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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, 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. The majority block consists in the first place of the LXX and the SP group, but also of liturgical texts such as 4QDeut and many of the tefillin. In all

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


3 See the discussion by Esther Eshel, ”4QDeut: 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 LXX 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.

Textual harmonization in small details is visible throughout the Torah in both the LXX and SP, mainly in the nonlegal segments but also to a lesser extent in the phraseology used to ver-
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. Textual harmonization also occurs in several liturgical Torah texts, such as 4QDeut and many of the tefillin.

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 Toepfer in 1830, and he provided a long list of examples. He was followed by Zecharias Frankel, who added several examples, but he ascribed the phenomenon to the editors of the manuscripts (diaskeuastes). In recent times, this approach has been adopted by several scholars with regard to the book of Numbers.

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: (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. 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...
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 וַיַּהַרְגָּדְדָה; LXX וַתַּחְיָה (περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό). Based on v. 18. There is a different Greek equivalent (καὶ ἐξωθογονίτε) with exactly the same meaning.

20:10 MT SP וַיִּשָּׂא הָעַבְרִי הָעַבְרִי; LXX κειμένος ἐν τοῖς προσκυνοῦντεσ. Based on Lev 16:29: καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ἐν σοί. 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 לְדוֹתָה; LXX + μεταφη + (κρίσιν). Based on v. 6 (κρίμα).

**Different construction**

3:12 MT SP וַיֹּאמֶר; LXX + אֶלְהָם אֶל מֹשֶׁה + (εἴπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσεί). Based on v. 14 (καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωυσεῖν).

21:36 MT SP וַיַּשְׁלַח; LXX + διαμεμαρτυρημένοι ὦσιν 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 4QExod⁴, see 2:6 (§2c); for 2:11, 13, 16 (all: §1a) and other Qumran scrolls such as 4QpaleoExod⁵, 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.⁶

Turning now to the data,⁶ 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-

---


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 as recorded in their critical editions. Harmanizations 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:18</td>
<td>לחדש</td>
<td>LXX + (τοῦ πρώτου). Based on Lev 23:5. This verse speaks about the same festival of matzot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:23</td>
<td>שמה</td>
<td>LXX + (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου). Based on 17:7, referring to the giving of a name to the same place, Marah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:10</td>
<td>ואמתך</td>
<td>4QMez A LXX + (ὁ βοῦς σου καὶ τὸ υποζύγιόν 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

17 The following editions were used: BHS; Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin, The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version (Tel Aviv: Haim Rubin 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. 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 אָבִי; LXX + (ἢ αἰχμάλωτον γένηται). Based on v. 9. This addition shows a legal interpretation.

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. For example:

2:16a MT SP LXX בֹּנַת; LXX + (ποιμαίνουσα τὰ πρόβατά του πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ιοθορ) = 4QExodb. Based on v. 16b (where the words אֲבֵיהֶן recur). The first word, בֹּנַת, is also found in 4QExodb, 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 4QExodb creates a tautology.

3:2 MT LXX בת יָשָׁנָה וַאֲשָׁא רַעְתָּהּ מֵאֱוָה וַאֲשָׁא רַעְתָּהּ מֵאֱוָה. Based on 11:2 MT SP יָשָׁנָה מֵאֱוָה. The expanded version of the SP creates a tautology.

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 לִשְׁלֹם; LXX + (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ημέρας τὰς πολλὰς έκείνας έτελευτήσεται οἱ βασιλεῖς Αἰγύπτου). Based on 2:23 with free rewriting of the context.

6:20 MT SP LXX עֲנָה מִרְפָּא רַאוּם; SP LXX + (καὶ Μαριάμ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν). Based on Num 26:59.

17:9 MT SP מָכַשׁ לְיָלִי; LXX άνδρα δυνατού (Ανδράς 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 לֵילָה יָתִין (Καταβαίνεις διαμάρτυρις 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, תֵּמִיקָה יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1972), 302–3.

21 See examples provided in the studies mentioned in n. 1.
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19:13 MT SP (בַּמֵּשֶׁךָ הַמֵּרָסִים וַיְשַׁלָּחֵן מִזְרַע הָאֱלֹהִים; LXX: μετὰ τὸ ἐξέπεσεν 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 קָלָת and עָנָן together with the words “from the mountain.”

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: יַפְרֵץ + (σφόδρα σφόδρα). Based on 1:20 and Gen 17:2.

1:16 MT SP: יָדִיעַ; LXX: περιποιεῖται αὐτό (and ζωογονεῖται) 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; 4QExod b LXX + הרִיבָּה + (ταῖς πολλαῖς). Based on v. 23.

2:11 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX + נְפֶשֶׁת + (בָּנָי). Based on v. 23.

2:13 MT SP; 4QExod b LXX אֲרֵיחַ + (ורָע). Based on v. 11.

2:14 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX + (וּבָה). Based on v. 15.

2:16a MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX + (ποιμαίνουσαι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ιοθορ). Based on v. 16b. See introduction, §4.

2:17 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX + (וּרֹשֵׁה). Based on v. 19.

3:12 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX אֶלֶּה יְהוָה אֲלֹהֵי מִשְׁתָּחֵץ + (εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσεῖ). Based on v. 14 (καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν). Different formulation.

3:16 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX אֲלֹהֵי יְהוָה אֲלֹהֵי עִקָּדָה (καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαάκ καὶ θεὸς Ιακώβ). The addition of אֲלֹהֵי is based on the context (אֲלֹהֵי אֶלֶּה).

4:1 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX: לֹא + (ם הַמָּר אֲלֹהֶה). Based on 3:13.

4:6 MT SP LXX: לֹא + (ם הַמָּר אֲלֹהֶה). Based on v. 7.

6:16 MT SP LXX init; LXX + אֲלֹהֶה + (וּבָּה). Based on v. 16.

5:2; 14:5, 19 MT SP LXX: (תְּשׁוֹרָא); LXX pr נִבְּנֵי (נִבְּנֵי שָׁאוֹ). Based on the frequent expression. Same in 24:11 MT SP (§4a).

7:7, 9, 19; 8:3 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX אֲלֹהֶה + (וּבָּה). Based on v. 1.

7:9 MT SP LXX; 4QExod b LXX: (סֶם יֵבֶן). Based on v. 3 and Deut 13:2. Similarly 11:9, 10.

---

22 The exegesis is unusual as the verb סְפַר 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 מָשָׂה in mind, but more likely this is an etymological rendering as in 21:12 מָשָׂה – ἀπελθόντες λάβετε.

23 Thus Rahlfs with most manuscripts; Wevers records the longer reading in the apparatus. Wevers probably recognizes too many harmonizing readings to the apparatus. See the next notes.
7:9 MT SP LXX הָלְפִּינָה מָשָׁה; LXX + (καὶ ἐναντίον τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 10. Similarly 9:8.

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

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

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

8:7 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑπαύλεων). Based on v. 9.

8:12 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ). Based on v. 13.

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

8:24 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (אלהיכם). Based on v. 25.

9:4 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ). Based on v. 14.

9:7 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (ידיוν δέ). Based on v. 34.

9:7 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (דּוּת). Based on v. 34.

9:9 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (אוֹבְּעָבָע). Based on 8:13.

9:11 MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (אֱלֹהִים אֲרוּם). 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 לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (η ὄσονα). Based on v. 25a.

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

9:29 MT SP LXX לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). Based on v. 34.

10:4 MT SP LXX לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (τῇ ὥρᾳ τὴν ὥρᾳ). Based on 9:18.

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

10:13 MT SP LXX לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (τῶν υἱῶν). Based on v. 21.

10:19 MT SP לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (γῆ). Based on v. 15.

10:24 MT SP LXX לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 8.

11:3a MT SP לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (ἐναντίον). Based on v. 3b.

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

11:10 MT SP לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ). Based on v. 9.

12:3 MT SP LXX לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (ἐκαστὸς). Based on the context.

12:21 MT SP LXX לְשׁוֹב; LXX + לְשׁוֹב; (הָלְפִּינָה מָשָׁה). Based on 4:29. Same in 3:16 ($2a$).

13:12a MT SP LXX מָשָׁה; LXX + מָשָׁה; (תὰ ἄρσενικά). 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.
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13:12b (2x) MT SP LXX פֶּהו; LXX + מִדֶּמֶנ (מְיָרָפָא). Based on v.12a.
13:12b MT SP LXX וּלְכַרְשׁ; LXX + (άγιά́σεις). Based on v. 2.
13:14 MT SP LXX אֲלֵי; LXX + בּ (דֵּת). Based on v. 9 (same phrase).
14:3 MT SP LXX פָרְדְרֵשׁ; LXX + (פְּרֵדְרֵשׁ). Based on v. 5.
14:12 MT SP LXX רְאוֹת; LXX + (רְאוֹת). Based on v. 32.
14:17a MT SP LXX פֶּה; LXX + מִדֶּמֶנ. Based on v. 17b.
15:22 MT SP LXX וְנַעֲמָה; LXX + (וְנַעֲמָה). Based on v. 23.
16:6 MT SP LXX בְּנֶבֶר (בְּנֶבֶר) + (סְעָנָו). Based on v. 9.
16:31 MT SP LXX כְּבָיִישָׁרֲאֵל; LXX + (כְּבָיִישָׁרֲאֵל). Based on vv. 12, 15, 17.
17:5 MT SP LXX וַיָּשְׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשְׁרֶה). Based on v. 4. See n. 26.
17:10 MT SP LXX וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). 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 (וַיָּשְׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on vv. 9–10.
18:9 MT SP LXX וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וְיָשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 10.
18:10 MT SP LXX (וַיָּשְׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 1.
19:10 MT SP LXX וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וְיָשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 21. The two divine commands have been combined. See introduction, §4.
19:16 MT SP LXX רַנְד (רַנְד) + (כְּלֵי חַיָּה). Based on vv. 11, 18, and 20.
19:18 MT SP LXX וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 16.
20:11 MT SP LXX (וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 10.
21:36 MT SP LXX (וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 29 (different construction: וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 29 (different construction: וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 9. For the legal interpretation, see the introduction, §4.
22:16 MT SP LXX וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on the frequent expression (e.g., Gen 30:4, 9). Same in 2:21 (§ 2b).
22:29 MT SP LXX (וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on vv. 3, 8, and 9, where is taken as part of the וַיָּשָׁרֶה. Same interpretation as in 21:28–23:4 in the SP (§3a).
23:2 MT SP LXX (וַיָּשָׁרֶה; LXX + (וַיָּשָׁרֶה). Based on v. 6 (κρίμα).
ib. Remote context (32x)

4:17 MT SP LXX הָיוּתָה; LXX + (τὴν στραφείσαν εἰς ὄφιν). Based on 7:15.

4:18 MT SP LXX + (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ημέρας τὰς πολλὰς έκεῖνας έτελεύτησεν οἱ βασιλεῖς Αἰγύπτου). Based on 2:23, with free rewriting of the context.

4:23 MT SP בֵּית (תון λαὸν μου). Based on 5:1; 7:16.

4:24 MT SP + (ἄγγελος). Based on 3:2 (theological exegesis).

7:9 MT SP + (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς πολλὰς ἐκείνας ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου). Based on 2:23, with free rewriting of the context.

4:23 MT SP בֵּית (תון λαֹו μου). Based on 5:1; 7:16.

4:24 MT SP + (ἄγγελος). Based on 3:2 (theological exegesis).

7:9 MT SP + (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς πολλὰς ἐκείνας ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου). Based on 2:23, with free rewriting of the context.

4:24 MT SP + (ἄγγελος). Based on 3:2 (theological exegesis).

8:28 MT SP אֲלֵהוּ אֲלֵהוּ אֲלֵהוּ (καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη ἐξαποστείλαι). Based on 10:27 (different Greek: καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη ἐξαποστείλαι αὐτούς) or 9:2 (εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ βούλει ἐξαποστείλαι).

10:22 MT SP Ле סָפָה; LXX + (θυέλλα). Based on Deut 4:11; 5:22.

12:3 MT SP לָעַד; LXX + בֵּין (רַשָּׁאָר). Based on frequent expression.

12:16 MT SP לָשׁוּם, לָשׁוּם, לָשׁוּם; LXX + בּוֹרָר (לַחָּשֶׁם). 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 יָשָׁה to ποιήσετε in the LXX, equaling תעשׂו in Lev 23:7.


12:20 MT SP LXX + (עָנַף). Based on Deut 7:6; 14:2.


19:3 MT SP LXX + (םְנֵה). Based on 3:1. Same in 3:1 MT SP (§ 4b).

19:5 MT SP LXX + (םְנֵה). Based on Deut 7:6; 14:2.

20:17 MT SP LXX + (םְנֵה). Based on 15:23, with free rewriting of the context.

20:22 MT SP LXX + (םְנֵה). Based on 19:3.

27 Thus Rahlfs with the main manuscripts. Wevers records this reading in the apparatus.
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21:13 MT SP LXX summons; LXX + הָרַגָה (וֹ φονεύσας). Based on Num 35:6.
21:14 MT SP LXX has been + (καὶ καταφύγῃ). Based on Num 35:25.
21:16 MT SP LXX LXX + מַכֵּץ (טַוִּיָּן יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּגוּן וְהָרַגָה). Based on Deut 24:7.
23:12 MT SP LXX ishar + לְשׁוֹן (ַנִּנָּה). Based on 35:2 (ןִנָּה).
23:15 MT SP LXX + לְשׁוֹן (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on Num 35:25.
23:16 MT SP LXX LXX + הַכּוֹסֶד מַקְרֵי נַעַרְיָא + (בִּמְשָׁל הֵרָע מַעְרַכָּה). Based on Num 35:25.
23:17 MT SP LXX LXX + (יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם). Based on 2:23.
23:28 MT SP LXX + מִצְרַיִם (קָנָה אֶל). Based on Deut 7:1.
23:31 MT SP LXX תֶּבֶן מִצְרַיִם (תְּבֵּן מִצְרָיָא). Based on Gen 15:18 and Deut 1:7.

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

1:12 MT SP LXX אֱמֹרִים + . Based on v. 13.
3:10, 11 MT SP LXX מִצְרָיִם + מִצְרָיִם + . Based on 2:23.
3:18, 19; 12:31 MT SP LXX מִצְרָיִם + מִצְרָיִם + . Based on 2:23, 3:10, 11 and the respective contexts.
3:18, 19 MT SP LXX + + (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on v. 31a.
5:1 MT SP LXX + + (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on the context.

2. SP LXX ≠ MT (13× + 17× + 2× = 32×)

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

2:22 MT SP LXX pr שְׁאָר + הָרַגָה (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on v. 22.
3:16 MT SP LXX מַכֵּץ + מַכֵּץ (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on 2:22.
5:13 MT SP LXX + לְשׁוֹן + לְשׁוֹן (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on v. 10, 16.
7:10 MT SP LXX מַכֵּץ מַכֵּץ (וֹ קְרִידָה). Based on v. 9.

28 Thus Rahlfs with Codex B. Wevers presents the LXX text as ἀναπαύσῃ on the basis of the other manuscripts (= MT).
Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24

8:3 MT SP LXX + מַעְרִיס (תְּוֹנִי הָיוֹן). Based on 7:11, 22.
8:5b MT SP LXX + מַעֲמָך (קָדָךְ צִיוְנוֹ). Based on v. 5a.
8:12 MT SP LXX + בֵּיתךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל (יִשְׂרָאֵל). Based on v.13.
10:12 MT SP LXX + ארץ פרי (בֶּטֶנֶת חֵרָת). Based on v. 15.
12:40 MT SP LXX + מצרים (בֶּטֶנֶת חֵרָת). Based on frequent phrase. Similarly 13:3. Same in 9:11 LXX (§1a); 5:12 (§5).

2b. Remote context (17x)

2:21 MT SP LXX + (וֹיְדוּ מֵאָדָם בַּעֲבֹד). Based on frequent expression. Same in 22:16 (§1a).
3:8, 17; 23:23 MT SP LXX + וַהֲרֵנָם; SP LXX + (יֵדְעָם). 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 + וְיֶלֶדֶת מָרָיו (יִשְׂרָאֵל). Based on Num 26:59.
7:15 MT SP LXX + מְלָטָה; 4QpaleoExodம SP LXX + (בָּא וְיָתְמָה) + (אָבַד וְקָפֲרָה). Based on 4:14. Similarly 8:16.
10:24 MT SP LXX + (יָבִיאוּ לָהֶם). Based on Deut 7:1 and passim.29
11:2 MT SP LXX + חֵרָת; SP LXX + וַתֵּלֶב + (וַיֵּלֶב). Based on 12:35.
11:3 MT SP LXX + מְצֵרַת; SP LXX + וָדַשִּׁיאִיהוּ + (וָדַשִּׁיאִיהוּ). Based on 12:36.
13:5 MT SP LXX + (יִשְׂרָאֵל מְצֵרַת). Based on Deut 7:1. Same in 3:8, 17 above.
13:5 MT SP LXX + (יִשְׂרָאֵל מְצֵרַת). Based on Deut 7:1. See above on 13:5.
20:10 MT SP LXX + (יֵאִית בְּנֵיהֶם). Based on Deut 5:14.
20:17 MT SP LXX + (דיִּיאֶרֶךְ). Based on Deut 5:21.
20:24 MT SP LXX + (יֵאִית בְּנֵיהֶם). Based on Deut 12:5.
21:2 MT SP LXX + (יֵאִית בְּנֵיהֶם). Based on Deut 15:22.
23:8 MT SP LXX + (יֵאִית בְּנֵיהֶם). Based on Deut 16:19.

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

2:3 MT SP LXX + (יִשְׂרָאֵל מְצֵרַת). 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 4QpaleoExodמ, as well as twice in 4QExod). This was not done consistently in all possible places where the name could be added (e.g., not in 10:2b).
3. SP ≠ MT LXX (8× + 10× = 18×)

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

6:27 MT LXX סדרה; SP + מרשים. 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 מדרשים את הגיעתו (במי שראה), SP + עם פרעה. Based on v. 4.

10:5 MT LXX נשב Hữu [+ ששם, בחרו], +. Based on v. 15.

12:25 MT LXX התפדה; SP + בחזרו [+]. Based on vv. 2, 3, 6.

13:15 MT LXX + סך היה,. Based on v. 13.

14:18 MT LXX + בכל [+]. Based on v. 17.

19:12 MT LXX + נ.SelectedItem [+]. Based on v. 23.


3b. Remote context (10×)

3:22 MT LXX סך ומכן פרסומו [ומשנים,] SP+sך ומכן פרסומו [+]. Based on 11:2. The expanded version of SP creates a tautology: משלות משכנעות.

8:20 MT SP LXX מראש; 4QpaleoExod SP + מֻתכּה. +. Based on 9:3, 18, etc.

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

21:28 MT SP LXX ישור; SP + בכאן אחרון [+]. Based on 22:9. The inclusive legal interpretation of the SP by way of harmonization changes the subject matter of the law.30


22:3 MT LXX מַשָּׁר (אֵלָה וְעַד יִהְיֶה); SP + בַּמַּרֶשׁ (+ שָׂדָה). +. Based on 22:9.


24:1 MT SP LXX בָּאָלֵה יְהִי; SP + בָּאָלֵה יְהִי [+]. Based on 28:1.

24:5 MT SP LXX שָׂדָה; SP + בָּאָלֵה יְהִי [+]. 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 נָסִי; MT SP + נָסִי. Based on v. 6.

5:12 LXX בֵּיתֵי יְהִי; MT SP + בֵּיתֵי יְהִי [+]. 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 (καὶ υπενέχειν αὐτοῖς); MT SP + אל בָּאָלֵה יְהִי [+]. Based on v. 13b.

---
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8:1 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on vv. 2, 3.
8:13 MT SP LXX init; MT SP + . Based on vv. 3, 14.
9:12 MT SP LXX ירד; MT SP + . Based on v. 13.
9:20 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on v. 21.
10:12b MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on v. 12a.
11:3b MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on v. 13a.
16:2 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on vv. 1, 3.
21:36 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on v. 29.
23:29 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on v. 30.
24:11 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . 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 + . Based on 4:27. Same in 19:3 LXX (§1a).
18:25 MT SP LXX ; MT SP + . Based on Deut 1:13, 15.

5. MT ≠ SP LXX (2×)

5:6 MT SP LXX ; MT + . Based on 8:18.
9:24 SP במדבר LXX (ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ); MT . 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
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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.1 At the same time, some meaningful data on harmonization have been preserved in two pre-Samaritan scrolls of Exodus, 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}, and 4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{t}. When comparing the texts of these fragmentary scrolls with the MT, SP, and LXX, it is noted that 4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{t} contains more cases of harmonization than these three texts, while 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} contains slightly fewer.2 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.3

An identical picture reveals itself in the text of the other books of the Torah,4 as shown in table 1:5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis 1–11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis 12–50</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis (total)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus 1–24</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis 1–11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis 12–50</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


See the studies quoted in n. 1.

These numbers do not constitute the combined number of harmonizations in these books, since many instances are shared by two sources.
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 4QDeut, 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.

---