Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has been forced to rely heavily upon secondary witnesses — translations, quotations and paraphrases — in order to pursue the history of the text and to evince, whenever possible, original readings. The problems inherent in the use of secondary witnesses are well known: one can seldom be certain that the 'reading' presented by them is indeed a variant to the Massoretic Text (=MT), not a pseudo-variant created by the translator or by a late author quoting freely from the Scripture.\(^1\) However, there are cases where certainty can be obtained, one class of them being the instances in which two secondary witnesses belonging to distinct lines of text-transmission, such as the Septuagint (=LXX) and the Qumran non-biblical scrolls, converge to establish the same reading. Systematic study of the witnesses and their correspondences has indeed been undertaken by scholars.\(^2\) And the editors of the Qumran documents usually indicated their biblical textual affinities. Some paraphrases, however, happened to pass unnoticed. I believe to have detected one such instance in Josh. 24:28-33 where the LXX is corroborated by a historical reference contained in the Damascus Document (=CD).\(^3\) Another case in the book of Joshua, in which the LXX to 6:26 is sustained by 4QTestimonia, has recently been highlighted by Ms.


Leah Mazor. In the present paper, I shall point out four more instances, all in the book of Deuteronomy, in which LXX deviations from the MT are fully confirmed by paraphrases in Qumranic non-biblical texts. All four cases are, in my opinion, impressive, because these textual variants are implausible when presented by one secondary text-witness only, and therefore have not attracted the critics’ attention. Moreover, the readings we are about to reclaim evidence various scribal, linguistic and theological factors which determined transformations of the biblical text; at least one of these factors will prove to be surprisingly new.

Before the discovery of the 11QTemple, one would construe the LXX translation ἐμαρτύρησον as a misreading of the Hebrew noun רע, it being taken as a verb: רע. All the more so, since the Greek translator here—as usual with most LXX translators—did not understand the expression ב רע at the end of the sentence. Yet the 11QTemple stands to prove that the reading רע was extant indeed, while conversely the LXX demonstrates that רע of 11QTemple is not an exceptional Qumranic plene writing for רע. Thus the reading of the phrase רע must be considered a real variant.

There can be little doubt, however, that this is a secondary reading vis-à-vis the MT. The reasons for this decision are primarily linguistic. Classical Biblical Hebrew used the verb רע for the witness’ deposition, רע meaning 'to testify

4L. Mazor, "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho," in the present volume of Textus. The editor of 4QTest noticed one single point of contact with the LXX; cf. J. Allegro, Qumran Cave 4-I (DJD; Oxford 1968), 5. 57-60. This was rectified by J. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V etc.,” RQ 26 (Avril, 1970) 163-276, ad p. 228.

5Out of 20 occurrences of ב רע = 'testify against' in the Hebrew Bible (see below, n. 7), only six have been properly rendered in Greek: Exod. 20:16 = Deut. 5:17; Num. 35:30; Prov. 25:18; Job 15:6; Sir. 46:19. The last one, with ἐγκαλέω, 'to accuse,' is certainly the best.

against, 'to accuse,' and — לְ הָעָלָה — 'to depose in favor.' In Second Commonwealth Hebrew this verb was gradually substituted with הָעָלָה which became the norm in rabbinic writings. If now 11QTemple and the LXX construe הָעָלָה as a verb, הָעָלָה, meaning 'he testified,' this is undoubtedly a secondary reading due to the impact of late diction. Thus, the reading of the LXX and 11QTemple in Deut. 19:18 demonstrates how developments in the Hebrew language in post-exilic times affected the text of the Hebrew Bible.

II

Deut. 19:14, MT: לא ת+='ג תבּוֹל וַתְּרָעָה אָשָּר בָּבָל רַשֲׁשִׁים בָּבָל אָשָּר תְּרָעָה
CD 1:16: הלֵשֶׁת בָּבָל אָשָּר בָּבָל רַשֲׁשִׁים בָּבָל
Deut. 19:14, LXX: Οὕτως μετακινήσεις ὡς οὐκ ἔδωκεν οἱ πτέρες σου ἐν τῇ κληρονομίᾳ καὶ κατεκληρονομήθης

The sectarian homily of CD 1:16 clearly paraphrases Deut. 19:4 with one outstanding difference from MT, namely הָעָלָה as against הָעָלָה. This divergence could certainly be attributed to the author of the CD who did not commit himself to reproducing exactly the passages of Scripture he was integrating in his speech. Yet, a doubt arises. The idiom of MT, הָעָלָה, is relatively common in the Hebrew Bible, occurring no less than five more times: Deut. 27:17; Hos. 5:10; Prov. 22:28; 23:10; Job 24:2. Clearly then, a late scribe could have changed an original

7Gen 30:33; Exod. 20:16 = Deut. 5:17; Num. 35:30; Deut. 19:16, 18; 1 Sam. 12:3, 3 (cf. LXX); 2 Sam. 1:16; Isa. 3:9; 59:12; Jer 14:7; Hos 5:5; 7:10; Mic 6:3; Prov. 25:18; Job 15:6; 16:8; Ruth 1:21; Str. 46:19.
8Mesad HaŠabýahu inscription, lines 10, 11; cf. H. Donner and W. Röllig, Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften, I-III (Wiesbaden 1962-64), n 200. In Deut. 31:21 one should read: יָעַץ הָשִּׁירָה הָוָא לָמְפִי לָעַץ (cf. LXX), since לָמְפִי does not make sense at all.
10Cf. L. Ginzberg, An Unknown Jewish Sect (English Transl.) (New York 1976) 6. In his opinion the deviation of CD from Deut. 19:14, MT, was intentional. Note, however, that the sect's opponents (the Pharisees?) are defined in CD 5:20 and 19:15-16 as מָשִׁ哳/מָשִׁחינ (ה)בּוֹל, מָשִׁーション, not מָשִׁחינ הָבּוֹל.
ל.au into a secondary לא תמצא, under the impact of the more common expression. The supposed reading לא תמצא in Deut. 19:14 thus has the value of a lectio difficilior, i.e., the reading less expected by the copyists. Were it not for its attestation in a paraphrase only, it should be preferred by the text-critic.

The Greek version seems to confirm a reading לא תמצא. While in Deut. 27:17 the same translator rendered מכסי (בבל) רעמה with ἀνταπαύεται (ὅρα τοῦ παλαιστέου) the same as in the LXX of Hos. 5:10; Prov. 23:10, here the Greek reads οὗ μετακινήσεις. The two verbs, indeed, have the kindred meanings of 'removing' and 'moving away', respectively but while μετατίθημι denotes transposition, κινεῖ and its compound μετακινέω conform to the idea of motion attributed to the Hebrew verb יג娩 (11x), and Рע in Deut. 32:30; 2 Sam. 15:20 and ה in Isa. 54:10; μετακινήσεως in Ezr 9:11 seems to have derived from Р,ג. All in all the equivalence οὗ μετακινήσεις = לא תמצא is most plausible here and it is substantiated by לא תמצא in the paraphrase of CD.

We have inferred above that the MT reading in Deut. 19:14 is the result of contamination from similar passages in the Hebrew Bible. It is peculiar that the similar phenomenon occurred in a different way in the LXX. The text here quoted, that of MS B, seems to reflect a Vorlage אצאר בבל אל אתו. It is likely that the Vorlage of the LXX here was contaminated by Prov. 22:28 לא תמצא בבליעל אחר עשו עשו אצארו. If so, one comes to the conclusion that the same proverb contaminated, though in two different ways, both the MT and the Vorlage of the LXX in Deut. 19:14. One further contamination, this time of Prov. 23:10, is to be found in y. סנה 4:5:

A few more words about the meaning of the two readings. The hifil of יג娩 actually does not mean here 'moving away' as construed by the LXX, but 'uprooting', a

12 Erroneously used in this passage; see below, p. 167.
meaning well established in biblical Hebrew (cf. e.g., Judg. 16:14; Ps. 80:9; Job 19:10). The idea is of a forceful eradication of the boundary stone. This plastic image has been substituted by a more technical term, the hif'il of 'مي' meaning 'moving back.' The idea now is of the deceitful removal of the boundary-sign back into one's neighbor's field. Yet, the original sense, connected with הב' hif. had in view the concept of the divine origin of boundary-stones, well-known from Mesopotamia. Its presence in Israel is shown by the popular saying preserved in Prov. 15:25: 'ביה תואם ישוע י' וְיִבֵּד גְּבֵרָם. The Lord is conceived as the one who establishes the boundary of the widow.

III

Deut. 29:18-20, MT: 'יהי שמשת את דריב דאתה וחת増ך כְּבָּרַן וְאָמְרֵךְ שָׁלֹם.
'יהי לי כבשירת לְּבֵן יָאָלִּים סְמֹת וְרָהִים אֵלֶּה תַּנְמוּת. לא יִהְבְּרוּ וְאֵלֶּה שָׁלֹם.
כִּי עַתָּה אַתָּה וּקְבַּעְתָּ בַּעֲשָׂא וְהָוָא יִבֵּד בָּלָהָלָהּ שָׁמָּה וְגוֹאַ.
'יהבֶּל ה' לָיִשָּׂ הָעְמָלָה שָׁמָּה...'

1QS 2:12-16: 'יהי שמשת את דריב הָעִיר הָותָה, הָבַרְבּ יָאֹלָהּ זָמָרָם. שָׁלֹם ה' לָיִשָּׂ
כִּי בְּשִׁירָה לְבֵן יָאָלִּים. נִסְמֹתָה וּרְחֵם הָוָאָה יָאָלָה שָׁלֹם. אָלֶיה וְאֵלֶּה
סְמֹמֵת עֲרָבָה וּלָלָה שָׁלֹם יִבְּדָה בָּלָהָלָהּ שָׁמָּה הָוָאָה יִבְּדָה...'

Deut. 29:19, LXX: οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ ὁ θεὸς εὐιλατεύσαι αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ἢ τότε ἐκκαιωθῆσαι ὁ χρήστος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπῳ ἑκεῖνῳ, καὶ κολληθῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ πάσαι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἤπειρας αἱ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦτῳ, καὶ ἐξαλείψει κύριος τὸ δόνομα αὐτῷ ἡ ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν σύρκοντον.

cf. CD 1:15-16:

Targum Deut 29:19:

יִבְּדֶקְוֶה בָּה כְּלֵי לֶאָשָׁהָוֶה בּכָּרָהָוֶה וּכְלָוֶה בּרֶהְתֶּה...

13This, in my opinion, is the meaning of מְשַׁר אָבָנָה in Qoh. 10:9. In the context, vv. 8-9, four actions are specified, all meaning to damage one's neighbor, but resulting in harming oneself. Cf. E. H. Plumptre, Ecclesiastes (CB; Cambridge 1881), a.l.


15Note the similar sense of the two kindred roots 'בָּשָׂ...כְּמָ'.
It is only natural that the Qumran sect would use, for its own annual ceremony of renewal of the covenant, an extended paraphrase from the old act of covenant in Deut. 28:69—30:20.\(^\text{16}\) The paraphrase agrees with the LXX in reading the verb פ"нные (= κολλάω) instead of פ"נן, and in turning the single curse (בניים) into curses of the covenant (בניים).\(^\text{17}\) The Targum partially agrees with LXX and 1QS. Thus, there cannot be any doubt that the divergence between MT and LXX + Targum is not due to the translators' interpretation, but reflects a different Hebrew text. This variant, presented by three distinct textual traditions, must therefore be very old. Could it also represent the original text?

In my opinion, there is no doubt that MT here is nearer to the original. One should note that the verb פ"נן is a favorite with the D document (8x) and the Dtr redactions (8x),\(^\text{18}\) while the curses of the covenant (in plural: בניים) appear in the immediate sequence of the passage under discussion (29:20b), as well as in 30:7 and in 28:15, 45. Thus it is to be expected that early scribes, versed in the D-Dtr phraseology, substituted the common ו"ק ב כל בניים for the rare ו"ק ב כל בניים.

The problem, however, should not be construed as a mere substitution of an awkward reading by an easier one. It has a theological dimension as well. The curse lying in a man is a mythical or at least a demoniac entity.\(^\text{19}\) That such a concept did exist in Israel is made clear by Zech 5:4 which mentions the curse lodging in houses and consuming their timber and stone. However in the context of Israelite religion at the end of biblical times, a religion dominated by the Deuteronomistic theology, such a concept of the curse was felt extraneous if not

\(^{16}\)I have tried to reconstruct the original form of this covenant in my contribution to Das Deuteronomium. Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft, N. Lohfink, ed. (BETL 68; Leuven 1985) 310-320.


\(^{19}\)Cf. A. Bertholet, Das Deuteronomium erklärt (KHat; Freiburg i. B., etc., 1899) 90: "Der Fluch wird so persönlich gedacht...dass er dem, den er überfallen will, wie ein böser Dämon auflauert (vgl Gen 4:7); freilich lasen LXX Targ. רכש [which is not exact, A. R.].
altogether idolatrous. No wonder that it was substituted with the image of the
curses of the covenant cleaving to the sinner, since the prime-mover of these had
already been declared to be the Lord (Deut. 28:21, 60).

Thus, if I have seen it right, LXX, 1QS and the Targum join in testifying to an
old variant of MT. The variant is secondary, having originated as a correction,
the grounds of which border on phraseology on one side, and theology on the
other.

IV

Before turning to the next passage, I would like to observe that the three cases so
far examined do not come as a surprise at all. Readings in the Qumran scrolls that
confirm Septuagint renderings have become a truism in biblical text criticism of
the last four decades. This is especially pertinent to the Book of Deuteronomy
where such correspondences are remarkably numerous,20 some of them submitting
even superior readings as in the passages 11:25; 32:15; 31:1; 32:8, 43. 21

A theory of text-families cannot be established on these foundations. But to our
present study the recognition of this wide correspondence is significant, because it
lends credit to other cases where the evidence might at first arise due skepti-
cism.22 On the basis of what has been said, one may approach the following in-
stance in which an apparently slim documentation leads to far-reaching conclu-
sions.

The law of the king in Deut. 17:14-20 properly calls the ruler מְלֶךְ (vv. 14, 15, 15)
and his dominion — מָמָלֵךְ (vv. 18, 20). These terms are translated in the LXX as
άρχων and άρχη respectively, a rather peculiar rendering since άρχων is the

20 Cf. E. Tov, "The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism," (Hebrew), H. M.
Orlinsky Volume—Eretz Israel 16 (Jerusalem 1982) 100-111; J. T. Milik, "Tefillin, Mezuzaot et
Targums (4Q 128—4Q157)," in Qumran, Grotte 4 II (DJD; Oxford 1977), 6. 31 ff.

21 Cf. Milik (preceding note) 48-50; 73; D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, Qumran Cave I
(DJD; Oxford, 1955), 1. 59-60; P. W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32)

most of his stricture, however, refers to minor divergences between the MT and the LXX,
such as pronominal suffixes.
standard equivalent of אַשְׁנָא in the Pentateuch.\(^{23}\) This could have been attributed without hesitation to the conception of the translator\(^{24}\) were it not for CD 5:12 which refers to the same law saying: ...ועל משעך כותב אל ישה בל נפש. Not only does אַשְׁנָא stand here for king, but David, the king of Israel par excellence, is referred to as an illustration of a אַשְׁנָא whose conduct should have conformed to the ruling of Deut. 17:17. One is led to infer that the LXX translated here from a Hebrew Vorlage that read אַשְׁנָא throughout the king's law—one more correspondence between the Greek Deuteronomy and the readings contained in the texts of the Qumran sect.

This conclusion demands our going into the other passages in the Pentateuch where בֶּן מֶלֶךְ occurs in the MT in order to follow up its rendering in the LXX. One finds, indeed, that the standard Greek equivalent to the Hebrew בֶּן מֶלֶךְ is βασιλεύς. However, the situation becomes complex whenever a king of Israel is mentioned. In most of Genesis its equivalent is βασιλεύς (17:6, 16; 35:11; 36:31), in the rest of the Pentateuch it is ἀρχων (Gen 49:20; Num. 23:21; Deut. 17:14, 15, 15; 28:36; 33:5).

These data suggest that the Hebrew Vorlage of the Greek Pentateuch contained a recension in which all Israelite 'kings' had been turned into 'princes'!

A special problem is posed by five additional instances of ἀρχων, namely those corresponding to MT בֶּן מֶלֶךְ: Lev 18:21; 20:2, 3, 4, 5.\(^{25}\) In conjunction with the other instances,\(^{26}\) one should surmise that here too the Vorlage read אַשְׁנָא. Yet, the

\(^{23}\)Out of 109 occurrences of ἀρχων, 65 are equivalents of אַשְׁנָא in the MT; next come the equivalents of רָשׁ, 15 occurrences only.

\(^{24}\)Cf. the cases of θυσιαστήρων and προσήλυτος discussed by R. Marcus, "Jewish and Greek Elements in the Septuagint," L. Ginzberg Jubilee Volume (English Section) (New York 1945) 227-245, ad p. 242, with reference to earlier discussions by Churgin and Meek.

\(^{25}\)In what follows I have come near to Z. Frankel, Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik, (Leipzig 1851) 155-156. The alternative explanation of A. Geiger, Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel, (Breslau 1857) 299-308, is farfetched, in my opinion. Cf. also A. Geiger, Nachgelassene Schriften, (ed. L. Geiger; Breslau 1885), 4. 74.

\(^{26}\)Of course if one does not take into account the usual equivalents of ἀρχων, he will come to utterly different conclusions; cf. G. C. Heider, The Cult of Molek: A Reassessment (JSOT Supp. Ser. 43; Sheffield 1985) 236-239.
misinterpretation contained in such a reading is astounding,\textsuperscript{27} and its outcome — self-defying: what is the terrible crime committed by giving one's offspring to the 'prince' (Lev 20:2, 3, 4, 5)? A solution to this seems to be offered by Lev 18:21. Here the Hebrewaber הלוע ותת המורים is rendered by the LXX: και ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐ δώσεις λατρεύειν ἐρχόντα. Since λατρεύω in the Pentateuch usually applies to worship,\textsuperscript{28} it appears that the Greek translator of this passage, reading in his Vorlage לשביעי לא תהלת המורים,\textsuperscript{29} rightly interpreted it as a protest against king-veneration in Israel. As far as I can see, we face here a midrashic exposition: the old, obsolete injunction against Molek-worship was reinterpreted as denying the ruler any divine qualities.\textsuperscript{30}

At the same time this very assertion reveals the rationale for the substitution of נביא instead of מלח whenever it applied to the rulers of Israel: it was meant to lower the king's stature in the presence of the only true king, the Lord God of Israel.

In search of the circles responsible for such a revision in the text of the Pentateuch, we shall consider further biblical passages where נביא is used in the sense of the state leader. Most significant is 1 Ki. 11:34. Solomon being denied tenthwidths of his kingdom and thus remaining ruler over a much curtailed state is titled נביא. As against him Jeroboam, who will reign wherever he wishes, will be a מלח over Israel (v. 37).\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{27}For our problem it does not make any difference what the original meaning of molek-cult was. It is clear that by the third century B.C.E. that meaning was all but forgotten; cf. further below, n. 30.

\textsuperscript{28}As noted long ago by H. St. J. Thackeray, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, (Cambridge 1909) 8.

\textsuperscript{29}Sam. Pent.: לשביעי לא תהלת המורים.

\textsuperscript{30}Cf. the saying in b. Sanh. 64a, attributed to Rabbi Haninah ben Antigonus (1-2 century, C.E.): ממנ התרחשת שבעים מלח? כל ש listar במליה אריאלו זיירוא במליה כוס. Since the saying was transmitted through the Amora Abbaye, one may doubt if the ending אריאלו זיירוא במליה כוס is original. Different authorities for a similar saying are quoted in y. Sanh. 7:10. An alternative reinterpretation was offered already by the second century B.C.E.: the injunctions of Lev. 18:21; 20:2-5 were explained as an interdiction of mixed marriages; cf. Jubilees 30:5-16 together with m. Meg. 4:9; b. Meg. 25a and T.J. to Lev. 18:21.

\textsuperscript{31}The original sequence of 1 Ki. 11:26-40 described the revolt of Jeroboam, incited by the prophet Ahijah during the reign of Solomon. Besides, it was not hampered by the impossible arithmetic 12-10=1 (vv 32, 36). Therefore the original elements in this story lie
This meaning of נִשְׁרָה, as referring to a ruler whose dominion is limited geographically and—we may add—politically, seems to be the one used in the ipsissima verba of Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{32} He did not avoid לְדָּם, as is made clear by Ezek. 7:27\textsuperscript{33} and 17:12, but preferred to designate the kings of Judah of his times, all of them vassals to the great empires, as מִשְׁרָה: 12:10, 12; 19:1; 21:17, 30.

Ezekiel’s disciples, who transmitted his words and compiled his book, appropriated his terminology using it persistently as a designation for all Israelite kings, past and future. This is made clear by the evidently secondary passage Ezek 34:17-31\textsuperscript{34} where David himself, about to return, is designated נִשְׁרָה (v. 24). Along the same line, in my view, one should construe the title נִשְׁרָה for the ruler occurring in the reconstruction program (Ezek. 40-48). It is the result of a compromise, made by Ezekiel’s disciples, between their master’s antimonarchic theology (Ezek 34:1-16: the Lord alone will be Israel’s shepherd) and their own perception that a state must have a leader, albeit submitted to the Lord. That this נִשְׁרָה-theology persisted for generations, is proved by the fact that the revision of the Book of Ezekiel was done gradually: of the nine occurrences of לְדָּם over Israel in the MT of Ezekiel, two are translated by the LXX with βασιλέας (1:2, 17:12), one is left out from the Greek (7:27) and six others are represented by ἀρχηγόν (37:22, 22, 24) and ἱγοῦμενος (43:7, 7, 9), each being the standard rendering of נִשְׁרָה in vv 26-31, 34, 37, 40. Cf. Z. Talshir, The Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom and its Development (Hebrew University M.A. Thesis; Jerusalem 1976) 61-80, esp. 77-80 [Hebrew].

\textsuperscript{32}L. Rost, Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament (BWANT\textsuperscript{4} 24, 1938; Repr. Darmstadt 1967) 72.

\textsuperscript{33}אשֵׁר יְהֹוָה in Ezek 7:27 is not represented by the LXX. But the MT is original: three parallel members appear in 7:26b and three in 7:27a. נִשְׁרָה here is plausibly a synonym of נְשָׁר; cf. M. Greenberg, Ezekiel, 1-20 (Anchor Bible; Garden City, N. Y. 1983) 156. The same meaning has הָרְדָּם = ἀρχηγὸς in Ezek. 22:26, since the passage in Ezek. 22:25-28 is but a comment on Zeph. 3:3-4.

\textsuperscript{34}Ezek 34 is perhaps the best start for distinguishing original and secondary portions in the book of Ezekiel. See my arguments in "The Battle of David and Goliath," Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel (ed. J. Neusner et alii; Philadelphia 1987) 117-151, ad pp. 142-143, with former literature at n. 81. That article having been edited without my consent, I decline responsibility for its exact wording.
in its own textual milieu.\textsuperscript{35} One may conclude that the substitution of מַלִּים for מֶשֶׁךְ in the LXX-Vorlage of most of the Pentateuch and Ezekiel is due to a theological revision that insisted on the Lord’s exclusive kingship and the consequent re-dimensioning of human rule.\textsuperscript{36} The persistence of this trend is proved by the large segments of Qumran literature that do not envisage a king for the future, but a נַשָּׂא (תּוּדָּה) as a secular leader of the Sons of Light (1Q5s b v 20; 1QM iii 12 + 4QM\textsuperscript{6}; 4QPsSa. 5—6:33;\textsuperscript{37} 1QM v 1; 4QpIsha. v 20). Along the same line one may explain the unstable position given to the kingdom of David in the Rabbinic liturgy: David was secondarily introduced in the fourteenth of the eighteen blessings; alternatively the (present) fifteenth blessing, wholly dedicated to him, was composed as late as the 3rd century C.E.\textsuperscript{39} The original expectations of the Pharisees were expressed in the tenth and eleventh blessings which pray for the ingathering of the exiles and the kingdom of God.

Coming back to the Greek Pentateuch, we note one single exception (in the block Gen 49—Deut. 33) to the assumed substitution of מַלִּים with מֶשֶׁךְ in its Vorlage: this is Num. 24:7: “A man will come out of his (Israel’s) seed and will rule many peoples, his kingdom will be exalted over Gog, his kingdom will be elevated.” Assuming that there too there was a Hebrew Vorlage (cf. Sam. Pent.: מַלִּים for MT מֶשֶׁךְ), one wonders whether a different revision introduced here this eschatological homily,\textsuperscript{40} or was it the אֶשֶׁת-מששנ recension that distinguished between historical future times, when Israel would be ruled by a prince, and the eschaton entailing a supernatural kingdom.

\textsuperscript{35} Incidentally, the fact that two different terms translating אֶשֶׁת-מששנ correspond here to MT מַלִּים demonstrates that the non-correspondence of the Greek to the MT can hardly be attributed to the translator(s).

\textsuperscript{36} A similar theological revision operated in the books Genesis—Judges, Ezekiel and most of LXX-Jeremiah expunging מַלִּים as a title for the Lord.

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. M. Baille, Qumran Grotte 4 III (DJD; Oxford 1982) 7.62.

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. J. Allegro (supra n. 4) 12.


\textsuperscript{40} Cf. the many homilies of this kind to Num. 24:17 in the next song of Balaam.
We began our study with text-critical induction and to text-criticism we shall now return. Was the correction of נָשָׁא מַלֶּךָ in the Pentateuch limited to the LXX-Vorlage and the Qumranic texts? In my opinion there is one passage where it affected the MT as well, namely Exod. 22:27: אַלּוּחַ אֲכָלֵה חַדַּי נָשָׁא יִשָּׁא אֵלָה יְהֹוָה.

The pair of nouns appearing here in parallelism is unique; everywhere else one finds דָּוִד וֹטַח (Prov. 24:21; 25:2). Moreover, the curse of god and king is a common expression, as attested by 1 Ki. 21:10, 13; Isa. 8:21. On this basis one could surmise that the original phrasing of the law mentioned a king parallel to God. It will not be easy to attribute the pair אַלּוּחַ וֹטַח to the idiosyncrasy of the author of the Book of Covenant, seeing that אַלּוּחַ וֹטַח was not a stock-phrase of the older documents.

Now, at any rate, since we recognized a נָשָׁא-recension at work in Hebrew manuscripts of the Pentateuch, we are allowed to deduce that the same kind of correction entered, by way of contamination, the MT of this verse. Thus, notwithstanding the absence of direct textual evidence, I believe the following to be a plausible restoration of the text of Exod. 22:27: אַלּוּחַ אֲכָלֵה מַלֶּךָ יִשָּׁא אֵלָה יְהֹוָה.

POSTSCRIPTUM While this article was being set, Prof. Paul E. Dion (Toronto) published a critical note in which he masterfully indicated more correspondences between 11Q Temple paraphrases and the Greek Pentateuch (Lev. 1:15; 7:2; Deut. 12:27). The cumulative evidence makes it plausible that in one passage at least, Deut. 12:27, 11Q Temple and the LXX attest a real variant, namely: וַיֶּעַבֵּר הָאָבָרֶךְ... והַרְגָּן עַל יִשָּׁא מַלֶּךָ אָלָה. The secondary nature of this reading comes out clearly from Prof. Dion's discussion.

41 Besides, the epithets 'king' and 'god' were applied to YHWH: Ps. 5:3; 68:25; 84:4; 145:1. Outside Israel, cf. the Akkadian pair ḫu (DINGIR) u @Setter (LUGAL); references in the Assyrian Dictionary (Chicago, 1960), 7. 97-98.