

Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24^{*}

Emanuel Tov

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Of all the textual features in the manuscripts of all the witnesses of the Torah books, harmonization is probably the most prominent feature. The author has studied this phenomenon in the other books of the Torah and now devotes attention to Exod 1–24. This study is limited to chapters 1–24, because the special complications of the tabernacle chapters do not relate to their internal harmonizations but rather to their editorial changes both large and small. More than the other sources, including the Sam. Pent., LXX-Exod is harmonizing, including some very intriguing changes. Often the LXX and Sam. Pent. go together in their harmonizing tendencies, but more often the LXX reflects such changes (especially pluses) alone among the textual witnesses. Also the pre-Samaritan texts, the tefillin and the liturgical scrolls harmonized to a great degree.

The paper presents all the data subdivided into categories of textual relations, in Hebrew and Greek, together with statistics. The paper substantiates the thesis that the harmonizing changes and pluses were made in the Hebrew text from which the Greek translation was made and not by the translator.

I. Introduction

In the wake of my previous studies on textual harmonizations in the other four books of the Torah,¹ I now turn my attention to the book of Exodus. This study is limited to chapters 1–24, because the special complications of the tabernacle chapters do not relate to their internal harmonizations but rather to their editorial changes both large and small.

The study of harmonization has become increasingly more central to my textual analysis since I have come to realize that the textual witnesses of the Torah can be divided in a binary way between a block of texts in which harmonization is a central textual feature and a block in which there is little harmonization.² The majority block consists in the first place of the LXX and the SP group, but also of liturgical texts such as 4QDeutⁿ and many of the *tefillin*.³ In all

* The author wishes to thank the anonymous readers and peers for their judicious remarks.

¹ Emanuel Tov “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy,” in Emanuel Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 271–82; Tov, “Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs,” in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Writings*, VTSup 167 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 3:166–88; Tov, “The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11,” in Tov, *Collected Writings*, 3:470–89; Tov, “Textual Harmonization in Leviticus,” forthcoming; “The Septuagint of Numbers as a Harmonizing Text,” forthcoming.

² See Emanuel Tov, “The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks,” *Text 26* (2016): 1–27, <http://www.hum.huji.ac.il/units.php?cat=5020&incat=4972>.

³ See the discussion by Esther Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117–54; Tov “The *Tefillin* from the Judean Desert and the Textual Criticism of

these texts, the central textual feature is harmonization. The second block consists of a single text only, the MT, and it contains very little or no harmonization.

Harmonization is recognized when a detail in source A is changed to align with another detail in source A or source B because they differ. Scribes adapted many elements in the text to other details in the same verse, the immediate or a similar context, the same book, or parallel sections elsewhere in Scripture. Some such changes were inserted unconsciously, but most were inserted because of a theological concern for perfection, especially in harmonizing pluses. In the SP and LXX, harmonization is coupled with other secondary features such as adaptations to the context.

When focusing on characteristic textual features, the Torah is distinguished quite unexpectedly from the other biblical books by the occurrence of a large number of harmonizing changes, especially additions. These additions are found in differing numbers in the textual witnesses, most frequently in the LXX⁴ and secondarily in the SP group. The MT also contains some harmonizing changes, but it reflects a purer text than the other witnesses.

Mentioning the LXX as the main source of harmonizing pluses in all Scripture books and not merely in the textual witnesses of the Torah may be surprising when viewed in light of previous discussions in which that feature was almost solely ascribed to the SP. However, the data are quite clear in this regard. By way of clarification, our analysis excludes the large editorial additions in the SP group in Exodus and Numbers because they are not harmonizing pluses. These large additions, sometimes involving as much as nine verses, are part of a special editorial reworking of the Torah not seen in other books. This reworking is visible especially internally in Exod 7–11 and in the duplications from Moses's speech in Deut 1–3 in the parallel chapters in Exodus and Numbers. These changes duplicate or rearrange other Torah verses based on the inclination of the SP group to improve the consistency of the divine message. Such editorial changes are distinct from the small harmonizing alterations in the SP. The principle and substance of the small harmonizing changes are shared with the LXX, while the editorial changes described above are characteristic merely of the SP group.⁵

Textual harmonization in small details is visible throughout the Torah in both the LXX and SP,⁶ mainly in the nonlegal segments but also to a lesser extent in the phraseology used to ver-

the Hebrew Bible," in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*; STDJ 119; ed. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioata, and Charlotte Hempel (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 277–92.

⁴ This was recognized first by Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 82–92.

⁵ The scribes of this group were especially attentive to what they considered to be discrepancies within and between stories in Scripture. Particular attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially that of God and Moses; it was duplicated from one context into another when the editor considered it lacking, differing, or incomplete. Ultimately, the editorial changes derive from theological concerns and reflect the wish to create narrative structures that present the stories of the sacred Torah in the most perfect way possible.

In a way, editorial changes perfect the system by inserting small-scale harmonizations at a higher literary level. The small-scale harmonizations analyzed below attempt to make the text more congruous. The large-scale editorial intervention visible in the SP group reflects the next step up the ladder of perfecting the Torah. If my intuition is correct, the smaller harmonizations such as those in the *Vorlage* of the LXX thus reflect a first step in the development of a free approach towards Scripture, while the editorial changes in the SP group reflect a second stage. At the same time, too little is known in order to sketch a chronological development.

⁶ The presence of harmonization in the LXX of the Torah was recognized long ago in scholarship, but it was usually ascribed to translators. See n. 11.

balize the laws. On the other hand, the substance of the laws is only rarely harmonized within a specific pericope or between parallel law codes.⁷ Textual harmonization also occurs in several liturgical Torah texts, such as 4QDeutⁿ and many of the *tefillin*.⁸

It is usually suggested that the Greek translator inserted these harmonizations, but I suggest that they were, as a rule, already found in his *Vorlage*, although this cannot be proven conclusively. The first scholar to claim that the translators inserted these harmonizations was Theophilus Toepler in 1830, and he provided a long list of examples.⁹ He was followed by Zecharias Frankel, who added several examples, but he ascribed the phenomenon to the editors of the manuscripts (*diaskeuastes*).¹⁰ In recent times, this approach has been adopted by several scholars with regard to the book of Numbers.¹¹

Before turning to the evidence itself, I will address four arguments that support the assumption that the harmonizations had been inserted in the *Vorlage* of the LXX rather than by the translator:¹² (1) the translator's relative fidelity to his source; (2) the level at which the harmonization took place; (3) the frequent agreement of the SP with the LXX; and (4) the occasional agreement of the LXX with a Qumran scroll.

1. *The translator's fidelity.* If a translation was relatively literal, by implication, the harmonizations reflected in that translation were probably carried out in the *Vorlage*. The overall impression of the LXX of Exodus is one of fidelity to the Hebrew parent text.¹³ However, this translation of Exodus was definitely not literal, as it includes unusual translation choices. At the same time, the translator freely inserts contextual exegetical choices and does not go as far as inserting harmonizing renderings.

2. *The level at which the harmonization took place.* If all instances of harmonization were created by the same hand, the changes must have taken place at the Hebrew level and were

⁷ For an exceptional example of such a harmonization, see LXX-Deut 16:7 adapted to Exod 12:9 as discussed by David Andrew Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, FAT 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 127, 194–95.

⁸ See the studies mentioned in n. 3.

⁹ Theophilus E. Toepler, *De Pentateuchi interpretationis alexandrinae indole critica et hermeneutica* (Halle: C. Schwetschke, 1830), 8–16.

¹⁰ Zecharias Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1851), 58–63, 103–04, 163–64, 187–88, 221–23. The basis for Frankel's approach was laid out in his earlier *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1941), 78–79.

¹¹ Giles Dorival, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, 4: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 42–43. See also his summarizing methodological remark on p. 40; John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, SCS 46 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), xvii–xviii; Martin Rösel, “Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri,” in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à A. Schenker*, ed. Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehlinger, OBO 179 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25–40 (29–30).

¹² Inner-translational activity did take place, but it did not create the harmonizations described in this study. I refer to the following instance: 12:10 MT SP LXX בִּקְרָה; LXX + וְעִצָּם לֹא תִשְׁבְּרוּ בּוֹ (καὶ ὁστούν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ). This plus is clearly based on v. 46, but it is more in the nature of an interpolation than a regular case of harmonization. In any event, the two Greek texts agree against the Hebrew with regard to the preposition and therefore the addition was probably made at the Greek level.

¹³ See the analysis and literature provided by Bénédicte Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called 'Plagues Narratives' in Exodus 7:14–11:10*, OTS 56 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 96–150.

not created by the translator. This suggestion is based on the fact that in several cases the two Greek texts—the text that was changed by way of harmonization and the text to which the harmonized text was adapted—differ, rendering it impossible that the translator was influenced by the Greek context. Examples are provided below of differences in Hebrew *Vorlage*, vocabulary, and construction:¹⁴

Vorlage (the plus is based on a slightly different *Vorlage*)

Vocabulary

1:16 MT SP וְחִיָּה; LXX ותחייין (περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό). Based on v. 18. There is a different Greek equivalent (καὶ ἐζωογονεῖτε) with exactly the same meaning.

20:10 MT SP וְגֵרָךְ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעֲרֶיךָ; LXX והגר הגר בתוככם (καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ παροικῶν ἐν σοί). Based on Lev 16:29: וְהֵגֵר הַגֵּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם (καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ προσκειμένος ἐν ὑμῖν). The borrowing did not take place on the Greek level since the two texts used different terms and differ in their singular/plural presentation of the pronoun.

23:2 MT SP LXX לְהַטָּה; LXX + מִשְׁפָּט + (κρίσιν). Based on v. 6 (κρίμα).

Different construction

3:12 MT SP LXX וַיֹּאמֶר; LXX + אֱלֹהִים אֵל מֹשֶׁה + (εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσεῖ). Based on v. 14 (καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν).

21:36 MT SP LXX שְׁלֹשִׁים; LXX + וְהוֹעֵד בְּבַעֲלֵיוֹ + (καὶ διαμεμαρτυρημένοι ὧσιν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 29 (καὶ διαμαρτύρωνται τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ).

3. *Frequent agreement of the SP with the LXX.* The fact that the LXX agrees with the SP against the MT in many harmonizations (§2 below) strengthens the assumption of a Hebrew background for other harmonizations as well.

4. *Occasional agreement of the LXX with a Qumran scroll.* For 4QExod^b, see 2:6 (§2c); for 2:11, 13, 16 (all: §1a) and other Qumran scrolls such as 4QpaleoExod^m, see 7:10 (§2a), 15 (§2b); 8:20 (§3b); 9:7 (§2a); 10:24 (§2b). These agreements strengthen the assumption that the LXX pluses are based on a Hebrew text that differs from the MT.

Beyond the examples provided above, it is unlikely that Greek translators, certainly literal ones, harmonized scriptural verses, especially when dealing with remote (as opposed to immediate) contexts. The same cannot be said of the influence of the translation of the Greek Torah on translators of other biblical books. This is especially clear in the vocabulary of the later books and in certain key passages such as the influence of Deut 32 on the Greek Isaiah.¹⁵

Turning now to the data,¹⁶ we record cases in which scribes adapted elements in the text to other details appearing either in the same verse or in the immediate or remote context. The de-

¹⁴ For similar suggestions in the case of harmonizing pluses, see Emanuel Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29 (20–21).

¹⁵ See Emanuel Tov, “The Septuagint Translation of the Torah as a Source and Resource for the Post-Pentateuchal Translators,” in *LXX.H: Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of the Septuagint*, vol. 3 of *Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2016), 316–28.

¹⁶ The analysis is based on a fresh examination of the data included in the critical editions (see n. 18). Most agreements between SP and the LXX were denoted in the CATSS database (Emanuel Tov and Frank H. Polak, *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* [division of the

cision as to whether or not a certain detail reflects a harmonization to another verse is always subjective since it is never certain that the translator consciously adapted the text in order to harmonize it with another text. Likewise, to decide that the LXX and SP agree against the MT is equally subjective because secondary developments sometimes took place independently in both sources, such as the change from singular to plural or vice versa as in Exod 17:12. Thus, the agreement between the SP and the LXX may sometimes be misleading.

Below, we list the harmonizations in Exodus in the MT, LXX, and SP,¹⁷ as recorded in their critical editions.¹⁸ Harmonizations in individual manuscripts of these sources are not recorded. Harmonizations are found in several configurations of textual witnesses for which the change/addition is recorded before the “≠” sign. The examples listed below provide a *subjective* recording of the harmonizing changes in Exodus that is meant to be exhaustive.

The data are listed according to the clustering of the textual witnesses. The largest group of examples (1) includes harmonizations exclusive to LXX, while group (2) contains similar data from both the LXX and SP. Far fewer harmonizations are exclusive to SP (3) and even fewer to MT (groups 4 and 5).

I distinguish between harmonizations influenced by: (a) the immediate context; (b) the remote context; and (c) an addition or expansion of a subject or object on the basis of the context. In the case of additions based on remote contexts, one can usually recognize the idea or phrase that triggered the harmonizing change (§1a, exemplified below). Usually such instances are not considered harmonizations, but as long as the contextual base of these pluses can be indicated, I consider them harmonizing. I suggest that most harmonizations of groups (a) and (b) were conscious, while those of group (c) could have been unconscious. The harmonizations of groups (a) and (b) reflect a certain conception, almost ideology, that intertextual links should be added in order to perfect the biblical stories.

I have not included other sources of differences between the various texts, such as nonharmonizing pluses or changes in the LXX (e.g., 12:39; 13:21) and textual complications (e.g., in 4:10, 25–26; 5:9, 13; 6:1, 17; 8:18; 9:10, 23; 10:15; 12:3; 22:4, 30).

Examples of harmonizations to *remote* verses show the scribe’s knowledge of the content of the Bible (underlined words have been added in SP or LXX):

12:18 MT SP LXX לְחַדֵּשׁ; LXX + הַרְאֵשׁן + (τοῦ πρώτου). Based on Lev 23:5. This verse speaks about the same festival of *matzot*.

15:23 MT SP שְׂמָחָה; LXX הַהוּא הַמְקוֹם הַהוּא (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου). Based on 17:7, referring to the giving of a name to the same place, Marah.

20:10 MT SP LXX וְאִמְתַּךְ; 4QMez A LXX + שׁוֹרֵךְ וְחִמּוֹרֵךְ וְכָל + (ὁ βοῦς σου καὶ τὸ ὑποζύγιόν σου καὶ πᾶν). Based on Deut 5:14. This verse is remote from Exodus, but since this verse is situated in the Decalogue, scribes would have scrutinized every detail.

CATSS database, directed by Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov]), and modules in the *Accordance*, Oaktree Software, Inc., and *BibleWorks* computer programs, 2005 (with updates, 2006–). For the LXX, the following tool was also helpful: Frank H. Polak and Galen Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint*, part 1: *Introduction*; part 2: *The Pentateuch*, CATSS Basic Tools 4–5 (Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002). See further the following studies: John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SCS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990); Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, AAWG, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3, 192; MSU 21 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997).

¹⁷ In addition, the text of the Qumran scrolls is quoted when relevant.

¹⁸ The following editions were used: *BHS*; Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin, *The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Tel Aviv: Haim Ruben Tel Aviv University Press, 2010); John W. Wevers, *Exodus, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum*, Vol. 2.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

Some of the changes and pluses in the textual witnesses of Exodus had halakhic implications, and such instances have been analyzed by Zecharias Frankel and Leo Prijs in their important studies on the LXX and by David Andrew Teeter in his equally penetrating investigations of all the textual witnesses.¹⁹ In principle, harmonizing pluses likewise could have been based on legalistic interpretations, and in some instances this was indeed the case. For example:

22:13 MT SP LXX **או מת**; LXX + **או נשבה** + (ἡ αἰχμάλωτον γένηται). Based on v. 9. This addition shows a legal interpretation.²⁰

These instances are naturally concentrated in the legal chapters, especially in the Book of the Covenant (Exod 20:22–23:33).

However, as a rule, it was merely the formal similarity between verses that led a scribe to adapt one verse to another one and not halakhic reasoning, and I see most of the changes in the LXX in this light. The harmonizing pluses were added inconsistently, and such inconsistency is the rule for this kind of content revision.

By definition, all harmonizing additions represent secondary developments. They were made in order to adapt one context to another. However, the fullness of the wording is often artificial, even tautological, a feature that is more recognizable in Genesis and Deuteronomy than in Exodus.²¹ For example:

2:16a MT SP LXX **בנות**; LXX + **רעות את צאן אביהן יתרו** + (ποιμαίνουσαι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ἰσθὸρ) = 4QExod^b [**צאנו**] **ת** **רוע**[**ו**] **ת**. Based on v. 16b (where the words **צאן אביהן** recur). The first word, **רעות**, is also found in 4QExod^b, and part of the remainder is reconstructed. The name of Jethro, not found in MT in this verse, derives from the *Vorlage* of the LXX. The plus in the LXX and 4QExod^b creates a tautology.

3:22 MT LXX **ושאלה אשה משכנתה**; SP **ושאלה אשה מאת רעותה משכנתה**. Based on 11:2 MT SP **מאת רעותה**. The expanded version of the SP creates a tautology, **רעותה משכנתה**.

All five books of the Torah resemble one another with regard to the procedures followed in the course of inserting harmonizations, but in one aspect Exodus is somewhat different from the other four. Harmonizing one detail in a text to another detail is obviously a very personal decision. Sometimes, the harmonizing was combined with a degree of content rewriting, and in Exodus there seem to be more such instances than in the other books of the Torah. For example:

4:18 MT SP LXX **לשלום**; LXX + **ויהי אחרי הימים הרבים האלה וימת מלך מצרים** + (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς πολλὰς ἐκεῖνας ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου). Based on 2:23 with free rewriting of the context.

6:20 MT SP LXX **ואת משה**; SP LXX + **ואת מרים אחותם** + (καὶ Μαριάμ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν). Based on Num 26:59.

17:9 MT SP **אנשים**; LXX **אנשי חיל** (ἄνδρας δυνατούς). Based on 18:25. The original text was rewritten to fit a different situation. The mighty men in chapter 18 are the judges set by Moses, while in chapter 17 they are Israelite soldiers who fight against Amalek.

19:10 MT SP **לך אל העם**; LXX **רד הער בעם** (Καταβὰς διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῷ). Based on v. 21. The two divine commands have been combined.

¹⁹ Frankel, *Einfluss*; Leo Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948); Teeter, *Scribal Laws*.

²⁰ This instance was mentioned already by Abraham Geiger, *המקרא ותרגומו* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1972), 302–3.

²¹ See examples provided in the studies mentioned in n. 1.

19:13 MT SP (הם) יעלו בהר (במשך הי(ו)בל (המה [הם] יעלו בהר; LXX במשך הקלת והיבל והענן מן ההר (ὄταν αἰ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ σάλπιγγες καὶ ἡ νεφέλη ἀπέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους). Based on v. 16. By way of harmonization, all three phenomena that accompanied the theophany have been combined in an unusual manner (addition of קלת and ענן) together with the words “from the mountain.”²²

II. The Data

The witnesses that are mentioned first (LXX in group 1) are the ones that are supposed to evidence the harmonizations.

1. LXX ≠ MT SP (86× + 32× + 19× = 137×)

1a. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (86×)

1:12 MT SP LXX יפרץ; LXX + במאד מאד + (σφόδρα σφόδρα).²³ Based on 1:20 and Gen 17:2.

1:16 MT SP וחיה; LXX ותחיי (περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό). Based on v. 18 ותחיי. Different Greek equivalent (καὶ ἐζωογονεῖτε) with the same meaning (“to save,” “keep alive”). Verse 16 speaking of the females has been adapted to v. 18 speaking of males.

2:11 MT SP LXX בימים; 4QExod^b LXX + הרבים + (ταῖς πολλαῖς). Based on v. 23.

2:11 MT SP LXX מאחיו; LXX + (מ)בני ישראל +. Based on v. 23.

2:13 MT SP LXX והנה; 4QExod^b LXX וירא (ὄρα). Based on v. 11.

2:14 MT SP LXX והדר; LXX + הזה + (τοῦτο). Based on v. 15.

2:16a MT SP LXX בנות; LXX + רעות את צאן אביהן יתרו + (ποιμαίνουσαι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ιοθορ) = 4QExod^b [רוע[ו]ת] [צאנו] [?]. Based on v. 16b. See introduction, §4.

2:17 MT SP LXX וישען ((ויושיענה); LXX + וידל להן + (καὶ ἤντλησεν αὐταῖς). Based on v. 19.

3:12 MT SP LXX ויאמר; LXX + ואלהים אל משה + (εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσεῖ). Based on v. 14 (καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν). Different formulation.

3:16 MT SP LXX ויצחק ויעקב; LXX + ואלהי יצחק ואלהי יעקב (καὶ θεὸς Ισαακ καὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ). The addition of אלהי is based on the context (אלהי אברהם).

4:1 MT SP LXX יהוה; LXX + מה אמר אליהם + (τί ἐρῶ πρὸς αὐτούς). Based on 3:13.

4:6 MT SP LXX אה(י)ו; LXX + מחיקו + (ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 7.

6:16 MT SP LXX init; LXX + ואלה + (καὶ οὗτοι). Based on v. 16.

5:2; 14:5, 19 MT SP LXX ישראל; LXX pr בני (τοὺς υἱούς). Based on the frequent expression. Same in 24:11 MT SP (§4a).

7:7, 9, 19; 8:1 MT SP LXX וואהרן; LXX + אחיו + (ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 1.

7:9 MT SP LXX מופת; LXX pr אות או (σημεῖον ἢ). Based on v. 3 and Deut 13:2. Similarly 11:9, 10.

²² The exegesis is unusual as the verb משך originally referred only to the horn, cf. Josh 6:5, but now it also includes the other two subjects. The Greek translator may have had the root מוש in mind, but more likely this is an etymological rendering as in 21:12 וקחו משכו – ἀπελθόντες λάβετε.

²³ Thus Rahlfs with most manuscripts; Wevers records the longer reading in the apparatus. Wevers probably relegates too many harmonizing readings to the apparatus. See the next notes.

7:9 MT SP LXX לִפְנֵי פָרְעָה; LXX + וּלְפָנֵי עַבְדָּיו + (καὶ ἐναντίον τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 10. Similarly 9:8.

7:10a MT SP LXX פָּרְעָה; LXX + וְעַבְדָּיו + (καὶ τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 10b. Similarly 14:8.

7:11 MT SP LXX לַחֲכָמִים; LXX + מִצְרַיִם + (Αἰγύπτου). Based on v. 11b.

8:4 MT SP LXX הִעֲתִירוּ; LXX + בְּעָדֵי + (περὶ ἐμοῦ). Based on v. 24. Similarly 9:28.

8:7 MT SP LXX וּמִבְּתִיךְ; LXX+ וּמִן הַחֲצֵרוֹת + (καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπαύλεων). Based on v. 9.

8:12 MT SP LXX לִכְנָם; LXX + בְּאֵדָם וּבִבְהֵמָה + (ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν). Based on v. 13.

8:19 MT SP LXX הַזֹּהָה; LXX + בְּאַרְץ + (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Based on 9:5.

8:24 MT SP LXX בְּעָדֵי; LXX+ אֵל יְהוָה +. Based on v. 25.

9:4 MT SP LXX יְהוָה; LXX + בַּפְּעַם הַזֹּאת + (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ).²⁴ Based on v. 14.

9:7 MT SP וַיִּשְׁלַח; LXX וַיִּרְא (ἰδὼν δέ). Based on v. 34.

9:7 MT SP וַהֲנֵה; LXX כִּי (ὅτι). Based on v. 34.

9:9 MT SP LXX אֲבַעֲבַע(ו); LXX + בְּאֵדָם וּבִבְהֵמָה + (ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τετράποδα). Based on 8:13.

9:11 MT SP LXX וּבְכָל; LXX+ אֶרֶץ (מִצְרַיִם) +. Based on v. 9. Similarly in 3:10, 11; 10:6; 14:11. Same in 12:40; 13:3 SP LXX (§2a); 9:12 MT (§5).

9:25b MT SP LXX שָׁבַר; LXX + הַבְּרַד + (ἡ χάλαζα). Based on v. 25a.

9:28 MT SP LXX וּבְרַד; LXX + וְאֵשׁ + (καὶ πῦρ). Based on v. 24.

9:29 MT SP LXX וְהַבְּרַד; LXX + וְהַמָּטֵר + (καὶ ὁ ὑετός). Based on v. 34.

10:4 MT SP LXX מִבְּיָא; LXX + כַּעַת (מַחַר) + (ταύτην τὴν ὥραν). Based on 9:18.

10:4 MT SP LXX אֲרֵבָה; LXX + כְּבֵד + (πολλήν).²⁵ Based on 10:14.

10:5b MT SP LXX וַיִּתֵּר; LXX + הָאֶרֶץ + (τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 5a.

10:13 MT SP אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם; LXX הַשָּׁמַיִם (τὸν οὐρανόν). Based on v. 21.

10:19 MT SP גִּבּוֹל (מִצְרַיִם); LXX אֶרֶץ (γῆ). Based on v. 15.

10:24 MT SP LXX אֵת יְהוָה (עַבְדּוֹ); LXX + אֱלֹהֵיכֶם +. Based on v. 8.

11:3a MT SP אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם; LXX בְּעֵינֵי (ἐναντίον). Based on v. 3b.

11:3a MT SP LXX מִצְרַיִם; LXX + וּבְעֵינֵי פָרְעָה + (καὶ ἐναντίον Φαραώ). Based on v. 3b.

11:10 MT SP LXX הָאֱלֹהִים; LXX + בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם + (ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου). Based on v. 9.

12:3 MT SP LXX אֲבָב(ו); LXX + אִישׁ + (ἕκαστος).²⁶ Based on the context.

12:21 MT SP LXX יִשְׂרָאֵל (זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל); LXX + בְּנֵי + (τῶν υἱῶν). Based on 4:29. Same in 3:16 (§ 2a).

13:12a MT SP LXX רָחַם; LXX + הַזְּכָרִים + (τὰ ἀρσενικά). Based on v.12b.

²⁴ Thus Rahlfs, with the main manuscripts. Wevers records this reading in the apparatus.

²⁵ The translator used the same adjective to describe the locusts and the hail.

²⁶ Thus Rahlfs with the main manuscripts. Wevers records this reading in the apparatus.

- 13:12b (2×) MT SP LXX פטר; LXX + רחם + (μήτραν). Based on v.12a.
- 13:12b MT SP LXX הזכרים; LXX + תקדש + (ἀγιάσεις). Based on v. 2.
- 13:14 MT SP LXX אליו; LXX + כי + (ὅτι). Based on v. 9 (same phrase).
- 14:3 MT SP LXX פרעה; LXX + עמו + (τῷ λαῶ αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 5.
- 14:12 MT SP LXX במדבר; LXX + הזה + (ταύτη). Based on v. 32.
- 14:17a MT SP LXX לב; LXX + פרעה +. Based on v. 17b.
- 14:20 MT SP LXX ישראל; LXX + ויעמד + (καὶ ἕστη). Based on v. 19. See n. 26.
- 15:22 MT SP LXX מצאו מים; LXX + לשתות + (ὥστε πιεῖν). Based on v. 23.
- 16:6 MT SP LXX כל; LXX + (בני ישראל) + עדת + (συναγωγήν). Based on v. 9.
- 16:31 MT SP LXX בית ישראל; LXX בני ישראל. Based on vv. 12, 15, 17.
- 17:5 MT SP LXX העם; LXX + הזה + (τούτου). Based on v. 4. See n. 26.
- 17:9 MT SP LXX אנשים; LXX אנשי חיל (ἄνδρας δυνατούς). Based on 18:25. See introduction, §4.
- 17:10 MT SP LXX אמר לו משה; LXX + ויצא + (καὶ ἐξελάθων). See n. 26. Based on v. 9. The LXX completes the execution of the command in accordance with the exact wording of the command. This small detail, together with others, shows that the *Vorlage* of the LXX preceded the SP in its major editorial tendencies.
- 18:8 MT SP LXX ויצלם יהוה; LXX + מיד פרעה ומיד מצרים + (ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραω καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων). Based on vv. 9–10.
- 18:9 MT SP LXX מיד מצרים; LXX + ומיד פרעה + (καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραω). Based on v. 10.
- 18:10 MT SP LXX הציל אתכם; LXX + הציל את עמו (ἐξείλατο τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 1.
- 19:10 MT SP LXX אל העם; LXX + רד הער בעם (καταβάς διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῶ). Based on v. 21. The two divine commands have been combined. See introduction, §4.
- 19:13 MT SP LXX [הם] יעלו בהר; LXX + במשך היו(ו)בל (המה) (ὅταν αἱ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ σάλπιγγες καὶ ἡ νεφέλη ἀπέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους). Based on v. 16. See introduction, §4.
- 19:16 MT SP LXX (ה)הר; LXX + סיני +. Based on vv. 11, 18, and 20.
- 19:18 MT SP LXX ההר; LXX + העם (ὁ λαός). Based on v. 16.
- 20:11 MT SP LXX יום השבת; LXX + (ה)יום השביעי (ἡμέρα τῆ ἐβδόμη). Based on v. 10.
- 21:36 MT SP LXX שלש(ו)ם; LXX + והועד בבעליו + (καὶ διαμεμαρτυρημένοι ὧσιν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 29 (different construction: καὶ διαμαρτύρωνται τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ).
- 22:13 MT SP LXX או מת; LXX + או נשבה + (ἢ αἰχμάλωτον γένηται). Based on v. 9. For the legal interpretation, see the introduction, §4.
- 22:16 MT SP LXX לתתה לו; LXX + לאשה + (γυναῖκα). Based on the frequent expression (e.g., Gen 30:4, 9). Same in 2:21 (§ 2b).
- 22:29 MT SP LXX לצאנך; LXX + וחמרך + (τὸ ὑποζύγιόν σου). Based on vv. 3, 8, and 9, where שָׁה is taken as part of the צָאן. Same interpretation as in 21:28–23:4 in the SP (§3a).
- 23:2 MT SP LXX להט(ו)ת; LXX + משפט + (κρίσιν). Based on v. 6 (κρίμα).

1b. Remote context (32×)

4:17 MT SP LXX ואת המטה הזה; LXX + אשר נהפך לנחש + (τὴν στραφεῖσαν εἰς ὄφιν). Based on 7:15.

4:18 MT SP LXX לשלום; LXX + ויהי אחרי הימים הרבים האלה וימת מלך מצרים + (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς πολλὰς ἐκεῖνας ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου). Based on 2:23, with free rewriting of the context.

4:23 MT SP בני (שלח את); LXX עמי (τὸν λαόν μου). Based on 5:1; 7:16.

4:24 MT SP LXX ויפנשהו; LXX + (יהוה) מלאך + (ἄγγελος). Based on 3:2 (theological exegesis).

7:9 MT SP ויהשל(י); LXX והשליכהו ארצה (καὶ ῥίψον αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν). Based on 4:3.

8:14 MT SP LXX כן; LXX + גם + (καί). Based on 7:11.

8:16 MT SP LXX ויעברני; LXX + במדבר + (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ).²⁷ Based on 7:16.

8:28 MT SP ולא שלח; LXX ולא אבה שלח (καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἐξαποστεῖλαι). Based on 10:27 (different Greek: καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη ἐξαποστεῖλαι αὐτούς) or 9:2 מאן אתה לשלח (εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ βούλει ἐξαποστεῖλαι).

10:22 MT SP LXX אפלה; LXX + ערפל + (θύελλα). Based on Deut 4:11; 5:22.

12:3 MT SP LXX עדת; LXX + בני (ישראל) +. Based on frequent expression.

12:16 MT SP LXX מלאכה; LXX + עבודה + (λατρευτόν). Based on Lev 23:7. This addition reflects the scribe's intimate knowledge of the text, since both verses speak about the *matzot* festival. The rewriting involves the change of the verb from 12:16 MT SP יעשה to ποιήσετε in the LXX, equaling תעשו in Lev 23:7.

12:18 MT SP LXX להדש; LXX + הראשן + (τοῦ πρώτου). Based on Lev 23:5. See introduction, §4.

12:30 MT SP LXX צעקה גדלה; LXX + בכל ארץ (במצרים) + (ἐν πάσῃ γῆ). Based on 11:6.

15:23 MT SP שמחה; LXX שם המקום ההוא (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκεῖνου). See introduction, §4.

19:3 MT SP LXX האלהים; LXX pr הר. Based on 3:1. Same in 3:1 MT SP (§ 4b).

19:5 MT SP LXX לי; LXX + (סגלה) עם + (λαός). Based on Deut 7:6; 14:2.

19:8; 24:3 MT SP LXX נעשה; LXX + ונשמע + (καὶ ἀκουσόμεθα). Based on 24:7.

20:10 MT SP LXX ואמתך; 4QMez A LXX + שורך וחמורך וכל + (ὁ βοῦς σου καὶ τὸ ὑποζύγιόν σου καὶ πᾶν). Based on Deut 5:14.

20:10 MT SP ויגרך אשר בשעריך; LXX והגר הגר בתוכם (καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ παροικῶν ἐν σοί). Based on Lev 16:29 (καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ προσκειμένος ἐν ὑμῖν). The borrowing did not take place on the Greek level since the two texts use different terms and they also differ in their singular/plural presentation of the pronoun. The plural suffix of בתוכם has been reconstructed in accordance with the prevalent usage.

20:12 MT SP למען; LXX למען לך ולמען (ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα). Based on Deut 5:16.

20:17 MT SP LXX וחמו(ו)רו; LXX + וכל בהמתו + (οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ). Based on 22:9.

20:22 MT SP LXX תאמר; LXX + לבית יעקב ותגיד + (τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰακωβ καὶ ἀναγγελεῖς). Based on 19:3.

²⁷ Thus Rahlfs with the main manuscripts. Wevers records this reading in the apparatus.

- 21:13 MT SP LXX שמה; LXX + הרצה + (ὁ φονεύσας). Based on Num 35:6.
- 21:14 MT SP LXX בערמה; LXX + ונס + (καὶ καταφύγη). Based on Num 35:25.
- 21:16 MT SP LXX איש; LXX + מבני ישראל והתעמר בו + (τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ καταδυναστεύσας αὐτόν). Based on Deut 24:7.
- 23:12 MT SP LXX תשבת; LXX שבתון (ἀνάπαυσις). Based on 35:2 (κατάπαυσις).²⁸
- 23:15 MT SP LXX תשמר; LXX + לעשות + (ποιεῖν). Based on 31:16. The formulation of the laws of the *matzot* festival is harmonized to those of the *shabbat*.
- 23:16 MT SP LXX וחג קציר בכורים תעשה ממעשיך; וחג הקציר בכורי מעשיך (καὶ ἑορτὴν θερισμοῦ πρωτογενημάτων ποιήσεις τῶν ἔργων σου). Influenced by (not based on) the parallel law in 34:22 (וחג שבעת תעשה לך בכורי קציר).
- 23:17 MT (SP) LXX יהוה יהוה; LXX + הארץ אתגבולך; LXX + כי אורישי גוים מפניך והרחבתי אתגבולך + (ὅταν γὰρ ἐκβάλω ἔθνη ἀπὸ προσώπου σου καὶ ἐμπλατύνω τὰ ὄριά σου). Based on 34:24. The formulation of the Greek is identical, except for the word πλατύνω.
- 23:28 MT SP LXX ויגרשה; LXX + את האמרי + (τοὺς Ἀμορραίους). Based on Deut 7:1.
- 23:31 MT SP LXX הנהר הגדל פרת; LXX + הנהר הגדל פרת (τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου). Based on Gen 15:18 and Deut 1:7 הנהר הגדל נהר פרת. The Greek translation of LXX Exodus is not identical to the Hebrew text of either of these verses. It is closest to the LXX of Deuteronomy with an inverted sequence (τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου Εὐφράτου).

1c. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (19×)

- 1:12 MT SP LXX ויקצו; LXX + מצרים +. Based on v. 13.
- 2:22 MT SP LXX ויקרא; LXX + משה +. Based on v. 13. Similarly 4:13; 10:6, 18; 11:8; 15:25; 16:23; 24:4. Same in 24:13 MT, SP (§4a).
- 3:10, 11 MT SP LXX פרעה; LXX + מלך מצרים +. Based on 2:23.
- 3:18, 19; 12:31 MT SP LXX מלך מצרים; LXX + פרעה +. Based on 2:23, 3:10, 11 and the respective contexts.
- 3:18, 19 MT SP LXX יהוה; LXX + אלהינו +. Based on 2:23, 3:10, 11.
- 4:31b MT SP LXX ויקרו; LXX + העם + (ὁ λαός). Based on v. 31a.
- 5:1 MT SP LXX ויאהרן; LXX + אל פרעה +. Based on the context.

2. SP LXX ≠ MT (13× + 17× + 2× = 32×)

2a. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (13×)

- 1:22 MT SP LXX היל(ו); SP LXX + לעברים + (τοῖς Ἑβραίοις). Based on 2:6.
- 2:22 MT SP LXX ותלד; SP LXX pr ותהר האשה (ἐν γαστρὶ δὲ λαβοῦσα ἢ γυνή). Based on 2:2.
- 3:16 MT SP LXX (ישראל); SP LXX + בני + (τῶν υἱῶν). Based on 4:29. Same in 12:21 (§1a).
- 5:13 MT SP LXX התבן; SP LXX + נתן לכם + (ἐδίδοδοτο ὑμῖν). Based on vv. 10, 16.
- 7:10 MT SP LXX אל פרעה; 4QpaleoExod^m SP LXX לפני פרעה (ἐναντίον Φαραώ). Based on v. 9.

²⁸ Thus Rahlfs with Codex B. Wevers presents the LXX text as ἀναπαύση on the basis of the other manuscripts (= MT).

- 8:3 MT SP LXX (ה)הרטמים; SP LXX + מצרים + (τῶν Αἰγυπτίων). Based on 7:11, 22.
- 8:5b MT SP LXX ממך; SP LXX + ומעמך + (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ σου). Based on v. 5a.
- 8:12 MT SP LXX נטה; SP LXX + בידך + (τῆ χειρὶ). Based on v.13.
- 9:7 MT SP LXX ממקנה; 4QpaleoExod^m SP LXX + בני (ישראל) + (τῶν υἰῶν). Based on v. 6. Similarly 12:6.
- 10:12 MT SP LXX את כל; SP LXX + פרי הארץ + (βοτάνην τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 15.
- 12:40 MT SP LXX במצרים; SP LXX בארץ מצרים (ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου). Based on frequent phrase. Similarly 13:3. Same in 9:11 LXX (§1a); 5:12 (§5).

2b. Remote context (17×)

- 2:21 MT SP LXX בחרו למשה; SP LXX + לאשה + (γυναίκα). Based on frequent expression. Same in 22:16 (§1a).
- 3:8, 17; 23:23 MT SP LXX והפרזי; SP LXX + והגרנשי +. Based on Deut 7:1. These two peoples do not appear together in the Torah before this verse in Deuteronomy. Same in 13:5 below.
- 6:20 MT SP LXX ואת משה; SP LXX + ואת מרים אחותם + (καὶ Μαριάμ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν). Based on Num 26:59.
- 7:15 MT SP LXX הנה; 4QpaleoExod^m SP LXX + הוא (יצא) + (αὐτὸς ἐκπορεύεται). Based on 4:14. Similarly 8:16.
- 10:24 MT SP LXX אל משה; 4QpaleoExod^m SP LXX + ולאחרן + Based on 9:29 and passim.²⁹
- 11:2 MT SP LXX זהב; SP LXX + ושמלות + (καὶ ἱματισμόν). Based on 12:35.
- 11:3 MT SP LXX מצרים; SP LXX + והשאלום + (καὶ ἔχρησαν αὐτοῖς). Based on 12:36.
- 13:5 MT SP LXX והחתי; 4QPhyl A SP LXX + והחוי והגרנשי +. Based on Deut 7:1. Same in 3:8, 17 above.
- 13:5 MT SP LXX והאמרי; SP LXX + והפרזי +. Based on Deut 7:1. See above on והחתי.
- 20:10 MT SP LXX תעשה; SP LXX + בו + (ἐν αὐτῇ). Based on Deut 5:14.
- 20:17 MT SP LXX רעך; SP LXX + שדהו + (οὐτε τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ). Based on Deut 5:21.
- 20:24 MT SP LXX שמי; SP LXX + שם + (ἐκεῖ). Based on Deut 12:5.
- 21:2 MT SP LXX יעברך; SP LXX + יעבדך (δουλεύσει σοι). Based on Deut 15:22.
- 23:8 MT SP LXX יעור; SP LXX + עיני + (ὀφθαλμούς). Based on Deut 16:19.

2c. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (2×)

- 2:3 MT SP LXX לו ותקח; SP LXX + אמו + (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 2. This is a logical addition.

²⁹ Bénédicte Lemmelijn (“Influence of a So-Called P-Redaction in the ‘Major Expansions’ of Exod 7–11?: Finding Oneself at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism,” in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera, Florilegium Complutense*, ed. Andrés Piquer Otera and Pablo A. Torijano Morales, JSJSup 158 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 203–22) noticed that the SP group systematically added Aaron to the figure of Moses in the long pluses (7:18b, 29b; 8:1b, 19b; 9:5b, 19b; 13:3b in SP and usually in 4QpaleoExod^m, as well as twice in 4QExod^l). This was not done consistently in all possible places where the name could be added (e.g., not in 10:2b).

6:26 MT SP LXX עליו; 4QExod^b SP LXX + בת פרעה + (ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραώ). Based on v. 5.

3. SP ≠ MT LXX (8× + 10× = 18×)

3a. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (8×)

6:27 MT LXX ממצרים; SP מארץ מצרים. Based on frequent expression. Same in 9:11 LXX (§1a) 9:24; 12:40; 13:3 LXX SP (§2a); 5:12 (§4a).

7:5 MT LXX והוצאתי את בני ישראל; SP והוצאתי את עמי (בני ישראל). Based on v. 4.

10:5 MT LXX (העץ) את כל פרי; SP + עשב הארץ ואת כל פרי +. Based on v. 15.

12:25 MT LXX הזאת; SP + בחדש הזה +. Based on vv. 2, 3, 6.

13:15 MT LXX בכור; SP + אדם +. Based on v. 13.

14:18 MT LXX פרעה; SP + ובכל חילו +. Based on v. 17.

19:12 MT LXX והגבלת את העם; SP והגבלת את ההר. Based on v. 23.

19:25 MT LXX משה; SP + מן ההר +. Based on v. 14.

3b. Remote context (10×)

3:22 MT LXX ושאלה אשה משכנתה; SP ושאלה אשה מאת רעותה משכנתה. Based on 11:2. The expanded version of SP creates a tautology: רעותה משכנתה.

8:20 MT SP LXX כבד; 4QpaleoExod^m SP + מאד +. Based on 9:3, 18, etc.

15:22 MT SP LXX וילכו; SP + (שלשת ימים) +. Based on 8:23.

21:28 MT SP LXX שור; SP + וכל בהמה +. Based on 22:9 כל בהמה או כל בהמה. The inclusive legal interpretation of the SP by way of harmonization changes the subject matter of the law.³⁰

21:33 SP MT LXX שור או חמור; SP + או כל בהמה +. Based on 22:9.

21:35 MT SP LXX שור רעהו; SP + עד כל בהמה +. Based on 22:9.

22:3 MT SP LXX משור עד חמור עד שור; LXX מחמור עד שור (ἀπό τε ὄνου ἕως προβάτου); SP + או כל בהמה +. Based on 22:9.

23:4 MT SP LXX חמור; SP + או כל בהמתו +. Based on 22:9.

24:1 MT SP LXX ואביהוא; SP + אלעזר ואיתמר +. Based on 28:1.

24:5 MT SP LXX פרים; SP + בני בקר +. Based on Lev 4:3.

4. MT SP ≠ LXX (14× + 2× = 16×)

4a. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (14×)

5:10 LXX הנגשים; MT SP נגשי העם. Based on v. 6.

5:12 LXX (מצרים) בכל; MT SP + (מצרים) ארץ +. Based on frequent expression. Same in 9:11 LXX (§1a); 9:24; 12:40; 13:3 LXX SP (§2a); 6:27 (§3a).

6:13a LXX ויצום (καὶ συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς); MT SP + אל בני ישראל +. Based on v. 13b.

³⁰ Teeter, *Scribal Laws*, 119: “A minor expansion functions to specify the wider application of the law.” The same pertains to the next examples from Exod 21:33, 35; 22:3, 4.

8:1 MT SP LXX **הצפרדעים**; MT SP + **על ארץ מצרים** +. Based on vv. 2, 3.

8:13 MT SP LXX **init**; MT SP + **ויעשו כן** +. Based on vv. 3, 14.

9:12 MT SP LXX **יהוה**; MT SP+ **אל משה** +. Based on v. 13.

9:20 MT SP LXX **את (הניס)**; MT SP+ **עבדיו ואת** +. Based on v. 21.

10:12b MT SP LXX **ארץ**; MT SP+ **מצרים** +. Based on v. 12a.

11:3b MT SP LXX **פרעה**; MT SP+ **ובעיני העם** +. Based on v. 13a.

16:2 MT SP LXX **אהרן**; MT SP + **במדבר** +. Based on vv. 1, 3.

21:36 MT SP LXX **ישמרנו**; MT SP + **בעליו** +. Based on v. 29.

23:29 MT SP LXX **אנרשנו**; MT SP + **מפניך** +. Based on v. 30.

24:11 MT SP LXX **אצילי**; MT SP + **בני (ישראל)** +. Based on v. 17. Same in 5:2; 14:5, 19 LXX (§1a).

4b. Remote context (2×)

3:1 LXX **הר** (τὸ ὄρος); MT SP + **האלהים** +. Based on 4:27. Same in 19:3 LXX (§1a).

18:25 MT SP LXX **אתם**; MT SP + **ראשים** +. Based on Deut 1:13, 15.

5. MT ≠ SP LXX (2×)

5:6 MT SP LXX **ויצו פרעה**; MT + **ביום ההוא** +. Based on 8:18.

9:24 SP **במצרים** LXX (ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ); MT **בכל ארץ מצרים**. Based on v. 25.

III. Some Conclusions

Statistics

The number of harmonizations in the three witnesses may be summarized as follows:

1. LXX ≠ MT, SP (86 + 32 + 19 = 137)
2. SP, LXX ≠ MT (13 + 17 + 2 = 32)
3. SP ≠ MT, LXX (8 + 10 = 18)
4. MT, SP ≠ LXX (14 + 2 = 16)
5. MT ≠ SP, LXX (2)

Unique harmonizations are as follows:

LXX: 137
 SP: 18
 MT: 2

The combined figures for each of the three witnesses are as follows:

LXX: 137 + 32 = 169
 SP: 32 + 18 + 16 = 66
 MT: 16 + 2 = 18

One of the purposes of this study is to investigate the nature of the textual differences between the major textual sources in Exodus. This study is limited to the three complete witnesses, the

MT, SP, and LXX. *Grosso modo*, T, S, and V display the same tradition as MT, and only fragmentary evidence has been preserved for the Qumran scrolls.³¹ At the same time, some meaningful data on harmonization have been preserved in two pre-Samaritan scrolls of Exodus, 4QpaleoExod^m, and 4QExod-Lev^f. When comparing the texts of these fragmentary scrolls with the MT, SP, and LXX, it is noted that 4QExod-Lev^f contains more cases of harmonization than these three texts, while 4QpaleoExod^m contains slightly fewer.³² These data show that the phenomenon of harmonization is firmly established in the SP group and the LXX.

Although we do not list here in detail the other exponents of textual transmission, it is clear that textual harmonization, especially pluses, is by far the most frequent *textual* phenomenon in Exodus in the SP group and LXX.

Quite surprisingly, the LXX rather than the SP includes by far the largest number of harmonizations in Exodus, especially in pluses. Altogether, the LXX contains 169 instances of harmonization, followed by the SP with 66 and the MT with 18 instances. The LXX and the SP have 31 harmonizations in common, indicating that they share a tendency in some details, but at the same time they also differ much in other details. These two texts probably derived from the same source, as I attempted to show elsewhere.³³

An identical picture reveals itself in the text of the other books of the Torah,³⁴ as shown in table 1:³⁵

Table 1: Combined Numbers of Harmonizations in the Pentateuch

	LXX	SP	MT
Genesis 1–11	61	31	11
Genesis 12–50	198	120	36
Genesis (total)	259	151	47
Exodus 1–24	169	66	18
Leviticus	281	108	25
Numbers	224	103	44
Deuteronomy	134	93	54

Among these harmonizations, it is important to recognize unique occurrences of harmonizations, which are recorded in table 2.

Table 2: Unique Harmonizations

	LXX	SP	MT
Genesis 1–11	51	9	0
Genesis 12–50	145	31	0
Genesis	196	40	0
Exodus	137	18	2

³¹ For the data, see Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, VTSup 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

³² See Emanuel Tov, “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP,” in Tov, *Collected Writings*, 3:387–410 (398–400).

³³ Emanuel Tov, “The Shared Tradition of the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch,” in *Die Septuaginta: Orte und Intentionen*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer et al., WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 277–93.

³⁴ See the studies quoted in n. 1.

³⁵ These numbers do not constitute the combined number of harmonizations in these books, since many instances are shared by two sources.

Leviticus	201	8	5
Numbers	179	16	1
Deuteronomy	99	22	2

The following conclusions may be drawn:

1. For the Torah as a whole, the LXX contains the largest number of harmonizations. It is possible that an equally large number was once contained in the pre-Samaritan scrolls, for which we have only fragmentary information (see n. 32). Among the Hebrew texts, the *tefillin* and the liturgical scrolls harmonized to a great degree. The best examples of this group are 4QPhyl A and 4QDeutⁿ, the latter of which was well analyzed by E. Eshel.³⁶

2. The LXX stands out not only regarding the number of its harmonizations, but also in relation to their nature. The harmonizations in that source are much more frequent and sometimes longer than those in the SP and MT.

3. Since this study is limited to chapters 1–24, the conclusions do not cover the book as a whole. Major, probably literary, differences between the sources are noticeable within the tabernacle chapters, which, in my view, constitutes one of the greatest unsolved mysteries of LXX research. Therefore, the conclusions are limited to the harmonizing character of chapters 1–24 in the LXX and the SP group.

³⁶ Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ,” 117–54.