

The Source of Source Criticism

The Relevance of Non–Masoretic Textual Witnesses

Emanuel Tov, Jerusalem

I Introduction

This study examines the textual sources on which the so-called Documentary Hypothesis (DH) has been based throughout the many decades of the investigation of the Torah. It is clear that the Masoretic Text (MT) has been the major source, but we wish to investigate to what extent the non–Masoretic textual sources are relevant to the creation and compilation of the Torah as reflected in the DH. Scholars have expressed many different views within the framework of the DH, while those who deny its very existence have suggested alternative views on the literary growth of the Torah. For this analysis, the differences between these views, large as they may be, are less relevant, and the term DH here will refer to the totality of all these views. A second clarification pertains to the term MT. Strictly speaking, that term refers to the central text of the Hebrew Bible in its medieval form, and its predecessors, especially those written 2,000 years ago, are usually named proto–Masoretic. However, by way of shortcut, in this study the term MT will include the ancient texts since the differences between the proto–MT (from all sites in the Judean Desert except for Qumran) and the medieval MT are negligible.

My working hypothesis is that the DH in all its manifestations is exclusively based on MT, and that no relevant data are included in other sources, with the possible exception of the LXX version of Exodus 35–40, to be discussed below. As a matter of fact, most literary theories relating to Hebrew Scripture are based almost exclusively on MT, and therefore the situation in the Torah does not differ from that in the other books. Even though important literary insights are now gained from the LXX and a few Qumran scrolls in Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, Esther, and Daniel, MT remains the basis for most literary theories.

A further clarification is in order. In the Torah two types of analysis are distinguished, the historical–critical approach in general and the DH, the latter being an exponent of the former. The historical–critical approach to the Torah does not differ from that applied to the other Scripture books, and pertains to all aspects of the development, growth, composition, and editing of the Torah. This approach is variously named *historical–critical*, *literary–historical*, and *literary historical–critical*. In historical–critical analyses in general, some non–

Masoretic sources are found to pertain to the development of the Torah, and I will mention some examples below, as opposed to the theory of the DH, which is based almost exclusively on MT. Indeed, the founding fathers of the source criticism theory based their views on the printed editions of MT, merely one of the textual sources of Hebrew Scripture, and this procedure has not changed until this day. Some or many scholars must have scrutinized the non-Masoretic sources for relevant material, but found little or none. However, in his survey of „the Priestly elements of the Hexateuch (P)“¹, Kuenen did mention the major differences between MT and the LXX in Ex 35–40.

In this study I intend to locate non-Masoretic data possibly relevant to the DH in all its forms. I try to identify blocks of data, not individual readings, that may be relevant for the DH in a particular verse. This is a modest goal that does not refer to historical-critical analysis in general. If I am right in suggesting the irrelevance to the DH of all textual sources other than MT, this assumption involves certain implications for that hypothesis and also for the understanding of MT.

Before starting our journey, let me stress the utter subjectivity of this analysis.² Of course, all analyses of this type are subjective, and we need not mention this aspect in all our writings, but this is a special case. Our descriptions are based on a conglomerate of examples relating to literary analysis, vocabulary, and ancient translations, and if the examples are not acceptable, the descriptions cannot be defended either. Two scholars may agree in their interpretation of a certain text, yet disagree with regard to the general outlook, or, conversely, they may agree regarding a theory yet disagree regarding specific pericopes. In the case of the evaluation of an ancient translation like the LXX, the possibilities for disagreement are even more numerous than in the case of Hebrew texts. After all, one scholar may claim to have detected the vestiges of a short version of a Hebrew story in the LXX, while another one may consider the short LXX text to have been abbreviated by the translator. In my view, the LXX has been the object of much abuse in the literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible. Scholars unaware of the intricacies of that translation too quickly ascribe a sensitivity to literary understanding to the translators, while in my view they did not think at all in those terms. Greek translators usually limited their exegesis to the word level, and did not address contexts and pericopes. Beyond the word level, the Greek translators did not consider the biblical text to be illogical or inappropriate. Both literal and free translators tried to express words and sentences of the source language in the translation without getting involved in what we would call *literary exegesis*. Therefore, I find it difficult to ascribe the major differences between MT and the rather literal Greek translations of Ex

¹ A. Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, London 1886, 65–107, esp. 76–80.

² This aspect has been stressed also by A. Rofé, *Introduction to the Literature of the Hebrew Bible* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 9) Jerusalem 2009, 274.

35–40, 1Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other books to literary activity by the Greek translators. Rather, these translations reflect deviating Hebrew texts that were earlier or later than MT. The short LXX text of Job, abbreviated by the very free translator, is an exception.³

Our analysis of ancient documents possibly relevant to the DH will include some Qumran documents, biblical and nonbiblical, including so-called *rewritten Bible texts*. Some scholars consider these rewritten texts to be a direct continuation of the stages of the compilation and editing of the Torah. While these Qumran documents would be too late to reflect such compositional processes, early building blocks of the present amalgam of textual layers in the Torah could coincidentally have been preserved in an ancient scroll or translation. This possibility would make an examination of these data worthwhile but, to the best of my knowledge, no such evidence has been identified. Had direct evidence been available to scholars in the past, it would have been extraordinary, and some of the theories suggested from Astruc onwards (1753)⁴ could have been confirmed, refuted or made superfluous. The search for vestiges of ancient evidence in the Torah would not be out of place in modern textual–literary research since similar material has been found in the post–Pentateuchal books, especially in the LXX translations of the books.⁵

II Data in Non–Masoretic Sources Relevant to Source Criticism?

Non–Masoretic sources of the Torah are sometimes relevant for literary analysis in general, but in the present context we focus on details relevant to the DH.

Distinguishing between the layers of the Torah involves a variety of criteria relating to: (1) style and language; (2) the different names of God; (3) contradictions and discrepancies; (4) doublets and repetitions; and (5) theological differences.⁶ These criteria have been used in different combinations and some have been emphasized more than others. In the case of duplicate traditions, we might coincidentally find an ancient manuscript containing only one of the two stories of Hagar and Ishmael (Gen 16 = J; Gen 21,9–21 = E), a text with **one** of the two lists of those going down to Egypt (Gen 46,8–10; Ex

³ See my **E. Tov**, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis ³2012, 138.283 – 326 (henceforth, *TCHB*).

⁴ J. Astruc, *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s’est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse*, Paris 1753, 10–13.

⁵ For a summary, see *TCHB*, 136–140.

⁶ I follow the summaries of C. Westermann, *Genesis (BK. AT I/1 + I/2)*, Neukirchen–Vluyn 1974; English Translation: C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. A Commentary*, Minneapolis 1984f., 567–584; C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. A Commentary* (trans. J.J. Scullion S.J.); E. Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century. The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*, Oxford 1998, 228–237.

1,1 and 6,14–16), or an ancient text with only one or two of the three stories of an *ancestress in danger* in Gen 12 and 20 (Abra[ha]m and Sarah) and Gen 26 (Isaac and Rebekah). Such an imaginary situation would give insights into the Torah text in the making, so to speak, but all these thoughts remain mere dreams.

It would be equally spectacular if one of the non–Masoretic sources were to use different divine names in, for example, one of the two creation stories. However, such texts have not been found. By the same token, we do not know of any ancient text of Ps 42–72 (book 2) and Ps 73–83 (89) (book 3), the so-called Elohistic Psalter, that uses יהוה for אלהים of MT.⁷ I am aware of only very few examples of possibly relevant material in the Torah. Hundreds of examples would have been significant, but at this stage I can only offer a few examples of the material I have been looking for in vain.

II.1 Occasional Differences in Vocabulary

Gen 31,33 MT

האמהת שתי

Gen 31,33 SP

השפחות שתי

Gen 31 tells us about Jacob's two maidservants, called אמהת in MT and שפחות in SP, usually taken as characterizing the vocabulary of J (שפחה) and E (המא).⁸ It is very unlikely that this small difference between MT and SP would in any way be relevant to the DH. It would only be relevant if the two texts were to differ with some consistency. By necessity, the detail in SP would have to be primary because secondary readings, reflecting scribal activity, have no bearing on the DH. In my view, the SP reflects a harmonizing adaptation⁹ to the later stories in 32,23; 33,1.2.6 in which the maidservants of Leah and Rachel are named שפחות.

⁷ Such texts, if ever extant, would have preceded the change of יהוה to אלהים reflected in all known textual witnesses of the book of Psalms. See my analysis in E. Tov, The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures, in A. Lemaire (Hg.), Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007 (VT.S 133), Leiden / Boston 2010, 153–169, esp. 164–166. Likewise, the deuteronomistic (Dtr) revision of Joshua–2Kings and Jeremiah is reflected in all the textual witnesses. The suggestion that the shorter LXX text of several books seemingly reflects an earlier, pre–Dtr layer has been discussed in my study E. Tov, The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists, in: E. Tov (Hg.), Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran. Collected Essays (TSAJ 121) Tübingen 2008, 398–417.

⁸ See J. Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, Edinburgh 1930, li.

⁹ For the harmonizing character of the SP, see TCHB, 82–87.

Gen 37,3 MT+,¹⁰ SP
LXX Gen 37,3

ישראל
Ιααβ

The two names of Jacob are usually ascribed to different sources, Yisrael to J and Jacob to E.¹¹ Since Gen 37,3 is ascribed to J,¹² the LXX reading could be relevant for the DH. However, here, as elsewhere, the LXX reflects a harmonizing change, bringing the name of the third patriarch in line with the occurrence of *Jacob* in V. 1 and V. 2.¹³

Examples like these are scarce, and have no bearing on the essence of the DH. They are merely reflections of the vicissitudes of the textual transmission, especially when reflecting harmonizing tendencies. In my view, these relatively few scribal interchanges have no bearing on the compositional stage of the Torah.¹⁴

II.2 Divine Names

The main challenge to the DH from textual sources lies in the realm of the divine names in the LXX. In my view, the few known variants in Hebrew sources are negligible. Carr mentions a mere six differences between MT and the Qumran scrolls,¹⁵ but because they occur in different scrolls, they are of no significance. Equally insignificant are the variations in the SP.¹⁶

On the other hand, the divine names in the LXX do deserve attention. They have often been discussed, especially since the appearance of Baudissin's monumental monograph on *κύριος*, which contains a wealth of data.¹⁷ Most of these variations pertain to deviations from the standard LXX equivalents יהוה – *κύριος* and אלהים – *θεός*. Some of the nonstandard renderings (*θεός* for יהוה and

¹⁰ MT+ refers to the combined evidence of MT, the V(ulgate), the T(argumim), and usually also the Peshitta (S).

¹¹ Skinner, Genesis, li.

¹² Skinner, Genesis, 444.

¹³ TCHB, 136.

¹⁴ On the other hand, in an innovating monograph Carr mentions these instances as reflecting earlier textual developments: D.M. Carr, *The Formation of the Bible. A New Reconstruction*, New York 2011, 107, in a section named *From Documented Growth to Method in Reconstruction of Growth* (102–110). Carr notes: „In both cases, these terms / names have been used for source attribution in these and other passages, yet the SamP and LXX readings show that, at least occasionally, they could be switched in the process of textual transmission“ (108).

¹⁵ Carr, *Formation*, 106.

¹⁶ Carr, *Formation*, mentions a few differences between SP יהוה and MT LXX אלהים (*θεός*) in Gen 7,9; 28,6; 31,7.9.16; Ex 6,2; he also mentions the reverse interchanges in Gen 7,1; 20,18; Ex 3,4.

¹⁷ W.W. Graf von Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*, Bd. 1–2, Giessen 1926 – 1929.

κύριος for אלהים) could have been created by the translators, who might have lacked a fixed translation vocabulary at the beginning of their work. In such a scenario, the LXX evidence would be irrelevant. On the other hand, if the LXX was based on Hebrew variants, this evidence should be taken into consideration. However, in my view this is not the case, with the possible exception of Gen 1–11, in which the LXX appears to differ frequently from the other sources. The equivalents in the LXX could be relevant to the DH, and this issue was indeed hotly debated at the beginning of the twentieth century (A23–26 below).

An earlier study summarized all the equivalents in Gen 1–11, including the unusual ones that could be relevant to the DH.¹⁸ These were our findings: When appearing alone, אלהים is rendered mainly by θεός (66x), but rarely also by κύριος ὁ θεός (4x). Further, in these chapters, the phrase יהוה אלהים is usually rendered by κύριος ὁ θεός (14x), but surprisingly also by θεός alone (7x in 2,4b–3,22). With regard to אלהים, the major problem thus seems to be centered round the combination יהוה אלהים, for which no standard equivalent is visible. Thus, the alternation of the different equivalents in chapters 2 and 6 defies all explanations. The only possible clue seems to be that after a steady row of thirty–five equivalents of אלהים – θεός in the first creation story (1,1–2,3), the translator continued using this equivalent also in 2,4–7.9.19–21 (7x), in disregard of the Hebrew, יהוה אלהים. The idea behind such a harmonizing rendering¹⁹ would be that the translator was attempting to represent the deity throughout with the same equivalent. However, in such a scenario, the translator’s plan was carried out very inconsistently: sometimes he rendered the two components of this phrase with κύριος ὁ θεός, while at other times he continued to use the equivalent of 1,1–2,3, θεός. While not unusual in the Septuagint, such inconsistency does not provide a good basis for a theory.²⁰

The equivalents of יהוה seem to defy all explanations as in the case of אלהים. However, there seems to be a possible explanation for the renderings of יהוה אלהים in 2,4b–3,22 (7x) with θεός, since they continue the equivalent used in the

¹⁸ E. Tov, The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11, in: M. Karrer / W. Kraus (Hg.), Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012 (WUNT 219), Tübingen 2014, xx–xxi.

¹⁹ R.S. Hendel, The Text of Genesis 1–11. Textual Studies and Critical Edition, New York / Oxford 1998, 35–39, likewise turns to the assumption of harmonization, but according to him this process took place in Hebrew manuscripts. He supports this assumption with five instances of an interchange of יהוה (sometimes followed by אלהים) and אלהים in Qumran scrolls in Numbers, Deuteronomy and 1Samuel. However, evidence from books other than Genesis may not be relevant; moreover, the assumption of different Hebrew readings has not been substantiated.

²⁰ See my study E. Tov, Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators, in: U. Dahmen / J. Schnocks (Hg.), Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit. Herrschaft – Widerstand – Identität (FS Fabry) (BBB 159), Göttingen 2010, 325–337.

first creation story, 1,1–2,3. This harmonizing rendering, executed inconsistently, was analyzed above for אלהים.

If the rendering of יהוה with θεός in 4,1–8,20 (7x) reflects a similar wish to continue the use of θεός of chapter 1, this tendency was carried out equally inconsistently as the rendering of יהוה אלהים with θεός, since יהוה was also rendered often by κύριος in 4,1–9,28. Particularly intriguing is the equivalent יהוה – κύριος ὁ θεός in these chapters (14x in 4,1–10,9) used alongside יהוה – θεός (7x). In these chapters, we thus witness two possible harmonizing tendencies alongside the rendering יהוה – κύριος (8x). The equivalent יהוה – κύριος ὁ θεός may display continuity with the text of 2,4–3,23 in which the *main* phrase used is יהוה אלהים, usually rendered by κύριος ὁ θεός. Secondly, the other equivalent used in these chapters, יהוה – θεός (7x), may hark back to Gen 1,1–2,4a where the equivalent אלהים – θεός (35x) is the only one used. Both developments would be inner-Greek, in defiance of the Hebrew.

Thus, the emerging harmonizing pattern in 2,4–3,22 is that the renderings of unit (1)

1:1–2:3 (35x) אלהים θεός

are followed inconsistently by the LXX in unit (2):²¹

2:4–3:22 (7x) אלהים יהוה θεός

This harmonizing tendency is more clearly visible in the next units (3,23–11,9), in which two different harmonizing renderings are used, again inconsistently, continuing the rendering of unit (1): יהוה – θεός and יהוה – κύριος ὁ θεός, with several exceptions of יהוה – κύριος (8x), which later became the standard LXX rendering. These harmonizing tendencies by the translator involved pluses, minuses and changes. Of these eight *exceptions* to the translation pattern of יהוה, five occur at the end of this unit (10,9b–11,9), possibly indicating that at that point a translation equivalent emerged that was to become the main LXX equivalent in the later chapters of Genesis and in the next books.²²

Following a different approach, it has often been suggested that the unusual equivalents of the LXX reflect Hebrew variants, possibly shedding light on the DH. In 2,4b–3,24, in particular, this suggestion is intriguing. The MT of this unit

²¹ In 2,4–3,23, the majority rendering is κύριος ὁ θεός (13x).

²² Hendel's suggestion (Hendel, *Text of Genesis 1–11*) has not been worked out in detail. In his monumental study, Baudissin, *Kyrios I*, 453 A1, he ascribes the double divine name κύριος ὁ θεός for אלהים to the translator's preference („Liebhaberei“) or textual corruption, while he assigns the double divine name κύριος ὁ θεός for יהוה to a different *Vorlage*, יהוה אלהים, to be taken into consideration in the DH (Baudissin, *Kyrios I*, 84–86).

(source J) uses mainly יהוה אלהים (20x), but also features אלהים in verses 3,1b–5 (5x). If the LXX reflected a different Hebrew text, this chapter would present a different grouping of יהוה אלהים (13x) and יהוה (7x + 5x) in the LXX. In sum, this evidence would somewhat alter the analysis of the divine names, but in my view it is irrelevant to the DH.

The LXX renderings of the divine names in Genesis were brought to bear on the DH, especially in the beginning of the twentieth century,²³ and in recent years by Carr,²⁴ but no firm suggestions have been made. One argument against the relevance of the LXX for the DH was presented by Dahse, who claimed that scores of inner-Greek variants uproot the validity of the evidence of the LXX for the DH.²⁵ However, most of these variants actually adapt the Old Greek to MT in manuscripts of the LXX revisions and therefore are irrelevant to the issue under investigation.²⁶ In my view, the LXX reflects harmonizing renderings that were carried out inconsistently (see above). The most cogent argument against the relevance of the LXX for any literary analysis is that the LXX reflects no visible pattern that could be used for any source-critical analysis. Furthermore, the choice of equivalents for the divine names in the LXX is not determined by any content considerations and the DH depends only partially on the distinctive use of the divine names.

II.3 Non-Masoretic Sources Possibly Relevant to the Documentary Hypothesis

So far, no relevant evidence for the DH has been found in non-Masoretic sources, with the possible exception of Ex 35–40 in the LXX.²⁷ Scholars are constantly searching for relevant evidence, especially in the large deviations from MT in the textual sources. In evaluating that evidence, we should make a

²³ H.M. Wiener, *Pentateuchal Studies*, London 1912; H.M. Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, London 1913, 13–41; J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis*, London 1914; H.M. Wiener, *The Pentateuchal Text. A Reply to Dr. Skinner*, London 1914 (reprinted from *BSac* 1914, 218–268); J.B. Harford, *Since Wellhausen. A Brief Survey of Recent Pentateuchal Criticism*, London 1926 (reprinted from *Expositor* 1925). Hendel, *Text of Genesis 1–11*, 35–39, likewise assumes that the LXX representation of the divine names reflects Hebrew variants, but he did not connect the evidence with the DH.

²⁴ Carr, *Formation*, 106–110.

²⁵ J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, Giessen 1912, 104–121; J. Dahse, *Textkritische Bedenken gegen den Ausgangspunkt der heutigen Pentateuchkritik*, *AR* 6 (1903), 305–319.

²⁶ Thus already Skinner, *Divine Names*, 253–261, reacting to Dahse. See the data in J.W. Wevers, *Genesis, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, Göttingen 1974.

²⁷ In his discussion of „Factual evidence for the historico-literary criticism of the Pentateuch“ (within the chapter dealing with *Challenges to the Documentary Hypothesis*), Rofé, *Introduction*, 274–291, mentions only the example of the SP (see A45 below), the MT of Num 21,33–35 // Dtn 3,1–3.12a, and the LXX in Jos 20.

distinction between historical–critical criticism in general and one exponent of that discipline, the DH. Several textual data are relevant for literary criticism in general, but not for the DH. The main sources are the LXX and some Qumran scrolls, in that order. For most scholars, this situation implies that the LXX, dating to the third and second centuries BCE, preserved early material that preceded the LXX as well as elements later than MT, whether coincidentally or not. However, a few scholars date the early material to the time of the LXX itself, and the parallel MT material to the period after the LXX translation.²⁸ This type of reasoning created an atmosphere that enabled scholars to search for material relevant to the DH in textual witnesses dating to the last centuries BCE. A second factor that influenced the search for relevant material in the textual witnesses is the understanding that the editing of the Torah was completed only at a late period, in Persian times and, according to some, in early Hellenistic times.²⁹ However, not all aspects of these difficult questions are relevant for the limited scope of the present analysis. The main issue is whether or not we possess non–Masoretic data going back to the period of the compilation of the Pentateuch sources. In the eyes of some scholars, the boundary between the compositional stages of the Torah and its scribal transmission has been blurred, but in my view they can be distinguished rather well.

Each individual case of possible relevance included in late sources must be evaluated separately, since all cases are different.

a. The possible relevance of the SP: In the story of the ten plagues in Ex 7–11, the descriptions of God’s commands to Moses are sometimes followed by a detailed account of their execution (e.g. Ex 7,10.19f.; 8,12f.). However, often the execution of the command is merely alluded to by such formulations as „[...] and he (etc.) did as [...]“ (e.g. 7,6 referring to 7,1–5). In such cases, the SP group (SP and the pre–Samaritan Qumran scrolls)³⁰ supplemented the description of God’s commands by the addition of a detailed account of their execution. For example, after Ex 8,19, 4QpaleoExod^m and SP, following the

²⁸ See my remarks in **E. Tov**, Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran. Collected Essays (TSAJ 121), Tübingen 2008, 155–170, esp. 169.

²⁹ Carr, Formation, 219f., ascribes the decisive stage in the formation of the Torah to the „late fifth, early fourth century“. Earlier scholars espousing similar views are mentioned by Carr, Formation, 218. See also E. Blum, Studien zur Komposition des **Pentateuch** (BZAW 189), Berlin 1990, 333–360, esp. 358 (*Die Komposition der jüdischen Tora und die persische Politik*). R.G. Kratz, The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament, trans. J. Bowden, London, 2005, 245–246, 321, ascribes the redaction of P to approximately 500 BCE. The final edition of the Torah or Hexateuch was completed at a later stage, in the Second Temple period (p. 307). More precisely Kratz assigns the date of the combination of P and JE and the late expansions of the Enneateuch to the fifth / fourth century BCE (**321**). In the words of Kratz, „The process comes to an end with the separation of the Pentateuch as the Torah of Moses and its translation into Greek“ (321). No date for this process is given, but since the next sentence speaks about the third century and since the Torah was translated into Greek in 285 BCE, Kratz must have had a late fourth–century BCE date in mind.

³⁰ See my TCHB, 90–93.

formulation of V 16ff., add: „And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him: „Thus says the Lord: Let My people go that they may worship Me. For if you do not let My people go, I will let loose [...].”³¹ These are signs of scribal–editorial activity, joined by manifold small harmonizing changes, and they should not be projected back to earlier periods. However, in a recent study, Lemmelijn³² wondered whether the expansions of the SP group were „part of a so-called Priestly school”³³. The MT of these chapters contains a mixture of references to Moses acting alone and Moses acting together with Aaron, while in most cases the figure of Aaron has been added in the witnesses of the SP group.³⁴ According to Lemmelijn, the base verses in MT belong to the P layer, and their expanded versions in the SP group display literary development by a person or group who worked in the wake of P *before* the activity of the SP group. According to this scholar, the late P source displayed an interest in Aaron.³⁵

The activity of the SP group should indeed be considered literary, but it was part of the creative scribal–exegetical reworking of a text like MT, involving harmonizing activity. If the full range of the literary aspects of these texts is examined, it will be seen that we need not postulate any post-P literary activity.

In order to determine whether the SP group is relevant to the DH we need to capture its essence, which may be expressed as the removal of irregularities (contextual and linguistic), the inclusion of harmonizing readings, and editorial innovations. The most characteristic editorial changes of the SP group are additions (duplications) of other Torah verses (with changes in names and verbal forms) and a few rearrangements, but no omissions, following a strong inclination in SP not to alter the content of the divine word.³⁶ These scribal–editorial changes reflect a late layer in the development of Hebrew Scripture on the basis of MT or a similar text. They were inserted *inconsistently* in the early

³¹ Additions of this type are not exclusive to the SP group, to be found, for example, in 4QGen^k and in the LXX in Gen 1,9; 1Sam 9,3 LXX^{Luc}; 1Kgs 18,36 LXX based on V 37.

³² B. Lemmelijn, *Influence of a So-Called P-Redaction in the „Major Expansions” of Exod 7–11? Finding Olf at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism*, in: A.Piquer / P.A. Torijano Morales (Hg.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*, *Florilegium Complutense (JSS.S 158)*, Leiden / Boston, 2012, 203–222.

³³ Lemmelijn, *Influence*, 219.

³⁴ E.g. Ex 7,18b = 7,15; 7,29b = 7,26; 8,19b = 8,16; 9,19b = 9,13–19. Usually Moses and Aaron together govern a singular verb, possibly pointing to an addition. However, in a few cases, MT+ contains similar formulations (7,10 *פרעה ויעשו* 8,8; 10,3).

³⁵ In one instance, 10,24, Aaron is also added in the text common to MT, SP, LXX, and 4QpaleoExod^m.

³⁶ A distinction should be made between these editorial changes and small harmonizing alterations in SP. The principle and substance of the small changes is shared with the LXX (see A9 above), while the editorial changes are characteristic of the SP group alone. Its scribes were especially attentive to what they considered to be incongruence within and between stories in Scripture. Ultimately, these changes reflect theological concerns.

text, that is, some topics were scrutinized more than others.³⁷ The two pericopes that were edited most extensively were: (1) Moses' summarizing speech in Dtn 1–3; and (2) the story of Ex 7–11, both involving spoken words.³⁸ The data in the SP group are thus not relevant textually to the DH, but we will return to this issue below.³⁹

b. The possible relevance of the Temple Scroll: Sometimes the Temple Scroll is mentioned as relevant to the DH. Thus Carr presented this composition as a text within the biblical tradition itself, introducing it as a „rendition of the Pentateuch“⁴⁰ in a chapter named „Documented Cases of Transmission History, Part 1“⁴¹. However, Carr disregards the great divide between the creation of the Torah literature and its rewriting in post-biblical compositions such as the Temple Scroll.

In my mind, these are the only possibly cases, together with the LXX of Ex 35–40 (see below), that could be relevant as textual evidence for the DH, but in the end the evidence is negative.

³⁷ Apparently, the scribes of the SP group were more sensitive to discrepancies in narratives than to differences between parallel laws (except for the frequent changes in the Book of the Covenant [Ex 21–23]). Laws dealing with the same subject matter were not altered because they were conceived of as pertaining to different matters. See M. Segal, *The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *Materia giudaica XII* (2007), 5–20, 17. By the same token, beyond the Torah, the differences between parallel sections in Joshua // Judges and Samuel–Kings // Chronicles were not harmonized much during their textual transmission.

³⁸ The editor compared the details of this speech with the preceding books of the Torah with pedantic precision. If a detail was not mentioned explicitly in Exodus or Numbers, or if it did not appear in these books in exactly the same wording, it was repeated in the earlier books as foreshadowing Deuteronomy. The details are recorded in the tables of E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*, 57–70, esp. 63–65, and M. Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans* (VT.S 128), Leiden / Boston 2009, 310–312.

³⁹ Gary Knoppers wondered whether the relation between the MT and SP should be described as „Two different Pentateuchs or two parallel Pentateuchs?“ (G. Knoppers, *Two different Pentateuchs or two parallel Pentateuchs?*, in: T.B. Dozeman u.a. (Hg.), *The Pentateuch. International Perspectives on Current Research* (FAT 78), Tübingen 2011, 507–531, 511, but he concluded (513) by saying that „[t]he two Pentateuchs are very similar“.

⁴⁰ Carr, *Formation*, 38: „First, the Dead Sea Scrolls preserve a number of divergent manuscript versions of biblical traditions, including substantially different renditions of the Pentateuch in 4QRP and the Temple Scroll.“ However, these two texts differ substantially in their approach to the Torah: the five manuscripts of 4QRP (once considered a nonbiblical composition, but now understood as biblical manuscripts) provide the running biblical text with *some* changes, while the Temple Scroll, not containing a biblical book, deviates greatly from the biblical text.

⁴¹ Carr, *Formation*, 37–56. „Case one“ deals with „the growth of the Gilgamesh epic“, and „case two“ with the Temple Scroll (48–56).

III Ancient Parallels to the Act of Combining the Sources of the Torah

If the SP group and the Temple Scroll are not textually relevant for the DH, they are relevant at another level since both provide parallels for the act of combining the sources of the Torah. Such parallels are also found in the unusual Torah manuscripts named 4QRP. While the identification of parallels for the assumed composition process of the Torah is not the topic of the present study, I will pay some attention to this issue in order to better define the different levels of relevance, those of textual evidence and parallel editorial techniques. S. Kaufman showed that the main editorial techniques used by the author of the Temple Scroll when creating his composition from prior documents had been used previously by the presumed editor(s) of the Torah.⁴² For example, the author of the Temple Scroll integrated the various biblical laws for erecting an altar (col. LI 19–21), and those for the violated virgin (col. LXVI 4–8). The Temple Scroll is characterized by the rewriting of the laws of Deuteronomy with the addition of some material from the parallel law codes and much additional material.

The Temple Scroll and the SP group both combined elements pertaining to the same issue: different laws in the former and mainly narrative elements in the latter. In the Temple Scroll, these different elements were integrated in the text, while in the SP group they were usually juxtaposed, thus creating unnatural contexts where the same subject matter was narrated twice. Some of these juxtaposed texts contradict each other or provide parallel texts within the same context.⁴³ At the same time, in the story of the appointment of the judges by Moses, a partial integration is achieved,⁴⁴ but the resulting text is still very unnatural, to say the least. In the combined Ex–Dtn version of Ex 18 in the SP, Moses first listens to Jethro’s advice to appoint judges who would aid him in his judicial work (18,13–24). However, in the SP Moses gives additional arguments for appointing judges without mentioning Jethro, this time in the wording of Deuteronomy (18,24a–27 reflecting Dtn 1,9–14). Afterwards we hear about the implementation of these plans, first in the words of Dtn 1,15 (Ex 18,24f. in the SP), and afterwards according to the Exodus version (18,25). This duplication in the SP group proceeds almost always in one direction, from Deuteronomy to the earlier books, Exodus and Numbers, and not vice versa. The SP thus provides

⁴² S.A. Kaufman, *The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism*, HUCA 53 (1982), 29–43.

⁴³ E.g. Num 12,16b (= Dtn 1,20–23a) contradicting 13,1; Num 13,33b (= Dtn 1,27f.) paralleling chapter 14; Num 14,40b (= Dtn 1,42) paralleling 14,42f.

⁴⁴ Likewise, in the theophany at Mount Sinai in SP, elements from Dtn 5,20–27 and Dtn 18,18–22 have been inserted in Ex 20,15–18. The addition of the Samaritan tenth commandment, composed of several scriptural verses, represents a different technique. For an analysis, see J.H. Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, Philadelphia 1985, 78–83.

some parallels to the compilation of the Torah,⁴⁵ but the aims of the two sources, and therefore the results of their actions, differed. The SP group juxtaposes different versions of the same account more or less verbatim because the scribes–editors wished to create a text from which Dtn was able to quote,⁴⁶ while the presumed redactor of the Torah combined different building blocks as part of his creation of a new composition.

The integration of the elements into the Temple Scroll as part of its literary approach more closely resembles the system of the presumed redactor of the Torah than that of the SP group, as do the manuscripts of 4QRP. Thus, the *Sukkot* laws of Num 29,32–30,1 and Dtn 16,13f. were combined in 4QRP^b (4Q364) 23a–b i.⁴⁷ Likewise, 4QRP^c (4Q365) 36 and the pre–Samaritan 4QNum^b combine the text of Num 27 and Num 36, both dealing with the daughters of Zelophehad, into one unit in chapter 36.⁴⁸

Other parallels to the assumed procedure of combining the Torah sources exist elsewhere. Within Hebrew Scripture, I refer to the juxtaposition of two different stories about the encounter of David and Goliath in the MT of 1Sam 16–18 (the short story is presented in the combined evidence of the LXX and MT+, amplified by parts of a second story found only in MT+)⁴⁹ and to the Chronicler who combined different sources. External parallels are provided by the Harmony of the Gospels (*Diatessaron*) by Tatian written in c.170 CE and by mSotah 7, which combines the parallel accounts of Dtn 27 and Jos 8,35–40. All these sources provide parallels to the topic under investigation, but they have no bearing on the central issue itself.

⁴⁵ These parallels were emphasized much in the writings of Tigay, *Empirical Models*; Rofé, Introduction, 274–280, 275, and Nicholson, *Pentateuch*, 224–228. For Rofé, „[w]here the books of Exodus and Numbers have one version of an incident and the book of Deuteronomy has another, the Samaritan Pentateuch merges the two versions. There are examples in the books of Exodus and Numbers, and to a lesser extent in the book of Deuteronomy” (275). „The Samaritan Pentateuch thus furnishes evidence of the custom by which scribes conflated into a single account different documents which concern the same event” (277). However, as explained above, it is not so much the merging of the texts in the SP (illustrated by Rofé’s detailed analysis of Ex 18,13–27 // Dtn 1,9–18) as the duplication of texts from Dtn 1–3 in the literary antecedents of that speech.

⁴⁶ The three mentioned scholars speak of „conflation” (Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 53–89; Rofé, Introduction, 277) and „merging”, while I would describe the essence of the system of the SP group as juxtaposition.

⁴⁷ In this case, one does not know if this fragment was placed in 4QRP in Numbers or Deuteronomy.

⁴⁸ In the course of his rewriting, the author of 4QRP^c combined Num 27,11, probably preceded by earlier parts of the chapter, and 36,1f., probably followed by additional verses of that chapter. The two texts were also fused in 4QNum^b, but in a different way; as a result, the two texts are not identical. In the reconstructed text of 4QNum^b, the sequence is: 36,1f., 27,2–11; 36,3f.; 36,1f.; 36,5–13. On the other hand, in 4QRP^c, the only certain evidence is that 27,11 was followed by 36,1f.

⁴⁹ See my TCHB, 301–303.

IV Textual Criticism and the Historical–Critical Analysis

In order to place the topic under discussion in the right context, I will briefly discuss a different area partially relevant to the topic at hand, namely literary differences between textual witnesses. With the possible exception of Ex 35 – 40, all these are unrelated to the DH.

(1) The LXX version of Ex 35–40 probably reflects a Hebrew text different from MT+, but the nature of that text remains unclear. This widely divergent text may reflect original elements as in the case of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, or it may display a rewritten Hebrew text as in the LXX of 1Kings, Esther and Daniel. The possibility of a rewritten text is suggested by a midrashic element in the LXX of 38,22 („This one made the bronze altar from the bronze fire–pans that belonged to the men who rebelled together with the gathering of Kore“), which parallels MT 38,1f. This Greek text contains a midrash–like explanation of the origin of the bronze of the altar (MT V. 1) and the laver (V. 8) created from the censers of the followers of Korah. The LXX uses a word, *καταστασιάσασιν* („to the men who rebelled“ = למרדים), not found in the story in Num 16,36–40 or anywhere else in the LXX. Since the story of Korah is to appear only in Num 16, the Greek text of Exodus probably reflects an exegetical addition based on a Hebrew source.⁵⁰

On the other hand, the LXX may possibly reflect an earlier or later stage in the development of the Hebrew text than MT.⁵¹ A central difference between the LXX and MT+ versions concerns the garments of the priesthood (ch. 39,1b–31 MT), which in the LXX precede the other items (36,8a–40).⁵² In both texts the court is positioned in different places (MT 38,9–20; LXX 37,7–18). In addition, the LXX lacks and adds sections. Knohl stresses the fact that the LXX lacks the incense altar (MT 35,15; 37,25–28), although the LXX does mention incense in 38,25 (= MT 37,29). According to Knohl, the LXX reflects a first compositional

⁵⁰ See A. Aejmelaeus, *Septuagintal Translation Techniques. A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account*, in: A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators. Collected Essays*, Kampen 1993, 116–130, 118.

⁵¹ It is less likely that the present LXX text resulted from the Greek translator's manipulations. Finn and Gooding suggested that the translator or a later reviser rearranged the Greek text without regard to the Hebrew: A.H. Finn, *The Tabernacle Chapters*, JTS 16 (1914/15), 449–482; D.W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle (TS.NS VI)*, Cambridge 1959. For a convenient summary of the complicated analyses, see D.W. Gooding, *On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums*, JTS 25 (1974), 1–11, and S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford 1968, 273–276. R.D. Nelson, *Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account* (Ph.D. diss. Harvard University) Harvard 1986, appears to reflect a mediating position between the assumption of a Hebrew or Greek source for the Greek text.

⁵² For details, see the tables and lists in Kuenen, *Historico–Critical Inquiry*, 76f.; H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge ²1914), 231f.234–236; BHS ad Ex 36,8. For the LXX I follow the verse numbering of J.W. Wevers, *Exodus, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum*, Göttingen 1991.

layer that mentioned only the *olah* altar, while the later MT mentioned two altars.⁵³ Likewise, according to Kuenen⁵⁴, Aejmelaeus⁵⁵, Schenker⁵⁶, Carr⁵⁷, and Knohl⁵⁸ the Hebrew text underlying the LXX preceded the more developed MT. The LXX version of chapters 35–40 differs more from the instructions given in chapters 25–31 than does the equivalent section in the MT, and for Aejmelaeus and Schenker this is reason enough to consider the LXX earlier than the somewhat more harmonious (harmonized?) version of MT.⁵⁹

The scholars who analyzed these chapters in the LXX did not explicitly link the data in the LXX to the DH, but if the LXX aids us in unraveling the different strata of P, the LXX may well be relevant to the DH. However, in my view, it does not suffice to pinpoint details in the LXX of Ex 35–40 that are anterior to MT. All of its aspects need to be analyzed in depth with constant reference to the vocabulary and nature of both P and the LXX, and this has yet to be done. I therefore delay a decision regarding this LXX text;⁶⁰ in the meantime, I am

⁵³ Oral communication, 27.5.2013.

⁵⁴ Kuenen, *Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 73, „The remarkable divergences of the Greek translation of Ex. xxxv.–xl. make us suspect that the final redaction of these chapters was hardly completed – if indeed completed – when that translation was made, i.e. about 250 B.C.“ He finds the Greek text „not so satisfactory“ (78), and he notes „the very strange order“ of the LXX (78). Further, „Finally, the Greek translation furnishes yet another proof of the late origin of the whole section [...]. The text was not yet fixed“ (79).

⁵⁵ Aejmelaeus, *Tabernacle Account*, 121, regards the account of the tabernacle as „the outcome of gradual growth, textual and editorial growth that may have continued for some time“. On 128, she accepts the view of M. Noth, *Das zweite Buch Mose (ATD 5) Göttingen* 8 (1988), who noted that the summarizing remark in the LXX of 39,42f. lacks reference to the incense altar and the copper laver, which reflect the first stage of the development of chapters 25–31 when they included only chapters 25–28.

⁵⁶ A. Schenker, *Der Ursprung des massoretischen Textes im Licht der literarischen Varianten im Bibeltext*, *Textus* 23 (2007), 51–67, 59f. From this and similar examples, Schenker concludes that the LXX presents an unrevised text form of these chapters.

⁵⁷ According to Carr, *Formation*, 104, these chapters show how documents were written. While Carr does not distinguish between changes inserted at the Hebrew and Greek level, he probably refers to the Hebrew. He notes „Aejmelaeus and (now) Bogaert, among others, have presented good arguments that many of the distinctive aspects of the fuller MT / SamP texts can be seen as various sorts of coordination of different parts of the tabernacle narrative with each other. These include various additions to the list of ‚all the things that Yhwh commanded‘ in 35,16–19 that seek to collect more comprehensively the items commanded in Exodus 25–31 (cf. also parallel lists in 31,9–11; 39,39–42), and additions to the list of offerings in Exod 35,23 (MT) to make sure that the textiles and skins required for the construction are also contributed by the Israelites“.

⁵⁸ See A53.

⁵⁹ Aejmelaeus, *Tabernacle Account*, 128–130; Schenker, *Der Ursprung*.

⁶⁰ The status of the *Vetus Latina* is equally difficult to evaluate. Bogaert suggested that *Codex Monacensis* of the *Vetus Latina*, disregarded by other scholars, reflects a third source earlier than MT+ and the LXX: P.–M. Bogaert, *L'importance de la Septante et du ‚Monacensis‘ de la Vetus Latina pour l'exégèse du livre de l'Exode (chap. 35–40)*, in: M. Vervenne (Hg.), *Studies in the Book of Exodus. Redaction-Reception-Interpretation (BETHL 126)* Leuven 1996, 399–428. On the other hand, the edition of Wevers, *Exodus*, 23, disregards this

influenced by the mentioned midrashic elements in this translation, which point to its secondary nature.⁶¹

Of the better known literary differences between MT and the other textual sources, I mention (2) the well-known large editorial differences between the SP group and MT LXX⁶² and (3) three manuscripts of 4QRP (4QRP^{c,d,e}) that differ much from the other texts in exegetical changes and pluses.⁶³ The following four instances are less well known:⁶⁴

(4) Differences between MT, LXX and SP in the genealogies of *Gen 5 and 11*. Possible tendencies are recognized in the different texts. It seems that MT is not recensional in chapter 11, but may be so in chapter 5. On the other hand, the *Vorlage* of the LXX and SP probably revised MT or a similar text in both chapters in a certain direction, in similar yet not identical ways. I posit two recensions (SP, LXX), and one text (MT) in chapter 5, and possibly 3 recensions in chapter 11. The analysis of these chronological systems pertains to the primacy of MT, LXX, the SP, or another system in these chapters, and is irrelevant for the source-critical analysis.⁶⁵ (5) The sequence of Gen 31,46–48 in the LXX; (6) the position of Num 10,34–36 in the LXX; (7) different literary editions of Numbers in LXX and MT+ visible in small details.⁶⁶

manuscript, which is shorter than the other manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina*, because according to him it has little in common with the LXX.

⁶¹ These chapters may well present the most vexing problem in LXX scholarship. The problems are no more complex than those in 1Kings, Esther and Daniel, but their subject matter complicates the analysis.

⁶² See TCHB, 80–82.

⁶³ The other two manuscripts of 4QRP, 4QRP^{a,b} belong to the SP group.

⁶⁴ For all these, see TCHB, 283–326.

⁶⁵ See my analysis in E. Tov, *The Genealogical Lists in Genesis 5 and 11 in Three Different Versions*, in: C. Werman, *From Author to Copyist: Composition, Redaction and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible* (FS Z. Talshir) Winona Lake 2013, 000–000.

⁶⁶ Possible instances include: (1) The repetition of the speech introduction formula in Exod 32: 7 and 9. J. Baden, J. E. and the Redaction of the Pentateuch (FAT 68), Tübingen 2009, 162 A156, makes a literary argument, based on MT only. He claims „that D contains what has long been felt to be an oddity of the E text: the repetition of the speech introduction formula in vv. 7 and 9“. However, the difficulty of this unusual repetition is removed when we realize that V. 9, lacking in the LXX, is likely a harmonizing plus to Dtn 9,13 in MT SP, which is unusual because the MT displays far fewer instances of harmonization than the SP group and the LXX. Thus also Carr, *Formation*, 103. An opposite type of argumentation would be to claim that it was the LXX translator who removed V. 9. This approach was adopted by J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, Atlanta 1990, 523, and B. Sommer, *Translation as Commentary. The Case of the Septuagint to Exodus 32–33*, *Textus 20* (2000), 43–60, 46, who claimed that the LXX removed this verse because it contradicts V. 10 and because the translator wanted to avoid the repetition of God starting to speak in V. 7 and V. 9. However, the Greek Torah is known to harmonize (see my TCHB, 136) and it would be unusual to ascribe literary sensitivity to a translator.

(2) Num 14,23a MT (sim. SP) אשר נשבעתי לאבתם יראו-אם ארץ-את. The LXX adds ἀλλ' ἢ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἃ ἔστιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ὅδε ὅσοι οὐκ οἶδασιν ἀγαθὸν οὐδὲ κακὸν πᾶς νεώτερος ἄπειρος τούτοις δώσω τὴν γῆν („Instead, their children who are with me here, as many as do

In my view none of these examples, with the possible exception of the first one, are relevant for the DH.

V Between Early Compositional and Late Scribal Activity

Distinguishing between the activity of authors and editors involved in the creation of the Torah and scribes who transmitted the book proves a difficult task. In antiquity each scribe changed the text to such an extent that he may be considered a major or minor participant in the process of its development.⁶⁷ Indeed, books were written, expanded and revised over the course of many generations. The scribes of MT contributed not a little to the shape of that text as we can see in 4QDtn^q.⁶⁸ Likewise, the scribes of the MT, LXX and SP gave differing shapes to the chronologies in Gen 5 and 11 (above IV). The editorial changes of the SP group in general greatly altered the content (III.3).

The original authors undoubtedly harmonized both major and minor details. Likewise, A. Rofé showed how „late copyists (Second Commonwealth), brought up in the tradition of the dominant documents of the Pentateuch, contaminated old stories by introducing phraseology and concepts of the Priestly document“⁶⁹. This phenomenon is visible in manuscripts of the post-

not know good or evil, every inexperienced younger person—to these I will give the land“). This long plus in the LXX is clearly based on a Hebrew text like Dtn 1,39, though not exactly in the formulation of the MT or LXX since they differ in details. The elements added in the LXX, based on a Hebrew text, represent a free reworking of the story in Dtn 1,39 because the base text of Numbers in MT differs in conception from Deuteronomy. According to the MT of Num 14,23, the only one to reach the promised land would be Caleb, while according to God’s second speech in v. 30 of the same chapter, also Joshua would reach the land, followed by the mention in V. 31 that the children would also be brought to the land. Now, a much shorter but similar addition has been made in the LXX of 32,11, and both that addition and the plus in the LXX of 14,23 are based on Dtn 1,39, though not exactly on the MT or the LXX since they differ in details. These instances are harmonizing pluses in the LXX of Numbers, analyzed in detail by H. Ausloos, LXX Num 14,23. Once More a ‚Deuteronomist’ at Work?,“ in B.A. Taylor (Hg.), X. Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo 1998 (SBLSCS 51) Atlanta 2001, 415–461. This textual development is unrelated to a possible Dtr revision of the Tetrateuch that was detected by Blum, Studien, 164–207, and 132, A125. Ausloos, LXX Num 14:23, 415, rejects the idea of Dtr formulations reflected in the LXX of Ex 33,1–6, instead ascribing **the** LXX to harmonizing influences on its *Vorlage*.

⁶⁷ A. Rofé, Historico–Literary Aspects of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls, in: L.H. Schiffman u.a. (Hg.), The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997, Jerusalem 2000, 30–39, describes the techniques used in Qumran biblical scrolls that were presumably also used by early scribes and editors: compilation and conflation, supplementation, omission and abbreviation, rewriting, reorganization.

⁶⁸ See TCHB, 249f.

⁶⁹ A. Rofé, Textual Criticism in the Light of Historical–Literary Criticism. Deuteronomy 31:14–15, in EI 16 (1982), 171–176.



Pentateuchal books and also in Dtn 31,14 where, in the original version (MT) of the story of the appointment of Joshua (E), the *Vorlage* of the LXX might have introduced terminology of P with regard to the entrance to the Tent of the Meeting. Alternatively, the *Vorlage* of the LXX might have harmonized V. 14 to V. 15, which mentions the entrance to the Tent of the Meeting. In either case, the activity of these scribes took place when the sources had already been combined.

VI Some Conclusions

VI.1 MT as the Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis

If the above analysis is relevant, our conclusions are intriguing from a textual point of view. The DH is based solely on MT because no meaningful deviating evidence has been found in the non-Masoretic sources with the possible exception of Ex 35–40 in the LXX. Such evidence could have pertained to the criteria for the distinction between the Pentateuchal sources, viz., duplication of stories and differences in vocabulary including the divine names. Not all the details concerning evidence relevant to the DH may be known to me, but I dare say that if there were significant deviations, someone would have detected them **by now**.

When the DH was first launched the only source for a theory like this was MT, although the non-Masoretic sources were used in the analysis of small details from the days of Cappellus (1650) onwards.⁷⁰ In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, non-Masoretic sources were used to a great extent in the analysis of the divine names in Genesis, among other things.⁷¹ Textual critics stress that all available sources, and not only MT, need to be utilized, but in this case these additional sources do not add to our knowledge.

This being the case, we may also formulate our conclusion differently, in a positive way, noting that the DH is based not only on MT, but on the combined evidence of all the textual sources. I do not know whether anyone has formulated the textual base of the DH in this way, but it would present the data correctly. Having researched the non-Masoretic sources, and having reached a negative judgment on their relevance for the DH, we realize that its starting point, the printed medieval MT text, was not so bad after all since the other sources do not add significantly to the analysis.

This situation is not the result of coincidence. It implies that all the textual sources reflect the assumed combination of the Pentateuchal documents to the same extent. It also implies that this literary activity took place before the

⁷⁰ L. Cappellus, *Critica Sacra sive de variis quae in sacris Veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex*, Paris 1650 = Halle 1775 (–1786).

⁷¹ See **A23**.

textual evidence branched off into different directions. Such an assumption necessarily has implications for our view of the original status of the Scripture text.

VI.2 Superiority of the MT in the Torah

Since the non-Masoretic textual witnesses do not reflect ancient material relating to the DH, we suggest that the preserved witnesses are too young to reflect significant ancient evidence of the type analyzed in this study. However, we could also claim that we should not even expect significant ancient variants in the non-Masoretic texts, assuming the superiority of the MT witness in the Torah and the secondary nature of most other sources.⁷²

The textual status of the Torah differs in many ways from the other Scripture books. Due to its great popularity, the textual witnesses were altered much, thus creating a great number of textual branches. The special sacred nature of the Torah did not prevent its literary and textual development, as reflected in its widely divergent textual branches known from the third century BCE onwards. The studies quoted in A72 present my view of the character of the many textual branches of the Torah, which involves a working hypothesis claiming the secondary nature of most textual traditions in the Torah in relation to MT.

In sum, when examining the textual sources from which the Documentary Hypothesis draws its evidence, we found only one, the Masoretic Text. Historical-critical analyses take non-Masoretic sources into consideration all the time, while the theory of the DH relies exclusively on MT, with one possible exception, the LXX version of Ex 35–40. This being the case, we may also formulate our conclusion in a positive way, noting that the DH not only makes use of MT, but also of the combined evidence of all the textual sources. The literary activity of combining the Pentateuchal sources probably took place at an early stage, before the textual evidence branched off in different directions. Actually, MT provides the base for almost all literary theories.

Distinguishing between the sources of the Torah involves a variety of criteria. We found no data in the non-Masoretic sources that had any bearing on these criteria, the strongest case being the unusual equivalents in the LXX of the divine names in Gen 1–11. However, it seems that these special equivalents of the LXX reflect harmonized Greek renderings that were inserted inconsistently and are therefore irrelevant.

In evaluating the possibly relevant evidence, we make a distinction between historical-critical criticism in general and one exponent of that discipline, the

⁷² See my study E. Tov, Textual Developments in the Torah, in: XX (Hg.), Discourse, Dialogue, and Debate (FS Polak), XX 2014, forthcoming. In the meantime, see E. Tov, The Development of the Biblical Text in the Last Centuries BCE in Light of the Judean Desert Scrolls, Igeret 35 (2013), 14–21 (Heb).

DH. The textual witnesses provide much evidence relevant for literary criticism in general, but not for the DH. The SP group and the Temple Scroll were found to be of little relevance regarding the provision of deviating data for the DH. We also examined their relevance as parallels for the act of combining the sources of the Torah, concluding that the SP provides very few parallels, while the Temple Scroll provides more. The distinction between the authors and editors of the Torah on the one hand and its scribes on the other remains difficult.

If our analysis is correct, it provides intriguing conclusions regarding the textual sources since we found virtually no evidence relevant to the DH in the non-MT sources. However, we could also claim that we should not even expect significant ancient variants in the non-Masoretic texts. MT is the best witness in the Torah as most other sources are later and secondary, with harmonization as the major driving force behind their development.