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Studies on the literary development of the Minor Prophets tend to understand this development in linear terms. Though acknowledging the intricate connections between the emergence of individual parts of prophetic writings, the writings themselves, and the collection of “the Twelve,” most scholars assume that the twelve books of the Minor Prophets, once they had come to be read together, were consistently approached as a collection. The reference to the Twelve in Sir 49,10 and the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the ancient versions would show that “the Twelve” were understood as a collection already in the Second Temple period.¹

However, this linear development of the Twelve is contradicted by the earliest manuscripts of the Minor Prophets. Dating from the 2nd century BCE to the 1st century CE, the Dead Sea manuscripts of the Minor Prophets paint a varied picture.² Some of them do approach the Twelve as a collection, others do not. In my view, this variation reflects the existence of two different scribal approaches in the Second Temple period. The adoption by a scribe of either one of these approaches hinged on the intended purpose of the manuscript that scribe was producing.

I. SCRIBAL APPROACHES IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

Surveys of current debates on the textual history of the Hebrew Bible are readily available and will not be repeated here.³ Instead I wish to highlight the existence

---

¹ I am grateful to Eibert Tigchelaar for his comments on an earlier draft of this article.
of two scribal approaches in the late Second Temple period. Amongst the first to see these approaches reflected in the manuscript evidence from that era was A.S. van der Woude. In his *Pluriformiteit en uniformiteit*, Van der Woude argued that a uniform textual tradition, closely linked with and having a long pedigree in the Jerusalem temple, existed alongside textual pluriformity outside of Jerusalem and the temple. Van der Woude’s view has found widespread acceptance, and scholars like E. Tov, E. Ulrich, A. van der Kooij, and S. White Crawford have also recognized two scribal attitudes — one geared towards the production of an exact copy (by our standards) of a Vorlage, the other taking a more “liberal” stance — in the late Second Temple era. Tov and Van der Kooij follow Van der Woude in assuming a connection between the conservative attitude (which they equate with the [proto-]Masoretic tradition) and the Jerusalem temple. White Crawford is more hesitant, pointing out that the conservative approach cannot neatly be identified with the Masoretic tradition in all instances (e.g., Jeremiah). Yet even if they disagree on the particulars, Tov, Van der Kooij, and White Crawford share the view that the distinction between the conservative and the liberal scribal approaches in the late Second Temple period is a socio-historical one.

This socio-historical explanation of the difference between a conservative and liberal scribal approach has recently been criticized by D.A. Teeter. Pointing to the situation at Qumran, where both scribal approaches are attested within the same socio-historical context, Teeter dismisses socio-historical explanations of the distinction between the conservative and the liberal — or “interventionist” — attitude. Instead, he holds that both scribal approaches could exist side by side within a single socio-historical context and constituted a textual polysystem. Within this polysystem they fulfilled different purposes: depending on the intended use of a manuscript scribes would choose either to make an exact copy of their Vorlage or to adopt a more interventionist approach.

---


10. It is unclear if a single scribe mastered both approaches and could choose between them at will. This seems the most straightforward explanation, but it is possible that Jewish groups housed
In this contribution I aim to show that manuscripts of the Minor Prophets from the late Second Temple period reflect the two scribal approaches outlined by Teeter. I further argue that the use of these two approaches depended on the intended use of these manuscripts as it can be reconstructed on the basis of their physical characteristics.

II. THE MINOR PROPHETS IN THE JUDEAEN DESERT

Manuscripts of the Minor Prophets have been found in three different sites in the Judean Desert: Wadi Muraba’at, Nahal Ḥever, and Qumran.\textsuperscript{11} The character of manuscripts recovered from Qumran and the other find-sites, differs markedly.\textsuperscript{12} The Minor Prophets manuscripts from Muraba’at (MurXII; late 1\textsuperscript{st}–early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE\textsuperscript{13}) and Nahal Ḥever (8ShevXII gr; 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE\textsuperscript{14}) reflect a conservative scribal approach. These manuscripts contain all twelve Minor Prophets in the order Hos–Joel–Am–Obd–Jonah–Mic–Nah,\textsuperscript{15} which is also attested in the later Masoretic codices. What is more, the orthography and text-type of the Muraba’at manuscript are very close to those of the Masoretic tradition.\textsuperscript{16} This demonstrates the conservative approach of its scribe, who aimed at producing a word-for-word copy of his Vorlage. The Nahal Ḥever scroll — or possibly scrolls\textsuperscript{17} — is more complicated, as it contains a Greek version of the Minor

different kinds of scribes, of which some produced exact copies of their Vorlagen, others more interventionist manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{11} For an overview of the available material see B. EGO – A. LANGE – H. LICHTEMBERGER – K. DE TROYER (eds.), Minor Prophets (Biblija qumranica, 3B), Leiden, Brill, 2005; for the Qumran material also E. ULRICH (ed.), The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants (VTSup, 134), Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 590-626.

Some unprovenanced manuscripts from the Minor Prophets have recently been published. I exclude them from this analysis, as their origins and authenticity are still being debated. Some fragments of Amos (DSS F.Amos1) were published by E. TOV, New Fragments of Amos, in DSD 21 (2014) 3-13. Fragments of Jonah and Micah were published by C. MCDOWELL, T. HILL, P.W. FLINT, and D.R. HERRISON in E. TOV – K. DAVIS – R. DUKE (eds.), Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments in the Museum Collection (PMB, 1), Leiden, Brill, 2016, pp. 168–89. A manuscript of Joel was published in T. ELGOVIN – K. DAVIS – M. LANGLOIS, Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection, London, Bloomsbury, 2016, pp. 223-232. The editors of the latter fragment tentatively ascribe it to Nahal Ḥever, but it appears that at least some fragments from the Schøyen collection do not stem from the Dead Sea area, and probably not even from the Second Temple period. See E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR, Gleanings from the Caves? Really? On the Likelihood of Dead Sea Scrolls Forgeries in the Schøyen Collection. Online at: https://www.academia.edu/27765763/Gleanings_from_the_Caves_Really_On_the_likelihood_of_Dead_Sea_Scrolls_forgeries_in_The_Schøyen_Collection (last accessed 24 December, 2016).

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, The Text of the XII Prophets at Qumran, in OTE 17 (2004) 103-19.


\textsuperscript{15} Hosea-Joel-Amos-Obadiah-Jonah-Micah-Nahum.


\textsuperscript{17} The Greek Minor Prophets fragments from Nahal Ḥever were penned by two different scribes. As both hands are contemporaneous (PARSONS, The Scripts and Their Date) and show no overlap
Prophets. This Greek version belongs to the kaige group, which is characterized by its strict adherence to the proto-Masoretic text. Thus, even if 8HevXII gr constitutes a revision of a more original Greek version of the Twelve, the Hebrew text it chooses as the basis for its revision reflects a conservative scribal attitude.

The situation at Qumran is different. Some Qumran Minor Prophets cannot be properly assessed due to their fragmentary preservation. The better-preserved exemplars, however, all seem to echo an interventionist rather than a conservative scribal approach. The interventionist character of these manuscripts is reflected both in how they present the writings of the Minor Prophets and how they engage with the text of these writings.

It is highly unlikely that all Qumran Minor Prophets manuscripts contained the entire collection of the Twelve. The large handwriting and average writing block (18–20 lines per column) of 4Q76 (150–125 BCE) suggest that this scroll did not have all the twelve prophets. The remaining fragments of 4Q79 (late 1st century BCE) contain only Hosea, and the manuscript may well have had only part of the Twelve — perhaps even just Hosea. Third, 4Q81 (c. 50 BCE) may contain only Hosea, and the manuscript may well have had only part of the Twelve — perhaps even just Hosea. 24

in contents, 8HevXII gr appears to be a single manuscript, written by two different scribes. Yet it remains a possibility that 8HevXII gr constitutes two different manuscripts of the Greek Minor Prophets. See É. Puech, Notes sur le manuscrit saccalique de la Bible (150–125 BCE) (JSOSup, 23), Netherlands, Leiden, 1996, 86–101, p. 87. Cf. PH. Guillaume, A Reconsideration of Manuscripts Classified as Scrolls of the Twelve Minor Prophets (XII), in JHS 7 (2007) article 16. Online at: http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_42.pdf (last accessed 24 December, 2016)


The present remains of 4Q76 contain text from Jonah and Malachi. The editio princeps identifies Zech 14:18 in 4Q76 1, but this is uncertain. See Fuller, 76, 4QXII; for a critique see Guillaume, The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXII), 9.


The present remains of 4Q76 contain text from Jonah and Malachi. The editio princeps identifies Zech 14:18 in 4Q76 1, but this is uncertain. See Fuller, 76, 4QXII; for a critique see Guillaume, The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXII), 9.
have had only Jonah.\textsuperscript{26} The editor of this manuscript recognizes traces of Mic 5,1–2 in 4Q81 5, but it is not certain that fragment 5 really belongs to 4Q81.\textsuperscript{27} Finally, 5Q4 (1\textsuperscript{st} century CE\textsuperscript{28}) may have contained only Amos.\textsuperscript{29}

The interventionist approach of the scribe of 4Q76 is further exemplified by the order in which he presents the Minor Prophets. In this manuscript, Malachi is followed by another writing. This might be Jonah — as Fuller and others have suggested\textsuperscript{30} — but it seems more likely that it was another work, perhaps not even one of the Twelve Prophets.\textsuperscript{31} The order of 4Q76 is unattested elsewhere and (as we shall see) probably reflects the whims of the scribe of this manuscript.

The ways in which the scribes of the Qumran Minor Prophets manuscripts engaged with the texts of these prophetic writings also reflect their interventionist attitude. The textual character of the Qumran Minor Prophets manuscripts has commonly been described in terms of Tov’s text-types, but this is not always helpful.\textsuperscript{32} The main issue is that statistical categorizations of the evidence do not necessarily say much about the approach of the scribes that produced it.\textsuperscript{33} The
text-form of 4Q76 and 4Q78 (c. 75 BCE) has been classified as “non-aligned,”\(^{35}\) and both scrolls exhibit an interventionist approach.\(^{36}\) In 4Q76, the readings in Jon 3,2 (4Q76 22 2) and in Jon 1,8 (4Q76 5:18) probably reflect the liberty the scribe felt to smoothen the text of Jonah.\(^{37}\) The scribe of 4Q78 also intervened freely in the text of the Minor Prophets, for instance by adding or omitting *copula*\(^{38}\) and definitive articles.\(^{39}\)

But even manuscripts usually classified as close to the Masoretic tradition can exhibit interventionist traits. Little remains of 4Q77 (c. 150-125 BCE), but the text that does remain is close to the Masoretic tradition.\(^{40}\) Even so, the spelling *דהיה וידירש* for MT’s *הדים והירש* may reflect an intervention on the part of the scribe. More clearly interventionist is 4Q82 (35-1 BCE).\(^{42}\) As A. Lange has recently shown, the scribe responsible for 4Q82 made grammatical, contextual, exegetical, and stylistic improvements in the manuscript he was producing.\(^{43}\) The affiliations of the text-form of 4Q82 with the Masoretic tradition leads Lange to classify the manuscript as “semi-Masoretic” (instead of “proto-Masoretic”).\(^{44}\) However, this terminology is not without its problems: using the term “Masoretic” to describe both MurXII (“proto-Masoretic”) and 4Q82 (“semi-Masoretic”) suggests that these manuscripts exhibit the same (Masoretic) text-type, but in different ways. It appears, however, that the two manuscripts reflect different scribal attitudes: the

---


\(^{38}\) The addition of מִשָּׁרֵי may be a grammatical improvement by the scribe; the reading מִשָּׁרֵי לְשׁוֹנֵי is probably a harmonization with Jon 1:7.

\(^{39}\) Cf. Hos 14,6 (4Q78 9 7); Joel 1,14 (4Q78 10-12 5); Amos 2,13 (4Q78 21-23 2).

\(^{40}\) Cf. Joel 1,18.19 (4Q78 10-12 8, 9); 4,17 (4Q78 18-20 10).


scribe of MurXII sought to produce a word-for-word copy of his Vorlage, whilst the scribe of 4Q82 felt free to intervene in the text of his Vorlage when he saw fit.

It follows from this survey that Minor Prophets manuscripts from the late Second Temple period can be divided into two groups: manuscripts from Qumran tend to reflect an interventionist scribal attitude, whereas those from other find-sites are more conservative in character.

III. THE PURPOSE OF MANUSCRIPTS

The difference between the text-forms of Qumran and non-Qumran manuscripts of the Minor Prophets has often been explained in diachronic or socio-historical terms. The diachronic explanation holds that the central position of the proto-Masoretic text in non-Qumran manuscripts reflects the standardization of this text-form by the time these manuscripts were produced. But this explanation is problematic: contemporary with 8ḤevXII gr are manuscripts such as 4Q79, 4Q80 (75–50 BCE), and 4Q82, which reflect an interventionist scribal approach. The socio-historical explanation, which attributes the textual character of MurXII and 8ḤevXII gr to circles connected with the Jerusalem temple, is not entirely convincing, either: other Qumran manuscripts — and perhaps even some of the Qumran Minor Prophets scrolls — reflect a scribal approach similar to that of MurXII and 8ḤevXII gr.

It seems more fruitful, therefore, to attribute the difference between the Qumran and non-Qumran Minor Prophets manuscripts to the purposes of these manuscripts and the contexts in which they were kept. The Muraba’at and Nahal Ḥever manuscripts were part of personal manuscript collections that belonged to refugees at the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt. Their preservation in a personal collection suggests that part of the appeal of these scrolls lay in their layout and ability to impress as artefacts or collector’s items. The execution of MurXII confirms this suggestion. The manuscript has a large writing block, large upper and bottom margins, a well-executed hand, and an almost complete absence of corrections. This combination of features led Tov to classify it as a “deluxe

---


The conservative approach of its scribe probably ties in with the intended purpose of MurXII. All Scripture manuscripts from non-Qumran find-sites have a proto-Masoretic text-form, and many of these manuscripts are classified by Tov as deluxe editions. This suggests that the primary purpose of these manuscripts, like that of MurXII, was collection and display. For reasons that are not entirely clear, the conservative scribal approach appears to have been particularly at home in context of personal manuscript collections, and scribes producing manuscripts to be collected and displayed would often strive to make as faithful as possible a copy of their Vorlage.

52 Ibid., pp. 127-128 (sub γ).
53 J. Teeter, Scribal Laws, pp. 234-236, where he points out that the deluxe format is also used for copies of the Temple Scroll (11Q19).
54 The case of 8ḤevXII gr is less clear-cut. The manuscript exhibits some features of well-executed, deluxe manuscripts, but some features that may contradict this assessment. First, the handwriting of scribe A “aspires to be a book-hand” and scribe B is even more successful in this aspiration (Parsons, The Scripts and Their Date, p. 21). This may be a sign of the scribes’ attempt at neat execution. Second, Tov classifies 8ḤevXII gr among his manuscripts with a very large writing block (Scribal Practices, p. 89) and this classification is confirmed by Johnson’s analysis of the Oxyrhynchus papyri; see W. A. Johnson, Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2004, pp. 119-125. It is not clear what this says, however. For Tov, a large writing block can be one of the characteristics of a deluxe edition (Scribal Practices, p. 126), but Johnson observes that “the typical ‘deluxe’ manuscript will often show ... characteristics no different from those of an everyday production, excepting the fine execution of the script. Yet when deluxe bookrolls differentiate themselves from ordinary productions in ways other than the script, the following will be most likely: (1) a short height for the column, particularly if the text is verse written to a wide column or a prose text written to a narrow column ...” (Bookrolls and Scribes, p. 156). Third, column width in 8ḤevXII gr ranges from 7.9-11.5 cm. For Tov this counts as an average column width, but it falls on the wide side of Johnson’s scale (Bookrolls and Scribes, pp. 101-108). As Johnson shows, this column width would more readily correspond with a less than a more carefully executed manuscript, especially in the 1st century BCE.
55 Tov, Die bibliischen Handschriften, pp. 3-4; Lange, “They Confirmed the Reading”, pp. 51-52.
56 Tov, Scribal Practices, pp. 125-129.
57 The argument as presented here assumes that these manuscripts were copied in order to be included in a personal manuscript collection. We cannot be certain of this, however. Perhaps manuscript collectors were drawn to conservative scrolls, which had been originally produced for another purpose.
The Qumran collection presents a different case. Including manuscripts from a range of different origins, the collection as a whole has recently been taken as a “scholarly, school-like collection of predominantly literary texts.” Generalizations are hazardous, but it seems justified to assume that most of the Qumran scrolls were used for the reading and study of Scripture by members of the movement that collected them. This assumption works especially well for Cave 4, whence most Qumran manuscripts of the Twelve stem. Thus, many of the Qumran manuscripts of the Twelve were probably intended for reading and study purposes, and the interventionist approach of their scribes reflects this use.

That being said, it should be acknowledged that the Qumran manuscripts of the Twelve exhibit ample variety amongst one another. Due to their semi-cursive handwriting and (in the case of 4Q76) somewhat careless execution, manuscripts like 4Q76 and 4Q79 can be assumed to constitute personal scholar’s copies. In that case, the unexpected position of Malachi in 4Q76 may reflect the whims of its scribe rather than anything else. Other manuscripts, such as 4Q78,
4Q80, and 4Q81 show no traces of careless execution or a semi-cursive hand, but exhibit interlinear corrections and additions. These corrections and additions, whether they originate with the same scribe as that of the main text or with a different one, point to the scholarly context in which these manuscripts were produced. Finally, 4Q82 is a well-executed manuscript: it has an average layout, presumably a large writing block, and it contains vertical and horizontal ruling. As we have seen, however, the text it contains reflects the scholarly interests and interventionist approach of its scribe: rather than copying its Vorlage faithfully, this scribe improved its style and grammar as he copied it. Notwithstanding their variety, therefore, the Qumran manuscripts of the Minor Prophets all reflect the scholarly and interpretative interests of the scribes that produced them.

This connection between an interventionist scribal approach and the use of Scripture for study and exegesis is confirmed by the Qumran Pesharim. Like the Qumran Minor Prophets manuscripts, these commentaries are selective in their choice of base texts: some Minor Prophets are interpreted in a Pesher, others are not. This selective approach accounts for the absence of parts of these prophetic writings from the Pesharim. The absence of Hab 3 from Pesher Habakkuk, for instance, does not point to an early stage in the literary development of the book of Habakkuk, but reflects the interventionist approach and exegetical aims of the scribe/exegete. This interventionist approach is further reflected in how the Pesher commentators dealt with their scriptural base texts. This issue has been discussed in terms of a distinction between “textual” and “exegetical variants,” but it appears that exegesis and textual transmission are intricately intertwined in


66 But cf. LANGE, Handbuch, p. 337, who labels the hand of 4Q78 as a Hasmonean semicursive. FULLER remarks that the hand of 4Q78 “stands closest to the semiformal tradition” (78. 4QXII, p. 238).

67 On corrections and additions as indications of scholarly engagements with texts and the living traditions in which these texts partake see P.B. HARTOG, Interlinear Additions and Literary Development in 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C, 4Q169/Pesher Nahum, and 4Q171/Pesher Psalms A, in RevQ (forthcoming); IDEM, Pesher and Hypomnema.


the Pesharim (as they are in ‘biblical’ manuscripts) and cannot be understood as distinct phenomena. Thus, the interventionist approach towards the text of the Minor Prophets by the Pesher scribes/exegetes is closely connected with the exegetical use of the Minor Prophets in the Qumran commentaries.

IV. CONCLUSION

Ben Sira’s reference to the Twelve demonstrates that the Minor Prophets were known as a collection in the late Second Temple period. However, they were not consistently approached as such. Manuscript evidence from this period shows that a reading of all twelve Minor Prophets together was no default practice. Instead, scribes could choose whether or not to read the Twelve together, depending on the intended purpose of the manuscript they were producing. Hence, to explain the literary development and textual transmission of the Twelve it is essential to study the various aims the Minor Prophets could fulfil in different contexts.
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