

prepared from a Hebrew text other than that which became the basis for the MT has been given some support although the matter is not conclusive.

(3) the statements of the care given the Hebrew mss through the long centuries of the Middle Ages has been substantiated.

So far the findings from Qumran have been healthful and definitive.

d. The Differences in the Q and MT texts

There are really quite a few of them and the variations go along this line which, in most cases, results in almost no difference at all.

The confusion of vowel letters
Alternate spellings
Word re-arrangements
Suggested "corrected" texts.

The first three of these are hardly changes at all and the last is argued as to whether it has happened or not. I attended a lecture at Kenneseth Israel (in Elkins Park) several years ago at which Dr. Harry Orlinsky, Hebrew member of the Revised Standard Version committee, was the speaker. He was asked about the importance of the differences in the Qumran and MT books of Isaiah, especially as the RSV translators were concerned for the better text. He mentioned that the RSV committee accepted **twelve** textual adaptations from the DSS of Isaiah and that he thought half of these were unnecessary. (Twelve is not very many in a book of that size.) I later heard Dr. Luther Weigle, chairman of that committee, note that if it had to be done again he would not favor accepting any of the changes. Now, the memory of a Taylor is not infallible, and I have no written documentation on either of these persons so the evidential value of this paragraph is mighty small. But it does highlight the fact that obviously the differences are minor. And when men of these academic persuasions say that, you had better be sure it is pretty solid. You must recall that they are seeking to undermine the authority of the Bible, not to sustain it.

e. Comparison of the Q, LXX and the MT.

There are about 6,000 differences in the text of the LXX and the MT. The number may shock you but