

On the contrary, in 2 Sam. 11:2-2 Sam. 24:25, the relation of 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> with LXX<sup>B</sup> changes wholly. Now 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> normally stands with LXX<sup>L</sup>, the Lucianic recension,<sup>39</sup> against LXX<sup>B</sup>, and LXX<sup>B</sup> normally reflects a Proto-Massoretic tradition. We have seen above, that Thackeray and most recently Barthélemy have argued that this section of Samuel is not the Old Greek, but the *καίγε* or Proto-Theodotianic recension. The evidence of the Samuel manuscripts confirms this conclusion beyond dispute. Further, Josephus and the text of Chronicles also continue to side with 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> and the Proto-Lucianic text.

<sup>37a</sup> On this text, see the analysis of S. Talmon, *Textus I* (1960), 167, 152.

<sup>38</sup> That is, in 1 Sam. 31; 2 Sam. 5:1, 6-25; 6:1-23; 7-8; 10; 11:1.

<sup>39</sup> On the Proto-Lucianic character of the sixth column of the *Hexapla*, see below, n.44.

Some illustrations may be found already published in my *Ancient Library of Qumrân*.<sup>40</sup> More follow below:

1. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 12:15  
 מֵ יְהוָה [אלוהים] | κυριος B | ο θς bgoc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>
2. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 12:16  
 מֵ וּשְׁכַב [וישכב בשק] | και ηγλισθη B | και εκαθευδεν εν σακκω  
 boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> | . . . επι σακκου Jos. vii, 154 | και ηγλισθη εν σακκω  
 MN cgjnuvb<sub>2</sub> | etc.
3. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 13:3  
 מֵ יוֹנָדָב [ני] הוֹנָתָן | ιωναδαμ B | ιωναδαβ G<sup>o</sup> | ιωνναθαν boe<sub>2</sub> |  
 ιωναθης Jos. vii, 178. Cf. 2 Sam. 21:21 = 1 Chr. 20:7.
4. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 24:17  
 מֵ הָעִיִּיתִי [הרעה הרעותי] | והרע הרעותי 1 Chr. 21:17 | εμι  
 ηδικησα B | ο ποιμην εκακοποιησα G<sup>OL</sup>. Cf. ο ποιμην Jos.  
 vii, 328.
5. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 24:16 +  
 מֵ > [פנ]יהם מ[כסים בשק] | εμ G<sup>BOL</sup> | בשקים על פניהם  
 מכסים 1 Chr.; cf. Jos. vii, 327.
6. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 24:18  
 מֵ וַיֵּאמֶר לוֹ [ויאמר] | και ειπεν αυτω B | και ειπεν abovc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>
7. 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: 2 Sam. 24:20  
 מֵ > [וארנא דש חטים] | εμ G<sup>BOL</sup> | וארנן דש חטים 1 Chr. 21:20 |  
 ορονας δε τον σιτον αλωων Jos. vii, 330.

The agreement between the text of Chronicles and 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> is most significant.<sup>41</sup> It makes clear now that the text of the Deuteronomistic history used by the Chronicler toward 400 B.C. was by no means identical with the received text. Yet it is equally clear that the Chronicler used the Old Palestinian text current in Jerusalem in his day. That in 1 Sam. 1-2 Sam. 11:1 the Chronicler used a text very closely related to that of 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>BL</sup> and in 2 Sam. 11:2-24:25 a text closely related to 4Q

<sup>40</sup>ALQ<sup>a</sup>, pp. 188-89, n.40a. Samples are chosen arbitrarily from a passage at the beginning and a passage at the end of the section.

<sup>41</sup>Among other things it means that we can control better the Chronicler's treatment of his sources. The usual picture painted of the Chronicler violently or willfully distorting Samuel and Kings to suit his fancy must be radically revised.

Sam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>L</sup>, but not to LXX<sup>B</sup>, yields further evidence for the Old Palestinian substratum in the Lucianic recension.

Perhaps we can now proceed to sketch a general theory of the development of the Hebrew text-types and the Greek recensions of Samuel. There is evidence that the Septuagint of Samuel and Kings was translated from an Egyptian Hebrew text that separated from the Old Palestinian textual tradition no later than the fourth century B.C.<sup>42</sup> This text differed sharply from the *textus receptus*, and while more closely allied to Palestinian texts from Qumrân, nevertheless is distinct from them. This Old Greek text was revised no later than the first century B.C. toward a Hebrew text we can trace in Palestine in the Chronicler and in the three manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrân. The Greek form is extant in quotations in Josephus, in the substratum of the Lucianic Recension preserved in the Greek minuscules boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>, and, surprisingly enough, in the sixth column of Origen's Hexapla to 2 Sam. 11:2-1 Kgs 2:11. Adam Mez first noted that the sixth column in the Hexapla, normally Theodotion, was directly related to the Greek biblical text used by Josephus, and to the Lucianic recension.<sup>43</sup> To Barthélemy must go the credit, however, for fully demonstrating the importance of this material, of freeing the sixth column here of its Theodotonic label, and of dealing systematically with its relations to the family boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>. Barthélemy concludes that the column contains the lost Septuagint of this section of Samuel-Kings. Here he errs, not being aware of the new evidence relating to the Proto-Lucianic recension. In fact the column preserves the Proto-Lucianic recension in relatively pure form. The Old Greek is lost in this section as in 2 Kgs (Thackeray's γδ).<sup>44</sup> The first stage, then, in the history of the

<sup>42</sup>See W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recension of the Hebrew Bible," pp. 27-33; ALQ<sup>a</sup>, pp. 189f.

<sup>43</sup>A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus* . . . (Basel, 1895). Cf. Barthélemy, DA, pp. 139f.

<sup>44</sup>See Barthélemy, DA, pp. 126-36. The following points should be stressed about θ, i.e., the sixth column in the section βγ of Reigns: (1) the readings follow the Lucian text closely, but occasionally are superior to the witnesses boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>; (2) the readings are very often against MT; and (3) the readings often give translations of terms where LXX<sup>B</sup> transliterates!

In addition to the new Qumrân evidence, supporting the identification of the Proto-Lucianic recension, we should observe that elsewhere in Samuel there are Greek materials difficult to explain by Barthélemy's hypothesis. For example, in



Greek recensions was the Proto-Lucian recension of the second or first century B.C., revised to conform to a Palestinian Hebrew text.

The second stage is represented by the *καίγε* recension made about the middle of the first century A.D. The Palestinian tradition underlying the Proto-Lucianic Greek was jettisoned, replaced by the Proto-Massoretic text as the Hebrew base.

The final stage is found in the late Greek recensions of the second century A.D., notably Symmachus, and Aquila, who undertook the further revision of the *καίγε* text, bringing it into conformity with the official Rabbinic text of Samuel.

Similarly we can schematize the history of the Hebrew textual families. The text of Samuel as it developed from a fifth century archetype split into three branches. (1) The Old Septuagint witnesses to an Egyptian local text. (2) 4Q Sam in its several manuscripts, as well as the Chronicler and Josephus, give witness to a Palestinian tradition at home in Palestine in the fourth century B.C. (Chronicles), the third century B.C. (4Q Sam<sup>b</sup>), the first century B.C. (4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>, the Hebrew text underlying the Proto-Lucianic Recension), and the first century A.D. (Josephus' text). (3) The Proto-Massoretic text is known only from the *καίγε* Greek Recension of the first century A.D. in Samuel. With Egypt and Palestine preempted by local text-types,

<sup>1</sup> Sam. 17-18, where the Old Greek text has not been suppressed, the Old Greek is much shorter than the Massoretic text, and perhaps original in its short form (cf. J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* [Göttingen, 1871], pp. 104f.). The Greek minuses in 17:12-31, 55-18:5 are filled in by (1) a recension belonging to the *καίγε*/Theodotianic group, and (2) the Lucianic recension of *boc.ε*, which, despite its Hexaplaric character, preserves many older readings against the MT, against the Theodotianic recension, and, of course, against the Old Greek (omissions).

Barthélemy's readiness to discard the Lucianic recension, *sensu stricto*, is puzzling. He recognizes that L in *boc.ε*, and in  $\theta$  of the  $\beta\gamma$  section go back to a non-Massoretic Hebrew tradition, closely related to the Old Greek. But these data do not require or even support his radical solution.

It may be observed in passing that Barthélemy's selective treatment of Jerome's testimonies to Lucian leaves much to be desired, and that he omits mention of the relatively early and important witness of Pseudo-Athanasius. Compare the judicious recent treatment of these testimonies to Lucian by B. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden, 1963), pp. 3-7. Cf. also S. Jellicoe, "The Hesychian Recension Reconsidered," *JBL* 82 (1963), 409-18.

In short, I do not perceive any ground for doubting the existence of a "late" Lucianic recension, and, in any case, the evidence for an early or Proto-Lucianic recension, the substratum of the text of Antioch, remains unaffected.

there is no escaping the conclusion, I believe, that the Proto-Massoretic text goes back to a local text preserved in Babylon in the fourth-second centuries B.C., reintroduced into Jerusalem in the Hasmonaean or Herodian period.

#### 4. A THEORY OF LOCAL TEXTS

The evidence marshalled to support a theory of local texts of Samuel can be applied to other recensionally diverse texts from Qumrân, especially to the Pentateuch. In the Pentateuch in the Proto-Samaritan text at Qumrân and in the later Samaritan recension *sensu stricto*, we find, I believe, a text which developed in Palestine in the fifth-second centuries B.C. Its text is marked by "scholarly" reworking; parallel texts were inserted, grammar and orthography brought up to date, explanatory expansions and glosses intruded. As Kahle observed long ago, it is a text which was the work of centuries of growth, not systematic recension.<sup>15</sup> It appears at Qumrân both in Palaeo-Hebrew script, certainly a Palestinian trait, and in the Jewish character. The Samaritan texts have strong relations with the Egyptian *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, and certain texts of Cave IV, notably the 4Q Num<sup>a</sup> manuscript, though of Samaritan type, have very strong Egyptian affiliations. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this text-type is Palestinian and, like Samuel, closely allied to the Egyptian local text utilized by the translators of the Septuagint in the third century B.C. The oldest witness to the existence of this Palestinian text is to be found in the passages of 1 Chronicles 1-9, which quote from the Pentateuch. Gillis Gerleman has shown that these passages in Chronicles "show greater resemblance to the Samaritan Pentateuch than to the Massoretic."<sup>16</sup>

This leaves the Proto-Massoretic text once again without provenience in Palestine or Egypt, and presumably we must look again to Babylon as the locale for its preservation and emergence as a distinct, if conservative, textual type. It reflects little

<sup>15</sup> P. Kahle, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 88 (1915), 359-439 (now republished in *Opera Minora* [Leiden, 1956], pp. 3-37).

<sup>16</sup> *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* (Lund, 1948), pp. 9-11. As will be evident below, I cannot accept his explanation of the reasons for this phenomenon. Cf. S. Talmon, "The Samaritan Pentateuch," *JJS* 2 (1951), 146-50.

of the active scribal endeavor which shaped the other recensions, especially the Palestinian. Since it would not have been preserved in Palaeo-Hebrew, perhaps we find here cause for the rejection of the national script for the official text.

It is necessary to take up, finally, some of the objections raised against a theory of local texts. Some scholars, not always those with conservative axes to grind, argue that the manuscripts underlying the official recension must have come ultimately from the Temple library, and hence would be "Palestinian" texts. Further, it is argued that different texts might arise in one locality, and one must therefore distinguish between exact or official texts of the Temple, etc., and vulgar texts.

To the first argument we may readily answer that the manuscripts used in the official recension may well have come from the Temple. The question is when. Obviously various texts had come to Qumrân, to the Temple, into scribes' hands in the era immediately preceding the textual crisis which is the normal pre-condition for recensional labors. It does not follow at all that the text-type in question derived originally from Palestine because exemplars of the textual tradition finally came to rest in a Palestinian library.

The distinction "official versus vulgar" must be abandoned, however, as anachronistic. Official and vulgar texts do exist, but after official definition, that is, precisely after the promulgation of an official text. To use the term "vulgar" of the Proto-Samaritan recension, because of its reworking and revision, is not wholly unreasonable, though it obviously was not considered a vulgar text in the Samaritan or Qumrân community, nor was it deemed vulgar, I dare say, by the Chronicler. But our evaluation on scientific grounds of the text-critical worth of a text is not identical with the mode of judgment applied by the ancients, and it would be absurd to apply the designation *vulgar* to the old Samuel manuscript, to the manuscript used to revise the Septuagint to produce the Palestinian Greek Recension (Proto-Lucian) — in brief, to manuscripts equal to or superior to the *textus receptus* of Samuel. Or to put it most strongly, I challenge anyone to give a sensible reason for labeling the short, superb text of Jeremiah from Qumrân and underlying the Septuagint

#### THE HISTORY OF THE

a vulgar text.<sup>47</sup> No, the term *vulga* denigrated in favor of an official text is a Bionic Bible or Homeric text, or else "non-traditional," or even "unfamiliar."

We must object brusquely also to conditions, each having a known character each quite distinct from the other, the same community or locality for centuries to analogies drawn from other fields of the classical field, in Septuagint criticism of the old Latin Bible and the Gospels have come to recognize that criticism regularly follows an era of local text.

It must be remembered that criticism is fragile creations: one text, coming in immediately dissolves into a mixed text. Centuries of development are destroyed observe that there are few mixed texts. Massoretic text reveals no evidence of Former Prophets. The development of the Pentateuch and Samuel cannot have been so. Too many centuries were required in the community had insufficient space to radically distinct texts to mature over pristine innocence of one another.

<sup>47</sup> For this analysis of the short recension of Jeremiah see my student Mr. Gerald Janzen.