A Presentation of 4QLXXNum
in Comparison with the LXX and MT

Koot van Wyk*

1. Introduction

   Texts from Qumran received attention in publications and research since their discovery. The text under investigation here is no exception.[1] There are some serious questions to consider in relation with this text: What can this Qumran text tell us about the relationship with the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition? What can it tell us about its relationship with any of the Ancient Translations? What can it tell us about its relationship with the so-called LXX or

---

* Koot van Wyk is a Visiting Professor in the Department of Liberal Arts Education at Kyungpook National University Sangju Campus, South Korea and a Conjoint lecturer for Avondale College, Australia. He holds a DLitt et Phil in Comparative Semitic Linguistics from the University of South Africa (2004) and a ThD from Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan (2008). He is married to Sookyoung Kim (Phd in New Testament, Andrews University, Michigan USA 2008). She has worked on the "Warrior Messiah" and her dissertation was published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing. He has studied Textual Criticism under Prof. dr. Johann Cook of Stellenbosch University, Cape, South Africa; Prof. dr. Johann Erbes of Andrews University, Michigan, USA; and Prof. dr. John Lübbe of the University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa. The impact of the secretary of William Foxwell Albright, Leonna Running of Andrews University, Michigan, USA and another student of Albright, Frederick Charles Fensham of Stellenbosch, Cape, should not be left unnoticed.

1) There are two major models suggested for the line-up of manuscripts from the Old Greek of the original LXX (OG) to Qumran Greek (4QLXXNum) to the Göttingen edition (G[ed]) (N. Petersen 2009, 484-495). One can classify them as *I Skehan A* (1956/1957, 57); *II Skehan B* (1977, 39). The early Skehan analysis of 4QLXXNum shows that there existed the OG or 4QLXXNum which was subsequently reworked in later times to provide the G[ed]. The later Skehan view modified and stated that the OG was indeed the oldest Greek text and was similar if not identical to the current G[ed] but that 4QLXXNum (at a later period) was a stylistic revision and reworking of the Greek to conform with the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition. Supporters in the direction of Skehan's A position in 1956/1957 were E. Ulrich (1990, 75-76); L. Greenspoon (1998, 109-110); and E. Tov (2001, 10; 2003, 106-110). Skehan's B position was favored by J. Wevers 1982, 235 and N. Petersen (2009, 481 and 484 at paragraph 1.3).

Septuagint? And what can it tell us about the condition of the Septuagint in the pre-Christian era?

What scholars may not have realized, is that 4QLXXNum is able to tell us something about the conditions of the Hebrew Vorlage in the pre-Christian period related to the existence or not of one canonical perceived and applied text. Textual variety over millennia is no secret nor surprise. Close correlation of texts over millennia is a noteworthy surprise.

2. **Approach and Purpose**

The approach here is to recognize that the translators were doing their best to be true to what they perceived as their Vorlages. Therefore, the investigation in this research attempted to reconstruct the Vorlage for each translation (Qumran Greek or Late Roman Greek or Byzantine Greek) or each relevant manuscript in order to see whether a Semitic base was the origin of some or all of the variants.

This approach is quite different from that of studying the translation techniques, since the focus is not on the *translator* behind the translation but rather on the *copyist* of the Vorlage to the translation.

As far as *translation techniques* are concerned, this researcher is somewhat skeptical of the success of such an investigation since one is dealing with doubtful layers,[2] meaning *firstly* that copyists made errors: (1) wrong or

---

[3] Modern textual criticism presents some ironies. One of them is that the popular current paradigm insists, on the one side that a stable Hebrew text did not exist for the Second Temple Period, to use the words of Tov, but then the same scholars and others insist that computers will be a good way of determining a literal or free translation of the Greek of the so-called LXX. If a person insists, that a compass is unstable how can one determine the literalness and free use of the compass by others? One cannot teach eclecticism and emphasize the value of the use of computers for determining the literalness and free use of the text for translation. What text? What makes it even more complex is J. Wevers' comment in the introduction to the Göttingen edition (G[ed]) of the LXX of Genesis that he does not live under the illusion that he has constructed the original LXX "Der Herausgeber unterliegt nicht der Illusion, dass er durchgängig den ursprünglichen Septuaginta text wiederhergestellt habe." The original text does not exist (Frankel 1841, 4; Kahle 1915, 439 where Kahle also said "Die älteste Form dieser Übersetzung rekonstruieren zu wollen, ist eine Ütopie⋯."). Thus, Septuagint or LXX is an elusive task, so how does the scholar with a computer try to establish a translation tecnique of a text that is not fixed but elusive comparing it to an original Hebrew that is due to the Arabist Wellhausen *et al* only concocted, reworked and added later? The above text (4QLXXNum/ 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803) helps to establish one stable point regarding this dilemma, and that is why

different divisions of letters, words or paragraphs; (2) substituting letters or transposing them; (3) relying on memory instead of the text on his desk; (4) not always knowing what to do with supra-linear corrections or entries; (5) misconstrued illegible sections on his manuscript. *Secondly*, readers to the translators made errors in similar ways even if the copyists were perfect in their copying. *Thirdly*, translators made errors: (1) by mishearing; (2) confusing letters and sounds; (3) relying on memory; (4) transposing letters and words.

In this researcher's approach, variants in the versions are not due to a *free* translation of the consonantal text of the Masoretic text but rather to an error that entered the process of transmission through a copyist or by the process of reading by a reader or the process of translation from a translator who misread or misheard. One can identify these as five slips: *slip of the tongue, slip of the hand*, *slip of the memory*, *slip of the eye* and *slip of the ear*.[3]

It is thus imperative to reconstruct the possible Vorlage to each manuscript and to understand the origin of a variant in that way by comparison with other reconstructions. Variants sometimes coincide in the same zone in the verse in the versions lending support to the idea that an illegible reading in a Semitic text commonly used by all of the scribes of the versions led to these variants. This was the approach particularly in this research.[4]

---

this researcher is discussing this important piece of evidence. Paul Lippi, a doctoral student of E. Tov said orally in Jerusalem to this researcher in 1989 that E. Tov did not support the multiplicity of texts theory in the Second Temple Period for the Torah, only for the rest of the Old Testament books. Tov's view on 4QLXXNum is very similar to this researcher. This researcher is very thankful to all the Daniel fragments that Eugene Ulrich sent him from Notre Dame University in Indiana. Incidently, and only in this case with 4QLXXNum, Ulrich and Tov findings are strongly supported also by this researcher. Different from these scholars, this researcher is opting for a one-standard text for the whole Old Testament, not only the Torah as Tov would have said, according to Paul Lippi.

3) Koot van Wyk, "Linguistic Slips: A Window to Ancient Methods of Bookmaking", *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 31 (2012), 158-175.

4) The importance of *translation techniques* in the Greek translations has been the subject of discussion by a number of scholars in the past (see S. Olofsson 1990; J. Barr; E. Tov; and A. Aejmelaeus 1993). Olofsson indicated that the traditional distinction between a *free* and *literal* translation is not easy to make and that the distinction is *subtle and complicated and there **exist no criteria** for dividing them* (Olofsson 1990, 12). Gehman showed that literal translation and a free translation sometimes even co-exist (Olofsson 1990, 13, footnote 110). The position taken by this research is this: if you do not know what the original Semitic underlying the translation look like, you are not able to judge whether it is literal or free. If you choose the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition as the given standard and presumably the closest approximation

3. **Qumran Text from Cave 4**[5]

Although this researcher's view is also in favor of Skehan's A position, there are many points that cannot sufficiently answer the history of the text in the light of other considerations. My intention here is to first fix the standard textual form and then to opt for the Greek translation corresponding closest to the standard form, to explain why there was or was not a degenerative process in scribal practices following the original translation of the original Septuagint. This is done by looking at the scribal practices at the Library of Alexandria before Antiochus Epiphanes and after him (164 BCE) with the help of what one can know about the Early Greek works of Homer. The phenomena in Classical Greek scholarship during first two centuries before the Christian Era gives one then a bed in which to lay similar phenomena in the G^{ed}.

The puritanic intentions of the 70/72 Rabbis in 289 BCE in Alexandria and their high view of the inspiration of their Old Testament would have resulted in phenomena that N. Petersen listed, which he found in 4QLXXNum = 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803:

> It may be concluded that a concern of this author was that his text be intelligible in the target language (Greek). This necessitated that some of the more egregious standard equivalents be abandoned. Despite this concern for clarity, the author still seems to have adhered closely to his base scriptural texts, and this resulted in a number of literalistic renderings. Furthermore, even when he abandoned a standard equivalent, his alternative translation, did not go far beyond the meaning implicit in the base text.[6]

---

of the original, then any deviation from that standard can assist in the allocations of modes of literalism or differences between literal and free translations. The current populist trend in textcritical sciences cannot answer this question since it employs in essence the eclectic method. Someone who is applying eclecticism to textual analysis cannot determine the original text since that scholar is reconstructing the text by him/herself and by picking and choosing from a variety of textual traditions, the endproduct is not the original but the perceived original in the mind of the reconstructing modern scholar. To use an analogy: it is Wellhausen's Pentateuch not Moses' Pentateuch.

5) The text was presented by Skehan in *HTR* 69 (1976), 40-42 but can also be found in *DJD* 9 (1992). A reduplication is thus not necessary here.

6) N. Petersen, "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev[a] in the Light of Previous Studies", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19:4 (2009), 494.

4. **Variant list of 4QLXXNum = 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803**

Certain items were listed by Petersen and discussed by various scholars at times, mentioned by him:

4.1. Numbers 3:40 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. I 2
[λεγων] αριθμησον [παν πρωτοτοκον αρσεν]/[των υι]ων Ισραηλ ···]] επ ισκεψαι παν πρωτοτοκον αρσεν των υιων Ισραηλ G^{ed}.

פקד כל־בכר זכר לבני ישׂראל MT, SamP

4.2. Numbers 4:6 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 18
[α]ρτηρας] τους αναφορεις G^{ed}; בד MT. Equivalent αρτηρ / αναφορευς variants for בד Num 4:8, 11. Num 4:12 ε[π]αρτηρος επι αναναφορεις G^{ed}; על־המוט MT

4.3. Numbers 4:7 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col.
υ[α]κινθι[νον];

4.4. Numbers 4:8 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col.
και τα σπ[ονδεια] (και τας π[···]).

4.5. Numbers 3:42 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. I 10
αυτωι] nothing G^{ed}; אתו MT.

4.6. Numbers 4:7 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 21
···ιμ]ατιον υ[α]κινθι 21 [νον και δωσουσιν επ α]υτην τα τ[ρ]υβλι] Verb unaccounted for by G^{ed} but present in ונתנו עליו MT.

4.7. Numbers 4:12 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. III 10
και θησουσιν] εμβαλουσιν G^{ed}; ונתנו MT.

4.8. Numbers 4:12 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. III 13
αρτηρος] αναφορεις G^{ed}; מוט MT.

It is very important to note that internal evidence in 4QLXXNum/4Q121 =
Rahlfs 803 does not come with a tag, "this is the original Septuagint". To look
for such evidence and ignoring the general character of 4QLXXNum may not be
an advanced step. What one can know about the history of the origin of the
Septuagint and the number of scholars involved in its original translation, albeit
considered by some scholars to be nothing but a myth, taken at face value seems
to be a reliable state of affairs. The Jews saw the opportunity to provide society
with a Greek translation in a prestigious Library like Alexandria, thus one can
assume that great care was taken with this project.

To illustrate the care Jewish traditions took, one should consider the
percentage of deviation in the copying of the book of Daniel for example. If one
compares the proximity of 4QDanᵃ with Codex Aleppo realizing that more than
a millennium is in between, then one has to conclude that in all likelihood, the
form of the original Septuagint would be very literalistic.

One can mention the case of αριθμησον in Numbers 3:40 at Column I 2 of
4QLXXNum instead of επισκεψαι in G^ed in Numbers 3:40 which was to avoid
misunderstanding for the Greeks of the time of the original LXX with the word ε
πισκεψαι. This last word was probably loaded with a wider semantic range that
could give a misunderstanding for the academic Greek audience which the
Rabbis sought to delimit.[7] After all, it does not matter how many times the
equivalent επισκεψαι = פקד appears in the later Byzantine preserved LXX (or
G^ed), since it was a later modified degenerative text any way.

The explanation of Petersen that [α]ρτηρας was used as a desire "to more
accurately communicate the Hebrew text's בד" as not a human agent but an
instrument instead of the later G^ed form αναφορεις, which can be interpreted
also as a human agent,[8] is well taken here. The Rabbis were careful and did not
want to destroy the sanctity of the text.

5. Non-MT variants in 4QLXXNum/ 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803

A number of cases are considered by scholars to be evidence of variants with

---

7) Hinted also by N. Petersen, "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran", 494.

8) N. Petersen, "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran", 494.

the MT and more in line with the later G^{ed}. Especially the work of J. Wevers are mentioned in this regard.[9] The evidence seems meagre.

5.1. Numbers 4:6 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 18

Ø = zero αυτου] Ø = zero αυτου G^{ed}; בדיו MT. Actually, the argument is not fair here since the evidence is too limited to make a decision on this issue. We do not know for example if the Greek equivalent for "table" was another shorter Greek word/synonym and if there was on that basis enough space to fit in the word αυτου. The position of Wevers[10] is viable only if it can be supported with certainty that the text indeed reads the G^{ed} form but notices the reconstructions of the greater part of both lines and the meagre data.

5.2. The case in Numbers 4:8 in 803 is the same where Wevers suggested that 803 did not follow the MT in adding a pronominal at the end of the sentence. However, where is the end of the sentence in the fragment and what if shorter Greek words/synonyms were used in the next line that could have allowed for the so-called missing pronominal to be used in the beginning of the next line? The argument is *argumentum ex silentio* for the greater part from a scientific point of view.[11]

---

9) Ibid., 493 footnote 51.

10) John W. Wevers, "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers", *Eretz Israel* 16 (1982), 235.

11) Another example of conclusions based on reconstructions or *argumentum ex silentio* is 4QpaleoExod^m which was extensively researched by J. Sanderson and others. It is also in *DJD* 9 plus plates until xlvii. The reconstruction of this text was done under the assumption that there are close resemblances with the Samaritan Pentateuch. In Exodus 7:18b it is not based upon 7:15-18 (Tov 1992, 98). Line 6 is a recasting of the order of the verses and follow phrases from 7:26. Line 9 is from 7:20, lines 10-11 is from 7:21. From lines 11-14 is 7:19. Some conclusions were based on reconstructions like Exodus 10:2b; 11:3b; 20:21b. Conclusions on scanty evidence is *DJD* 9, 114 at Exodus 27:19b where the so-called Samaritan Pentateuch agreement is based only on one word. Line 7 is from Exodus 27:18; line 8 is from Exodus 27:19; line 9 is in this researcher's view, from Exodus 27:9. One can mention the scanty evidence of the combination of the three fragments on *DJD* 9, 101-102. The left margin of one of the three is smaller than the fragment of column I. Is there any proof that these three fragments are physically connected? Is there any evidence that they are connected to columns XX and XXII? A DNA test can probably confirm their connection? The so-called Samaritan Pentateuch connection in 4Q158 in *DJD* 5 (1968) is curious since it is a biblical paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus. With a paraphrase one may expect to find reliance on memory and planning well known in cognitive linguistics with characteristics: phrase order changes, words omitted and added and spelling confusions.

5.3. Wevers also mentioned that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 added some words which were left out by the MT in Numbers 4:7 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 20 where 803 and G[ed] used επ' αυτην. One has to be very careful with this conclusion that both 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 and G[ed] added what was not in the original Hebrew of the MT. Notice for example that the order of the translation of עליו with επ' αυτην was moored from its later position and brought earlier in the sentence in G[ed]. G[ed] then cancelled the word ונתנו of the MT and fused it with יפרשׂו.

That does not mean that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 did the same merely because we can hardly see επ' αυτην and nothing more. We do not know if 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 honored both these verbs instead of fusing them like the later G[ed] did. The suggestion of Wevers is again based on meagre data.

5.4. The last case mentioned by Petersen where Wevers suggested that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 followed G[ed] instead of the MT is in Numbers 4:8 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 28 where Wevers felt that both 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 and G[ed] were using δι' αυτης but as Petersen admitted, it was only in the restored or Wevers' reconstructed text of 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 that it appeared.[12] It is again *argumentum ex silentio* and cannot stand scientific verification.

6. Comparison of texts

This researcher will select a section from Numbers 4 of 4QLXXNum, Column iii, and align it with the consonantal text of the Masoretic text as opposed to the so-called Septuagint that survived through Christian hands of their era.

6.1. Selection from Column iii (4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803)

---

12) N. Petersen, "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran", 493 footnote 51.

Numbers 4:13-15

Column iii lines 15-23

15. επαυτοιματιονολο]ΠΟΡΦΥΡ[ον¹⁴καιεπιθ
16.
17.
18.
19. ΚΑΙΤΑΣΠ[ονδεια<u>και</u>πανταταςκευητουθυ
20. ΣΙΑ[σ]ΤΗΡΙ[ουκαιεπιβαλουσινεπαυτοκα
21. ΛΥΜΜΑΔ[ερματινονυακινθινονκαιδιεμ
22. βαλουσιντουϛαρτηραςαυτου¹⁵καισυντε
23. λεσουσινΑαρωνκαι]ΟΙΥΙΟΙΑ[υ]ΤΟΥ[καλυ

It is necessary to retrovert Column iii lines 15-23 to compare this text to the reading of the consonantal form of the Masoretic Text.

6.2. Retroversion of a Selection of 4QLXXNum to Hebrew

Numbers 4:13-15

15. ונת **ארגמן** בגד עליו
16. תנו עליו את כל כליו
17. אשר ישרתו עליו בהם את ה
18. מהתת את המזלנת ואת היעים
19. **ואת המ**זתקת כל כלי המז
20. כ עליו ופרשו בח
21. ש ועור תחש סוי
22. וכ ובדיו מ
23. לכ אהרן ובניו לה

6.2.1 Comments:

1. The letters in relief are those of the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition. This is my reconstruction of the text and therefore it is in relief.

2. The letters in bold are those remnants from the manuscript that survived.

3. Texts are placed in this section consecutively in order to compare the correspondences and to see if there is any connection between them. Supra at point 6.1 is given a pericope from Numbers 4:13-15 of **4QLXXNum**, followed in 6.2 by the **consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition and in bold those characters that are on the fragment**. Below at 6.3 is the **Greek** of Rahlfs (1935) on the same.

6.3. Addition in Byzantine LXX Edition (G^{ed}) of Numbers 4:14

G^{ed}LXX Numbers 4:13-15

15. επαυτοιματιονολο]ΠΟΡΦΥΡ[ον^{14}καιεπιθ

16.

17.

18.

19. ΚΑΙΤΟΝΚ[αλυπηρακαιπαντατασκευητουθυ

20. CΙΑ[σ]ΤΗΡΙ[ουκαιεπιβαλουσινεπαυτοκα

21. ΛΥΜΜΑΔ[ερματινονυακινθινονκαιδιεμ

22. βαλουσιντουςαρτηρασαυτουκαιλημψυνται

ιματιονπορφυρουνκαισυγκαλυψουσιντον

λουτηρακαιτηνβασιναυτουεμβαλουσιναυτα

εισκαλυμμαδερματινονυακινθινονκαιεπι

θησουσινεπιαναφορεισκαισυντε^{15}καισυντε

23. λεσουσινΑαρωνκαι]ΟΙΥΙΟΙΑ[υ]ΤΟΥ[καλυ

6.3.1 Comments:

1. In this selection from Column iii lines 15-23 is presented a section that survived from Numbers 4:14-15. It is not certain whether verse 14 actually started in line 15 since one has no evidence to substantiate Skehan's suggestion that it is.

2. There is a long section that has been added in the Christian period LXX edition at the end of verse 14 before the start of verse 15. See the sample above. This addition is definitely not in 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803.

3. It may be argued that the three lines open between lines 15-19 could have been the space for the long addition at the end of verse 14. If that was the case, it would be unusual, taking into consideration that nowhere else is there a tendency to follow the variants of the later LXX. See e.g. line 1 in Column I. In this case a comparison of Numbers 3:40 in Rahlfs and the Qumran fragment revealed different vocabulary:

4QLXXNum on 3:40: ^{40}]ΑΡΙΘΜΗCΟ[νπανπρωτοτοκοναρσεν

Rahlfs Numbers 3:40: ^{40}]ΕΠΙΣΚΕΨΑΙπανπρωτοτοκοναρσεν

Furthermore, if one reconstructs the Hebrew then it is clear that these three lines were filled up with the rest of verse 14 in the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition and that there is no space to add the long addition of the Christian period LXX.

4. This data poses a problem to the acceptance of the *later* LXX reworking as the *original* LXX. The inclination is to suggest that the original LXX reads a more literal translation of the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition but that in later centuries it became distorted and reworked due to Hellenism during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and other factors like the degenerative quality of scholarship after Epiphanes. 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 would then be an example of a copy of the original LXX.[13]

5. In those areas where this researcher do not agree with Skehan in his reconstruction the *letters in relief plus underlined* καί are used to indicate that possibly the underlined word in relief was used in this way in 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803.

6. This fragment is very important in establishing the form of the Greek text in the early centuries. If one compares the number or ratio of correspondences between the Christian period LXX edition and Qumran fragments on the one hand and the number or ratio of correspondences of the Greek fragment 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 with the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition on the other, one has to conclude that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 displays a stronger affinity than does the Christian period LXX. It is worth reminding oneself what Tov concluded:

> Although no text has been found in Qumran that is identical or almost identical with the presumed Hebrew source of [Septuagint], a few texts are

---

13) The phenomenon of condensation of texts could be for functional purposes or because the method of copying was by memory. There is also the phenomenon of abbreviation that was witnessed in the scholarship at the library of Alexandria or later for the Old Testament as witnessed by Justin the Martyr (ca. 150 CE) in his *Dialogue with Trypho* 68:71-73 and Origen in a letter to Africanus (ca. 230 CE) in *PG* 11:36-37 and 40-41. M. Fraser (1972) indicated that the Iliad texts that existed before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (167 BCE) are longer than those Iliad texts after his time (Fraser II 1972, 691 note 278). The phenomenon of epitomizing of texts in the ancient world was discussed by Francis Witty (1974, 111-112) and these works coincide with the origin of Qumran manuscripts and the Septuagint. Nothing is mentioned by E. Tov (1992) and others, about these important phenomena in the quality of scribal scholarship of the Second Temple Period.

very close to the [Septuagint] ⋯.[14]

The "*very close*" that Tov mentions has been placed under scrutiny in this research and the result is that there are *a few (if possible) points of contact* but not *very close*. Tov listed 4QSam[a] here as an example[15] and that text was also re-evaluated by this researcher with, though, a few brief remarks.[16]

Tov's *New Description[17]* of the so-called *development of the biblical text*, stands under review in this research. The facts do not support *a variety of texts in*

---

14) E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 115.

15) One's best efforts (whether using the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition or Cross who used the Greek text, presumably the Septuagint) cannot explain all open spaces in the fragment. It is my conclusion that 4QSam[a] is not the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition nor the Greek text presumed to be the Septuagint, but a *para-biblical text* fulfilling a function that one cannot yet ascertain. The fact that there are points of contact between the later Greek versions and this Qumran fragment does not make it Septuagintal *per se*. There are too many details in the text that do not correspond. In the light of the obvious error Column 2 line 11 with the reading of ויפקד = ⊿9ᒣ⅂⅄ instead of כי פקד = ⊿9ᒣ⅂⅄ caused by misreading presumably Paleo-Hebrew letters, and the cases of triple readings (Column 2 lines 15-17) as well as the Targumistic additions (Column 2 lines 1, 3-4) and changes in order of the verses, it is accepted in this research that there was no Paleo-Hebrew Vorlage that compares with the Late Roman and Byzantine Greek versions. In this research it seems rather that the scribe misread and composed a *para-biblical text* due to his inability to read the Paleo-Hebrew of a text that is very similar to that of the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition. This position is contra Cross (1953) and Tov (1993) but more in line with Eybers (1960). The problems in the proper order of words may be due to slips of the memory as is the case with the triple reading in the last part of Column 2. The following brief remarks should suffice: 1. There is a *typographical error* in Cross'es transcription (1953) in Column 2 line 4. 2. This researcher's main difficulty with Cross'es transcription is the open spaces that he left. See lines 15-17 in Column 1. 3. Cross used the LXX in order to reconstruct the text whereas in this researcher's reconstruction the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition was used. 4. As far as the scribe of 4QSam[a] is concerned, there is a scribal error or a mistake in Column 2 line 7. This error is supported by a clear photo and is identified as such by Cross and Eybers as well. Cross called it *a slip of the scribe* (Cross 1953, 22) and Eybers agreed that it was probably *a scribal error* (Eybers 1960, 6). There are more: Column 2 line 16; Column 2 line 17. 5. There are a number of additions in this fragment not shared by the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition (Column 2 line 1); Column 2 lines 3-4 (but in this researcher's view rather 2 Samuel 2:13 was considered to belong to 2 Samuel 2:16 by the scribe). 6. Cross argues that the Qumran fragment is an earlier and older type of the Hebrew text and that any other variation from it is considered later or an addition (including the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition). See also Tov (1992, 273) who shares Cross' views regarding this fragment. It is probably better to consider a further scrutinizing of Cross' presentation for publication at another time.

16) Koot Van Wyk, "The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a witness to degenerative scribal and copyist activity", 16-17 Appendix D.

17) E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 187ff.

the second temple period,[18)] but rather a number of reworkings and distortions of the main text during this period due to (1) functional use of the biblical text (parabiblical text). Other options also apply for the period was known for its (2) degenerative scholarship at Alexandria in Egypt since the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.[19)]

---

18) Ibid., 117 at 8.[2].

19) It is P. M. Fraser (1972) who studied in detail the degenerative scholarship of Homer's works at Alexandria during the time of Ptolemees is Fraser (P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria,* Vol. I. Text; Vol. II. Notes [Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972]). He said Zenodotus' treatment of the text (of Homer) seems to have been quite arbitrary at times: he omitted consecutive series of times which he regarded as superfluous and at other points he fused two or more lines of which he disapproved on the ground of impropriety (which might cover various grounds of unsuitability but particularly included those lines which seemed to him to show insufficient respect to the gods) into single lines by omitting the supposed improprieties. It was to combat this that Aristarchus a century later introduced into the armoury of critical signs a special sign, the διπλη περιεστιγμενη to denote readings of Zenodotus of which he disapproved (Fraser I 1972, 451). Fraser mentioned that Apollonius (270-245 BCE Fraser; 240-230 BCE Parsons) attacked Zenodotus. The text of Zenodotus on the *Iliad* was the basis of the editions of Aristophanes (204/1-189/6 BCE Fraser; 195-180 BCE Parsons) and Aristarchus (175-145 BCE Fraser; 160-131 BCE Parsons). Fraser also mentioned that the codex of the *Iliad* Venetus A at Θ 284 reads: παρα Ζηνοδοτωι ουδε ην. ηθετειτο δε και παρα Αριστοφανει (My translation: "But from Zenodotus it was not. However, from Aristophanes it was also accepted"). (Citation of Greek from Fraser II 1972, 664 note 102). Aristophanes invented two critical signs, the αστερισκος and the κεραυνιον and Fraser said it appears probable that Aristophanes used the former to indicate that a colon or a poem should be shifted, the latter to mark a corrupt passage. He also apparently employed the sigma and antisigma to distinguish between duplicate lines (Fraser II 1972, 664 note 103). Aristophanes wrote a book *On Words suspected of not being used by the early Writers* (Fraser I 1972, 460). Aristarchus wrote many commentaries (Fraser I 1972, 461). Fraser said about his textual conservatism: Like many scholars after him, he fell at times a victim to his own special knowledge, and farthered on the text of other authors, particularly Pindar, many Homeric usages foreign to them (Fraser I 1972, 462, also II 1972, 668 note 141). Later Ammonius found it necessary to write a pamphlet with the title: *On the fact that there were not more than two editions of the recensions of the Iliad by Aristarchus* = περι του μη γεγονεναι πλειονας <των δυο> εκδοσεις της Αρισταρχειον δι ερθωσεως τουτο φασκοντι. (see Fraser I 1972, 464 and II 1972, 671 note 157). For examples where Aristarchus improved the text of Homer when it seemed illogical to him (see Fraser I 1972, 464). Fraser said that Aristarchus tried to determine the true reading whenever possible. Application of this and other principles of criticism might lead either to emendation (μεταθεσι ς), or to preference for one reading over another, or, when longer passages were involved, to censure or even suppression of the entire passage (Fraser I 1972, 464-465). These examples of freedom to emend or omit or add to the traditional texts, on the basis of logic or other considerations, are part of the *modus operandi* of the scholars of Alexandria concurrent with the Qumran texts. Demetrius was a student of Aristarchus and he wrote two pamphlets *Against the Aristarchean Exegesis of Homer* and *Against Athetized Lines* (Fraser I 1972, 471). Didymus also wrote *On the Aristarchean Recension* (Fraser I 1972, 472). Didymus wrote:

7. **Analyzing key words in Numbers 4:6-14 in the Hebrew**

Key elements repeated in the pericope Numbers 4:6-14 analyzed

A	B	C	D
	ונתנו עליו	ופרשו בגד	ושמו בדיו
	Num 4:6a	Num 4:6b	Num 4:6c
	και επιθησουσιν	και επιβαλουσιν	και διεμβαλουσιν αναφορεις
		C	
		יפרשו בגד	
		Num 4:7a	
		επιβαλουσιν	
	ונתנו עליו	ופרשו ... בגד	ושמו את־בדיו
	Num 4:7b	Num 4:8a	Num 4:8c
	εν οις σπενδει	επιβαλουσιν	και διεμβαλουσιν....αναφορεις
ולקחו בדיו	ונתנו אתה		
Num 4:9a	Num 4:10		
και λημψονται	και εμβαλουσιν		
	ונתנו על	יפרשו בגד	ושמו את־בדיו
	Num 4:10b	Num 4:11a	Num 4:11c
	και επιθησουσιν	επικαλυψουσιν	και διεμβαλουσιν...αναφορεις
ולקחו	ונתנו		
Num 4:12a	Num 4:12b		
και λημψονται	και εμβαλουσιν		
	ונתנו על	ופרשו עליו בגד	
	Num 4:12c	Num 4:13	
	και καλυψουσιν	επιθησουσιν	
	ונתנו עליו	ופרשו עליו	ושמו בדיו
	Num 4:14a	Num 14:14b	Num 4:14c
	και επιθησουσιν	επιβαλουσιν	και διεμβαλουσιν···αναφορεις

"This is however, incorrect, for if we give preference to published writings over the lecture-notes, we should write according to Aristarchus Ζευς μεμεγας." = το δε ουκ εχει τακ ριβες ουτως. ει γαρ τα συγγραμματα των υπομνηματων προταττομεν ενεκα γουν τακριβ ους γραφομεν κατα Αρισταρχον Ζευς με μεγας (Fraser II 1972, 685 note 240 with a citation from the codex of the *Iliad* Venetus A at B 111). One should not conclude from this that Didymus had access to all works published centuries before him. Although he had access to Aristarchus' publications, he did not have access to those of Zenodotus or other earlier works (see Fraser II 1972, 684 note 238 where he described the aspect of inaccessibility of originals to the scholars of Alexandria extensively). All these editorial reworkings, recastings or textual transformations of Homer's works at Alexandria took place concurrent with the origin of the copies at Qumran. To assume that the Qumran texts are virgin texts, with each form representing a perfect copy of different traditions, is a simplification of a much more complex state of affairs.

Elaboration in G^{ed}

A	B	C	D
ולקחו בנשמו בדיו	ונתנו עליו	ופרשו בגד	שמו בדיו
Num 4:14d	Num 4:14e	Num 4:14f	Num 4:14g

It is evident from an analysis of some key words that are used in patterns in the pericope between vv. 6-14 that the Hebrew composer selected them in such a way that it forms a beautifully balanced and harmonized grid. If one places these selected reoccurring words in a nice grid or even give colors or numbers or letters to them, one can see the pattern. The later Byzantine Greek translation did not keep to this grid or pattern and it appears from an analysis of literal synonyms on a one to one basis, that the Greek translator was using a Hebrew text that was probably copied by memory since there are *slips of the memory* in that key elements of the grid appear in the wrong order in the sentences of the Greek text.

This is not the only problem, namely that the Greek translation was done with a faulty Hebrew Original but also the word in the Byzantine text that differs with 4QLXXNum is evidence that something was wrong with the later text that was not with the earlier one. We know that Justin the Martyr was complaining about the Greek texts in his day[20] and also Origen wrote to Africanus[21] that they must flatter the Jews to give them better originals since the Greek translations used in the churches were problematic.

---

20) In his *Dialogue with Trypho* 68:71-73 Justin the Martyr in 160 CE raised the issue concerning the shortness of some biblical texts. He accused the Jews of removing many words and phrases from the Hebrew and Greek texts. He noted that the books of *Esdras* and *Jeremiah* have been abbreviated by the Jews of his day in the Septuagint copies but that the longer texts can still be found in the Synagogues.

21) Origen in his letter to Africanus (see *PG* 11:36-37 and 40-41) explained in detail his text-critical activities. He said that in his studies he noticed that there were many plusses (additions) in the Greek copies that were currently used in their day in the churches. He quoted examples to show that some Greek copies differed even among themselves from the book of *Daniel*. The Greek is longer, sometimes up to 200 verses longer. The edifying passages in *Esther* is not found in Hebrew "our copies are very much fuller than the Hebrew". In *Job* many passages were omitted by Greek copyists, between four to sixteen verses. In *Jeremiah*, Origen noticed cases of transposition and variation in the readings of the prophecies. The Greek of *Genesis* has a longer text and there is diversity in the Greek readings of *Exodus*. At this point Origen suggested that the Church should reject their copies and "put away the sacred books among them, and flatter the Jews, and persuade them to give [us] copies that are untampered with, free from forgery = ut nos puris, et qui nihil habeant figmenti, impertiant" (*PG* 11:40-41).

Let's look at some evidence of *slips of the memory* for the Hebrew Vorlage of the Greek of the Byzantine period: instead of reading και επιθησουσιν in LXXNumbers 4:10a, the text is reading και εμβαλουσιν which is the substitution of ונתנו עליו for ושׁופר. There is the same phenomenon in LXXNumbers 4:12b and 12c and in 4:13. Due to persecutions and bookburning practices and library thefts,[22] Jews had only access sometimes to a Roman Public library where the Hebrew texts were kept.[23] The only way to copy it was to read it and memorize it, walk out and write it down. This was the origin of the *slips of the memory*. If it was dictated to someone else to scribble down, some more errors crept in and if the handwriting was very bad, deciphering problems could have originated due to *slips of the hand*. The ancient practices of bookmaking has been studied by a number of scholars in the past.

The key elements in the sense of order of the grid give us the ruler to test the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXXNum text, namely how close the later translator kept to the grid. The translator attempted to be as literal as possible but the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXXNum read the elements in a different order at times.

This raises the eyebrows for the LXXNum text since the advantage of 4QLXXNum is that it kept to the vocabulary of the MTNum diagonally opposed to LXXNum which deviated from both 4QLXXNum and MTNum. Having a text (4QLXXNum) like the MT more than a millennium later aligned so closely

---

22) Parsons says that under the reign of Eumenes II of Pergamon, "for the second time the Hellenic world was ransacked for manuscripts⋯.Where the originals were now more difficult to find and sometimes unprocurable, copies were made for the princely bibliotheke of the famous Mysion city" (Pasrons 1952, 24-25). Cassius Dio reported the censorship of books of Cremutius Cordus in the days of Tiberius (before 37 CE) and wrote that his daughter Marcia as well as others had hidden some copies (see Cassius Dio LVII 24.4 in Cramer 1945, 195). Tacitus reported bookburning actions in Rome "the fathers ordered the books to be burned . . but some copies survived, hidden at the time, but afterwards published" (Tacitus *Annals* 35 in Cramer 1945, 196). Johnson and Harris mentioned that in 303 CE "the Emperor Diocletian made a concerted effort to destroy all Christian libraries, and many perished, but the one at Caesarea survived" (Johnson and Harris 1976, 66). See also Fraser II (1972, 48; 100; 147) for the appetite for books at the Alexandria library and Pergamene library. Ptolemaic kings ordered to take books from ships, copy them, keep the originals and hand back the copies to the ships (Fraser I [1972], 325). Such a culture encouraged books to be hidden.

23) "Although books in the Roman public libraries did not circulate outside the building as a general rule, it is apparent from several classical references that influential people could on occasion borrow them for home use" (Johnson and Harris 1998, 68). The rule was at the Athenian library in 100 CE, "no book shall be taken out, since we have sworn an oath to that effect" (ibid).

as opposed to LXXNum texts that are problematic, highlights the two sets of scribal phenomena: one careful and precise; the other of a degenerative kind.

It is thus legitimate to bring the two sets of scribal phenomena of Classical Works like Homer at the Library of Alexandria, one set before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and the other set after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and place it side by side with the nature and form of the LXX since its inception. The same degenerative phenomena are also found at Alexandria: elaborations, conflations, substitutions, omissions. On such basis this researcher is argueing that 4QLXXNum is a form that predates Antiochus Epiphanes and that the LXXNum is a form that was the result of degenerative scholarship. It was already done for Homer by scholars in the past.

8. The addition in LXXNum14d-g

There is a large addition in LXXNum 4:14 and the way this addition was composed is very similar to the parabiblical functional text 4QFlorilegium.[24)] In the case of 4QFlorilegium, citations from 2 Samuel 7:10-14 and 1 Chronicles 17:9-13 were placed in lines 1-3, 7-11 of that text. In lines 1 and 2, there are excerpts from 2 Samuel 7:10; in line 3 of Exodus 15:17; in line 4 of Exodus 15:18; in line 7 of 2 Samuel 7:11; in line 8 of 2 Chronicles 17:11; in line 10 of 2 Samuel 7:13-14; in line 12 of Amos 9:11; in line 14 of Psalm 1:1; in line 15 of Isaiah 8:11; in line 16 of Ezechiel 37:23; and in line 18 of Psalm 2:1 with pesher. "It was as if he moved from one to the other during the citation and selected those constituents that he wanted".[25)] "The method of excerpting is thus a cut-and-paste procedure with syntactical and explanatory additions".[26)]

In LXXNum 4:14, the presumable "composer" excerpted words and phrases from Numbers 4:9; 4:13; 4:14; Leviticus 8:11; and Numbers 4:6. This addition is also *parabiblical* in LXXNum 4:14. It was placed in this order in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXXNum 4:14 text and served some purpose that is not clear right now. This researcher has already mentioned that it was not the first error

---

24) 4QFlorilegium (174) can be found in J. Allegro DJD 5 (1968), 53 and plate XIX.
25) Koot Van Wyk, "The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a witness to degenerative scribal and copyist activity", 17, Appendix D.
26) Ibid.

this scribe or the scribe of his Vorlage committed. Supra was mentioned the order of elements problem in the pericope.

9. **Conclusions**

It appears that 4QLXXNum is the survival of a pre-Antiochus Epiphanes text-form of the Septuagint (pre-164 BCE) which was more literal and in line with the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition than the Greek text-form that survived in post-Epiphanes times through Christian hands. Since 4QLXXNum is aligning so well with the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition (a period of nearly 1148 years) the stability of these two texts calls for a canon form to have existed almost identical to the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition from which the literal translation was made.

It implies that this form existed already at Qumran. Any deviation from this standard is later and due to degenerative scholarship. Wevers is correct, he did not reconstruct the original Septuagint of Genesis for the Göttingen edition. He reconstructed the post-Epiphanes degenerative product and what was preserved through Christian hands, and not the original, of which 4QLXXNum is an example.

<참고문헌>(References)

Aejmelaeus, A., "What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?", *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99:1 (1987), 58-89.

Aejmelaeus, A., "Septuagintal Translation Techniques - A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account", G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., LXX: Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992, 381-402.

Aejmelaeus, A., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays,* Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993.

Allegro, J. M., Qumran Cave 4. *DJD* 5. 4Q158-4Q186, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Barr, J., *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Barrera, J. T., "Espias contra consejeros en la Revuelta de Absalon (II Sam., XV, 34-36): Historia de la Recension como Método", *Revue Biblique* 86 (1979), 524-543.

Barrera, J. T., "El estudio de 4Q Sam[a]: Implicaciones exegéticas e historicas", *Estudios Biblicos* 39:1 (1981), 5-18.

Barrera, J. T., "Textual Variants in 4QJudg[a] and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges (1)", *Revue de Qumran* 14:54 (1989), 229-245.

Barrera, J. T., "Edition Préliminaire de 4QChroniques", *Revue de Qumran* 60:15 (1992), 523-529.

Barrera, J. T., "Light from 4QJudg[a] and 4QKgs on the Text of Judges and Kings", D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty years of Research,* Jerusalem: The Magnus Press, 1992b, 315-324.

Barrera, J. T., "Critica textual de 1 Re 22,35. Aportacion de una nueva lectura de la Vetus Latina", *Sefarad* 52:1 (1992c), 235-243.

Bodine, W. R., "The Greek Text of Judges. Recensional Developments", *Harvard Semitic Monographs* 23, Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.

Bogaert, P.-M., "Les deux redactions conservees (LXX et MT) d'Ezechiel 7", J. Lust, ed., *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986, 21-47.

Bond, Z., *Slips of the Ear: Errors in the Perception of Casual Conversation*, California: Academic Press, 1999.

Cook, J., "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis", *Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23, Atlanta Georgia:

Scholars Press, 1987, 91-125.

Cook, J., "On the Relationship between 11QPs[a] and the Septuagint on the Basis of the Computerized Data Base (CAQP)", *Congress of the international Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 107-130.

Cross, F. M., "A Note on Deuteronomy 33:26. With D. N. Freedman", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 108 (1947), 6f.

Cross, F. M., "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 132 (1953), 15-26.

Cross, F. M., "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966), 81-85.

De Boer, P., *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI. A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel,* Amsterdam: Paris, 1938.

Driver, S. R., *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Paleography and the Ancient Versions,* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Ehrlich, A. B., *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Textkritisches, Sachliches und Sachliches. 3 Bd: Josua, Richter, I und II Samuelis*, 1910, 67-161.

Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia,* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1984.

Erbes, J., *The Peshitta and the Versions. A Study of the Peshitta Variants in Joshua 1-5 in Relation to Their Equivalents in the Ancient Versions. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Semitica Upsaliensa 16,* Stockholm, Sweden: Elanders Gotab, 1999.

Eshel, E., "4QDeut - A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing", *Hebrew Union College Annual,* 62 (1991), 117- 154.

Eybers, I. H., "Notes on the Texts of Samuel found in Qumran Cave 4. Studies on the Books of Samuel", *Papers read at 3rd Meeting of Die O.T. Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika*, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1960, 1-17.

Eybers, I. H., *Historical Evidence on the Canon of the Old Testament with special reference to the Qumran sect,* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1965.

Field, F., *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunti; sive Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta. Post Flaminium*

Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro Hexaplari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit Fridericus Field. Prolegomena, Genesis-Esther, Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1875, 1964.

Frankel, Z., *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta,* Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841.

Fraser, P. M., *Ptolemaic Alexandria.* Vol. I: Text; Vol. II: Notes, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.

Frensdorff, S., *Das Buch Ochlah W'ochlah (Massora),* New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1972.

Goshen Gottstein, M., *The Aleppo Codex*, The Hebrew University Bible Project, Jerusalem, 1976.

Goshen Gottstein, M., "The Development of the Hebrew Text of the Bible: Theories and Practice of Textual Criticism", *Vetus Testamentum* 42:2 (1992), 204-213.

Grabbe, L., "The Translation-Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?", G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., LXX: *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992, 505-556.

Hammershaib, E., "On the Method, Applied in the Copying of Manuscript in Qumran", *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959), 415-418.

Hanhart, R., "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences", G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., LXX: *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992, 339-379.

Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament***,** Oxford: Clarendon, 1897-1906. Reproduced Graz 1954.

Johnson, E. D. and Harris, M. H., *History of the Libraries in the Western World,* 3rd edition, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Methuchen. 1976.

Kahle, P., "Untersuchungen zurr Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes", *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 88 (1915), 399-439.

Kallai, Z., "Samuel in Qumran. Expansion of a Historiographical Pattern (4QSam[a])", *Revue Biblique* 103:4 (1996), 581-591.

Klostermann, A., *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1887.

Lee, J. A. L., *LXX: A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch,*

Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983.

Lippi, P., "The use of the computerized data base for the study of Septuagint revisions", *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 17 (1984), 48-62.

Lippi, P., "Recovered: a lost portion of the book of Samuel", *Ministry* 64:3 (1991), 20-21.

Lübbe, J. C., "Describing the Translation Process of 11QtgJob: A Question of Method", *Revue de Qumran* 13 nos. 49-52 (1989), 583-593.

Lübbe, J. C., "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of 4QSam[c]", *Revue de Qumran* 14:54 (1989b), 255-265.

Macleod, R. M., *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World*. London, 2000.

Martin, Malachi., *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Volumes I-II. In *Bibliothèque du Musèon*. Volume 45, Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958.

Olofsson, S., *God Is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*, Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell Int, 1990.

Olofsson, S., *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell Int, 1990b.

Orlinsky, H., "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 13:2: 81-91, 1941.

Parsons, E., *The Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenistic World: Its Rise, Antiquities and Destructions*, London: Cleaver-hume Press, 1952.

Penna, A., "La Volgata e il Manoscritto 1QIs[a]", *Biblica* 38 (1957), 381-395.

Petersen, N., "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev[a] in the Light of Previous Studies", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19:4 (2009), 481-510.

Poulisse, N., "Slips of the tongue: speech errors in first and second language production", *Studies in Bilingualism* 20, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999.

Qimron, E. and Strugnell, J., "Qumran Cave 4 V. Miqsat Ma`ase Ha-Torah, in Consultation with Y. Sussmann and with Contributions by Y. Sussmann and A. Yardeni", *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 10, 1994.

Rabin, Ch., "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint", *Textus* 6 (1968), 1-26.

Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta-Studien I-III*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

Rofé, A., "The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam[a]", *Israel Exploration Journal* 32:2-3 (1982), 129-133.

Rofé, A., "The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and Its Occurrence in 4QSam[a]", *Revue de Qumran* 14:54 (1989b), 247-254.

Running, L. G., "A study of the relationship of the Syriac version to the Massoretic Hebrew, Targum Jonathan, and Septuagint texts in Jeremiah 18", A. Kort and S. Morschauser, eds., In *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, 227-235, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1985.

Schniedewind, W. M., "Notes and Observations. Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple Tendenz in the Greek Text of Samuel-Kings", *Harvard Theological Review* 1 (1994), 107-116.

Skehan, P. W., "4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint", *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977), 123-152.

Skehan, P. W., Ulrich, E. and Sanderson, J. E., "Qumran Cave 4 IV. Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts, with a Contribution of P. J. Parson", *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 9*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Smith, H. P., *Samuel. International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1899. Reproduced Edinburgh 1969.

Stipp, H-J., "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neuen alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen", *Biblische Zeitschrift* nf 34:1 (1990), 16-37.

Thackeray, H. St. J., *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1906-1940.

Thenius, O., *Die Bücher Samuels. Kurzgefasster exegetisches Handbuch zum A.T.* Leipzig, 1842, 2nd edition 1864.

Tov, E., "L'incidence de la Critique Textuelle sur la Critique Littéraire dans le Livre de Jérémie", *Revue Biblique* 79 (1972), 189-100.

Tov, E., "The Relationship between the Textual Witnesses of the O.T. in the Light of the Scrolls from the Judaean Desert", *Beth Miqra* 77 (1979), 161-170.

Tov, E., *The Text-Critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Jerusalem: Simor, 1981.

Tov, E., "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues", E. Tov, ed., *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, Jerusalem: Simor, 1981, 45-67.

Tov, E., "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls", *Hebrew Union*

College Annual 53 (1982), 11-27.

Tov, E., "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986), 321-339.

Tov, E., "Recensional differences between the MT and the LXX of Ezekiel", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 62:1 (1986b), 89-101.

Tov, E., "Some sequence differences between the MT and LXX and their ramifications from the literary criticism of the Bible", *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 13 (1987), 151-160.

Tov, E., *The Nature and Study of Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present. VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* - Jerusalem, C. E. Cox, ed., Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987b, 337-359.

Tov, E., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḥevXIIgr)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Tov, E., *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Tov, E., "Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?) of Canticles from Qumran Cave 4", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46:1-2 (1995), 88-111.

Ulrich, E., "The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus", *Harvard Semitic Monographs* 19, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978.

Van der Kooij, A., "De tekst van Samuel en het tekstkritisch onderzoek", *Nederlands Theologische Tijdschrift* 36:3 (1982), 177-204.

Van Wyk, Koot, "The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a witness to degenerative scribal and copyist activity", *Doctoral Dissertation for the University of South Africa*, Pretoria: Unpublished, 2004.

Van Wyk, Koot, "Textual Criticism under Scrutiny: Xerox Problems since Epiphanes", *Korean Journal of Christian Studies* 75 (2011), 5-19.

Van Wyk, Koot, "Linguistic Slips: A Window to Ancient Methods of Bookmaking", *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 31 (2012), 158-175.

Walters, S. D., "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107:3 (1988), 385-412.

Wellhausen, J., *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1871.

Wevers, John W., "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers", *Eretz Israel* 16, Orlinsky Volume (1982), 235-239.

Witty, F. J., "Reference Books in Antiquity", *Journal of Library History* 9 (1974), 101-119.

<Abstract>

4QLXXNum를 LXX 및 MT와 비교하여 고찰함

쿳밴윅 교수

(경북대학교 기초교육원 초빙교수, 호주 아본데일대학 협력교수)

4QLXXNum가 많은 학자들에 의해 연구되었으며 이는 뚜렷이 맛소라 전승의 자음 본문에 근접한다. 본 연구에서는 이 중요한 증거에 의해 제시된 다음 사항들을 살펴보았다. (1) 쿰란 두루마리 사본들이 만들어질 때 안정적인 정경이 존재하였다. (2) 이 본문의 형태는 거의 1148년 후에 존재한 맛소라 전승의 자음 본문에 상당한다. 이와 같은 오랜 시간 간격에도 불구하고 두 문서가 일치하는 안정성을 보임을 간과할 수 없다. 안티오쿠스 에피파네스 (Antiochus Epiphanes) 전과 후의 기간은 사해 두루마리의 기원과 동시대인 알렉산드리아 도서관 학파가 안정성 또는 불안정성을 보인 기간과 일치하여 기원전 164년 이후의 기간에는 이 도서관의 학문이 변질된 양상으로 나타난다. 이는 이 기간 이후의 쿰란 사본에서는 불안정한 본문이 나타날 것임을 의미하며 현재 LXX로 알려진 재구성된 본문은 4QLXXNum에 의해 증거되는 기원전 287년경의 직역된 원형 그대로의 LXX 헬라어 본문이 아닌, 에피파네스 이후의 "변경된" 본문이 보존된 형태인 것으로 사료된다.