

Emanuel Tov

The Shared Tradition of the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch

1. Background

From the earliest days of the critical study of the SP it was known that this text often agrees with the LXX against MT, a situation that the early theological discussions comparing the value of the MT and LXX often exploited. Traditionally the Catholic scholars upheld the value of the LXX against MT, finding support in the frequent agreement of the LXX with the SP. They also considered the ancient Hebrew script of the SP more trustworthy than the square script of MT. These issues were discussed in the seventeenth century¹ not long after the SP had become known in the West.²

The Catholic scholar Jean Morin (Johannes Morinus) initiated the discussion on the value of SP when he opined that the combined evidence of the SP and LXX weighed heavier than that of MT alone.³ He also based himself much on the ancient origin of the Samaritan script compared with that of MT.⁴ A few years later he published another philological work that discredited the MT.⁵

¹ See especially JÜRGEN-CHRISTIAN HERMANN LEBRAM, “Ein Streit um die hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta,” in: *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century* (ed. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 21–63; LUDWIG DIESTEL, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena: Mauke, 1869), 343–440.

² See ROBERT T. ANDERSON & TERRY GILES, *The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Introduction to Its Origin, History, and Significance for Biblical Studies* (SBLRBS 72, 2012) 150–168. Much earlier WILHELM GESENIUS, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine indole et auctoritate commentatio philologico-critica* (Halle: Libraria Rengeriana, 1815), especially 10–14 also discussed these facts, himself a major participant in the discussion of the SP.

³ JOHANNES MORINUS, *Exercitiones ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum* (Paris: Antonius Vitray, 1631).

⁴ The influence of the Samaritan script on the discussion of the value of SP is described in detail by LEBRAM, “Streit,” 31–32.

⁵ JOHANNES MORINUS, *Exercitationum biblicarum de hebraei graecique textus sinceritate libri duo* (Paris, 1633; 2nd ed.: G. Meturas, 1660).

Several Protestant scholars rejected Morinus' claims,⁶ but the first to write a systematic treatise against him was Simeon de Muis (Musius).⁷ The scholarly discussion of the extra-Masoretic agreements between SP and the LXX suffered not only from its being part of the theological discussions between Catholics and Protestants, but also from scholarly prejudices concerning the nature of the early witnesses. For at that time, and often continuing into recent times, scholars were accustomed to expressing themselves in terms of a three-fold division of the textual witnesses, and within that framework they naturally thought to link the most recent document, the SP, with either MT or the LXX. They simply counted the number of agreements between these sources and considered these numbers impressive. Thus, from the seventeenth century onwards, it was declared that 1,900 or 1,600⁸ of the assumed 6,000 differences between the SP and MT involved readings common to SP and the LXX. Reacting to these figures, an endless number of theories were launched concerning the special relation between SP and the LXX. One suggestion, intrinsically logical, was that the LXX was translated from a Samaritan source. This view was expressed first by Guillaume Postellus (1510–1581),⁹ and later by J. H. Hottinger(us),¹⁰ J. Hassencamp(ius),¹¹ and Samuel Kohn^{12, 13} The reverse view, that SP was translated from the LXX,¹⁴ was strongly contested by Walton

⁶ The views of William Eyres, James Usscher, John Selden, Johannes Buxtorf, and Arnold Boates were summarized by ANDERSON-GILES, *The Samaritan Pentateuch*, 160–162.

⁷ *Assertio veritatis hebraicae adversus exercitationes ecclesiasticas in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum*. JOHANNIS MORINI (Paris: Libert, 1631).

⁸ Thus BLEDDYN J. ROBERTS, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951), 192 (this is probably a typo).

⁹ *Tabula Duodecim Linguarum* quoted by Walton in the *Prolegomena* to his Polyglot: BRIAN WALTON, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta complectentia textus originales, Hebraicum, cum Pentateucho Samaritano, Chaldaicum, Graecum; versionumque antiquarum, Samaritanae, Graecae LXXII Interpretum, Chaldaicae, Syriacae; Arabicae; Aethiopicae, Persicae, Vulg. Lat. etc.* (London: Roycroft, 1653–57; repr. Graz, 1965). The *Prolegomena* is consulted in the edition of FRANCISCUS WRANGHAM, *Briani Waltoni S.T.P. in Biblia Polyglotta Prolegomena*, vols. I–II (Cambridge: Joannes Smith, 1828), II.55.

¹⁰ JOHANNES HENRICUS HOTTINGER(US), *Exercitationes anti-Morinianae de Pentateucho Samaritano, ejusque uidentia authentia* (Zurich: Bodmer, 1644), 28–32.

¹¹ JOHANN MATTHÄUS HASSENCAMP, *Commentatio philologico-critica de Pentateucho lxx interpretum Graeco non ex Hebraeo sed Samaritano textu conuerso* (Marburg, 1765).

¹² SAMUEL KOHN, *De Pentateucho Samaritano ejusque cum versionibus antiquis nexu* (Leipzig: Kreysing, 1865).

¹³ For a detailed description of these views and bibliographical references, see GESENIUS, *Pent. Sam.*, 11. Gesenius also mentions L. de Dieu and J. Selden(us).

¹⁴ This view is discussed by WALTON, *Prolegomena*, 55.

in his *Prolegomena*.¹⁵ It was also claimed that SP had occasionally been revised or interpolated according to the LXX,¹⁶ or conversely, that the LXX was revised according to SP. All these views now belong to the distant past, but even so, in a monograph written in the nineteenth century W. Fitzgerald still claimed that “the more prevalent modern opinion is in favor of the hypothesis that the <Greek> translation was made from MSS. of the Samaritan recension.”¹⁷ The main argument in favor of this view is the fact that some Hebrew letters that had been interchanged by the LXX translators resemble the script of SP (similar to the paleo-Hebrew script), but not the square Hebrew script of MT.

This argument was understandable in the period before the discovery of the pre-Samaritan scrolls from Qumran, but not any more today since these manuscripts were written in both the square and the paleo-Hebrew scripts. Gesenius guided the discussion of the SP and the LXX into a more sound direction.¹⁸ He explained the background of the similarity between SP and the LXX by saying that “the Alexandrian translation and the Samaritan text derived from Judean codices which were similar to each other.”¹⁹ In his view, the two traditions derived from a common source that he named the “Alexandrino-Samaritan edition.” This text, adopted by both the Jews of Alexandria and the Samaritans in Palestine, removed many problems from the original text, and should therefore be characterized as secondary. This approach was followed by S. Kohn in 1865²⁰ and by J. Nutt in 1874.²¹

The views of Kahle differed from those of Gesenius since Kahle valued SP as an ancient text.²² Like Charles, he concluded that Jubilees followed the chronological system of SP in Genesis 5 and of the LXX in Genesis 11. He thus was the first to discuss readings that in later research would be

¹⁵ WALTON, *Prolegomena*, 56–58.

¹⁶ Thus JACOBUS USSERIUS, *De Graeca LXX interpretum versione syntagma* (London, 1655), 215, quoted by GESENIUS, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine*, 13. ZACHARIAS FRANKEL, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851) 237–241, takes an extreme position when claiming that the pluses of SP, common with the LXX (e.g. Gen 23:3; 27:27) were translated from the LXX.

¹⁷ WILLIAM FITZGERALD, “On the Supposed Samaritan Text of the Septuagint,” in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* II (1948): 324–331. See further the views expressed above.

¹⁸ GESENIUS, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine*.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁰ KOHN, *De Pentateucho Samaritano*.

²¹ JOHN W. NUTT, *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum: Edited from a Bodleian Manuscript, with an Introduction, Containing a Sketch of Samaritan History, Dogma and Literature* (London: Trübner, 1874), 98.

²² PAUL KAHLE, “Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes,” *TSK* 88 (1915): 399–439; repr. in *id.*, *Opera Minora* (Leiden: Brill, 1956), 3–37 (7). This study is quoted according to the page numbers of the latter publication.

called “pre-Samaritan”, a fact usually forgotten by those discussing pre-Samaritan texts from the Judean Desert.

Also in subsequent research, scholars stressed the close connection between the SP and LXX.²³ Some scholars emphasized their sharing of superior readings,²⁴ but this assumption is based on a misconception as the two hardly share any original readings.

2. The Data

Most discussions of the relation between SP and the LXX were based on the data recorded by B. Walton, E. Castellus and J. Lightfoot in Walton, *Polyglotta* (1657) on the basis of now outdated editions.²⁵ These scholars published a list of 6,000 differences between MT and SP among which one finds many extra-Masoretic agreements between SP and the LXX (1,900 or 1,600, see p. 278). The agreements between the SP and LXX have not been listed separately, preventing scholars to have a good overview of the data. Equally difficult, a complete picture of the relation between these two sources is harmed by the fact that until the study of Kim²⁶ disagreements between these two sources have not been taken into consideration in the analysis.²⁷ The list of agreements between the SP and the LXX by Metal did not advance the investigation much, since it is based on secondary sources and not on new research by the author.²⁸

²³ On the other hand, in her study of the relations between 4QpaleoExod^m and the other textual witnesses of Exodus, JUDITH E. SANDERSON, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 189, did not find any close relation between the LXX and SP. She believes that the LXX “has shown itself to be much further removed from the other three witnesses than any of them is from each other.” Indeed, in Exodus there are fewer common harmonizations of the LXX and SP than in the other books, and the major editorial features of SP are not shared with the LXX.

²⁴ E.g., ROBERT H. PFEIFFER, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper, 1941), 102: “... in some verses the Samaritan has preserved a better text and is therefore a valuable aid in emending erroneous readings, particularly when it is supported by the LXX or other ancient versions.”

²⁵ BRIAN WALTON, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, VI (1657), IV.19–34.

²⁶ KYONG-RAE KIM, *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994).

²⁷ The study by Sanderson of Exodus, that examines all the aspects of the relation between the SP and the LXX, is an exception: JUDITH E. SANDERSON, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

²⁸ ZELIG METAL, *The Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch in Jewish Sources* (Heb.; Tel-Aviv: Don, 1979). The list included in this study is less encompassing than that in Walton’s Polyglot. The details from the LXX are provided in their Hebrew forms, trans-

The new analysis by Kim provided more complete data than in the past, recording fewer figures, namely a mere 493 agreements between the SP and LXX, 328 of which are harmonizations. Kim's data are divided into two groups, 493 instances of solid agreement between the SP and LXX and an additional 471 instances of possible agreement (together 964). My own calculations find fewer possible agreements, but more real agreements, so that our overall figures for the agreements in the Torah are similar.

My figures are based on the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies) database comparing MT with the LXX, which probably provides the most complete listing of the agreements between the SP and LXX.²⁹ The listing in col. a of CATSS includes the recording of agreements between SP and the LXX against MT. CATSS does not record the differences between the two, but this fact does not harm the limited conclusions suggested in this study.

Our analysis focuses on the data in Genesis, Exodus 1–24, and Leviticus. The extra-Masoretic agreements between the SP and LXX are subdivided into three categories in what is admittedly a subjective subdivision. The major distinction pertains to (A) secondary elements, mainly harmonizing readings, (B) primary/secondary elements,³⁰ and (C) pseudo-agreements between the SP and LXX. Group C pertains to agreements that cannot be evaluated well because of problems inherent with the translation technique of the LXX.

It is unclear to what extent non-Masoretic agreements between SP and the LXX shared with the Peshitta (S) and/or one or more Targumim (T) need to be taken into consideration in the analysis.³¹ In such instances the agreement between SP and the LXX might seem less convincing because it is shared with other sources. However, this doubt is not well founded, as I will show in section β. I noticed that quite a number of short harmonizations of SP and the LXX are shared with the Peshitta (see n. 43), and I

lated (not reconstructed) from the Greek. The focus of this little monograph is the relation between SP and the Jewish sources, and within this framework, the LXX plays a major role.

²⁹ EMANUEL TOV and FRANK H. POLAK, *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (division of the CATSS database, directed by R. A. Kraft and E. Tov), module in the *Accordance and BibleWorks* computer programs, 2005 (with updates, 2006ff.). The corrected module is not yet available in 2016.

³⁰ This group lists textual variations when either the LXX = SP or MT may reflect the original reading. Phrased differently, some or many of the readings of group B reflect ancient variants. In my impression only a few common readings of the SP and LXX reflect original elements. E.g., the homoioteleuton in Exod 22:4 MT and all other texts should be compared with the longer text of SP LXX. Likewise, the singular form in MT Gen 12:3 is less appropriate than the plural in SP LXX. See further Gen 36:2, 14.

³¹ Agreements between the Vulgate and the LXX are not taken into consideration since Jerome testified that he consulted the LXX when preparing his translation.

therefore suggest that the Syriac translation was based on a text that shared certain tendencies with the forerunner of the SP and LXX. In order to obtain the most objective results, we nevertheless analyze both types of data. Thus in section α we include all the data, while in section β we exclude the non-Masoretic agreements of the pattern SP = LXX = S and/or T \neq MT.

*a. Non-Masoretic agreements of the pattern SP = LXX including other sources.*³²

In *Genesis* I count the following 173 instances:³³

A. Secondary elements (102)

1. Harmonizing pluses: 52
2. Harmonizing changes: 23
3. Harmonizations in sequence: 3
4. Grammatical and linguistic simplification or harmonization: 11
5. Addition of names, pronouns, etc.: 13

B. Ancient variants?: primary or secondary elements (44)

1. Pluses: 16
2. Differences in words: 22
3. Differences in sequence: 5
4. Minuses: 1

C. Agreements that cannot be evaluated well (27)

In *Exodus* 1 – 24 I count the following 99 instances:

A. Secondary elements (70)

1. Harmonizing pluses: 37³⁴
2. Harmonizing minuses: 1³⁵
3. Harmonizing changes: 7³⁶
4. Harmonizations in sequence: 0
5. Grammatical and linguistic simplification or harmonization: 19³⁷
6. Addition of names, pronouns, etc.: 6³⁸

³² Recurring patterns, such as the addition of וימה in chapter 11, were counted once.

³³ KIM, *Studies*, 82, lists 234 instances for this category with a different subdivision.

³⁴ Exod 2:21; 3:8, 16, 17; 4:6; 5:13; 6:20; 7:9, 15; 8:3, 5, 12, 16; 9:7; 10:12, 24, 24; 11:2, 3, 5; 12:3, 6, 11; 13:3, 5, 5, 5, 11; 14:10; 20:10, 17, 18, 24; 21:2; 23:8, 20, 23, 28.

³⁵ Exod 7:9.

³⁶ Exod 7:10; 11:5, 7; 17:11, 11; 18:25; 21:4.

³⁷ Exod 1:5, 11, 19; 7:28; 10:17; 12:11, 46, 48; 13:3, 6, 16; 15:22; 16:4, 32; 17:2; 18:21; 22:20, 22; 23:9.

³⁸ Exod 2:3, 6; 13:19; 18:16.

B. Ancient variants?: primary or secondary elements (25)

1. Pluses: 2³⁹
2. Differences in words: 22⁴⁰
3. Differences in sequence: 1⁴¹
4. Minuses: 0

C. Agreements that cannot be evaluated well: 4⁴²

In *Leviticus* I count the following 172 instances:

A. Secondary elements (112)

1. Harmonizing pluses: 48
2. Harmonizing changes: 15
3. Harmonizations in sequence: 3
4. Grammatical and linguistic simplification or harmonization: 45
5. Addition of names, pronouns, etc.: 1

B. Ancient variants?: primary or secondary elements (37)

1. Pluses: 14
2. Differences in words: 17
3. Differences in sequence: 3
4. Minuses: 3

C. Agreements that cannot be evaluated well (23)

These figures may be tabulated as follows:

Table 1: Non-Masoretic agreements of SP and LXX

	Category	Genesis	Gen reduced ⁴³	Exod 1- 24	Leviticus
	total number of agreements	173	105	99	172
A	<i>secondary elements</i>	102 = 59 % of total	55 = 52 % of total	70 = 71 % of total	112 = 65 % of total
A	harmonizing pluses	52 = 51% of A	28 = 51 % of A	37 = 53 % of A	48 = 43 % of A

³⁹ Exod 3:18; 7:5.

⁴⁰ Exod 1:10, 22; 5:9, 21; 7:9; 10:11; 12:17, 39; 12:17, 39, 40; 13:15; 14:13, 18; 15:3; 17:2; 18:6, 7, 16; 21:22; 22:9; 23:22, 33.

⁴¹ Exod 3:2.

⁴² Exod 2:6; 7:20; 17:12; 18:20.

⁴³ See section β below. This section disregards the non-Masoretic agreements of SP and the LXX that are shared with S and/or some or all the Targumim.

	Category	Genesis	Gen reduced	Exod 1- 24	Leviticus
A	harmonizing minuses	0	0	1	0
A	harmonizing changes	23	7	7	15
A	harm. Sequence	3	2	0	3
A	Simplification / harm	11	11	19	45
A	names / pronouns	13	7	6	1
B	<i>primary/secondary elements</i>	44 = 25 % of total	32 = 30 % of total	25 = 25 % of total	37 = 22 % of total
B	Pluses	16	3	2	14
B	differences in words	22	26	22	17
B	differences in seq	5	2	1	3
B	minuses	1	1	0	3
C	<i>agreements that cannot be evaluated</i>	27 = 16 % of total	18 = 18 % of total	4 = 4 % of total	23 = 13 % of total

Summarizing the data for the first three books of the Torah, we note that the overall frequency of the agreements between SP and the LXX, as well as the proportions of the different types of agreements, is strikingly similar.⁴⁴ Thus in all three books, the majority of the agreements pertains to secondary readings,⁴⁵ and among those secondary readings the largest group is that of the harmonizing pluses.⁴⁶ These data show unmistakably that the SP and LXX share a common background in secondary readings, even if they also disagree as often as they agree in readings that are not analyzed in this study.⁴⁷ Although the first three books of the Torah differ in content, they must have undergone a similar textual development since they share similar textual patterns. This pertains also to the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy not analyzed here in detail.

⁴⁴ For the 85 pages of Genesis in *BHS*, the number of agreements is 2.03 per average page, for Exodus 1 – 24 (40 pp.) it is 2.47 and for Leviticus (50 pp.) it is 3.44 per page.

⁴⁵ In Genesis 59%, in Exodus 71%, and in Leviticus 65%.

⁴⁶ In Genesis 52%, in Exodus 53%, and in Leviticus 43%.

⁴⁷ The disagreements between the SP and LXX are listed by KIM, *Studies*. They more or less equal the amount of the agreement, and if anything, they are less frequent. However, merely counting the cases is of limited value since several items pertain to major differences between the two, especially in the idiosyncrasies of the SP.

In textual studies, agreements in *secondary* readings are emphasized as they may point to a close affinity. Often a few examples may suffice to demonstrate such an affinity. In the following instances we wish to illustrate this principle:

Gen 20:14 (see the analysis on p. 286)

Gen 31:39 MT **אנכי אחטנה מידי תבקשנה גנבתי יום וגנבתי לילה**; SP **אנכי לילה אחטנה מידי גנבת יום וגנבת לילה** = LXX *ἐγὼ ἀπετίνησα παρ' ἑμαυτοῦ κλέμματα ἡμέρας καὶ κλέμματα νυκτός*. The traditional understanding is that of MT (NRSV: ... I bore the loss of it myself; of my hand you required it, whether stolen by day or stolen by night), based on the parallel status of these four stichs. The SP = LXX reflect a different understanding whereby **מידי** is connected with the previous word, and the last two stichs serve as the object of the verb **אחטנה**. In this understanding **תבקשנה** is left hanging in the air and possibly for that reason it was left out by both SP and LXX.

Gen 43:14 **ושלח לכם את אחיכם**; SP **ושלח לכם את אחיכם אחר ואת בנימין**; LXX *καὶ ἀποστείλαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑμῶν τὸν ἕνα καὶ τὸν Βενιαμιν*. According to MT and the other versions, Jacob tells his ten sons that they should demand from Joseph that he release their “other brother,” namely Simeon who was held back by Joseph, as well as Benjamin who would be sent as part of the next mission. The phrase “your other brother” refers back to the previous verse in which “your brother (Benjamin)” is mentioned. On the other hand, SP = LXX speak about “the one brother” referring to the same Simeon, as if he were the only one. This phrase is not supported by the context, and clearly reflects a wrongly created variant by a *resh/daleth* interchange, as in Gen 22:13 analyzed below. Alternatively, the reading of SP = LXX reflects a harmonization to 42:19 MT **אחיכם אחד** (NRSV, JPS: one of your brothers) referring to Simeon (= LXX; SP **אחיכם האחד**). Whatever the background of this reading, it is inappropriate in the context, even though it is preferred by Westermann.⁴⁸

Gen 43:16 **וירא יוסף אתם את בנימין** – “When Joseph saw Benjamin with them, ...” Benjamin was part of the delegation that came to Joseph, and he was spotted among them by Joseph. However, *ittam* is not as frequent in Scripture as *otam*, and the reader's first inclination would be to read as in SP = LXX. When that (wrong) reading was chosen by SP = LXX, the scribe was left with an incomprehensible context and had no choice but to add a conjunctive *waw* to the next word, thus reading **וירא יוסף אתם ואת בנימין** (When Joseph saw them and Benjamin, ...)” SP = LXX *εἶδεν δὲ Ἰωσηφ αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν Βενιαμιν*. From a literary point of view MT makes sense (Joseph saw Benjamin among his brothers). The observation that

⁴⁸ CLAUS WESTERMANN, *Genesis* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 126.

Joseph saw *both* the brothers and Benjamin (SP = LXX) is less valid. The *Vorlage* of the LXX went one step further by describing Joseph as “our brother, son of the same mother” (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁμομήτριον). This harmonizing plus repeats the text of v. 29 אַחִיו בְּנֵי־אִמּוֹ appearing in the exact same context when Joseph sees Benjamin, son of the same mother.

Gen 43:28 (see the analysis on p. 288)

Gen 49:5 (see the analysis on p. 288)

Gen 49:22 בְּנוֹת צַעְדָּה עָלַי שׁוּר. The meaning of this stich was difficult for ancient translators, medieval commentators, and modern scholars. Often בְּנוֹת is taken as “branches” of the vine, similar to בֵּן in the first stich, and צַעְדָּה as an ancient plural form (thus NRSV: his branches run over the wall). At the same time, the reading of SP and LXX (בְּנֵי צַעֲרִי = υἱός μου νεώτατος) is very difficult in the context. The reading of SP LXX must have developed from MT or a similar one (MT בְּנוֹת / SP בְּנֵי = LXX; MT צַעְדָּה / SP צַעֲרִי ; similarly LXX). The impression given by the MT of verses 22–25 is that at first Joseph lived in tranquility and prosperity (v. 22), but later this quietude is disturbed by hostile forces (v. 23). Subsequently Joseph wins the fight (v. 24), and receives the blessings of God (v. 25).⁴⁹ On the other hand, the picture of the LXX, completely different from that of MT, is problematical because Joseph is not the youngest son of Jacob.⁵⁰ In this probably secondary detail the SP and LXX display a common text.

I now turn to a systematic discussion of the different groups of agreements, *exemplified* as follows for *Genesis* (these categories are represented in the Table).

A. Secondary elements (102)

1. Harmonizing pluses: 52

17:14 MT SP LXX בֶּשֶׂר עָרְלָתוֹ אֵת בְּשַׂר יְמִינֵי ; SP LXX + בְּזִוּוֹם הַשְּׂמִינִי (τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ὀγδόῃ). Based on Lev 12:3 MT SP LXX. This is a striking case of a harmonizing plus based on a remote parallel.

20:14 MT SP LXX (צֶאֱן וּבִקָּר וְעִבְדִּים וְשִׁפְחָת) וַיִּקַּח אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ ; SP LXX + אֶלְף כֶּסֶף + (χίλια δίδραχμα). Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX.

The harmonization in this verse reveals its secondary nature. According to v. 14 MT, Abimelech gave Abraham “sheep and oxen, and male and female slaves,” but according to v. 16 MT SP LXX he told Sarah that he had given Abraham “a thousand pieces of silver.” That monetary unit probably represented the value of the items he had given Abraham according to v. 14. However, the SP LXX version of v. 14 added this detail from

⁴⁹ This forceful picture resembles that of Gad, who at first is attacked (v. 19a), but at the end overcomes his enemies (v. 19b).

⁵⁰ The continued text in SP, and especially the LXX, is unclear as well.

v. 16, and thus according to that version Abraham received twice as much in reparation. The correction solved one issue in SP LXX, but left a discrepancy between verses 14 and 16 – indeed, many harmonizations create new problems.

50:25 MT SP LXX מזה (את עצמתי) וזהעלתם; SP LXX + אתכם + (μεθ' ὑμῶν)

Based on Exod 13:19 MT SP LXX וזהעליתם את עצמתי מזה אתכם = S.

This example shows how well the harmonizing scribe of Genesis knew the Scripture text. Joseph's words in Gen 50:25 are quoted with a slight expansion in Exod 13:19, and this expansion was in turn inserted in SP LXX in Genesis.

2. Harmonizing changes: 23

18:29, 30 MT לא אעשה; SP LXX לא אשחית (οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσω) = S. Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX. MT uses a literary structure of variation of אשחית (v. 28), אעשה (vv. 29, 30), and again אשחית (vv. 31, 32). SP LXX, on the other hand, use the same verb אשחית throughout these verses.

39:8 MT מה; SP LXX מאומה (οὐδέν). Based on a similar phrase in v. 23 MT SP לידו מאומה בידו את כל.

3. Harmonizations in sequence: 3

2:4b MT ארץ ושמים; SP LXX וארץ ושמים (τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν) = S T2. Based on v. 4a. MT presents a chiasmic pattern in the two parts of v. 4, while SP LXX follow the traditional sequence that goes back to Gen 1:1.

4. Grammatical and linguistic simplification or harmonization: 11

31:29 MT ואלהי אביכם; SP LXX ואלהי אביך (ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου). The singular form is based on השמר לך in the continuation. At the same time, the verse refers to the appearance in v. 24 of God to Laban, who is described in this verse as either the God of Jacob (SP LXX) or the God of Jacob, Rachel and Leah (MT).

5. Addition of names, pronouns, etc.: 13

Throughout the textual transmission of all the textual sources, clarifying names have been added to the text as subjects and objects. Sometimes there is a special exegetical need to add such a clarification, as in the first example. In these cases the rule of the *lectio brevior* is valid.

14:19a MT ויברכהו; SP LXX ויברך את אברם (καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν Ἀβράμ). Based on v. 19b MT SP LXX. Although Melchizedek is the subject of the previous verse, 18, and he is described as a priest, it is not immediately clear who blesses whom. By the same token, it is not immediate-

ly clear who gives whom a tithe in v. 20. In that verse the SP LXX do not add a clarification, but in v. 14:19 the uncertainty is solved by the addition.

37:36 MT אתו (והמדנים מכרו); SP LXX את יוסף. It is clear that the text refers to Joseph, yet his name has not been mentioned explicitly after vv. 31, 33.

B. Primary or secondary elements (44)

The characterization of elements as harmonizing, and hence secondary (category A), is undoubtedly subjective. Equally subjective is the present category in which we include instances that we are not certain to be either harmonizing (secondary) or primary (that is, possibly reflecting ancient readings).

1. Pluses: 16

4:8 MT >; LXX SP נלכה השדה (Διέλωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον). MT does not state what Cain actually said. Probably some words have been omitted in that text, perhaps the same words as the pluses of SP and LXX. For similar pluses, see T-N ברא לאפי תרינן ונפק איתה (T-PsJ similarly), S נרדא לפקעתא, V *egrediamur foras*.

43:28 MT חי עודנו; SP LXX + ויאמר ברוך האיש ההוא לאלהים (καὶ εἶπεν Εὐλογητὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ θεῷ). When Jacob's sons visit Joseph, the latter inquires about the well-being of his father, upon which he hears that his father is still alive. According to SP LXX Joseph then blesses his father. The added blessing for Jacob resembles Jacob's blessing to his sons in 49:28 (ויברך אותם איש אשר כברכתו ברך אתם), but the exact wording is not found anywhere in Scripture. In the words of Skinner, this addition is "hardly original."⁵¹

2. Differences in words: 22

22:13 MT והנה איל אחר נאחז; SP LXX והנה איל אחד נאחז (καὶ ἰδοὺ κριὸς εἰς κατεχόμενος) = T-PsJ, T-N S. The reading of MT is difficult in the context since there is no word after אחר. Undoubtedly, אחד (LXX SP) was corrupted to אחר.

49:5 MT כלי חמס; SP LXX כלו חמס (συνετέλεσαν ἀδικίαν). According to the meaning of the next verse, v. 6, in all the witnesses, Simeon and Levi shared negative experiences as they were involved in acts of crime. In light of this, MT is understandable in v. 5, with its "weapons of iniquity," and in v. 7 stating that "their anger" is "cursed." In contrast, the context in

⁵¹ JOHN SKINNER, *Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930), 482.

the LXX is positive since *συντελέσαν ἀδικίαν* (= כלו חמס) can only be understood as “they brought the violence to an end” (MT: כלי, tools).⁵²

In my view, the reading of SP LXX developed secondarily. Two of the three words in this stretch were problematic, the *hapax legomenon* מכרותיהם and the word that can either be written as כלי or כלו (*yod* or *waw* were hardly distinguished). In light of these problems, the Greek translator interpreted the first letter of מכרותיהם as the preposition -מ and not as part of a word, thereby causing a change in the syntax of the surrounding words. His rendering ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (*NETS*: by their choice) is probably based on the etymological understanding of the two root letters כר of מכרותיהם as בר (“to choose,” as in ברה), also found elsewhere in the LXX.⁵³

3. Differences in sequence: 5

8:21 MT לא אסף לקלל עוד; SP LXX לא אוסף עוד לקלל (Οὐ προσθήσω ἔτι τοῦ καταράσασθαι) = S.

4. Minuses: 1

C. Agreements that cannot be evaluated well (27)

The items included in this category should be considered cases of pseudo-agreement between the SP and LXX. In these cases the agreement does not carry weight as it is created by the inner dynamics of the LXX translation when the Greek translator could not have translated otherwise.

10:25 MT ולעבר ילד שני בנים; SP LXX לעבר ילדו שני בנים (καὶ τῷ Εβερ ἐγενήθησαν δύο υἱοί). The Greek translator had to provide a plural form, as the lack of coordination between a singular verb and a subject in the plural is not tolerated in Greek. For similar instances, see Gen 24:55; 35:26; 46:27.

⁵² The attempt of *NETS* (“they perpetrated”) to bring the LXX in line with MT is problematic. The rendering of *NETS* is based on the fact that LSJ gives one reference for the meaning “perpetrate.” However, it would be more sound practice to explain *συντελέω* in accord with its base meaning, “to complete,” “exhaust,” as understood by the Old Latin *consummaverunt*. A good parallel for this understanding is Ezek 6:12 ובליתי חמתי בם (*NJPS*: I will spend my fury upon them) καὶ συντελέσω τὴν ὀργήν μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς (*NETS*: I will spend my anger upon them), implying that at the end of God’s action no anger was left with him.

⁵³ See my study “Bilateral Exegesis.” On the other hand, MARTIN RÖSEL, “Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta, *BN* 79, 1995, 54–69,” (59) ascribed this rendering to the root כרת.

β. Non-Masoretic agreements of the pattern SP = LXX including references to other sources agreeing with SP = LXX

By way of appendix I devote a few words to the shared agreements of LXX=SP and S or one of the Targumim. For the sake of fairness, I want to see whether such instances should possibly be deducted from our statistics. The number of these instances is rather high in Genesis (68 or 39% of the total of 173 instances).⁵⁴ If these data are deducted from the overall number, the frequency of the agreements of LXX=SP is of course smaller,⁵⁵ but the internal proportions remain the same. Most agreements still pertain to secondary readings,⁵⁶ and among the secondary readings, the harmonizations are still the major group.⁵⁷

In *Genesis* I count the following agreements of the SP and LXX not including the shared readings with S and/or one of the Targumim: 105 (173 for the untrimmed data):⁵⁸

A. Secondary elements 55 (102)

1. Harmonizing pluses: 28⁵⁹ (52 for the untrimmed data)
2. Harmonizing changes: 7⁶⁰ (23)
3. Harmonizations in sequence: 2⁶¹ (3)
4. Grammatical and linguistic simplification or harmonization: 11⁶² (11)
5. Addition of names, pronouns, etc.: 7⁶³ (13)

B. Ancient variants?: primary or secondary elements: 32 (44)

1. Pluses: 3⁶⁴ (16)

⁵⁴ The following abbreviations are used in this footnote: S = Peshitta; T1 = Targum Onqelos; T2 = Targum Neophyti; T3 = Targum Pseudo-Jonathan; T = the combined evidence of T1, 2, 3. The data are: 2:2 S; 2:4 S; 2:23 T1; 2:24 S T12; 7:2 S T; 7:2 S T; 7:8 S; 8:21 S; 12:3 S T; 12:7 S T2; 14:4 S T13; 14:10 S; 14:22 S; 16:6 S T13; 17:16 S; 17:17 T2; 18:29, 30 S; 19:12 S; 20:5 S; 21:13 S T2; 21:30 S; 21:33 S T2; 22:13 S T23; 25:5, 8 S; 25:28 S T12; 26:7 S T; 26:7 S T23; 26:18 S; 29:27 S T2; 30:40 S; 31:15 S T2; 31:16 S; 32:21 T; 32:24 S T2; 34:19 S; 36:2 S; 37:33; 38:21 S; 38:25 S T; 39:4 S T; 39:12 T2; 41:35 T2; 41:43 S; 41:48 ST3; 41:53 T2; 41:56 S T1; 42:21 S T2; 42:28 S T; 43:12 S T3; 43:23 T2; 43:30 S T; 44:9 T; 44:13 S T12; 44:23 S; 44:31 S T2; 45:20 S T3; 46:16 S; 47:3 S T3; 48:7 S T2; 48:8 T2; 49:18 S T; 49:25 S T2; 50:12, 20, 25 S.

⁵⁵ 1.23 instances per page of *BHS* (see n. 44).

⁵⁶ 51% (see n. 45).

⁵⁷ 51% (see n. 46).

⁵⁸ KIM, *Studies*, 82, lists 234 instances for this category with a different subdivision.

⁵⁹ 1:14; 6:20; 7:3; 8:19; 10:32; 11:8, 13 etc., 14; 12:20; 15:21; 17:14; 19:30; 20:8, 14; 21:8, 13; 22:16; 23:2; 24:15; 26:5; 28:4; 31:33; 38:13; 47:16; 48:8, 14, 16; 49:26.

⁶⁰ 9:2; 11:31; 15:10; 31:29, 29; 37:17.

⁶¹ 2:4; 31:17.

⁶² 27:33, 34; 29:8; 31:53; 34:31; 37:4; 41:16, 57; 42:32; 46:22, 27; 49:4.

⁶³ 14:19; 24:14; 26:11; 29:23; 35:9; 37:36; 39:4.

⁶⁴ 2:19; 27:27; 43:28.

2. Differences in words: 26⁶⁵ (22)
3. Differences in sequence: 2⁶⁶ (5)
4. Minuses: 1⁶⁷ (1)

C. Agreements that cannot be evaluated well: 18⁶⁸ (27)

The reduced data adduced in this section β display the same basic tendencies as the fuller data in section α . Both show that the SP and LXX share many secondary variants. Among the aforementioned examples described in detail, see especially Gen 20:14; 49:5, as well as the other instances analyzed on p. 286–289. One does not need many examples of shared secondary readings in order to establish a close connection between two sources, especially when these readings reflect common mistakes.

Section β was analyzed by way of exercise. It seems to me that the same type of conclusion is reached on the basis of an analysis of the complete material in section α as with the trimmed data in section β .

3. Summary

1. The SP and LXX share many harmonizing and other secondary readings, including common mistakes, showing that the link between the SP and LXX is rooted firmly. This is shown especially by the examples on pp. 286–288.

2. The closeness of the SP and LXX is visible also in the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11.⁶⁹ The two texts are not identical, but they show common features.

3. The pre-Samaritan texts fit the pattern of the agreements of SP and the LXX in harmonizations since they contain an equal amount of harmonizations and actually more.⁷⁰ These texts are closer to the SP than to the LXX, but 4QNum^b, a transition text, is close to both the SP and LXX.⁷¹

⁶⁵ 3:6; 6:19; 10:4, 27; 15:3; 18:19; 23:5, 14; 24:36, 62; 26:31, 34; 32:36; 34:16; 36:2, 6, 14; 43:14, 16; 46:12, 13, 16; 47:21; 49:5, 22, 23.

⁶⁶ 26:29; 34:12.

⁶⁷ 31:39.

⁶⁸ 4:10, 11; 10:4; 20:12, 13; 22:23; 24:55; 35:7, 26; 37:17; 38:30; 39:8, 12; 41:9, 50; 44:8; 48:27; 49:28; 50:21. Among the examples analyzed above, see further: Gen 2:2, 4; 14:10, 22.

⁶⁹ See my study “The Genealogical Lists in Genesis 5 and 11 in Three Different Versions,” in *From Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zippi Talshir* (ed. C. Werman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 37–52.

⁷⁰ See my study “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP,” in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead*

4. The closeness between the pre-Samaritan texts and SP and the LXX in harmonizations shows that this feature goes back to an early period. The shared tradition of the SP and LXX points in the same direction.

5. Beyond the common harmonizations of the SP and LXX, the LXX contains many harmonizations *not* shared with the SP. The LXX is actually more harmonizing than SP.⁷²

6. In the case of the LXX, the harmonizing changes, mainly pluses, present the most characteristic textual feature of the LXX in Genesis and Leviticus, as well as in the Torah as a whole. Only rarely does the reconstructed *Vorlage* of a LXX book reflect *textual* features that characterize a book as a whole, but the *Vorlage* of LXX-Torah is an exception.

7. The SP and LXX share a common background in secondary as well as some primary readings, but they also disagree as often as they agree in readings that are not analyzed in this study (see n. 47).⁷³ This situation resulted from the complicated transmission history of the Torah text. I surmise that the two texts had a common background, but SP gave that common text a very special twist. The SP changed the common text more than the source of the LXX did, since it included the large editorial interventions, such as in the story of the plagues in Exodus 7–11 and in the addition to Exodus and Numbers of segments copied from Deuteronomy 1–3.

8. We now turn to the general picture of the textual development of the Torah, including elements that are not analyzed in this study.⁷⁴ The relationship between the sources may be expressed by way of a stemma. In my

Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown (ed. S. Tzoref and I. Young; Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts 20; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013), 59–88.

⁷¹ Due to the fragmentary preservation of the pre-Samaritan texts, only some of this evidence is available. Examples are provided in the study mentioned in n. 70, especially for 4QNum^b.

⁷² See my recent studies “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 271–282; “Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. Dimant & R.G. Kratz; BZAW 439; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 19–50; “The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11,” *Die Septuaginta: Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19. – 22. Juli 2012* (ed. W. Kraus & S. Kreuzer; WUNT 325, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 315–332.

⁷³ This point was stressed by JAMES R. DAVILA, “Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Cases,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 3–37. That scholar classified the variants in a rather subjective way as either “original” or “secondary.” He considers MT and SP to reflect “one text type” (35).

⁷⁴ See my studies “Textual Developments in the Torah,” in *3D: Discourse, Dialogue, and Debate in the Bible: Essays in Honour of Frank Polak* (ed. A. Brenner-Idan; Hebrew Bible Monographs, 63; Amsterdam Studies in Bible and Religion 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014), 236–249, and “2.1. Textual History of the Pentateuch,” in *Textual History of the Bible Online*, vol. 1 (eds. A. Lange & E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2015).

view, at the top of the stemma stand the witnesses that do not display secondary features, namely MT and a few fragmentary (non-aligned) texts. Rather unexpectedly, contextual harmonization becomes the main criterion for characterizing the Pentateuch texts.⁷⁵ These harmonizations appear more in the Torah than in the other books, not because these books provide fewer occasions for harmonization, but because the scribes of the Torah scrolls endeavored to create what they considered to be near-perfect copies of the most sacred book of all. Almost all textual witnesses of the Torah are positioned at a lower point in the stemma, including the LXX, pre-Samaritan texts, and the SP.⁷⁶

9. Returning to the analyses reviewed in the beginning of this study, based on the incomplete and often incorrect data adduced in the Polyglot of Walton, I note that my views are closest to those of Gesenius. This scholar suggested that the SP and LXX derived from a common text that he named the “Alexandrino-Samaritan edition.”⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Thus already ESTHER ESHEL, “4QDeut”: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117–154. The importance of this textual and literary criterion is also stressed much by DAVID M. CARR, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 90–98.

⁷⁶ In modern research the dating of the pre-Samaritan texts, the SP and MT was analyzed by GARY N. KNOPPERS, “Parallel Torahs and Inner-Scriptural Interpretation: The Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuchs in Historical Perspective,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. Th. B. Dozeman; Tübingen, 2011), 507–531.

⁷⁷ GESENIUS had the correct insight, even if he described this common text as an “edition.” Only rarely should the SP or LXX be considered an “edition,” as in their common text in Genesis 5 and 11. Usually the term “text” is more appropriate.