THE OLD GREEK OF EXODUS IN THE LIGHT OF 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}\textsuperscript{*}

Judith E. Sanderson

Introduction

How are we to interpret differences between the Old Greek translation of the Bible and the Massoretic Text? Should we attribute most if not all of the discrepancies to the translator of the Greek or to his Vorlage?\textsuperscript{1}

If it can be demonstrated — or at least shown to be probable — that the Old Greek translation faithfully reflects a Hebrew Vorlage different from the Massoretic Text, can it be determined that one preserves more often than the other the preferable text? Can the secondary readings preserved by either text be characterized according to type? Can it be said that either text is characterized by any distinctive kinds of secondary readings? Is it possible to determine the relationship between these two Hebrew texts?

These questions must be put to each book of the Bible individually, for each book may well have had its own distinct history. The discovery at Qumran of fifteen Hebrew scrolls of Exodus from the Second Temple period provides new evidence for answering these questions as they apply to the book of Exodus. The

\textsuperscript{*}I wish to thank Professor Eugene Ulrich for his generous help at each stage of my work on 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}. It is impossible to express with footnotes the extent of my debt to him. The present article is based on my dissertation written at the University of Notre Dame under Ulrich's supervision, now published as An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the Samaritan Tradition (Harvard Semitic Studies 30; Atlanta 1986), which is a text-critical analysis of the scroll based on comparison with the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Massoretic Text, and the Septuagint.

\textsuperscript{1}For examples of the two approaches, see Arie van der Kooij, "A Short Commentary on Some Verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23" and Julio Trebolle, "Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings," in Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies 15 (1982) 36-50 and 12-35 respectively.
scroll of Exodus that has been by far the most extensively preserved is 4QpaleoExod$^m$, which has been dated on paleographical grounds to the first half of the first century B.C.E.$^2$ Forty-two columns are partially extant, ranging from Exod 6:25 to 37:16, but preserving most fully the narrative and legal portions. It is written in the Paleo-Hebrew script$^3$ and in relatively full orthography.$^4$

What is most remarkable about this scroll is the type of text which it preserves. It is the only ms of Exodus found at Qumran that represents the type of text preserved by the Samaritan community.$^5$ Wherever it is extant, it shares all of the distinctive characteristics of that tradition, with the sole exception of Exod 20:17$^b$, the addition to the Ten Commandments of the command to worship on Mount Gerizim.$^6$ These shared and distinctive traits include seven major expansions from Exodus (e.g., 7:16$^b$), three from Deuteronomy (e.g., the longer form of Exod 18:25 taken from Deut 1:9-18), and the different placement of the instruc-


$^3$Thirteen biblical scrolls, one non-biblical scroll, and two still unidentified scrolls have been found at Qumran in the Paleo-Hebrew script. 4QpaleoExod$^1$ and 4QpaleoExod$^m$ are the two scrolls of Exodus which share this script. 4QpaleoExod$^1$ seems to preserve a text quite different from that of 4QpaleoExod$^m$, however.

$^4$For a description of its script and orthography, see the introduction by Eugene Ulrich and me to the forthcoming edition of 4QpaleoExod$^m$, to appear in the series Discoveries in the Judean Desert (DJD) published by the Clarendon Press.

$^5$This was first announced when Patrick W. Skehan published a preliminary plate and edition of one column of the scroll, at that time provisionally designated 4QEx$m$, in "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," Journal of Biblical Literature 74 (1955) 182-7. (The alpha superscript was originally chosen to distinguish scrolls in the Paleo-Hebrew script. Since 1955 the scroll has frequently been cited erroneously as 4QEx$^a$, whereas that designation properly belongs to a scroll of very different nature and in the square script.) For a full analysis of the text of the scroll and its relationship to the Samaritan, Massoretic, and Old Greek traditions, see Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll.

tions for the incense altar (30:1-10 according to the versification as in the Mas-
sooretic and Greek texts is placed between 26:35 and 36).

Yet while these major characteristics place 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} (Q\textsuperscript{m}) clearly in the
tradition that we know as Samaritan (Sam), nevertheless in many smaller fea-
tures it differs from Sam, either agreeing with the tradition that we know as
Masoretic (M), or presenting a "unique" reading, i.e. disagreeing with all three
of the major early witnesses, Sam, M, and the Old Greek (G). This evidence pro-
vides further documentation of as well as the possibility of further refinement of
Tov's theory regarding texts and text-types.\textsuperscript{7}

Thus study of 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has provided new evidence for understanding the
text of Exodus and its early history. In this article I will bring together the major
results of my research as they shed light on the Old Greek of Exodus. This will
involve three aspects: the nature of the text of G the affiliation of G, and a pro-
posal regarding the early history of the text of Exodus.

\textsuperscript{7}Three prominent statements of theories that have been developed since the discovery of
the Qumran scrolls about the state of the biblical text in the Second Temple period are pre-
sented in Frank Moore Cross, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," and Shemaryahu
Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible — A New Outlook," \textit{Qumran and the History of
respectively; and Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls,"
\textit{Hebrew Union College Annual} 53 (1982) 11-27 (see in this connection especially pp. 22-26).
Method of Research

For my analysis I defined a variant as any discrepancy (other than orthographical) among any of the four major witnesses, Qm,8 Sam,9 M,10 and G11 wherever Qm is extant. As far as the Old Greek text is concerned, the first problem was the determination of variants.12 It is of course notoriously difficult to determine the Hebrew Vorlage of many Greek readings. Even if the reading is judged to be secondary to that of M and/or other Hebrew witnesses, one cannot be certain in each specific case whether the variation has arisen during the course of the transmission of the Hebrew Vorlage, or during the translation itself, or during the early transmission of the Greek text. Yet when variations which are unique to G are nevertheless similar to variations which are found among Hebrew texts, it is at least equally possible that they arose during the Hebrew stage as during the Greek stage. Such variations have been treated as variants for the purposes of this research. It remains a very difficult and subjective undertaking, however, to distinguish a variant from an element of Greek style and translational technique.

8Eugene Ulrich and I are collaborating on the edition of 4QpaleoExodm (see note 4 above). Before his death in 1980 Professor Patrick W. Skehan had worked several years preparing a draft of this edition, which served as the basis for our work. The transcriptions and statistics in this article are based on our work as of November 1987. Discrepancies between the transcriptions and statistics presented here and those in Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, reflect the progress made since April 1985, in particular the opportunity to study the leather fragments in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem. See especially note 14 below.

9The standard critical edition is that of August Freiherr von Gall, Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner (Giessen 1918). Though von Gall's method in establishing his eclectic text was clearly deficient, constant reference to his apparatus shows that, apart from orthographical differences, which are discounted here, his choices among the various readings available to him seldom affect the variants in this study.


11I wish to thank Professor John Wm Wevers for his kindness in providing me with a pre-published form of his critical text of those portions of the Old Greek where Qm is extant. Thus the establishment of variants was based on Wevers' text, soon to be published in the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint.

Once the variants had been isolated, I attempted next to establish the preferable readings on the basis of style, vocabulary, and context of the book of Exodus (and to a lesser extent of the entire Hebrew Bible) as well as patterns of scribal activity that emerged during the research.\textsuperscript{13} Those cases where no reading could be preferred on text-critical grounds I classified as synonymous variants. From these statistics I was able to draw some conclusions regarding the nature of each of the texts individually, affiliation among the four texts, the early history of the text of Exodus, and the nature of scribal practice during the Second Temple period.

The Data

Comparison of G with Q\textsuperscript{m}, Sam, and M yields a total of 128 variants that involve G.\textsuperscript{14} G preserves the preferable reading 40 times, the secondary reading 29 times, and a synonymous variant 59 times. Each of these three broad categories of readings can be divided into subcategories. Selected examples to illustrate these classifications follow, with the totals in each group indicated in parentheses. This section gives only the results of my research rather than the arguments adduced

\textsuperscript{13}For discussion of the method used in evaluating variants, see Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll}, pp. 42-9. It may be helpful to mention here one issue involved in the evaluation, namely that of the common textual rule \textit{lectio brevior}. While I agree with Emanuel Tov ("Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules," \textit{Harvard Theological Review} \textbf{75} [1982] 429-48, especially 440-441) that the automatic use of this rule is unacceptable, nevertheless it is a valid principle when used in conjunction with many other tentative criteria. I have observed that the history of the book of Exodus is one of expansion. This principle has validated itself in my experience when used with two clear restrictions: to the book of Exodus and as one criterion among others.

\textsuperscript{14}I dealt with 174 variants in \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, but 9 of those had to do only with the relationship of Q\textsuperscript{m} with Sam, so that the total involving all three Hebrew witnesses was 165; and in 44 cases the \textit{Vorlage} of G could not be established (e.g., the presence or absence of the accusative marker \textit{mā}, so that the total involving G was only 121. The statistics as of November 1987 are slightly different, reflecting further work on the edition of the scroll: there are now a total of 184 variants, with 9 involving only Q\textsuperscript{m} and Sam, yielding 175 that involve all three Hebrew witnesses; in 47 cases the \textit{Vorlage} of G cannot be established, so that the total involving G is now 128.
for the establishment of preferability of variants. For a full presentation of the
evaluation of each variant, see Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll. 15

Preferable Readings

The classifications of the 40 preferable readings preserved by G are as follows. 16
In each case the preferable reading is given first, with the texts that preserve
that reading. 17

1. **G** is longer with other witnesses (3 times):


2. **G** is shorter (28 times):
   a. uniquely (8 times):

   9:10 ἔναοντον G pr pr imeveda MQ<sup>m</sup>Sam
   9:20 τὰ κτήνη σῶσόν G | [אשת מקנין] M Q<sup>m</sup>Sam
   20:19 Ἀλληλοους σῷ ἡμῖν G | ἡ άνον ἀνονΥνος οὔτε ἡνοσ Q<sup>m</sup>Sam M; hab 20:19<sup>a</sup> Q<sup>m</sup>Sam
   32:9 comma deest G | hab MQ<sup>m</sup>Sam

   b. with **M** (14 times)
   (1) Against major expansions in the Q<sup>m</sup>M tradition: MG preserve the
   shorter original when Q<sup>m</sup>Sam add 11 major expansions. Nine are a
   sentence or paragraph in length (the verse numbering follows that of
   von Gall’s edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch): 7:18<sup>b</sup>; 7:29<sup>b</sup>; 8:19<sup>b</sup>;
   9:5<sup>b</sup>; 9:19<sup>b</sup>; 10:2<sup>b</sup>; 18:25<sup>Sam</sup>; 27:19<sup>b</sup>; 32:10 [cf. also 20:19<sup>a</sup> just above].
   Twice Q<sup>m</sup>Sam add ἀλλοῦρ οὐράμερος (at 24:1 and 24:9). 18

   (2) Against moderate and minor expansions in the Q<sup>m</sup>Sam tradition (3
   times):

   10:5 [כָּל] תָּמִיד הָאָזְרִי אַתָּה כָּל יְהוָה כִּי לָכֵּנִי Q<sup>m</sup>Sam

15Chapters II and III.

16For complete information on all 40 preferable readings, see chapter II of Sanderson, An
Exodus Scroll.

17M is listed first because, as will be shown below, the investigation has shown that for
the book of Exodus M generally preserves the best text of the four witnesses studied. Brack-
es indicate the extent to which Q<sup>m</sup> is preserved.

18For a discussion of the significance of these two expansions, see Sanderson, An Exodus
Scroll, pp. 212-214.
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17:13 MG \textit{ריבך לית} Q\textsuperscript{m}Sam

c. with other witnesses (6 times):

8:16[20] MGSam \textit{אל מש} Q\textsuperscript{m}

3. G is qualitatively preferable with other witnesses (9 times):

15:27 MQ\textsuperscript{m}G \textit{ __(ול)__(ה)___} Sam

21:29 MQ\textsuperscript{m}G \textit{__(ול)__(ה)___} Sam

Secondary Readings

The 29 secondary readings preserved in the Old Greek can be classified as follows.\textsuperscript{19} Again the preferable reading is given first.\textsuperscript{20}

1. G is longer (24 times):

a. uniquely (13 times; the secondary part in G is printed in italics):

9:8 MQ\textsuperscript{m}Sam \textit{ἐν αὐτοῖς θεραποῦν} μέχρι τῆς Εἰρήνης G

9:9 MQ\textsuperscript{m}Sam \textit{ἐν τοῖς θεραποῦν} καὶ ἐν τοῖς τεράταις καὶ ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ G

11:9 MQ\textsuperscript{m}Sam \textit{μοις} καὶ τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα G

19:24 MQ\textsuperscript{m}Sam \textit{μηδε} πάσης ἀνίσσεις ἀπὸ αὐτῶν κύριος G

32:7 Q\textsuperscript{m}M Sam: βάδιξε καταβήσαι τὸ τάξος ἐνεύθεν G (see below)

32:13 MQ\textsuperscript{m}Sam \textit{κολοφον} ὁ στόμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκ τῆς G

34:16 MQ\textsuperscript{m}Sam \textit{καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων} σοι δὲς τοῖς γεώργιος αὐτῶν G

b. with one or two other witnesses (11 times):

7:2 M + Q\textsuperscript{m}MSamG

9:8 M + Q\textsuperscript{m}MSamG

10:24 M + Q\textsuperscript{m}MSamG

\textsuperscript{19}For the complete listing, according to their classification, of the 18 secondary readings preserved uniquely by G, see Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll}, pp. 185-186. For an overview of all the secondary readings in G see p. 244. Minor discrepancies between the subtotals given here and the total for the category of secondary readings are due to the fact that the total, 29, is based on Q\textsuperscript{m} readings, whereas the subtotals are based on the G readings (see, e.g., 32:7, which is counted in both 1.a. and 1.b. below).

\textsuperscript{20}See note 15 above.
17:13 ἐπ’ ἐνῷ Ω̄μ Q̄m̄ + ἐπ’ ἐνῷ Q̄m̄²m̄ SamM; + καὶ (+ πάντα) τῶν λαὸν αὐτῶν G
32:7 ἀρὸ Q̄m̄ ἢ ἂς MSam; βασιλεῖς κατάβησίν (+τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν) G
(see above)
32:13 πάντ’ ἡ ΜJ θάλασσα Q̄m̄ SamG
34:1 έστι[ν] 2° Q̄m̄ + ἡ Νήσος(τ)ο(ν)ο(ν)α SamMG
2. G is uniquely longer and at variance (1 time):
19:10 πάντ’ ἡ ΜQ̄m̄ SamJ Καταβάς διαμάρτυραι G
3. G is uniquely shorter (2 times):
25:33 ἔσπερα ἀνέστη Q̄m̄ Sam] > G
34:11 ἄκος M̄Q̄m̄ Sam] > G
4. G is uniquely at variance (3 times):
18:4 ἐπὶ ἄνθρωπον M̄Q̄m̄ Sam] ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραώ G
18:21 ἐπὶ ἄνθρωπον M̄Q̄m̄ Sam] ὑπερηφανίαν G

Synonymous Variants

The classifications of the 59 synonymous variants preserved by G are as follows. In each case, since a preferable reading cannot be determined, the reading preserved by Q̄paleoExod̄m is given first.

1. G is longer with other witnesses (10 times):
9:9 ἤλυς θεῶν Q̄m̄ SamMG
10:21 έσπερα Q̄m̄ θεῶν MSamG
17:15 καὶ Q̄m̄ ψῆφος SamMG
31:13-14 έπεὶ ἀνείπηκα Q̄m̄ SamM G
34:16 έπεὶ ἀνείπηκα Q̄m̄ SamM G

21 For the complete listing, according to their classification, of the 35 synonymous variants where G is unique, see Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, pp. 168-71. For an overview of all the synonymous variants involving G, see pp. 244-5.

22 For a full discussion of the evaluation of these variants, see chapter III of Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll.
2. G is uniquely shorter (6 times):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>QmSam1</th>
<th>QmSam2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28:23-29</td>
<td>hab MQmSam hab vv 29, 29a (ex 23-28) G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:2</td>
<td>נֶפֶשׁ בַּכֶּשָּׁם MQmSam תָּוֵּנָּה בַּכֶּשָּׁם וְָוָּקְיַּרָּוָּן G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:10-34</td>
<td>hab MQmSam &gt; G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. G shares with M a different placement of a pericope or verse (2 times):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>QmSam1</th>
<th>QmSam2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30:1-10</td>
<td>post 26:35 QmSam post 29:46 MG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:22</td>
<td>post 29:20 QmSam post 29:21 MG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. G has a unique form of a pericope, shown in the constellation of 6 variants within those parts of 18:9-11 extant in Qm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>QmSam1</th>
<th>QmSam2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:9</td>
<td>לְוִיָּה MQmSam שֵׁסֶת וָתַּר G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:9</td>
<td>לְוִיָּה MQmSam שֵׁשֶת וָתַּר G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:9</td>
<td>מֵאָני MQmSam + וַוַּאָךְ פְּרָגָא G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10</td>
<td>מֵאָני MQmSam תָּוֵּנָּה וָתַּר G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10</td>
<td>מֵאָני MQmSam תָּוֵּנָּה וָתַּר G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. G uniquely preserves a conflicting description of the table in the tabernacle (2 times):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>QmSam1</th>
<th>QmSam2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:23</td>
<td>בָּרָאָה QmSam וָסָתָר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:24</td>
<td>בָּרָאָה QmSam וָסָתָר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. G has a different order of words or phrases (5 times):

a. uniquely (4 times):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>QmSam1</th>
<th>QmSam2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19:11</td>
<td>לְוִיָּה MQmSam שֵׁשֶת וָתַּר וַוַּאָךְ G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. with other witnesses (1 time):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>QmSam1</th>
<th>QmSam2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24:7</td>
<td>נָעֳשֵׁנָה נָעֳשֵׁנָה QmSam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. G has a different word or phrase (12 times):

a. uniquely (9 times):

---

23Sam places 29:21 after v 28. In Qm v 22 clearly follows v 20 immediately, but the section around v 28 is not extant, so that we cannot be certain that Qm agreed with Sam in placing v 21 after v 28. The verse could have been lost in Qm by parablepsis, but the pattern of agreement between Qm and Sam (in order of text as well as in expansions) and also the spacing of the column suggest that Qm agreed with Sam not only in lacking v 21 after v 20 but also in placing it after v 28.
The Nature of the Old Greek of Exodus

I will begin with a description of the text of the Old Greek as it has emerged from the comparison of the four texts. It is important to keep in mind that this description is necessarily a fragmentary, even a random one, for it is confined to those portions where QpaleoExod is extant. On the basis of comparison with Qm, Sam, and M, where Qm is extant, what can be said about the nature of G?

The first aspect of the nature of G concerns the relative proportion of its preferable and secondary readings as compared to the proportion in the other three witnesses. Of the total of 128 variants in which G is involved, G preserves 40 preferable readings (= 31%) and 29 secondary readings (= 23%); in the other 59

24In Qm seems to be systematically distinguished from מִצְרָיִם. This is not an orthographic difference, but refers to "the Egyptians" (the people) as opposed to "Egypt" (the land). This distinction is mirrored in G, which distinguishes מְיוֹן אֲגָרְסְיָו from מְיוֹן אֲגָרְסְיוֹ.

25Percentages have been rounded off for ease of comparison.
variants the preferable reading cannot be determined (= 46%). Of those 69 readings where preferability has been assigned, G has the preferable reading in 58% of the cases and the secondary reading in 42% of the cases. These percentages should be compared with the corresponding proportions of the three Hebrew witnesses:26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Qm</th>
<th>Sam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferable Readings</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Readings</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it can be seen that for the portions of the book of Exodus for which 4QpaleoExod₄ is extant, M preserves by far the best text. G preserves the next best text, when judging by the proportions of preferable vs. secondary readings. Qm is the third best text, while Sam shows the largest percentage of secondary readings of the four: its proportions are the approximate inverse of those of G.

The second aspect of the nature of G emerges from an analysis of its longer and shorter readings. The Old Greek of Exodus is generally described as an expansionist text.27 Comparison with the other witnesses bears out this description in general, but shows that it needs to be refined and clarified. Of the 29 readings in G which have been judged secondary, 23 are expansions, an impressive proportion (=79%). Yet we must also look at the broader picture. Of the total of 128 variants in which G is involved, whether preferable, secondary, or synonymous, 37 are longer and 38 are shorter readings, a very different proportion (=29% longer and 30% shorter). Further, of the 62 readings unique to G, whether preferable, secondary, or synonymous, 14 are longer and 17 are shorter readings28 (=23% longer and 27% shorter). Thus while G deserves its reputation of being expansionist in many places, it also deserves to gain a reputation of being shorter in other places, sometimes uniquely so.

26In the following chart all variants in which preferability cannot be determined are discounted. While the percentages for G are based on a total of 69 variants, the percentages for the three Hebrew witnesses are based on a total of 87 variants, since there are 18 variants in which preferability has been assigned but in which the Vorlage of G cannot be determined.


28Two of the 17 are judged accidental omissions.
Worthy of special note in this regard are the eight preferable readings that are unique to $G$: every one of them is a shorter reading. In one case MQ$^m$Sam have a major expansion, once $M$ adds one word while Q$^m$Sam have a major expansion, and six times MQ$^m$Sam all add a word or phrase.

But if the number of shorter and longer readings which $G$ preserves is worthy of note, another aspect of its pattern of readings is also important: the type of expansion which it uniquely preserves. This is best recognized by contrast with the expansions preserved by the Q$^m$Sam tradition. $G$ is often characterized as being somewhat more expansionist than $M$ in Exodus, while $Sam$ is characterized as being much more expansionist. Yet the statistics of a comparative study show that $G$ preserves numerically far more expansions than $Sam$ does.

A clear picture emerges only when we refer not only to the number but also to the type of expansions. While it is true that the unique expansions of $G$ are far more numerous than those of Q$^m$Sam, they are also far shorter. Whereas one expansion in the Q$^m$Sam tradition may represent four to nine lines of text, one expansion in $G$ usually represents one to four words. Thus while both traditions are expansionist, they represent quite different types of expansion: not only different in length, but also different in the procedures, the motivation, and the license that they represent on the part of the scribe who perpetrated them.

The third aspect of the nature of $G$ will be mentioned much more briefly. Careful study of the book of Exodus shows that in general the translator seems to have taken pains to render his Hebrew Vorlage with a high degree of precision. There is some variation ranging from a few wooden renderings into "Semitic Greek" (e.g., τελευταν/πληρουν τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶν for מְלֹא הָאָדָם in 28:41; 29:9, 29, 33, 35; 32:29) to free paraphrase (e.g., τῇ δύσει μου for ἐν τῇ κλίτῃ in 33:19). But in general the Old Greek of Exodus is a faithful translation of its Vorlage, relatively literal without often resorting to "translation Greek."


30For a detailed study of editorial and scribal attitudes and practices in the late Second Temple period as exhibited in the text of Exodus, see chapter VI of Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll.

31For a more detailed treatment of translational technique in Exodus, see Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, pp. 247-55. See the works of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, such as "Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen, als Subjekt stehenden Personalpronomens im griechischen Penta-
The faithful translational technique suggests strongly that the differences between G on the one hand and the other witnesses to the book of Exodus on the other hand are to be attributed for the most part not to the translator, but to the Hebrew scribes in the period of transmission of the Vorlage of the translation.

The Affiliation of the Old Greek

G is the least closely affiliated of the four texts of Exodus studied. It has by far the greatest number of unique readings, both secondary and synonymous. Approximately half of the time (62 of a total of 128 variants where the Vorlage of G can with some confidence be determined), G presents a unique reading. This proportion should be contrasted with the proportion of unique readings that Qm, Sam, and M present. Out of a total of 175 variants among the three Hebrew texts, Qm preserves 30 unique readings, Sam 29 unique readings, and M 35 unique readings. In the tabernacle sections where Qm is extant, Qm almost always agrees with Sam and M against G.32 This underlines the fact that G stands alone.

In light of the often repeated view that G shares a close relationship with Sam,33 it must be emphasized that this research has produced strikingly meager evidence for any such relationship, whether between Sam and G, between Qm and G, or among Qm, Sam, and G. Out of 128 variants, SamG share only 4 agreements against MQm, three of which are minor and only one of which (13:6) could possibly be interpreted as reflecting any affiliation. In only 7 variants, all of them minor, do QmG alone agree against MSam. QmSamG together share 13 agreements, again all of them minor and 3 involving parablepsis on the part of M.


32For details, see note 35 below.

Thus, though limited to the parts of Exodus extant in 4QpaleoExod⁷⁸, this research provides no grounds at all for claiming any affiliation of G with Sam or Q⁷⁸.

Yet although G differs more from M than Q⁷⁸ and Sam do, the research nevertheless supports Tov’s contention, "The Hebrew text presupposed by the LXX basically represents a tradition which is either close to that of MT or can easily be explained as a descendant or a source of it."34

The Early History of the Text of Exodus: A Proposal

On the basis of the new evidence provided by the discovery of 4QpaleoExod⁷⁸, some suggestions can be made as to the early history of the text of Exodus, especially as it concerns the Old Greek. It must be remembered, of course, that this is a partial view of that history, since it is based on evidence which is random in two ways. First, of all the texts which existed in the Second Temple period, only four witnesses of substantial length have been preserved for us, and these by different methods: three by centuries of copying, one by remaining hidden in a cave. Second, while the fragments of 4QpaleoExod⁷⁸ that have been preserved are significant, both in extent and in distinctiveness, they are nonetheless only random remains from the entire scroll. The following reconstruction is based only on the new light shed on the question by the discovery of the scroll, not on all that can be known about the entire book of Exodus.35


35 This reconstruction does not deal with the matter of the account of the tabernacle. In almost every variant within Exod 25:1-31:11 and 35:4-37:16 (where the scroll breaks off), many of which affect large blocks of text, Q⁷⁸ agrees with both M and Sam against G; in a very few variants it agrees with Sam against M and G.

The statistics are as follows: within this section there are 38 variants affecting the three Hebrew witnesses, but only 21 where the Vorlage of G can be determined with reasonable confidence. Of these 21, G is unique in 12 readings, 7 of which are of major to moderate significance. In 4 readings MG agree against Q⁷⁸Sam, of which 3 are of major to moderate significance. In 2 readings Sam presents a unique but minor reading, and in 3 Q⁷⁸ is unique because of a minor error.

As far as the tabernacle account is concerned, the positive result of the discovery of 4QpaleoExod⁷⁸ (apart from the 3 significant readings where Q⁷⁸Sam agree against MG) is the reinforcement of the sense of the wide distance between G and other texts known to us. Negatively, no new evidence has been introduced which has shed any light on the differ-
All four texts are so much alike that there must have been a period of time when they belonged together somehow in a group of closely related texts. There may or may not have been an Urtext, but the amount of variation in the early days was surely limited.

Apparently the tradition behind G was the first to become separated from the others in the group. This research provides no new evidence for speculation on the question whether that tradition was taken to Egypt and developed there in Hebrew before being translated, or even whether it was translated in Egypt or elsewhere. The research does, however, strongly suggest that the tradition behind G must have been the first of these four traditions to separate from the others. This suggestion is based on two results of the research: among the four texts G is the most different, and it still preserves a number of preferable — shorter — readings against the other three.

The terminus ad quem for this separation was probably 250 B.C.E., but it may have occurred long before that. This tradition continued developing separately from the other three texts, and through the course of time it grew through the successive additions of scribes. Presumably some expansions arose while the text was still in Hebrew, and others during the process of translation. Further, probably even what we call "Old Greek" reflects some additions made following the translation, because it is simply not possible to reach all the way back to 250 B.C.E. or whenever the translation was made.

The expansions and alterations all ranged from minor to moderate. While they were numerous, most of the variants were of little significance taken singly. The scribes in the G tradition took the liberty of adding text for the purpose of clarification, harmonization, and emphasis, but each of their additions or alterations affected only a word or phrase. Thus there are many deviations from MQSam, but few are extensive.

The secondary agreements among the three other texts suggest that the traditions behind MQSam continued to develop together in a group, probably with
many others, during which time they underwent some common expansion and probably some alterations. Judging by the variants in this study, most of these expansions were probably only moderate (e.g., "and they stood") or minor (e.g., conjunctions, various grammatical features) in significance. But at least one (32:9) was a major expansion imported from Deuteronomy. This major expansion represents the first instance discovered in this study of a new kind of scribal practice, one which was to play a large role in the later QmSam tradition.

The tradition behind M was the first to enter a period of conservative transmission. After the tradition behind QmSam separated from that behind M, one scribe, or perhaps several, made eighteen lengthy expansions for the purpose of harmonization within Exodus and between Exodus and Deuteronomy, as well as for greater emphasis within the plague narrative. The result is that certain pages of QmSam appear extremely expansionist, whereas the bulk of the text is very close to that of M.36

A text within the "QmSam tradition" became "the Samaritan Pentateuch" when one further major expansion was made within the Samaritan community, namely, the new tenth commandment to worship on Gerizim. Though this last expansion no longer affected other texts current in Palestine, such as 4QpaleoExodM, it was created according to the same methods used in some of the earlier QmSam expansions: two separate passages from Deuteronomy were interwoven with Exodus 20, in order to elevate passages originally unrelated to the Sinai narrative by introducing them into that pericope.37

Conclusion

The new evidence provided by 4QpaleoExodM, though fragmentary, provides a new opportunity to study the Old Greek of Exodus and sheds some new light on the nature, affiliation, and history of the text. The findings can be summarized as follows.

The Nature of the Old Greek of Exodus. When preferability can be reasonably determined, G preserves, uniquely or with other witnesses, the preferable reading in 58% of the variants and the secondary reading in 42% of the variants. Thus G

36For the history of the QmSam tradition and the M tradition, see Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, especially pp. 193-243, and 257-9.

37For details, see Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, pp. 235-7, 317-20.
compares unfavorably with M (77% for preferable readings) but favorably with Q\textsuperscript{m} (50%) and Sam (41%). Looking at all of the variants in G and discounting the question of preferability, G is found to preserve both longer readings and shorter readings, in about equal proportion (29% of the total are longer, while 30% are shorter). All 8 preferable readings unique to G are shorter readings. While G preserves numerically far more expansions than Sam does, its individual expansions are usually much briefer and reflect a different attitude and approach on the part of the scribes involved.

It should be emphasized that this study has confirmed that for the book of Exodus the Old Greek is generally a faithful translation of its Vorlage. Thus it appears that the variations between the Massoretic Text and the Greek are at least for the most part to be attributed to the period of the transmission of its Hebrew Vorlage.

*The Affiliation of the Old Greek of Exodus.* While on the one hand all four texts studied are clearly related, on the other hand G is the most removed of the four. Whereas M preserves a unique reading in only 20% of the total number of variants, and both Q\textsuperscript{m} and Sam in only 17%, G preserves the unique reading in 48% of its total.

Specifically, no evidence at all\(^{38}\) has been found to support the often repeated view of a special relationship between G and Sam, nor any evidence to suggest a special relationship between G and Qm or between G and the QmSam tradition. When G does agree with another tradition in any substantial variant, it is with M and against QmSam, and this is usually because MG preserve the preferable reading and QmSam have a secondary reading. In other words, the relationship of G to M is due to their common witness in preserving the original text, made apparent by the special expansionist relationship between Qm and Sam.

*A Proposed Reconstruction of the History of the Old Greek of Exodus.* The basic agreement among the four witnesses suggests that all go back to a common or at least similar origin. The preferable readings preserved in G and the fact that it is the most unlike the other three suggest that the Hebrew tradition behind G was the first to break off from the traditions behind the others. It then underwent a

---

\(^{38}\)Save possibly the one variant, 13:6, which might conceivably be interpreted as reflecting a causal relationship between the two witnesses.
period of expansionism different from that experienced by QmSam, receiving a host of minor expansions, perhaps by a succession of many scribes.