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Abstract

In this dissertation, I propose and apply a methodology that situates the Septuagint within the broader scribal culture of the ancient world. Drawing on theory from the field of Translation Studies and a comparative analysis of textual and translation data in Exodus 1-14, I argue that the phenomena of translation and textual transmission are fundamentally similar, particularly in the case of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint.

First, I consider the extent to which textual transmission could be considered translation, using the framework of “intralingual translation” derived from the field of Translation Studies. Second, I argue that the translator held the Hebrew from the source text in short-term memory before translating. This notion suggests that many of the differences between the Septuagint and the Hebrew Bible result from changes to the Hebrew in the translator’s mind before any translation has occurred. Third, I present a full investigation of the variants in Exodus 1, in both Hebrew manuscripts and the Septuagint, finding that the types of change are essentially the same in both transmission and translation. Finally, I consider “large-scale” variation in the Ten Plagues narrative, analyzing a much discussed pattern of insertions found in 4QpaleoExod™ and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Nothing comparable can be found in the Septuagint, showing that the translator, in this case, was more conservative in the transmission of the text than were some scribes.

The conclusions of my dissertation are significant: the process of translation does not, as many assume, introduce an insurmountable barrier between the Greek and the Hebrew text it represents; rather, the Septuagint should be used, though carefully, to reconstruct its source text for use in textual criticism and other studies.
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1 - Introduction

The Old Greek translation (OG) of the Hebrew Bible (HB), commonly called the "Septuagint," varies from the Hebrew of its source, or Vorlage, for many reasons. The most apparent difference is the use of Greek instead of Hebrew. While this might be obvious, it is worth saying; the only way to produce a version of the Hebrew Vorlage without any differences would be to replicate the Vorlage exactly. The process of translating into another language assumes and entails a myriad of differences.\(^1\) Even if we take the differences between the two languages into account, however, there remain many apparent dissimilarities between the OG and its Vorlage. Words appear to be added, removed, or changed in meaning. Details are changed; confusing phrases are explained within the text. Traditionally,\(^2\) such differences between the OG and its Hebrew Vorlage tend to be explained as the result of translation. Since translation already introduces a host of differences by virtue of using a different language, it seems natural to attribute any and every difference to the process of translation.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has challenged this traditional perception. In the Scrolls, we find numerous Hebrew manuscripts that agree with the translation found in OG. The differences we formerly saw between OG and “the Hebrew”—that is, the Masoretic Text (MT), before the discovery of the Scrolls—were actually differences between OG’s Hebrew Vorlage and MT. In other words, these differences did not stem from the process of translation. Regardless, the old perspective on the OG, which tends to put most differences into the catch-all category of “resulting from translation,” persists in many fields. Within the field of textual criticism of the HB, the evidence from the Scrolls has prompted a paradigm shift, in which the manuscript evidence has been re-evaluated. The OG is no longer set aside as an unreliable translation, as it has been shown to accurately preserve many ancient variant readings. The OG has thus moved out of the margins of HB textual criticism so that it now occupies a position of great significance.


\(^{2}\) That is, within the modern academic era; older approaches to the OG, and some modern approaches (e.g., in the Eastern Orthodox Church), treat OG differently.
New evidence from the Scrolls gives us a fuller picture of the kind of data and processes involved in the transmission of Hebrew texts during the late Second Temple period. Manuscripts were not simply copied letter-by-letter with the occasional scribal error; rather, significant changes were introduced that affect the meaning of the text. Based on evidence within the OG itself, scholars have long known that basic scribal errors (e.g., haplography, dittography, graphic and aural confusion) were committed by the translators; the more semantically significant differences—those resulting in a significant change in meaning—are the differences traditionally attributed to the translation process. In light of these new data from the Scrolls, however, where significant changes in meaning were introduced into the manuscript tradition, we find that there is significant overlap between transmission and translation. In other words, there is a striking similarity between the phenomena involved in the variation between Hebrew Bible manuscripts themselves, and the phenomena involved in the differences between the OG and HB manuscripts in general.

In the standard work on HB textual criticism, Emanuel Tov discusses the following impetuses—among others—for variation in Hebrew manuscripts involving significant change in meaning to the text: “Exegetical Changes” (including “Contextual Changes” and “Theological Changes”), “Harmonizations,” “Explanatory and Exegetical Additions to the Body of the Text,” and “Midrash-Like Changes and Additions.” Tov’s categories of change in the OG are remarkably similar, including: “Contextual Exegesis,” “Theological Exegesis,” and “Midrashic Tendencies.” “Contextual exegesis” and “theological exegesis” in OG correspond to the two subcategories of “exegetical” change in Hebrew manuscripts, “contextual” and “theological” change. The influence of a “midrashic” approach is noted in both manuscript transmission and

5 Tov, Textual Criticism, vii, 119-120, 122.
OG translation. Finally, the “harmonizations” and explanatory/exegetical additions seen in Hebrew manuscripts, such as those found also in OG, could be subsumed under Tov’s OG categories for contextual and theological exegesis.

Judging by the ways in which Tov’s categories describe the evidence, transmission of HB manuscripts and OG translation are demonstrably similar. The idea behind the present study is simple: to see just how similar isomorphic translation in OG and textual transmission of the Hebrew text are, by comparing manuscript transmission and OG translation along the lines of text-critical categories. Scribes and OG translators did many of the same things with the text, but did they do so to the same extent and for the same reasons? Does translation entail more variation than transmission? Are there particular types of variation that are characteristic of translation and other types more characteristic of transmission? As Tov puts it, “Hebrew scribes and translators inserted similar changes in their manuscripts, and it is often hard to distinguish between the two options.”

In this study, I hope to show that—given the extensive similarity between the two types of data—it is impossible to determine whether the insertion or change derives from the Vorlage’s scribe or the translator, so long as the OG isomorphically represents grammatical Hebrew.

---

In the field of Analytic Philosophy, scholars use hypothetical scenarios to help tease out the precise nature of the concepts under discussion. When considering the nature of identity, for example, philosophers consider far-fetched situations involving such things as time travel or brain transplantation to map out the relationship of personal identity to body, brain, and memory. Before moving into the methodological details undergirding this thesis, I would like to engage the reader in a similarly oriented thought-experiment. Imagine the following hypothetical situation, occurring sometime in the 3rd or 2nd century BCE. A scribe sits at his work, making a

---

6 See the discussion in Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 80-84, where the similarity of scribal activity and translation is noted for a wide range of phenomena; cf. also Wright, “Scribes, Translators and the Formation of Authoritative Scripture,” 6, 8-14.

7 Tov, Textual Criticism, 120.

8 On this term, see section 1.3 below.

9 Although there were female scribes in some Ancient Near Eastern cultures—cf. Karel van der Toorn, Scribal
copy of a scroll of Exodus. However, along with copying the Vorlage onto another Hebrew manuscript, this scribe also translates the Hebrew into Greek, on a third scroll. In other words, he is multitasking, producing a Hebrew manuscript and a Greek translation at the same time. We obviously cannot know with any certainty the plausibility of such a scenario, but—as with the case of time travel and brain transplants in the discussion of personal identity—the plausibility is beside the point. In our scenario, the scribe/translator has two Vorlagen, the parent Hebrew manuscript serving as the Vorlage of the new Hebrew manuscript, and the new Hebrew manuscript serving as the Vorlage of the Greek translation. Now, imagine a second scenario where there is no intermediate step of copying the first Hebrew scroll onto a second manuscript; the scribe/translator merely translates based on the parent Hebrew manuscript. This is the scenario most of us would assume for the process of OG translation. What is the difference between these two scenarios? Does the translator still have an idea of what the Hebrew is in his mind before translating into Greek? It seems sensible to assume that he does. The only difference, then, would seem to be the actual existence of a second physical scroll with Hebrew written on it by the tradent. Yet, in methodologies for using the OG in textual criticism, one criteria for using the OG as evidence is whether or not it represents its physical Vorlage. What if it represents a Hebrew text, but this text never had a physical existence?

Much of Eugene Ulrich’s work has explored the overlap of text transmission and text production, showing that the same processes are in play for both scribes and editors. In a similar fashion, I would like to explore the overlap of transmission and translation, arguing that the same processes are in play for both scribes and translators. This topic was recently broached by Benjamin Wright in a 2014 article. There, Wright explores the idea that translation was a

---

*Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 285n5—it is probable that most scribes (and translators) in Judea were male; as such, I will refer to scribes and translators using masculine pronouns.

10 See section 2.2.2 for a sustained argument for this view.


12 Wright, “Scribes, Translators and the Formation of Authoritative Scripture.”
“scribal activity,” noting that few studies have approached the two activities in tandem. He first suggests that translations exist on the same continuum on which we plot various types of “reworkings.” Stating that “we can compare the phenomena that we find in translations, in particular in the Septuagint, with the scribal interventions that we identify in Hebrew manuscripts,” Wright proceeds to give some examples of scribal activity in translation: “Scribal Corruption,” “Redaction and Rewriting,” “Harmonistic Editing,” and “Stylistic Abbreviation.” The examples demonstrate that translators, though they transferred meaning from Hebrew to Greek, used the same tools and processes as scribes who worked only within Hebrew. In Wright’s opinion, OG translations are “just as much the result of scribal activity as any copy of a manuscript found at Qumran”; moreover, for Wright, “[t]ranslators were scribes” whose work reveals the same kind of concerns as other scribes. The point here is clear: Wright wants to highlight the role of scribal activity in OG translation. The same goal is a primary aim in this study, as well. Through extensive theoretical discussion and an in-depth and comprehensive textual analysis, I hope to firmly establish Wright’s assertion about the similarity of translation and scribalism.

1.1 - Overview

My dissertation consists of four main parts. In the following sections of Chapter One, I discuss my basic methodological bases with respect to textual criticism, OG translation

19 The title of this study, “Translators as Scribes,” is not taken from this passage in Wright’s article, although I agree with the statement. A full draft of this study—title included—was completed before the publication of Wright’s 2014 article.
21 Having established this point of view, Wright uses the remainder of the article (14-29) to consider mechanisms by which texts garner authority, comparing the authority of translations to the authority of “reworkings,” both of which “extend and enhance the authority of prior texts” (14).
technique, and the use of the OG in textual criticism, and I discuss the selection of this study’s corpus. In Chapter Two, I explore theoretical issues involving the conceptual overlaps between transmission and translation. In Chapter Three, I give an in-depth analysis and comparison of textual data in the Hebrew manuscripts and translation data in the OG, focusing on scribal errors and individual variants. In Chapter Four, I focus on large-scale variants, particularly the pattern of insertions that distinguish the edition of Exodus found in 4QpaleoExod and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), comparing the character of the OG with this edition. In Chapter Five, I give a brief summary of my conclusions and explore some of their implications.

One central question frames the various discussions of the dissertation: To what extent did OG translators operate in the same manner as scribes—those who transmitted the text of the HB? In Chapters Two, Three, and Four, I explore this question using a variety of approaches, utilizing a close analysis of the texts and drawing on methodology from Translation Studies and Septuagint Studies. In Chapter Two, I consider some theoretical aspects of the transmission process. Using the concept of “Intralingual Translation” found in the field of Translation Studies, I analyze transmission of the Hebrew text and suggest that transmission, in large part, utilizes the same tools as those used in translation. In other words, within the transmission process, scribal changes can be seen as cases of intralingual translation. In Chapter Two, I also consider some theoretical aspects of the translation process. I begin with recent trends in Septuagint Studies, which suggest that most texts in OG follow a “source oriented” approach to translation, in which the purpose of the target text (the Greek) is to give access to the source text (the Hebrew). I then build an argument for the existence of a mental version of the source text held in the mind of the translator. I suggest that a majority of changes that occur in the making of OG in fact occur as the translator holds the Hebrew text in his mind, before the Hebrew source is translated into Greek. This sets the stage for my close textual analysis by laying out a model wherein translators change the text in precisely the same ways as scribes.

In Chapter Three, I conduct a thorough analysis of the differences between OG and the Hebrew text in Exodus 1, as well as the variants found in the Hebrew witnesses to Exodus 1. I compare the types of change we find in both these data sets, finding that, excepting the obvious
language differences between OG and the Hebrew, there is little difference in terms of what we see, how often we see it, and where in the text we find it. All of this suggests that OG translators altered their source text in essentially the same ways and to the same extent as the scribes who transmitted the text in Hebrew. Finally, in Chapter Four, I focus on large-scale variants—that is, variants that are related to one another—in the Ten Plagues narrative. In Exodus 1-14, a variety of extended insertions found in 4QpaleoExod$m$ and SP significantly alters the tenor and message of the Ten Plagues narrative. When we compare these insertions—found in Hebrew manuscripts—to the evidence of OG, we find that there is nothing parallel in OG. In this case, then, the Septuagint translator does not change the text to the same extent as the scribes transmitting the text in Hebrew.

Throughout this study, I highlight the points of similarity between OG translation and the transmission of Hebrew manuscripts. I contend that transmission could be considered intralingual translation at points. I show that there was a version of the text—albeit a mental version—that contained the Hebrew behind what is translated in the OG. I consider data suggesting that the OG translators did not feel a greater freedom to change that Hebrew text, with a corresponding amount of change between the Hebrew manuscripts and OG translation. Finally, when large-scale variation is considered, the Septuagint translator is more conservative than the scribes who transmitted the text in Hebrew. All of this evidence suggests a great overlap between scribalism and translation in the ancient world. Given this research, scholars of Textual Criticism and Septuagint Studies should give greater consideration to the evidence of OG. No longer should it be dismissed as translation; instead, the discernible layers of translation must be pulled back, and the Hebrew behind the Greek should be used.

---

In the remainder of the introduction, I will discuss three areas of methodology that are pertinent to the present study. First, a general methodology for textual criticism informs the specific text-critical framework I use. Second, the area of Septuagint Studies focused on theories of translation technique is extremely important for this study, since analysis of OG must constantly consider elements of translation technique. Third, it is necessary to establish a general
framework for understanding the use of OG in textual criticism, though we will seek to move beyond such a framework. In what follows, I review work in each field and articulate my own methodological convictions for each of these areas. Finally, I describe the corpus of my study and the reasons for its selection.

1.2 - Text-Critical Theory

The aspects of textual criticism most pertinent to this study include the history of textual development, the overlap of text transmission and text production, the role of orality and memory in textual development, and the categorization of text-critical data. Given the importance of categorizing text-critical data for Chapters Three and Four of this study, in the fourth section (1.2.4) I will include my own perspective on categorizing text-critical data.

1.2.1 – Modeling the History of Textual Development

There are essentially six different approaches to describing the developmental history of the text of the HB. For a long time the first, which I will call the “three-text model,” went unchallenged. However, with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and their subsequent publication, significant evidence challenging this model has emerged. As a result, five further models have been proposed, each with its own strengths and weaknesses: Frank Moore Cross’s (and William Albright’s) theory of local texts; Shemaryahu Talmon’s theory of multiple pristine texts; Emanuel Tov’s theory of minimal reconstruction of textual history; Eugene Ulrich’s theory of multiple literary editions; and the theory that these preceding theories can be combined or blended, represented by Ronald Hendel.

Before the discovery of the Scrolls, scholars treated the history of the text along the lines of the extant textual witnesses at their disposal. In their view, the MT was one type, considered to

---

be the best; the OG was another type, considered inferior because it is a translation; and the SP was a third type, considered inferior because of its sectarian content relating to the Samaritans. This model cannot account for the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls biblical manuscripts. The Scrolls show that there were manuscripts that were not affiliated with any of these three text types. Moreover, there are different manuscripts at Qumran that agree at various points with MT, SP, or OG, suggesting that these three texts do not represent three text-families or text-types. The manuscripts at Qumran display a variety of textual affiliations, supporting other witnesses besides MT and showing that there was textual variety at the time. As a result, the three-text model fails: fitting every witness into three types (whether MT, OG, and SP) clearly does not work because of the non-aligned texts. Moreover, the presence of both longer and shorter texts within the same collection points to the fact that the collections of texts in MT (and OG and SP) were assembled ad hoc, not according to any text-type or scribal school. Finally, the scrolls show that the SP does not actually contain much sectarian material—for example, 4QpaleoExod contains many of the expansions found in SP—and that OG did not make as many changes to its Vorlage as was previously thought. The three-text model is therefore inadequate. Despite widespread acknowledgment of its shortcomings, there are instances where the three-text model may influence more modern approaches like those of Tov and Segal (see below).

Frank Moore Cross, building on the work of William Albright, attempted to build a model that accounted for the data in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He postulated that three text-types

---


27 And thus expansive and later; e.g., MT Jeremiah.

28 And thus earlier; e.g., MT Numbers.


30 Frank Moore Cross, “The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text,” *IEJ* 16...
had developed in three locations where the texts were preserved, differing from one another as a result of the distance between the locations. These three text-types are: Babylonian, a short text that is earliest and essentially the best, though it contains many minor scribal errors; Egyptian, a somewhat expanded text, though still much shorter than and preferable to the third text-type; and Palestinian, which was much longer and characterized by expansion. Cross has been criticized for two main reasons. First, he has been characterized as taking the three-text model and assigning locations to the three collections; MT is the Babylonian text, OG is the Egyptian text, and SP is the Palestinian text. In fact, Cross does not make this simple equation; at numerous points in his work, it is clear that he viewed the later collections as containing several different text-types. For example, MT Jeremiah is Palestinian, and the OG contains evidence of all three text-types. Thus, Cross’s three text-types do not align with the earlier three-text model’s division of MT, OG, and SP. Second, the evidence that connects the locations of Egypt and Babylon to their two respective text types is very sparse. Moreover, in the Dead Sea Scrolls we see many text-types together in one location, which seems to argue against their belonging to different locales. Shemaryahu Talmon made the important observation that we do not have much evidence at our disposal, even with the Dead Sea Scrolls, and as a result much of the HB textual history remains unknown. He posited that there were many text-types, only a few of which survived. These surviving texts are “pristine” in the sense that it is impossible for us to understand their development before the physical evidence appears. That is, for all intents and purposes we must take each as its own pristine entity. Talmon claimed that the text-types corresponded to religious groups and their interests, each group having its own text-type. There are two difficulties with this theory. First, Talmon made no attempt to reconstruct the history of the text beyond our

---

31 Cross, “Contribution.”
33 Hendel, “Assessing.”
physical evidence. Although Talmon’s strong arguments should make us very cautious when attempting such reconstructions, we nevertheless have the necessary evidence at our disposal to attempt some limited reconstruction. Second, at Qumran we find many different text-types together in one collection, though these were supposedly adopted by different religious groups. Texts agreeing with the SP (and therefore associated with the Samaritans) were found alongside those agreeing with the MT (and therefore associated with the Pharisees). Moreover, there are very few truly sectarian variants in the manuscript evidence.35

Like Talmon, Emanuel Tov’s scholarship on text-critical theory begins with the perils of extensive reconstruction of the text’s history prior to our physical evidence.36 For Tov, there is not enough physical evidence for a sweeping theory like Cross’s. Instead, Tov suggests that we focus on the evidence at our disposal (i.e., the MT, SP, OG, and Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts), and that we should see how these manuscripts relate to one another. Tov states strongly that we should not presume that MT is the best text and that it should not be central in considerations of textual criticism.37 Moreover, we should allow for a fourth category of “non-aligned” texts that do not affiliate with MT, SP, or OG (a point also made by Talmon).

Tov’s theory—which, as a result of the status of his authoritative volume on textual criticism,38 is perhaps the most widespread and dominant text-critical theory—has nevertheless been critiqued. Tov recognizes in theory that the MT is not central in textual criticism, that the collections MT, SP, and OG do not necessarily indicate text types, and that one should use text-critical data to formulate theories of textual affiliation. However, in practice Tov’s method does not always seem to follow these three important points. Manuscripts from Qumran are compared to the MT, SP, and OG, and categorized based on which of these they most agree with. In other words, the MT, SP, and OG—whose evidence gives us no reason to suspect that every book contained within belong to one text-type—are treated as the three text-types into which other manuscripts must fit. Segal has argued persuasively that Tov’s categories do not follow from the

35 Ulrich, “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants.’”
37 Tov, Textual Criticism, 158.
38 Tov, Textual Criticism.
types of text-critical data that indicate affiliation.\textsuperscript{39} In practice, then, Tov’s work sometimes resembles the three-text model that he himself has criticized. His method presents three additional difficulties. First, it seems to favor the MT implicitly. If a manuscript agrees 50\% of the time with the MT, then it is categorized as agreeing with MT.\textsuperscript{40} A study by Chelica Hiltunen\textsuperscript{41} shows that, if this one principle were not followed—that is, if manuscripts affiliated equally with MT and another group (SP or OG) were categorized as such—Tov’s overall picture of the affiliation of the Scrolls manuscripts would be drastically altered. Second, I find that Tov uses statistics and percentages loosely; contrary to the method he follows, textual affiliation cannot be determined by counting up the total number of agreements and disagreements. Third, Tov begins with the notion that a manuscript must agree with MT, OG, SP, or it is non-affiliated; affiliation need not be so black and white, however.

Eugene Ulrich’s work on text-critical models is perhaps the most promising. He has shown that the processes of text production (i.e., composition, redaction, etc.) and text transmission are remarkably similar.\textsuperscript{42} In the Pentateuch and Prophets we see evidence that redactors “retold” and “reshaped” the material prior to its existence in the form it takes in the HB; these reshaped products were then at some point given authority as Scripture. The Scrolls have shown us that the exact same retelling, reshaping, and authorization occurred during manuscript transmission. For example, 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and SP show evidence of reshaping of the editions of Exodus found in OG and in MT; 4QJer\textsuperscript{a} and 4QJer\textsuperscript{d} (in agreement with OG) evidence an earlier version of Jeremiah that was reshaped as found in MT. Thus, different literary editions were created. The Scrolls also show us that these different editions were in circulation simultaneously during the late Second Temple period. Rather than focusing on a sweeping theory

\textsuperscript{39} Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible.”
\textsuperscript{41} Chelica Hiltunen, “An Examination of the Supposed pre-Samaritan Texts from Qumran” (M.A. Thesis, Trinity Western University, 2008).
of the entire HB or trying to determine the relationships of MT, SP, and OG (which are recognized as later, accidental collections), Ulrich focuses on a book-by-book description, showing which versions of each book were earlier and which later. Correspondingly, Ulrich argues that these multiple literary editions are what should be referred to by the term “text-type.” Ulrich has also made the strongest case for differentiating different types or “levels” of variation. For Ulrich, there are orthographic variants, individual variants, individual insertions, and patterns of variants (edition-level variation). Orthographic variants are of no value in determining textual affiliation. Moreover, Ulrich suggests that, for the purposes of determining the character of a witness, we should “[temporarily remove] individual textual variants that do not seem related to the pattern of variants by which [a scribe] systematically reworked an existing edition.” By focusing on large-scale indicative variants and ignoring variations in orthography and individual variants as insignificant for determining affiliation, Ulrich has shown that different “literary editions” of biblical books circulated during the Second Temple period.

According to Ulrich, his own theory and the theories of Cross, Talmon and Tov are complementary in many ways. In their strong points, they essentially describe different aspects of textual transmission and could be joined in a composite theory. Ronald Hendel has attempted to sketch such a blended model. He utilizes the overall framework of Cross and the chronological focus on multiple editions from Ulrich. He also focuses primarily on the evidence at our disposal, with Tov, and allows for non-aligned texts, with Talmon and Tov.

One factor that the most recent models hold in common is the principle that text-critical

43 Ulrich, Origins, 95-98.
45 See also below for further discussion of categorization of variants.
46 Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” 83. Note that orthographic differences are correctly deemed not to be true variants at all.
48 Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text.”
49 Hendel, “Assessing.”
data should shape one’s overall theory of textual history; the corollary point, given the influence of the old three-text model, is that the arbitrary collections found in MT, OG, and SP should not shape one’s overall theory. Although scholars generally agree on this point, I find that in practice it is not applied rigorously enough. One illustrative example of this is found in Michael Segal’s excellent 2007 article, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” A significant portion of this article is devoted to a critique of Tov’s method with respect to the point I am making here: Tov does not allow the textual data to shape his method in practice. One by one, Segal rejects Tov’s main categories by showing that none of the groups is “characterized by any specific tendencies.” In other words, Tov’s categories are not derived from the text-critical data. When he arrives at Tov’s grouping of pre-Samaritan manuscripts, however, Segal finds that here there actually is text-critical evidence supporting the grouping. Segal argues convincingly that the pre-Samaritan manuscripts (along with the SP) are not merely harmonistic but, more specifically, are characterized by the insertion of ideas from Deuteronomy into Exodus, such that the “earlier” book will have all of the material it is supposed to have. Although we might add that this phenomenon occurs also when Exodus refers to earlier incidents (i.e., in Exodus 1-14), the point here is that Segal has actually used text-critical evidence to argue that a particular set of texts should be grouped together. Up to this point, Segal has applied in practice the point that Tov emphasizes in theory. On the basis of this evidence, though, he concludes that a grouping of the SP and the proto-SP Scrolls is valid. Segal does not, however, show that all the texts of SP—for example, SP Leviticus—are characterized by this type of variation; nor could he, given the data of SP Leviticus. Moreover, he does not consider whether texts outside of SP and the Scrolls—for example, MT Jeremiah—should belong to this text grouping because they contain similar variation. In other words, at the end of his excellent argument for a particular textual grouping, using sound theory about how texts should be grouped, Segal appears to allow the presumption that all of the books of one collection (SP) should be grouped together to the exclusion of books.

50 Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible.”
in another collection. In my opinion, the group he is describing could consist of SP Exodus, SP Numbers, MT Jeremiah, and the “proto-SP” Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts. The only scholar who has successfully avoided this pitfall, in my mind, is Ulrich, whose book-by-book analyses only deal with each witness as “edition n+1,” “edition n+2,” etc.\(^53\)

1.2.2 – The Overlap of Textual and Literary Criticism

Traditionally, the field of textual criticism has not interacted with literary-critical areas like redaction or source criticism. The purpose of textual criticism was to establish the text, at which point the higher criticisms could subject the text to their analyses. This division reflected an assumption about the development of the texts themselves, wherein there was a clear distinction between the production of a text and its transmission.\(^54\) Such a view is reflected at one point in Tov’s *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, in which he states, “readings that were produced at the literary growth stage of the biblical books… should not be subjected to textual evaluation, since they were not produced during the course of the transmission of the texts.”\(^55\) Evidence in the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, has challenged these traditional divisions.\(^56\) In this manuscript evidence, we find textual development of the type we formerly relegated to the earlier stages of production; examples include Jeremiah, where the earlier version in 4QJer\(^b\), 4QJer\(^4\) and OG is expanded in MT, and Exodus, which we will discuss in Chapter Four. Ulrich,\(^57\) among others,\(^58\) has pointed out that the development occurring during the composition/editing


\(^{55}\) Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 2; note also, however, this same work’s recognition of the overlap of these two stages, 284-285.

\(^{56}\) Moreover, there is good evidence that many scribes in the ancient world functioned as more than mere copyists, functioning rather “as full-fledged tradents”; Alan Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition as a Tertium Quid: Orality and Memory in Scribal Practices,” in *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel* (ed. Tom Thatcher; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008), 220.


\(^{58}\) E.g., Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 284-285.
stage of biblical books corresponds significantly to the development that occurred during the transmission stage. Although scholars were initially inclined to view the pluriformity of texts at Qumran as the result of sectarian interests, in fact those texts clearly represent the broad spectrum of Judaism at the time; moreover, they simply fit with the evidence already preserved in the other witnesses of the HB. There is evidence in physical witnesses for “parallel literary editions” of numerous books of the HB. Thus, it appears that the physical evidence shows the same processes of development as can be discerned from the MT itself in the stage of development before physical evidence. The editorial activity traditionally studied by redaction and source critics is therefore a factor in the text-critical evidence.

Drawing on the usefulness of the concept of “authority,” Ulrich has posited a significant difference in the treatment of texts before and after they have taken on authoritative status. Before a work is authoritative, tradents may reshape material more freely—for example, the use of sources in the compilation of the Pentateuch before it was authoritative. After a work is authoritative, though it is still reshaped in the same sorts of ways, this occurs to a lesser extent and with less freedom. This idea becomes relevant to the discussion of “rewritten” texts when we realize that the Temple Scroll, Jubilees, and the like, were new compositions that reworked material during the stage before they (i.e., the “rewritten” texts) became authoritative—if they ever became authoritative. In other words, in some ways Jubilees resembles the Pentateuch more than it resembles 4QpaleoExod and the text-type it exemplifies. This distinction is very helpful for putting all of our evidence into one coherent framework; moreover, it has the advantage of being built on an emic idea (authority), rather than something etic. We can thus plot the various activities and techniques involved in the redaction, compilation, transmission, and reception of various texts on one continuous spectrum. On one side are the data and characteristics of works (e.g., the Pentateuch) that are being reshaped as literature, before they are viewed as

59 Ulrich, Origins, 8.
60 Ulrich, Origins, 9.
61 Ulrich, “Crossing the Borders.”
63 It is, however, often difficult to determine the level of authority granted to a work; Ulrich, “Crossing the Borders,” 98.
authoritative; in the middle are the data and characteristics of works that have been given authority as Scripture and are being reshaped (e.g., the third edition’s reshaping of Exodus); on the other side are new compositions that rework the older works (e.g., Jubilees), before these new works gain authority. At this point, the spectrum circles around, and we are back at the beginning of the process.\textsuperscript{64} In all of this, the characteristics are the same—retelling and reshaping—though the extent differs depending on the authoritative status of the work.

Although this study refers to the “transmission” of texts, it is with an understanding that this transmission was part and parcel of the development and even production of the text, and the broader phenomena of scribalism in general. Given one focus of my argument—the role of OG in textual criticism—I do not focus on the production side of scribalism. This is in order not to minimize my contention that the OG is \textit{not} just a disconnected and interpretive rendering of its source. In the broader picture, we must recognize that all tradents—scribe and translator alike—engaged in both preservation of their source texts and production of new material.

\textbf{1.2.3 – The Role of Orality and Memory in Textual Transmission}

In studies of redaction and source criticism, orality has long been recognized as an important part of textual development.\textsuperscript{65} However, frameworks for understanding orality in the ancient world were, for a long time, lacking in methodological basis.\textsuperscript{66} Now, however, numerous scholars are filling in this gap for the ancient world generally and for ancient Israel and Judaism specifically. Textual criticism has only recently begun to grasp the significance of orality and memory. Given the fact that aspects of textual production are factors of what occurs within our physical evidence (see section 1.2.2), orality must be integrated into our understanding of the transmission process. In the ancient Near East in general, in ancient Israel, and in Judah during the Second Temple period, cultures transmitted texts orally.\textsuperscript{67} Even with the advent and

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{64} Ulrich, “Crossing the Borders,” 101.
\bibitem{65} Raymond F. Person, \textit{The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World} (Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 20.
\end{thebibliography}
increasing use of writing, orality continued to play a large role in the transmission of texts. Moreover, oral culture entails the extensive use of memory. David Carr has demonstrated the widespread reliance on memory in connection to ancient texts.68 Texts used mimetic aids and the like, such that someone who did not already know the text could not have understood it merely by reading. In other words, the symbols of a written text sometimes functioned as visual cues for the text that the reader already held in his or her memory, rather than signs pointing clearly to a verbal text.69 Carr demonstrates the role of memory in the ancient world and in ancient Israel using numerous clear examples of textual variation resulting from memory70 and large-scale textual development where memory played a role.71

Carr and Kirk both point out the incorrect dichotomy between the pairings orality/memory and writing/literacy.72 In fact, all four of these elements played a significant role in the transmission of textual traditions. Though the text is written, orality and memory are important factors; Kirk, for example, sees “scribal memory” in the process of transmission as the primary location where writing and orality “converge,” referring to an “oral manuscript culture.”73 Carr contrasts “oral-cognitive textual transmission” (i.e., a purely oral transmission of texts) with “writing-supported cognitive transmission of texts” (i.e., where writing aids one’s memory in the transmission of texts). The scribes who created and transmitted texts during the Second Temple period were trained in an educational setting that used recitation; as such, the “committal of core texts to memory was a principal element of ancient scribal... education.”74

69 Cf. Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition,” 219; Toorn, Scribal Culture, 21ff. This is particularly true with the earliest writing systems; the description is less accurate of Hebrew manuscripts, which could certainly have been read and understood without a prior knowledge of them. Nevertheless, the memory components of reading would still have been present and strong with Hebrew texts.
71 Carr, Formation, 37-56. In section 2.2.2, I contend that the version of the text held in the mind of the translator played an important role in the translation process; the role of memory in scribalism suggested by Carr and others supports this positioning of the translator’s cognition in the middle of the translation process.
72 Carr, Formation, 5; Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition,” 216.
Given their role in scribal training, the oral performance and memorization of texts were married to the writing of a scribe at an early point in a scribe’s career. Outside of an educational context, scribes were also tradents who read the text publicly, relying on memory to perform the text orally. Scribes did not view themselves as authors of new texts, but as performers of already existing ancient traditions. In the ancient world, texts were less often the creations of individuals and more often “possession[s] of the community” from their outset. Because scribes were part of a scribal school which shaped and influenced their views, the developments we find in texts are more reflective of the scribal community than of the individual scribe. The textual developments are “what the ongoing tradition required as the meaningful context of the literature continued to change,” not “ideological manipulation[s].” Oral culture and memory thus entail an alternative third explanation besides rote copying or exegetical revision, namely, textual fluidity reflecting the scribe’s community. Given the less independent stance of the scribe whose identity was found mostly in his scribal school, it is not surprising that tradents more often combined existing known traditions rather than inserting completely new material.

The types of change characteristic of orality and memory most often occur in “long-duration literature,” that is, texts held in high esteem by the community, whose oral public performance is needed and which were therefore memorized by tradents in order to perform them orally. The texts of the HB, which were highly esteemed by Jewish communities during the Second Temple period, are obvious examples of such literature, as are several texts unique to Qumran (e.g., the Rule of the Community) and other Jewish literature like Jubilees and 1 Enoch.

Kirk gives several helpful insights into the implications of orality and memory for the transmission of these texts. Transmission was “not so much” concerned with “the visual as the

76 Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition,” 223.
80 Carr, *Formation*, 105.
81 Carr, *Formation*, 34-35.
aural.” Though writing was used to transmit the text, the primary orientation remained toward the oral versions of the texts, and as a result memory was crucial. When scribes copied, they read the text aloud and “simultaneously [converted the text] into a memory trace.” Thus the manuscript was not perceived visually only, but also aurally. As we consider manuscript evidence and the variants contained therein, it is therefore essential that we keep in mind the factors of memory, orality, and aurality, besides the typical considerations oriented toward visuality and writing. At the same time, Kirk cautions that orality, though important, is not the only factor involved in textual transmission; despite the roles of memory and orality, “[s]cribes were copyists and composers bound to and defined by the written medium.”

1.2.4 – Categorization of Text-Critical Data

Despite several basic points of agreement among scholars, their frameworks for categorizing variants differ in several ways (for a visual summary, see figure 1.4 below). Tov, in Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, addresses variants in two main sections, “Differences Created in the Course of the Textual Transmission” and “Readings Reflecting Content Changes”; these sections seem to reflect two basic types of variant for Tov. Hendel’s framework is similar; he speaks of “indicative errors” (errors shared by manuscripts that help us identify affiliation) as including “inadvertent errors and deliberate revisions,” corresponding roughly to Tov’s two categories. However, he notes that “simple kinds of scribal error” that happen “repeatedly” (e.g., dittography) are of an inferior quality and should not be included as indicative errors. Moreover, patterns of indicative errors—as opposed to individual indicative errors—are particularly important for discerning manuscript affiliation. Hendel, therefore, has

84 Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition,” 220.
86 Tov, Textual Criticism, 219-261.
three categories: simple scribal error, individual indicative errors (whether inadvertent or deliberate), and patterns of indicative errors (probably just deliberate revisions91).

Ulrich adds an important distinction to the discussion. Supposed variants that are of a linguistic nature—for example, differences in orthography and morphology—are not true variants.92 Spelling was not fixed, and one scribe may have used long orthography while another, copying the same manuscript, may have used short orthography. Distinguishing between individual variants and patterns of variants (resulting in variant editions)93 produces two additional groups.94 Ulrich further distinguishes individual variants into “individual textual variants” and “isolated interpretive insertions.”95 The former category includes both scribal errors and “intentional additions or clarifications,”96 while the latter category includes additions of “material that [scribes] considered valuable.”97 Unlike Tov and Hendel, Ulrich does not separate common errors and purposeful additions (both fall into his “individual textual variants” category).

Segal has argued that “original readings” should not be included in our consideration of textual affiliation.98 While this idea works conceptually—theoretically, an original reading could be present in any branch of a tree of textual history—in reality I find our evidence to be too sparse for such an idea to be practical. Moreover, if we eliminate “original readings,” then our final conclusions will be very dependent on our individual determinations of which reading is “original” in each case. Hendel’s elimination of common scribal error is perhaps also overstated. The reasoning is as follows: common scribal errors could have occurred anywhere in the transmission history, and do not really tell us about affiliation, whereas other individual variants,

91 Note the inadequacy of the term “error” if it is meant to describe deliberate revisions; I prefer “variant.”
93 Hendel’s distinction between individual errors and patterns of errors likely stems from Ulrich’s work in this area.
94 Ulrich, Origins, 89.
especially those involving insertions and “harmonizations,” can tell us about affiliation. Although changes involving content are of a different quality from scribal errors, it is nevertheless probably true that all scribes were capable of making such changes. In other words, there was no one scribal school that had a monopoly on, for example, sense-normalization. Content-related variants exist on the same spectrum of “indicativeness” as scribal error: all scribes made both types of change, and such changes could have entered at any point in the history.

I want to recast the discussion of these categories somewhat in an attempt to bring more clarity to what is being described. There are three different axes along which text-critical data can be categorized. We can describe the basic cause of a variant, the distribution or scale of the variant and variants to which it might be related, and the “indicativeness” of the variant—that is, how indicative the variant is of textual affiliation. Beginning with the first axis, although there is overlap among the various causes of variants, there are three basic types of cause corresponding to three main categories. First, sense variants stem in some way from the sense or meaning of the text. These are not mere mechanisms of sight or sound, nor do they deal solely with linguistic features of the text. Second, linguistic variants stem from the linguistic features of the text but not its sense (all “sense variants” will necessarily involve some linguistic aspects, since language is the medium carrying the sense). These are variants that have a linguistic impetus and, unlike orthographic differences, would not have been equivalent to the text as found in the scribe’s Vorlage. Third, scribal errors involve simple error of vision or hearing, not related to the sense or linguistic features of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1.1 – Axis One: Cause of Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scribal error</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense variant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic variant</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving to the second axis, the distribution of a variant or type of variant is simply how often that variant and related variants occur. By “type of variant” I do not mean something like dittography or normalization, but a particular change to the text that follows some particular pattern regarding when and how the change is made; for example, the set of variants examined in Chapter Four seems to follow a pattern, the insertion of an explicit command or the following of a command when a הוהי statement is involved.

**Figure 1.2 – Axis Two: Scale of Variation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Occurs</th>
<th>Can be the following cause categories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>Scribal error, sense variant, or linguistic variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale</td>
<td>often, in pattern</td>
<td>Sense variant or linguistic variant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third axis, indicativeness, seeks to answer the following question: When two or more witnesses share a variant, how indicative is that variant of affiliation between the witnesses? Rather than seeing a sharp contrast between variants that are indicative and those that are not, it is best to see a gradual scale of indicativeness.

**Figure 1.3 – Axis Three: Indicativeness**

Orthography, though linguistic in nature, was not something the scribe attempted to preserve in the text. In other words, לא and לאו were the same to the ancient scribe. As such, they indicate nothing about textual affiliation.

For Chapter Three of this study, I will rely on axis one, which deals with the cause of the
variants. I will not use axis two or three for the following reasons. Indicativeness pertains to the result of transmission, not transmission itself; for example, whether a scribal error is shared and thus indicative or not shared, the process that created the error is the same. Although scale does tell us about the transmission itself, in the case of Exodus 1-14 there are, with one exception, no sets of variants that occur on a large scale. The cases of large-scale variation are the focus of Chapter Four; there I examine change that occurs on a large scale and that is extremely indicative of affiliation. The reason for treating this type of change, however, is that when large-scale indicative variation occurs, it tells us about the cause of the variation in transmission. In other words, for both chapters of my study that examine the data of Exodus 1-14, I am interested in the cause of the variation and thus the nature of the transmission process itself.

The main categories that I use end up corresponding somewhat to those used by Ulrich, Tov, and Hendel. The major differences are that, unlike Ulrich, Tov, and Hendel, I distinguish variants that stem solely from linguistic features of the text. Moreover, for my purposes in this study, I only distinguish indicativeness and scale when looking at one subset of variants: extremely indicative sense variants occurring on a large scale.

Figure 1.4 – Typologies of Variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Srenock</th>
<th>Orthographic</th>
<th>Scribal error</th>
<th>Linguistic variant</th>
<th>Sense variant</th>
<th>Large-scale sense variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulrich</td>
<td>Orthographic</td>
<td>Individual textual variant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isolated interpretive insertion</td>
<td>Large-scale variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tov</td>
<td>Orthographic</td>
<td>Variants created in the course of textual transmission</td>
<td>Content changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendel</td>
<td>Simple scribal error (not indicative)</td>
<td>Indicative inadvertent error</td>
<td>Deliberate revision (a type of “indicative error”)</td>
<td>Patterns of indicative errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99 Tov does not distinguish between levels of indicativeness or scale (axes two and three). Ulrich and Hendel distinguish indicativeness (axis three), but at different points: Ulrich’s “isolated interpretive insertions” are more indicative sense variants; Hendel’s “simple scribal error” is an inadvertent error that is not indicative.
In Chapter Three of this study, therefore, the following main categories will be used to categorize the data: *scribal error*, *linguistic variant*, and *sense variant*. When working with actual data in Exodus 1-14, variants sometimes resist categorization according to these clearly defined categories. One way to approach this difficulty is to see the various causes working in concert. In other words, in some cases there is more than one impetus for change and/or more than one appropriate description of what has occurred. On several occasions, there are multiple main categories (typically scribal error and indicative change) involved. In the end, these categories are not perfect, but they serve their purpose: to characterize the transmission process and provide a benchmark by which to measure the phenomena of the OG. When working with the OG data, it is also necessary to identify perceived differences that are the result of translation technique. These are cases where a difference is merely *perceived*, but when the translator’s method is better understood, there is no difference. Thus, in addition to the three categories used for Hebrew manuscript data, a fourth category for OG data will be *translation technique*. For a discussion of the various subcategories listed in figure 1.5, see section 3.1.1.

*Figure 1.5 – Categories for Hebrew Manuscript and OG Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIATION (in mental or physical Vorlage)</th>
<th>TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scribal Error</strong></td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Variant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aural Error</td>
<td>Linguistic Modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dittography</td>
<td>Linguistic Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Error</td>
<td>Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haplography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metathesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocular Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waw Variant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(no subcategories)
1.3 - OG Translation Typology

In this section, I will describe my basic view of the OG as a translation and the appropriate ways to approach the issue of OG’s relationship to its Hebrew source text. Before considering the nature of the OG translation and its relationship to its Vorlage, a few important points should be mentioned, given their importance in orienting the discussion of translation technique correctly. First, we must engage in textual criticism of the OG itself to establish its text, preferably using the Göttingen edition if it is available.\textsuperscript{100} Second, we must not assume that the Hebrew of the MT is the Vorlage for the OG; while Septuagintalists recognize this point in theory, some scholars miss the importance of this point in practice.\textsuperscript{101} Third, as Albert Pietersma has clearly made the case, we must focus on the production of the OG, not its reception, when considering the translation profile of the OG.\textsuperscript{102} While this distinction may be obvious, Pietersma argues that it is far too often neglected in practice. We are interested in the production of the text, since that is where the translator’s interaction with OG’s Vorlage is located. The subsequent reception of the OG—the meanings Greek words and the meaning of the text for later audiences—should not enter our consideration\textsuperscript{103} (unless of course it somehow informs us about the production of the text).

In a 1987 article, Emanuel Tov called for a serious consideration of “translation technique” as opposed to mere “grammatical study” of the Greek of the OG.\textsuperscript{104} Since then, the


\textsuperscript{101} As pointed out by S. Metso and E. Ulrich, “The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus,” in \textit{The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception} (eds. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 251-252.


\textsuperscript{104} Emanuel Tov, “The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present,” in \textit{VI Congress of the IOSCS} (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987), 337-59; up to that point, linguistic studies of the OG had focused on the grammar of the Greek, sometimes with reference to the Hebrew Vorlage, but with an emphasis on the structure of the Greek text \textit{qua} Greek language.
Topic has been at the heart of many studies of the OG. “Translation technique” generally refers to methods and processes involved in the translator’s producing Greek to represent the Hebrew of the source text. Whereas in some cases of translation there is an explicit statement on translation philosophy, in our case the evidence for translation technique comes from the texts themselves. Anneli Aejmelaeus thus gives a definition of translation technique that centers on the texts involved: “the relationship between the text of the translation and its Vorlage.” Because we are concerned with the language of the texts, rather than any theological ideas they might connote, it might be more accurate to refer to the “linguistic relationship” of the two texts. Moreover, we must recognize that the translator had to come to some understanding of the text before translating it. Following Aejmelaeus, we will refer to this understanding as “decoding.” The translator’s decoding of the text may have been different from ours. For example, he may have chosen an alternative decoding based on different vocalization or understanding a homograph, or he may have misunderstood the language depending on his knowledge of Hebrew. Failure to recognize this factor can negatively influence one’s analysis. We should not, then, speak of the translation’s linguistic relationship to its Vorlage, but rather the translator’s decoding of the Vorlage. Translation technique, then, is the linguistic relationship between a translation and the translator’s understanding of its Vorlage.

Translation technique is typically described as involving a spectrum on which the translator’s approach can be plotted. The extremes of the spectrum are described using sets of

105 This concept has been debated at length; to access this debate, see Aejmelaeus “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator,” “What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique,” and “Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators,” in Aejmelaeus, On the Trail. For a brief, helpful summary of translation technique, see Jennifer M. Dines, The Septuagint (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004),117-128.
106 Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 205.
107 See the distinction made above between production and reception.
108 Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, throughout; “decoding” is what Tov refers to as “linguistic exegesis” (Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 45; Tov, Textual Criticism, 118-119).
109 See, for example, James Sanders’ work on the poem in 11QPsalms and its translation in Greek Sirach, discussed below.
110 I discuss this concept further in Chapter Two when arguing for a mental Hebrew text (see section 2.2.2). There, I talk about “decoding” as “reading,” “comprehending” or “understanding” the Hebrew before transferring its meaning to Greek.
terms like “literal” versus “free,” or “word-for-word” versus “paraphrase.” Within the field of Septuagint Studies, Pietersma and others have suggested a different set of terminology drawn from Gideon Toury’s work in translation studies. A “source oriented” translation caters more to the source language (in our case, Hebrew), and brings the audience to the text, whereas a “target oriented” translation caters to the target language (in our case, Greek), and brings the text to the audience (linguistically speaking). Target oriented translations want to make the target text intelligible and suitable for the target language and target culture. Source oriented translations want to preserve the linguistic structures of the source language. In other words, if the OG’s main goal is to represent the Hebrew of its Vorlage, it is source oriented, but if its main goal is to provide an understandable text to the Greek reader, it is target oriented.

The basic strategy for source oriented translation—both in the OG and other translations—is isomorphism. Isomorphism is the attempt to mirror the parent text exactly in morphology, syntax, and lexicon. Almost every morpheme in the Hebrew is represented by a corresponding morpheme in the Greek. This involves the way in which morphological items are divided and


112 See Gideon Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984).

113 All translations bring audience and text together; the emphasis here is about which moves more linguistically.

114 A precursor to the Pietersma school of thought can be found in Sebastian P. Brock’s “Translating the Old Testament,” in It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture (eds. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), where he speaks of “bringing the source text to the reader” (91).

115 Two other sets of terminology from Translation Studies are helpful. First, “covert” translation attempts to hide the fact that it is translation by following conventions of the target language closely, whereas “overt” translation presents itself openly as a translation by following the structure of the source text closely; see Juliane House, “Overt and covert translation,” in the Handbook of Translation Studies: Volume 1 (eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010). Second, “functional” translation attempts to preserve the form of the source text, whereas “dynamic” translation attempts to replicate the response the source text would have prompted in the audience; see Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, The Theory and Practice of Translation, With Special Reference to Bible Translating (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 200. Both these sets of terminology correspond to the source oriented versus target oriented terminology, though they highlight different aspects of translation.

understood (“segmentation”), the relative order of the morphological items (“word order”), and a one-to-one relationship of source items and target items (“quantitative representation”).

Moreover, every higher-level clause constituent (i.e., subject, verb, object) is carried over into the Greek. Finally, varying degrees of equivalences are set up between Hebrew and Greek lexical items. Although the “adequacy” of a lexical equivalent (i.e., the amount of semantic overlap between the translation’s lexical item and the source item) is a concern for isomorphic translation, the greater concern for a one-to-one lexical pairing across the entirety of a book often overrides the concern for semantic adequacy. The isomorphism found in the OG’s representation of its parent text has led Pietersma and others to suggest and defend the “interlinear paradigm” as a model for understanding the translation technique of OG.

This model suggests that the linguistic relationship between the OG and its parent text is conceptually

---


I have argued this in “Translation Technique and Word Order in Ben Sira 51 and Sirach 24” (unpublished paper delivered at the Upper Midwest Society of Biblical Literature in St. Paul, MN; April 1, 2011).


Or, more commonly, two-to-one or one-to-two; these types of lexical equivalences are still isomorphism, since they involve some level of standard pairings in order to give the audience some sort of access to the Hebrew lexical items, at the expense of semantic adequacy.

The classic example is the “peace of the war” in 2 Samuel 11:7, which makes as little sense in Greek as in English; the word “peace” (εἰρήνη) is used because of the one-to-one paring with שָׁלוֹם, despite its semantic inadequacy. Though part of the kaige recension, this nevertheless illustrates the general principle of lexical isomorphism found in much of the OG.

similar to the relationship found in an interlinear translation.\textsuperscript{123} The most important aspect of this model is that it sees the OG as dependent on the Hebrew Vorlage, such that “the translation is at times unintelligible and cannot be understood apart from [the] Hebrew.”\textsuperscript{124} In other words, the OG’s goal is to bring the Hebrew text into Greek with as little interference as possible, giving the audience access to the Vorlage.

Septuagintalists working on translation technique have by and large come to the conclusion that most\textsuperscript{125} books of the OG are source oriented, proceeding in an isomorphic fashion, that is, on a morpheme-by-morpheme basis.\textsuperscript{126} It is notable that text critics, on the basis of new evidence from Qumran, have come to the same conclusion: the OG faithfully represents its source text.\textsuperscript{127} Although a source oriented translation aims to preserve as much of the parent text as possible, rigid isomorphism can result in Greek that seems widely at variance with the Hebrew. Such divergences are inevitable given the significant differences between the Hebrew and Greek languages. An understanding of the translation technique of OG is therefore critical in assessing whether a difference in the OG represents a variant or not and, moreover, how one should reconstruct a variant if it is deemed that the Vorlage contains one.

\textsuperscript{123} There has been some controversy regarding the application of this framework to the actual historic and cultural setting of the OG translation; see, for example, Takamitsu Muraoka, “Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model,” in Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten (eds. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2008), and Pietersma, “Response.” Pietersma correctly asserts that the interlinear paradigm works as a model for the linguistic relationship of the Greek and Hebrew; it is my opinion, however, that the Pietersma school has at times gone too far in applying this model beyond a linguistic description of the texts (contra Pietersma; though Pietersma et al. do not suggest the actual existence of an interlinear Greek/Hebrew Bible, they do suggest that such interlinearity is the purpose for the type of translation we find in OG). For a balanced review of the Interlinear Paradigm, see Jan Joosten’s “Reflections on the ‘Interlinear Paradigm’” in Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

\textsuperscript{124} Wright, “Access,” 23.

\textsuperscript{125} That is to say, the translations of the OG in general; there are certainly books in the OG that are not very source oriented. For informed judgements on whether certain books are source oriented or target oriented, see the introductions to the various books in NETS.


\textsuperscript{127} See, for example, Metso and Ulrich, “The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus,” 267-268.
Aejmelaeus has explored the idea that OG translators did not follow a conscious translation technique. Through consideration of numerous “free” renderings in the OG, Aejmelaeus argues that the translators could not have been following a deliberate method, otherwise such free renderings would not have occurred. Aejmelaeus rightly draws our attention to the target oriented translation style that sometimes occurs in the OG. However, I disagree that these examples entail that the OG translators proceeded with a very “free” style. In addition to the several examples of free translation in the OG, there is a multitude of examples where isomorphic translation occurs (particularly in the Pentateuch). Moreover, the fact that the OG translators did not deliberately employ a translation technique does not mean that they did not in fact have a translation technique. As Pietersma points out,

While it is highly probable… that ancient translators of the Bible often proceeded in an ad hoc manner rather than according to a predetermined policy, this should scarcely be taken to mean that… their translational behavior was without norms, and thus not subject to description after the fact.

Isomorphism may be one of the most obvious de facto modes for translating; whether one consciously intends to provide a source-oriented translation or not, the resulting translation may still follow an isomorphic method.

1.4 - Basic Model for Analyzing Differences between OG and a Hebrew Manuscript

In this study, I attempt to reinvigorate the conversation about the use of the OG in textual criticism, by suggesting a new angle from which to view translation in the OG—that is, as transmission. Before introducing this angle, however, it is important to provide a basic model for utilizing the OG in textual criticism. In constructing a theoretical model for analyzing differences

---

128 Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator.”
129 Albert Pietersma, “Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited,” in Translation is Required, 7. Aejmelaeus also argues that translation technique is not something that is “acquired or developed... by the translators” (206); Toury’s description of the norms passed on in translation communities, however, contradicts this position (see chapter two of Descriptive Translation Studies; cf. also Daniel Simeoni, “The Pivotal Status of the Translator’s Habitus,” Target 10/1 [1998]). Although translation technique may not always have been acquired deliberately, it was nevertheless acquired.
between the OG and a Hebrew manuscript, Tov’s work on the use of the Septuagint in Textual Criticism offers an excellent starting point. Tov first notes that “all translations” contain “linguistic exegesis, which is an integral part of the act of translation.” In other words, Hebrew and Greek are different languages, and to represent the former using the latter necessarily involves some interpretation. This idea of “linguistic exegesis”—or, following Aejmelaeus, what I prefer to call “decoding”—involves much of what we discussed above concerning translation technique. A difference between the OG and a Hebrew manuscript may result from translation technique—for example, rigid isomorphism resulting in strange Greek, or periphrastic translation resulting in a significantly different manner of expressing the same meaning. Along with translation technique, Tov adds “additional forms of exegesis”—exegesis that goes beyond simply trying to represent Hebrew in Greek—and “scribal developments,” what Jobes and Silva refer to as “interpretive thought” and “carelessness,” respectively. Adding the possibility that a difference results from a variant Vorlage, a perceived difference in meaning between the OG and a Hebrew manuscript could be the result of any of these variables: translation technique, interpretive thought, scribal error, and a variant Vorlage.

Before proceeding further, it will be helpful to clarify how the two related terms, “difference” and “variant,” are being used in the present work. By “difference,” I mean simply a point at which one might think the OG does not translate a Hebrew witness accurately. Since the OG is written in Greek and the HB in Hebrew and Aramaic, and since translation involves more than mechanical replacement (it is, in many ways, an art), it is difficult to be more precise in defining what a “difference” between OG and a Hebrew witness. Differences may result from the process of translation or from an OG Vorlage at variance with the Hebrew witness one is comparing. We are, of course, interested in sorting out the legitimate variants from differences arising from translation; I use “variant” only to refer to true variants stemming from the OG’s

---

130 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint. Another extensive and helpful treatment of this issue can be found in Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?,” in On the Trail.
131 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 45; cf. Tov, Textual Criticism, 118-119.
132 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 45, and cf. 45-50; Tov, Textual Criticism, 119-122.
133 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 50-54, 58.
134 Jobes and Silva, Invitation, 153.
Any basic model for analyzing differences between the OG and a Hebrew manuscript revolves around the existence of competing explanations for perceived differences between the OG and a Hebrew witness. My model draws on the work of Tov and others, and as a result resembles those models. However, in a few important places my model takes a different approach (see figure 1.6 below). Most significantly, my model separates decoding and translation technique, and as a result it reflects the order and process of translation as a fundamental concern. First, a difference may arise because of a variant Vorlage. Second, a difference may arise because the translator read, heard, or remembered the text incorrectly, that is, in error. Third, a difference may arise because the translator decoded (i.e., understood) the language of the text in a different manner than we do. Fourth, the translator’s translation technique may result in a difference, though the translator is faithful to his Vorlage. Fifth, the translator may have made intentional changes, resulting in a difference.135

The fourth category has been discussed at length in section 1.3 above; the first, second, and fifth categories are discussed adequately in Tov’s work.136 The third category—the possibility of the translator’s decoding of the text differing from ours— is an important element missing in some models. We should not consider our reading of the Hebrew to be the only possible reading, however informed it is. Instead, we must recognize that the translator may have decoded the language of the Vorlage differently from the way we do. Regardless of how mistaken the translator may be in his decoding, it would be incorrect to categorize such a difference as an intentional, interpretational change.

Before even beginning to translate into Greek, the translator had to decode the Hebrew text. When we compare the OG with its parent text, we sometimes assume that our understanding of the parent text is the understanding of the parent text. However, the translator’s understanding of the text may have been different from ours. For example, he may have chosen

---

135 Note that these competing explanations are not necessarily exclusive; see below.
136 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint; Tov, Textual Criticism.
an alternative decoding based on different vocalization or understanding a homograph, or he may have misunderstood the language depending on his knowledge of Hebrew. Some treatments of the OG recognize this point and present its data more accurately as a result; Flint and Ulrich, for example, consider cases in Isaiah where OG “translates ambiguous or alternate forms” or “a plausible but non-extant or misread Hebrew text.” Other scholars, however, do not consider the way in which the translator read the text.

This point can be illustrated by considering the Greek translation of the acrostic poem found in 11QPs and Ben Sira. James Sanders describes Greek Sirach as an “interpretive rendering” of the Hebrew text. Often, the instances that he sees as interpretive can just as easily be explained as the result of the translator having a different decoding of the text from ours. In 51:17 (according to the Greek numbering), we find προκοπή “progress” instead of עָלָה, “wet nurse”; Sanders suggests that this difference arises from highly interpretational reading, and does not consider whether it might stem, instead, from the translator decoding the text differently. It is most likely that translator does not read a feminine participle of עֹלָה, “one who nurses” (as Sanders assumes), but the noun עָלָה, “ascent, stairway.” In other words, the translator and Sanders simply read the Hebrew differently. Another example is found in 51:13, where 11QPs is transcribed תֵעַתי by Sanders, but the Greek translator clearly read תֵעֵיתָּי.

---

139 DJD XXXII, 93-94.
140 DJD IV, 84. We assume that, regardless of whether the acrostic poem in 11QPs was original to Ben Sira, it was present in the work at the time of its translation into Greek; furthermore, we assume that 11QPs’s version of the Hebrew text is the best available witness, and moreover we can reasonably investigate how the Greek relates to 11QPs as a representative of its source. Cf. Eric Reymond, New Idioms Within Old: Poetry and Parallelism in the Non-Masoretic Poems of 11Q5 (=11QPs) (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 21, especially note 3.
141 DJD IV, 83.
142 DCH עָלָה II; BDB עָלָה II.
(πλανηθῆναί με), an infinitive with first person singular suffix rather than a finite, first person perfect verb. In other words, regardless of our knowledge regarding the correct transcription of this word, we must treat the Greek text of Sirach as having understood תעותי. In both of these cases, a modern scholar’s reading of the poem in 11QPs may be better than the Greek translator’s, but it does not follow that we should deem the Greek translation “interpretive.” We must, therefore, recognize the possibility that our decoding of the Hebrew Vorlage is not the same as the translator’s.

In another example of this issue from our corpus, Exodus 1-14, Childs and Wevers note a discrepancy between OG τῶν Ἑβραίων and “adjectival Ἑβραία” in Exodus 1:15, using the following logic. Since the preceding word מילדת is articulated (לַמְיַלּ), it must be in the free form (i.e., absolute), not bound to Ἑβραία (i.e., construct); as such, feminine plural Ἑβραία must modify מילדת adjectivally, meaning “Hebrew midwives.” On this basis, Childs and Wevers find the OG to have an odd translation for the Hebrew. However, the pointing of the ל before מילדת is the only indication of articulation in MT; since the OG translated an unpointed text, it could have easily read מילדת as non-articular (לִמְיַלּ), and thus bound to Ἑβραία, resulting in the meaning “midwives of the Hebrews.” The issue here involves the translator’s decoding of the text, not any aspect of translation technique proper or any interpretive move. Although Childs and Wevers, following the Masoretes, would have preferred the dative ταῖς Ἑβραίαις (agreeing with ταῖς μαίαις), we cannot fault OG for understanding a different syntax and thus translating τῶν Ἑβραίων.

The process of translation can be broken into two stages (see figure 1.6). In the first, the translator reads and decodes his Vorlage. The reading (or hearing) happens simultaneously with the decoding, but the two should be distinguished for the purpose of clearly identifying the cause of a difference in OG. In the second stage, the translator produces the translation in the target

143 Note that תעותי as understood by Greek Sirach may be the correct reading; see A. Di Lella and P. Skehan, *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York/London/Toronto/Sydney/Auckland: Yale University Press, 1987), 574.
language, utilizing some translation technique (whether consciously employed or not) and possibly altering the text intentionally. It should be noted that there could be two people at work in this process, one reading the Vorlage aloud and another translating on the basis of that reading, in which case the same two stages would still be involved. There are thus five possible explanations for a difference between OG and a Hebrew witness: a variant Vorlage, the translator misreading the text, the translator decoding the text differently than we do, translation technique, and intentional changes.

Figure 1.6 - Basic Model for Analyzing Differences between OG and a Hebrew Manuscript

- Vorlage
- Translator
- Translation

1. Variant Vorlage
2. Translator reads/hears/remembers text incorrectly (i.e., scribal error)
3. Translator decodes (understands) text differently from how we do
4. Translation technique (isomorphic or otherwise) results in perceived difference
5. Intentional changes

Category 2 includes scribal errors resulting from the translator misreading the text (rather than from a variant Vorlage), including errors of sight such as dittography and homoioteleuton, as well as errors of memory and hearing. Category 3 includes cases such as those described in the critique of Sanders above (including different vocalization of the consonantal text), as well as other phenomena such as interference from a translator’s vernacular language on his understanding of the Hebrew text,146 and cases where the translator did not understand the Hebrew.147 Category 5 is sometimes misused by Septuagintalists,148 but nevertheless is an important type of explanation to consider. In this category we place expansions and insertions

147 See Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 79-80.
148 See below.
that happen at the point of translation, as well as the phenomenon of pseudotranslation.149

These five categories are essentially competing explanations for any given difference between the OG and a Hebrew witness. Where one scholar sees the translator engaging in theological exegesis, another may postulate a variant Vorlage or appeal to translation technique. Some categories are more likely explanations than others, and some scholars prefer some categories over others. Unfortunately, the one category preferred by many scholars—category 5—is probably also the least likely explanation in any given situation. Sanders’ study of Sirach 51 again provides an excellent example.150 He claims that the Greek’s rendering of קָּנָאְרְבִּין (“I was zealous for pleasure”) as ἐζήλωσα τὸ ἀγαθόν in 51:18 “makes of the Q statement of zeal for pleasure the innocuous zeal for good.”152 Although the Greek may not carry the sexual overtones Sanders sees in the Hebrew, it is unlikely that the difference stems from an intentional change of the translator; instead, it is most likely the result of lexical isomorphism and the translator’s default rendering: in the OG, the adjective ἀγαθός (including the substantival use of τὸ ἀγαθόν) nearly always represents טוב or a related word (i.e., from the same root).153 Where the adjective טוב or the noun טוב appear, a variety of Greek words are used,154 however none are used nearly as often as ἀγαθός.155 Therefore, it is highly likely that the translator’s selection of

---

149 In pseudotranslation—the composition of a text in such a manner that the text presents itself as a translation—the ‘translator’ intentionally changes no Hebrew text into actual Greek text. See Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies, 40-52; and see the discussion in section 2.2.2.

150 For other examples of the misuse of this category, see Pietersma, “Messianism,” on supposed Messianic interpretation in the production of Psalm 28, and Boyd-Taylor, “Semantics,” on the supposed theology of hope in the OG Psalter.

151 Sanders uses Rahlfs’ text of Sirach; the Göttingen edition (Joseph Ziegler, Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) reads ἐζήτησα instead of ἐζήλωσα. The difference is of no consequence, however, to the point Sanders is making; rather, the point has to do with the meanings of τὸ ἀγαθόν and טוב.

152 DJD IV, 83.

153 This is the case in hundreds of instances, compared to just a handful of times where ἀγαθός representing other words (Hatch-Redpath ἀγαθός).


155 According to Dos Santos, ἀγαθός is used 332 times for טוב (EHI טוב; the next closest is καλός, at 99 times, but καλός is hardly a better option to communicate the semantics of “pleasure” (cf. LSJ καλός). For the noun
ἀγαθός had nothing to do with an interpretive approach that sought to remove the language of “pleasure.”

We must also recognize that often the various elements work in concert. A particular translation technique, for example, may allow for interpretational changes. The translator may have had a variant Vorlage and committed a scribal error based on that Vorlage. Multiple other combinations of two or more of the phenomena mentioned above are possible. The point is not to assign every difference to one and only one of these categories; rather, the point is to consider the full range of possibilities before reconstructing the cause or causes of a particular difference.

A variant Vorlage, then, is just one of several possible explanations for a perceived difference. A variant Vorlage is clearest when a Hebrew manuscript exists that appears to contain the OG’s Vorlage. Where no such manuscript exists, how do we then evaluate OG? Some scholars find it questionable to use OG when no supporting Hebrew manuscript exists. This makes sense at some level—there is always a chance, however slim, that the difference arose in translation. However, it does not take seriously the body of evidence showing that OG is typically faithful to its Vorlage. Moreover, this approach relegates the OG to a position of uselessness: OG’s only function in this scenario is to support an existing Hebrew manuscript. A similar methodological principle states that the OG should be seen as translating the MT if it is “possible” for the OG’s Greek to be a translation of MT’s Hebrew.156 However, based on a thorough understanding of translation technique, there may be a Hebrew Vorlage that more plausibly stands behind the Greek. In my opinion, we should not privilege the MT (or another existing Hebrew manuscript, for that matter) when reconstructing; instead, we should establish translational principles and retrovert what the most plausible Vorlage would have been. In summary, it seems the possibility that the OG contains a true variant should always be considered. The present study seeks to address this issue, albeit as an implication of the results.

Given the findings of this study, I conclude that it is often impossible to know for sure whether a difference between OG and a Hebrew manuscript is the result of a translator or the scribe of

---

156 See Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 79.
OG’s Vorlage. Moreover, I find that this difference is negligible. As a result, we should use most differences in OG (when it isomorphically represents grammatical Hebrew) in our textual criticism of the HB.

The kind of model I have just laid out, wherein five categories of explanation compete to account for differences in OG, represents the real world circumstances of the production of the OG. However accurate it may be, though, it is limited in its usefulness to modern scholars for several reasons. In particular, it can be difficult in many cases to determine whether a difference results from 1 or 2 above: if both scribes and translators could make scribal errors, how are we to know where the change stems from? Similarly, excessive interpretation or “theological” change can be found in both the OG and Hebrew manuscripts, making it difficult at times to decide between explanations 1 and 5. How can we tell if a difference arose in the process of translation or within Hebrew transmission, since both scribes and translators made the same sorts of changes? How can we distinguish between the nearly-identical activities of scribes and translators? Is it possible to distinguish them? Should we even try? It is these difficulties that the present work seeks to remedy. The in-depth consideration of the translation process at the point of reading and decoding, found in Chapter Two of this study, offers some reasons why the phenomena resulting from these two processes are difficult to distinguish. The comparison of translation data and transmission data, found in Chapters Three and Four, treats all of the OG data stemming from categories 1, 2, 3, or 5 within text-critical categories, showing that the same types of variation are just as likely in a Hebrew manuscript (such as OG’s Vorlage, i.e., category

---

159 The difficulty of distinguishing changes that stem from the Vorlage and those that stem from translation is highlighted several times by Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, 79-81; cf. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 140.
160 It seems to me that there is an assumption that a translator would feel more free to add interpretive/expansive changes to his translation than a scribe would, or in other words that such changes are more prevalent in a translation, even if the same things can happen in transmission. Aejmelaeus (*On the Trail*, 81) takes the opposite position, postulating that a high regard for the text would have kept translators from making significant additions and omissions. My dissertation hopes to address this issue, finding out if the OG, as highly faithful as it is, makes such changes more, less, or the same amount.
1) as in the creation of the OG (i.e., categories 2 and 5).

1.5 - Corpus and Selection of Data

Finally, a word must be said about the corpus of this study, which will consist of OG Exodus 1-14 and the Hebrew manuscripts containing Exodus 1-14. This corpus is optimal for two reasons. First, OG Exodus is an isomorphic translation,\textsuperscript{161} representative of many of the books in the OG. Second, Exodus 1-14 is one of several texts that contain large-scale variation leading to the creation of a new “edition.” I do not consider this selectivity to be a deficiency in method: because large-scale variant patterns occur in large sections of text (typically whole books), there are only a handful of examples in any of our textual witnesses, Hebrew manuscripts included.\textsuperscript{162} The Hebrew manuscripts will consist of all the manuscripts from the Dead Sea region, Tal’s edition of SP,\textsuperscript{163} and the Leningrad Codex. I will make limited reference to other Samaritan manuscripts \textit{via} Von Gall’s edition and apparatus,\textsuperscript{164} and similarly to other Masoretic manuscripts \textit{via} De Rossi\textsuperscript{165} and Kennicott.\textsuperscript{166} The purpose of reference to these manuscripts is to correct obvious errors, not to bring later transmission data into the study (since intra-SP and intra-MT variants would only give us access to medieval transmission practice). For the OG, I will rely on the Göttingen edition of Exodus. In the body of my analysis of the data, I will consider every perceived difference in the OG and every variant in the Hebrew manuscripts, giving brief description of the nature of the variant, categorizing it under a specific designation (main category and subcategory), and providing justification for the categorization. I will not use

\textsuperscript{161} This is my impression of OG Exodus, based on my own work for this study; so Perkins, “To the Reader of Exodus,” 43-44. Aejmelaeus, \textit{On the Trail}, 77, describes Exodus as one of the most “free” translations in OG, but by this she means that the Greek language used is natural and unstilted; she clarifies shortly after that the linguistic equivalences used in Exodus are consistent (\textit{On the Trail}, 78).


\textsuperscript{163} A. Tal, \textit{The Samaritan Pentateuch Edited According to Ms 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue} (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1994).

\textsuperscript{164} August F. Von Gall, \textit{Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner} (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1918).

\textsuperscript{165} J. B. De Rossi, \textit{Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti} (Parma, 1784).

\textsuperscript{166} Benjamin Kennicott, \textit{Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum} (Oxford, 1776).
the MT as the *de facto* baseline of comparison.

In the OG, I have attempted to be somewhat exhaustive by considering any differences which I perceive, and/or where Wevers, Emanuel Tov and Frank Polak, or Perkins indicate a difference. Recall the definition of “difference” made above: it may or may not reflect a true variant, depending on whether it stems from a Hebrew *Vorlage* that contains a variant reading. In my system of categorization, it may or may not be excluded as translation technique, depending on whether its presumed Hebrew source agrees or disagrees with the extant Hebrew manuscripts. The identification of such “differences” is somewhat subjective, given the nature of translation (i.e., every word of the OG is different from the Hebrew, but certainly not every word is significantly different in the way that the differences identified by Wevers, Tov and Polak, or Perkins are). These are the data I have examined in my study; many are discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3 below, while a full list of OG differences not resulting from translation technique are given in Appendix A. Some of the differences that I deemed to reflect translation technique are discussed in section 3.2.1 below, but in general these are not included in my discussion or Appendix A for space considerations.

1.6 – Summary and Preview

The preceding sections addressed some of the fundamental methodological considerations that form the basis of my analysis in Chapters Two, Three, and Four. Having established my approach to textual criticism in general, OG translation technique, and the use of the OG in textual criticism, we can now begin to address the central concerns of this study: Why do we see the same types of changes in the OG and in HB manuscripts? How similar are these two processes? In the following three chapters, I will provide answers to these questions, drawing from various theoretical perspectives in Chapter Two, using comparative analysis of textual data in Chapter Three, and viewing them through the lens of large-scale variants and their

---

167 Wevers, *Exodus.*
shaping of the character of Exodus 1-14 as a whole in Chapter Four.
2 – The Overlap of Transmission and Translation

In this chapter I will discuss the various ways in which transmission and translation—and in particular, the transmission of HB manuscripts and the isomorphic translation of the OG—are similar. In addition to demonstrating their similarity from theoretical perspectives, the point of this discussion will be to justify the angle used in Chapters Three and Four of this study, which look at OG translation data within a text-critical framework. I will first consider the transmission of HB as an instance of intralingual translation.\textsuperscript{1} Since intralingual translation and interlingual translation\textsuperscript{2} are essentially the same kind of process, the cases of intralingual translation found within HB manuscript transmission are fundamentally similar to interlingual translation such as that found in OG. The consideration of transmission as intralingual translation will lead to a conceptual mapping of OG phenomena, HB transmission phenomena, interlingual translation, and intralingual translation, in which the constituent parts of all four correspond with one another. Building on this conceptual mapping, I will then consider the isomorphic character of translation in OG as an instance of transmission, corresponding to one aspect of transmission, rote copying.\textsuperscript{3} Apart from the transfer of meaning necessitated by linguistic barriers between Greek and Hebrew, isomorphism resembles copying. Finally, I will consider another way in which OG translation resembles HB transmission, proposing yet another way of looking at translation in the OG in which the translator indeliberately constructs a virtual Hebrew text in his mind—a mid-point between the physical Vorlage and the translation—that is then translated into Greek. The presence of such a mental text seems self-evident when the process of translation is considered and, moreover, helps explain why so many of the same types of change occur in both translation and transmission.

\textsuperscript{1} For a definition and description of “intralingual translation,” see below.
\textsuperscript{2} “Interlingual translation” is what is typically thought of as translation; it is sometimes called “translation proper” in Translation Studies, though I will argue against the notion that only interlingual translation is properly translation.
\textsuperscript{3} For a definition of what I mean by “rote” copying, see footnote 88 below.
2.1 - Transmission as Translation

This section will proceed in several steps. First, I will introduce the concept of intralingual translation, a type of translation recognized in Translation Studies but not considered to be translation outside of that field. Second, I will give a more formal description of intralingual translation based on the authoritative work of Karen Zethsen. Third, I will argue, with Zethsen and others, that intralingual translation and interlingual translation are one and the same process, differing only in the degree of transfer in meaning. Fourth, I will show that much of the variation we find in HB manuscript transmission is intralingual translation, categorizing various types of indicative and linguistic variants within Zethsen’s description of intralingual translation. Fifth, I will follow the preceding two points to their logical conclusion: if intralingual translation and interlingual translation are the same kind of process and aspects of HB manuscript transmission are intralingual translation, then HB manuscript transmission and an interlingual translation like the OG to some extent involve the same kind of process. Sixth, and finally, I will map out corresponding constituent parts of OG translation, HB transmission, interlingual translation, and intralingual translation. This conceptual mapping will provide a basis in section 2.2 for considerations of OG translation as an instance of transmission.

2.1.1 – Intralingual Translation

Though most North American fans of the Harry Potter series might not realize it, they are reading translations when they read the books. J. K. Rowling’s originals use English that is highly British; the U.S. versions of the books change some lexical items and even points of syntax so that they are more readable for North American audiences. In addition to what we

5 Or, at the least, the books contain some instances of translation.
typically think of as translation, between two different languages, “Translation... exists between
different varieties of the same language.” Interlingual translation refers to translation between
two different languages, whereas intralingual translation refers to translation within the same
language. Intralingual translation occurs when the language of a text is restated to be more
understandable, whether to someone with a different dialect of the same language, someone with
less understanding of technical terminology, someone who cannot easily process the register of
the original, or someone whose language belongs to a different diachronic stage of the language.

Roman Jakobson’s seminal article on translation identified three types of translation.
Interlingual translation “is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language”;
this is translation from one language to another language (for example, from ancient Hebrew to
modern English). This type of translation is what is generally referred to as “translation.”
However, there are two other less considered types of translation that Jakobson discusses.
Intersemiotic translation “is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign
systems.” This is the translation that occurs when the meaning of a verbal text is transferred and
communicated by something like “music, dance, cinema, or painting.” Finally, intralingual
translation “is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.”
This type of translation is sometimes called “rewording” or “paraphrasing.” Examples of
intralingual translation include “expert-to-layman communication,” “précis-writing,” “liturgical
texts in modern (as opposed to genuine or fake Tudor) English,” rewriting classic
texts in the classroom in order to prove comprehension, and Bible translations based on previous
translations in the same language.

7 Hatim and Munday, Translation, 4.
Lawrence Venuti; London: Routledge, 2004; originally published in 1959), 139.
15 This is the primary form of intralingual translation discussed in Zethsen 2009; cf. Denton, “Waterlogged,” 245.
2.1.2 – Zethsen’s Model of Intralingual Translation

Although intralingual translation is discussed by numerous scholars in Translation Studies, two of the few studies devoted to fleshing out the phenomenon are by Karen Zethsen. Because the first half of her 2009 article is a restatement of her 2008 article, I will interact primarily with the fuller 2009 article. Zethsen, with others, notes the marginalization of intralingual translation within Translation Studies; she hopes by her contribution to “[put] intralingual translation (back?) on the map of translation studies.” Her empirical study focuses on five different Danish versions of the Bible, specifically the passage Luke 2:3-7. Although some of the Danish versions she analyzes are based in part on the Greek text of the passage, all have some recourse to earlier Danish versions of the Bible and are thus intralingual translation.

Zethsen’s analysis is split into two parts: a description of the evidence and a summary of “[m]ain parameters involved in intralingual translation.” The first part is essentially a cataloguing of the types of change involved in intralingual translation, while the second part catalogues the reasons for these changes. The following summary follows Zethsen’s analysis closely; however, I add my own conceptualization of how the various aspects should be categorized.

The types of change involved in intralingual translation include “explanations, explications, lexical and syntactical simplification,” and “textual additions.” These changes can


20 Note that she calls the “parameters” discussed in the second part “factors” that are “influential in intralingual translation” (Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 805).

21 Specifically, the distinction between “content changes” and “linguistic changes” is my own, as is the grouping of explications, explanations, objective additions, and subjective additions together as simply “additions.”

be separated into two groups: linguistic changes and (non-linguistic) content changes (see figure 2.1). Beginning with content changes, “explanations” and “explications” appear to be subtypes of the category of “additions.” Additions can be “objective” or “subjective,” the former being “factual explanations and the addition of factual information,” and the latter, presumably, opinions (non-facts) held by the translator. Another content change made in intralingual translation is changing the “structure of the text” (also termed “restructuring”). This is when the translation changes the order of the content of the source text, not for linguistic reasons, but to provide a better—in the translator’s opinion—organization or flow to the text. In Zethsen’s corpus, for example, one Danish translation alters where Joseph and Mary’s betrothal is first mentioned, to help the audience better understand the context of the story. The last content change Zethsen discusses is “content omissions,” when content from the source text is simply left out in the translation. One of the purposes of content omissions is to make the text simpler to the audience, by eliminating details that would be confusing to those with less “background knowledge” and lower “ability of comprehension.”

Figure 2.1 - Types of Changes Found in Intralingual Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Omission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Lexical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Syntactic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The linguistic changes involved in intralingual translation are either lexical or syntactic. Lexical changes involve the substitution of “synonymous expressions”; these can be single lexical items or larger expressions (i.e., phrases consisting of multiple words). Within Zethsen’s corpus, all of the lexical changes involve “absolute synonyms” from different points in the

---

23 Zethsen also calls them “subjective comments” (“Intralingual Translation,” 802).
language’s history. In other words, a diachronic gap between two stages of a language is spanned by the substitution of a newer word having exact semantic overlap with the older word being replaced. We could, of course, imagine cases where the synonym used does not have exact semantic overlap but is still adequate (as in equivalence in interlingual translation). Moreover, other types of intralingual translation, such as expert-to-layman communication, would not involve the spanning of a diachronic gap but a (synchronic) register gap. Syntactic changes involve the changing of syntax so that the text is more understandable to the implied audience. As with the lexical changes in Zethsen’s corpus, the syntactic changes are aimed at spanning a diachronic gap. Syntactic changes “[make] the text more contemporary” by creating “more modern and less stilted” syntax. Specific examples of such changes include the placement of causal phrases (before or after the main clause), and removal of syntactical markers that are no longer productive. Both lexical and syntactical changes have the purpose of providing “everyday language instead of formal or archaic language.” In other words, these linguistic changes transfer meaning from different registers (such as formal and non-formal) and different diachronic stages (such as archaic or non-archaic) in a language.

The second part of Zethsen’s analysis discusses the factors or reasons for any of these types of change to occur in intralingual translation (see figure 2.2). The first factor is knowledge, “the target group’s general ability to understand a text.” If the source text would be less understandable to the target audience because of a lack of knowledge, the intralingual translation would make certain changes to account for this. Zethsen initially connects the category of knowledge primarily to content changes (specifically, explication and explanation),

29 Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 804; interestingly, the latter example is the removal of the Septuagintalism (itself a Hebraism) “and it happened” (Og det skete = ἐγένετο δέ = וַיְהִי).
32 We should also note that, theoretically, a change could occur because the audience has more knowledge; for example, if a scholar took an academic talk aimed at a general audience and turned it into a paper presentation aimed at specialists, more technical terminology would be used.
but knowledge is a factor prompting linguistic changes as well. The second factor is time. This factor is related to the categories knowledge and culture (see below), but time refers specifically to cases where a “diachronic factor... results in the lack of knowledge or cultural understanding.” The third category, culture, involves a gap between the audience’s culture and that of the source text. Such a gap creates a “need to explain cultural references in a text which time or general background knowledge prevent the target group from understanding.” Zethsen’s fourth factor, space, refers to the extending or reducing the text because of a lack of knowledge (in other words, additions, and omission of confusing material). We should note, as Zethsen does in places, that there is significant overlap between all of these factors. A lack of background knowledge of the source text’s context can create distance in cultural understanding. Gaps in time can result in a lack of knowledge and a difference in culture. Differences in culture can result in a lack of knowledge about the source text’s presumed culture. Lack of knowledge, difference in culture, and gaps in time all create the need to change space (whether expanding for explanation/explication, or omitting confusing material).

Figure 2.2 – Factors Involved in Intralingual Translation

| 1. Knowledge |
| 2. Time |
| 3. Culture |
| 4. Space |

Zethsen’s first three factors clearly deal with gaps in understanding between the target audience and the source text. However, we might add some other impetuses that do not necessarily entail a gap in knowledge. Cultural, religious, and social perceptions can also be impetuses for translation, in order to give the text a different voice. This voice could be

33 So Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 808.
34 Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 806.
36 This category is somewhat out of place in Zethsen’s typology: it does not refer to a reason for change, but rather a macro-category of types of change including addition and omission.
communicative in itself (one thinks of the “Cotton Patch” versions of New Testament books created by Clarence Jordan, where a southern voice gives the text a more “down to earth” quality). Or the purpose of this different voice could be to give legitimacy and authority to the translation; a possible example of this would be the lofty King James Version English that some religious people might use when praying. Of course, cultural, religious, and social perceptions play a role in some interlingual translations as well, and we could add to the above examples cases where French is used in 19th century literature because it was a prestige language. Although in Zethsen’s corpus understandability is essentially behind all of the changes made, other factors can provide impetus for translation as well.

Below we will consider the variation that occurs in HB manuscript transmission within the two frameworks provided by Zethsen, asking whether the types of text-critical variants can be categorized within Zethsen’s types of change, and whether the impetuses behind text-critical variants are of the same sort as the factors for change outlined by Zethsen. In order to set the stage for that discussion, however, we will first consider the nature of intralingual translation and its relationship to interlingual translation. If variants in HB manuscript transmission can be understood as intralingual translation, we ought first to have an understanding of intralingual translation’s status *vis-à-vis* interlingual translation.

### 2.1.3 – Intralingual and Interlingual Translation: The Same Phenomenon

In this section, I will argue, with Zethsen and others, that intralingual translation and interlingual translation are two instances of the same thing. In his study *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, George Steiner begins by reviewing an impressive range of English literature that lies at some distance from the modern world; in particular, he is interested in the ways in which interpreters go about the task of interpreting. He points out that this process of

---


38 For example, “We thank thee, Our Father, for these gifts which thou has bestowed upon us,” instead of what the prayer would naturally think in English, “We thank you, God, for all the things you have given us.”

interpretation—its tools, methods, and processes—is essentially the same as the process of translation:

The schematic model of translation is one in which a message from a source-language passes into a receptor-language via a transformational process. The barrier is the obvious fact that one language differs from the other, that an interpretive transfer... must occur so that the message ‘gets through’. Exactly the same model... is operative within a single language.40

Both interpretation and translation strive to achieve what Steiner calls “transfer” (a notion we will return to below). In both activities, “the tools employed... are correlate.”41 Later, Steiner refers again to this similarity, this time speaking of interpretation as essentially intralingual translation. For Steiner, “The fundamental epistemological and linguistic problems implicit in interlingual translation... are already implicit in all intralingual discourse”; Jakobson’s notion of intralingual translation (rewording) “in fact raises issues of the same order as translation proper [=interlingual translation].”42 According to Steiner, the process of translation—its difficulties, methods, and results—essentially revolves around the nature of language itself. The issues of interlingual translation are just one instantiation of the issues involved in any language use (including intralingual translation).

Numerous other scholars warn against limiting our idea of translation to the traditional notion of translation, that is, interlingual translation.43 According to Zethsen, “the differences between intralingual and interlingual translation seem to be more a question of degree than of kind.”44 There is a clear “family resemblance”45 in that they both utilize the same strategies to overcome the same problems.46 Both intralingual and interlingual translation involve the same “mechanism of transfer” between source and target.47 Finally, both intralingual and interlingual

40 Steiner, After Babel, 28.
41 Steiner, After Babel, 28.
42 Steiner, After Babel, 416.
44 Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 795; cf. 808-809. Below, I will argue that this notion of difference in degree is correct only when applied to intralingual translations and interlingual translations in general, but not necessarily when applied to specific instances of both.
45 Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 808.
46 Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 809.
47 Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 796.
translation must surmount linguistic barriers in order to accomplish the transfer. Since there is no linguistic way of defining what a “language” is, as opposed to a dialect or different diachronic stage, there is no clear line between intralingual translation and interlingual translation.

Beginning with the notion of transfer, Rachel Weissbrod (following Itamar Even-Zohar) defines transfer as a “recreation of texts and models originating in another system.” Weissbrod uses the terms “model” and “system” to be inclusive of variables from intersemiotic translation (e.g., film). For our purposes, her definition of transfer is essentially a recreation of a text (the source text) existing within one (linguistic and cultural) setting as a new text (the target text) within a second (linguistic and cultural) setting. Such transfers or recreations can occur between settings of the same or different language and of the same or different culture. The essential point is that there are two different settings and thus two different audiences; although the difference may be a result of time, language, and/or culture (as in Zethsen’s description), the difference could be a result of anything conceivable. What is implied here is that, given the differences of setting, there exists some barrier keeping the audience within the new setting from properly comprehending the source text. Regardless of the source and target settings, “the mechanism of transfer [is] largely the same.” Applied to our case, we can say that both interlingual translation and intralingual translation utilize the same process of transfer, or recreation within a different setting.

In the types of change we labelled content changes above (for example, additions), the meaning of the source text is recreated within the setting of the target text, by the use of addition, omission, or rearrangement of words. The conceptual meaning of the source text, however, is meant to be retained to at least some extent, being transferred to the target text. These content changes are what Weissbrod calls “non-obligatory shifts”: they do not stem from the “structure of the target language” but from other elements such as “cultural and political pressures,” or the
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48 Rachel Weissbrod, “From Translation to Transfer” (Across Languages and Cultures 5/1, 2004), 27; cf. 23. See Itamar Even-Zohar, Polysystem Studies (special issue, Poetics Today 11/1, 1990), 73-78.
49 Weissbrod, “From Translation to Transfer,” 27; cf. 25, 29.
50 Cf. Steiner, After Babel, 28.
51 Weissbrod, “From Translation to Transfer,” 24.
52 Weissbrod, “From Translation to Transfer,” 41.
“values, ideologies and world-views” of the new setting.\textsuperscript{53} In other words, the barrier that must be traversed between the two settings is not linguistic, and therefore these shifts are not obligatory to make the target text understandable at the most basic level. Because these changes have nothing to do with the linguistic settings of the source and target text, it is clear that both intralingual and interlingual translations utilize content changes (non-obligatory shifts) in the same way and for the same reasons; in other words, the transfer involved in content changes is the same for both.

In the types of change we labelled \textit{linguistic} changes above (for example, the substitution of a synonym), the meaning of the source text must be transferred between two different linguistic systems. The meaning of the source text within linguistic setting A is recreated in the target text within linguistic setting B. Again, the conceptual meaning of the source text is meant to remain the same (i.e., it is transferred). Linguistic changes are “obligatory shifts,” since they stem from the “structure of the target language”;\textsuperscript{54} in other words, the linguistic barrier between setting A and setting B necessitates such changes to make the target text understandable at the most basic level. Because intralingual translation occurs within one language and interlingual between two languages, one might suppose that the type of transfer involved in linguistic changes (obligatory shifts) is in some way different between intralingual translation and interlingual translation. However, the types of linguistic barriers encountered in both are the same. Moreover, the language-related distinction between intralingual translation and interlingual translation is not essentially about linguistic criteria, but social criteria (see below). Therefore, the transfer involved in linguistic changes is the same for both intralingual and interlingual translation.

Besides the common element of transfer present in both intralingual and interlingual translation, the two types of translation bear a high level of resemblance in the problems they encounter\textsuperscript{55} when attempting to transfer meaning, as well as the solutions employed to surmount

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Weissbrod, “From Translation to Transfer,” 24.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Weissbrod, “From Translation to Transfer,” 40-41.
\item \textsuperscript{55} These problems arise principally because of the issue of correspondence (Jakobson, “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation,” 114; Steiner, \textit{After Babel}, 260-261; Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 797).
\end{itemize}
those problems. The issue of lexical pairings provides a good example of this reality. One of the key issues in interlingual translation is the selection of an appropriate lexical equivalent in the target text to represent the source text. Because there are no exact lexical equivalents between two languages, the translator is forced to choose an equivalent with partial semantic overlap (or to create a text-wide equivalence, i.e., lexical isomorphism). As Steiner points out, “Inside a language, synonymy is only very rarely complete equivalence.”

Synonyms within the language, which may be interchanged in intralingual translation (see above on lexical change), also have overlapping but differing semantic ranges. Thus intralingual translation is presented with the same difficulty. Whether the task is intralingual or interlingual translation, the same difficulty is present: how to select the correct pairing given no exact semantic equivalent but partial semantic overlap. Zethsen notes that “many of the microstrategies applied in intralingual translation resemble those commonly used when carrying out interlingual translation.” Strategies like lexical isomorphism and semantic adequacy, for example, are employed to overcome the difficulty of partially overlapping but not exactly corresponding semantic ranges, whether in intralingual or interlingual translation. Notably, Toury’s general framework of source oriented versus target oriented translation, developed to describe interlingual translation, accurately describes the strategies used in intralingual translation.

The most important overlap between intralingual translation and interlingual translation is at the point of linguistic changes. Both types of translation utilize linguistic changes to surmount linguistic barriers between the source setting and the target setting. Because the distinction between intralingual and interlingual translation deals entirely with whether the language of the two settings is the same or different, the definition of “a language” is crucial to fleshing out how intralingual translation and interlingual translation relate in terms of linguistic changes. In fact, language distinctions are not ultimately linguistic; as a result, the difference between intralingual translation and interlingual translation is not ultimately linguistic, and the linguistic changes

56 Steiner, After Babel, 261.
made in both are of the same kind.

In linguistic change (or non-obligatory shifts), the essential issue is the barrier between two types of language: some sort of transfer is needed to transfer meaning from the source to the target. “The barrier [involved in interlingual translation] is the obvious fact that one language differs from the other,” but such barriers exist “within a single language” as well.\(^5\) Transferring meaning between different dialects of a language, different diachronic stages in a language, and different registers within a language presents the same linguistic barriers as transferring meaning between two languages.\(^6\) As Zethsen states, “The codes of different discourse communities within the same language may be almost as different from each other as two different national languages.”\(^7\) In fact, the nature of the differences between two languages and the nature of the differences between two dialects, etc., are precisely the same. This is because the “language” distinction is not about linguistic criteria—though different languages surely differ linguistically, and this affects our perception of them—but about social criteria.\(^8\) What makes Spanish and Portuguese two different languages, instead of two dialects of the same language, is not the extent to which they differ linguistically; rather, social, cultural, and political factors result in our viewing them as two different languages. Similarly, these same factors are what influence us to say that Spanish is not a later diachronic stage of Latin but a different language.\(^9\)

Since “the main difference between [intralingual and interlingual] translation is the involvement in interlingual translation of two different national languages,”\(^10\) and since linguistic features do not determine whether two types of language are different languages or merely two


\(^6\) On dialects, diachronic stages, and registers, see David Crystal, “New Perspectives for Language Study: I Stylistics,” *English Language Teaching* 24 (1970), 103. Crystal refers to “regional dialect” (what we refer to as “dialect”), “class dialect” (what we refer to as “register”), and “temporal dialect” (what we refer to as “diachronic stages within a language”).


\(^9\) Cf. also M. Hale, *Historical Linguistics: Theory and Method* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 3-17, who points out the difficulty of defining a language from another angle: the difficulty of justifying why particular dialects, etc., should belong together as one language (i.e., what unites a language?).

\(^10\) Zethsen, “Intralingual Translation,” 808.
versions of the same language, there is no clear line between intralingual and interlingual translation—that is, no clear line deriving from the nature of these processes of translation themselves. To be sure, there appears to be a large difference between paraphrasing an English source text into English and translating a Hebrew text into English. However, other examples—for example, Old English to modern North American English versus Italian to Romanian—show clearly that the “intralingual” versus “interlingual” labels are reflections of artificial decisions, not the linguistic nature of the translations themselves. As a result, I find Zethsen’s idea that the difference between intralingual and interlingual translation is a matter of “degree than of kind” is not entirely accurate. Although in general intralingual translations have a lower degree of transfer than interlingual translations—because on average two dialects of a language tend to be closer than two languages—particular intralingual translations may involve a higher degree of linguistic transfer than particular interlingual translations. In the following example using the Lord’s Prayer, two particular sets of translation are juxtaposed; it would be difficult to say that the intralingual translation involves a lesser degree of transfer than the interlingual translations.

Figure 2.3 - Particular Intralingual Translation versus Particular Interlingual Translation

- Intralingual Translation of the Lord’s Prayer -
  Old English: Fæder ūre þū þe eart on heofonum
  Modern English: Our father, who is in heaven.

- Interlingual Translations of the Lord’s Prayer -
  French: Notre Père qui es aux cieux (Nouvelle Edition de Genève)
  Italian: Padre nostro che sei nei cieli (Nuova Riveduta)
  Latin: Pater noster qui in caelis (Vulgate)

Moving beyond linguistic issues, we should note also that there is not a difference of degree for content changes, either. An intralingual translation will often take more liberty (be more target oriented) than an interlingual translation (many of which are more source oriented). Whether a translation is within one language (even the same dialect) or between two vastly different languages, the translator is able to choose how closely she will follow the source text in terms of

additions, omissions, and restructuring of the text. In sum, the distinction between intralingual translation and interlingual translation belongs to human perception, not to the actual nature of translation itself. There are varying degrees of linguistic transfer depending on how different the languages or dialects or registers, etc., are, and different translators may utilize more or fewer content changes; these levels of transfer are not determined, however, by whether a translation is intralingual or interlingual.

One might respond to the claim that intralingual and interlingual translation are the same by positing that the difference between them is understandability. In other words, one might expect an audience of an intralingual translation to understand the original, whereas this should not be expected with an interlingual translation. However, this is again a matter of degree, not fundamental difference. Zethsen's exploration of knowledge, time, and culture as impetuses for change show that a lack of understanding is behind changes made in intralingual translation. Moreover, the issue of defining a language (crucial for defining interlingual versus intralingual translation) comes into play: a Spanish speaker may be able to understand the Italian original of a Spanish interlingual translation better than a speaker of Israeli Hebrew would understand an ancient Hebrew text.

2.1.4 – Variation in Textual Transmission as Intralingual Translation

The similarity of the language Zethsen uses to describe intralingual translation—for example, the terms addition, explication, and omission—with the language used in textual criticism already suggests overlap between the two areas. In what follows, I will work through Zethsen’s typology of intralingual translation as it applies to text-critical data, drawing examples from Tov’s section on “content changes.” We should note from the outset a difference in
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67 Tov, Textual Criticism, 240-262. Unfortunately, the field of Translation Studies does not address the phenomenon we see so clearly in the OG, namely, the presence of scribal error. Rather, Translation Studies assumes that the translator has not made any errors with regard to the reading of the source text, probably because so much of Translation Studies deals with translations of modern works in the modern era, where such errors are ideally eliminated. Note that there is a significant amount of literature on “mistakes” in translation, but this refers to the idea of a translator translating incorrectly, not reading the source text incorrectly (i.e., not
perspective between Zethsen’s categories and Tov’s. Zethsen’s categories deal either with the
types of changes (e.g., addition, omission) or with the overall conceptual factors and reasons for
change (e.g., culture, time); Tov’s categories, on the other hand, deal with more specific reasons
for change (e.g., theologically motivated change) and often deal with both the type of change
and the reason for change (e.g., “midrash-like changes and additions,” harmonization). As a
result, the two systems cannot be neatly overlapped.

Beginning with the linguistic changes noted by Zethsen, cases of lexical change are
abundant in the Hebrew manuscript tradition. In Isa 13:10, for example, 1QIsaא apparently
substitutes the word אור—meaning “to give light” in the Hifil (BDB s.v.)—for the rare word הלל
—meaning “to flash forth light” in the Hifil (BDB s.v.). This exchange of synonyms occurs for
the same reasons as discussed by Zethsen in intralingual translation: the word in the source text (הלל)
is unintelligible to some in the target text’s audience and must therefore be changed (to אור).
Such lexical changes illustrate well how the Hebrew manuscripts responded to the same factors
of knowledge, culture, and time highlighted by Zethsen. Cases of syntactic change are also
plentiful in the manuscript evidence. In Deut 21:7, for example, the ketiv reading of MT uses an
older form of the third masculine singular suffix (שפכ), while 4QDeutι, SP, and the qere reading
of MT have the later, more common form (שפכ). The extensive work of Martin Abegg on
syntax in the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls shows clearly, among other things, that syntactical and
grammatical factors were at work when variant readings emerged during the Second Temple
period.

68 See Tov, Textual Criticism, 256-257; see also the discussion of “synonymous readings” in 257-258.
69 See Tov, Textual Criticism, 257.
70 See Martin Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years (eds. Peter Flint
and James C. Vanderkam; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998); “Kutscher and the Great Isaiah Scroll: Where are
We Now?” (paper presented at the International Organization of Qumran Studies Congress, Ljubljana, Slovenia,
July 17, 2007); “The Linguistic Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls: More Than (Initially) Meets the Eye,” in
Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Co, 2010); and “The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Hebrew Syntax,” in Celebrating
the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection (eds. Jean Duhaime, Peter W. Flint and Kyung S. Baek; Atlanta:
Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).
numerous differences in orthography and morphology contained in the Hebrew manuscript tradition.\textsuperscript{71}

Moving on to Zethsen’s categories involving content changes, for the first, \textit{additions}, there are numerous examples in Hebrew textual transmission; although the more neutral term “plus” is preferred in many settings—thus deferring the judgment of whether the reading is secondary or not—when we make decisions about which readings are earlier, many pluses end up being additions. One general example comes from Isa 1:15 in Tov’s section on harmonization. Where MT has ידיכם מלאים (“your hands are full of blood”), 1QI\textsuperscript{a} adds\textsuperscript{72} בעאון ואצבעותיכם (“and your fingers [are full] of iniquity”).\textsuperscript{73} Zethsen refers to additions at various points as \textit{explanation} or \textit{explication}, and \textit{objective} versus \textit{subjective}. An example of an objective addition in the Hebrew manuscript tradition is found in Isa 14:2, where context influences 1QI\textsuperscript{a} to add the adjective רבים to MT’s text מלאים (“and peoples will take them” versus “and \textit{many} peoples will take them”); this change is “objective” because the information given in the addition is taken to be fact, as established by other texts in Isaiah such as 2:3-4 and 17:12.\textsuperscript{74} We find a subjective addition in 1 Sam 2:10; both MT and 4QS\textsuperscript{a} begin with the statement, “as for the Lord, those who contend with him will be shattered” (יהוה מרב). 4QS\textsuperscript{a}, however, adds an extended passage filling out some theological ideas associated with this statement.\textsuperscript{75} Given the nature of the subject matter, these theological ideas are subjective, the opinions of the scribe who inserted them. Tov includes a section of “explanatory and exegetical additions”; one of his cases, from Isa 7:25, provides an example of explanation. 1QI\textsuperscript{a} adds (supralinearly) the word ברזל just before the text שמיר, in order to explain that the word שמיר means “iron.”\textsuperscript{76} Finally, a good example of explication is found in 1Sam 2:17. The earlier text, found in 4QS\textsuperscript{a} (and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} See the work of Abegg on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls noted above.
\item \textsuperscript{72} I use the language of “add” in this context because we are comparing to Zethsen’s category of addition. In other contexts, I would perhaps reserve judgment. Rather than come to my own conclusions on the textual data in these examples, I follow Tov’s judgment on which readings are secondary.
\item \textsuperscript{73} See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 259.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Cf. Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 241.
\item \textsuperscript{75} See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 246.
\item \textsuperscript{76} See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 260; in fact, the word probably means “thorns,” but this does not change the point of the scribe’s addition.
\end{itemize}
presumably behind OG), has נאצו את מנחת יהוה ("they despised the offering of the Lord"); MT adds the word האנשים, giving the clause an explicit subject and thereby specifying that it was some men, not the "young boys" (Eli’s sons) from the preceding context, who committed this offense.77 Regarding additions, and the various subtypes Zethsen considers, it appears that many variants in Hebrew manuscript transmission can be conceptualized under this category.

For Zethsen’s second content change, restructuring, the only examples from Tov concern large-scale reordering of text, such as that found in Jeremiah.78 Although such large-scale changes fall under her category of restructuring, Zethsen’s examples involved small-scale restructuring, within one sentence or a shorter passage. Tov includes this type of change within his section on “differences created in the course of the textual transmission” ;79 although such changes are included by Tov under the category for common scribal error, he does not say anything about this type of change beyond that it occurs (i.e., there is no particular scribal error associated). An example of this scale of restructuring can be seen in Exod 5:3; SP reads נאלנה נלכה המדברה דרך שלשת ימים ("please let us go desertwards a journey of three days"), but MT reads דנא נלכה ימים שלשת ראך במדבר ("please let us go a journey of three days in the desert"). Besides the syntactical change involved (MT uses the preposition bet whereas SP has the postposition heh—the so-called “directional heh”), the text has been restructured so that “desert” appears at a different point in the clause. In this case, we do not need to determine which reading is earlier to see that restructuring has occurred.

For Zethsen’s third content change, omissions, we naturally think of certain scribal errors that result in omission of text (haplography, homoi, etc). One general text-critical rule—that a shorter text is preferred in the case of intentional changes but the longer text in the case of an unintentional error—presumes (correctly) that omissions occur more frequently in cases of scribal error. However, in Zethsen’s description of intralingual translation, omissions are purposeful; the translator omits some words that are unknown but unnecessary to the target

77 See Tov, Textual Criticism, 245.  
78 Cf. Tov, Textual Criticism, 287.  
79 Tov, Textual Criticism, 239.
audience, or that are unpalatable, etc. Although more difficult to find, HB manuscripts may plausibly include cases of intentional omission. First, in Deut 1:39, it may be the case that SP omits the relative clause אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדַע תָּבוּ כָּלֵי וַעֲדֵי (“who do not know, this day, good and evil”) when describing the children of the Israelites who will enter the land. The minus can be explained as an omission because the language of יִדְעֹת וַעֲדֵי, which may have connoted knowledge of sexual practices, was deemed unsavory. Second, SP omits כל in the commandment in Exod 20:24, changing a reference from “every place where I cause my name to be remembered” to “the place where I cause my name to be remembered” (i.e., Mount Gerazim). Third, SP omits השור in Exod 21:35, since earlier in the verse כל הבמות was added (i.e., the law is not just about a man’s ox but also “any animal of his”). All three of these examples, and the first one in particular, illustrate what Zethsen (and Zahn) refer to as omission. These show that, although cases of intentional omission are rare in our data, it did occur in the process of textual transmission.

The preceding examples illustrate a general principle: most textual variants in the Hebrew manuscripts can be categorized along the lines of Zethsen’s types of change—addition, restructuring, omission, lexical change, and syntactic change. At points it seems that the reason behind a change in the Hebrew manuscripts differs from the typical reasons in intralingual translation; for example, Zethsen’s study has no examples of theologically motivated change or harmonization. However, her corpus is fairly particular, consisting of Bible translations that do not have confessional commitments. We might imagine some other types of intralingual
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80 Tov’s section on variants dealing with “content changes” nowhere refers to omissions (i.e., a minus that is secondary), nor do any of his examples involve omissions. However, this may be due to the text-critical assumption that, when it comes to content related differences, the longer version of the text is always secondary. While this is a reasonable suggestion, we nevertheless must grant that some of the larger pluses may not be secondary. It is easier to think of theologically or exegetically motivated reasons to add some phrases to a text than to subtract them; this, coupled with the methodological preferencing of explanations involving insertions rather than omissions, might causes scholars to miss omissions on occasion.


83 Zahn, *Rethinking*, 157-158.
translation that would align much more easily with the type of data we see in Hebrew manuscript transmission; for example, a highly theologized retelling of a biblical story by a minister in a confessional context. I suspect the reasons for changes in such an intralingual translation would match quite closely the reasons for change seen in Hebrew manuscript variants.

We noted above that Zethsen’s other three factors—knowledge, culture, and time—are interrelated. As such, cases involving one of these factors will also illustrate one or two of the others. The example of Isa 13:10 discussed above involves the factors of time and knowledge. Presuming that הָלוֹל is rarer in the HB because it is an older word, a gap in time would have created a lack of knowledge in the target audience of the meaning of הָלוֹל, occasioning the lexical change to הָלוֹל, אֲרֵר. 84 Similarly, 1QIsa’s substitution of שִׁולֶךְ (“your hem”) for MT’s שְׁבָל (“skirt”) in שִׁבָל חָשְׁפֵי (“bare [your] skirt”) stems from the target audience’s lack of knowledge—perhaps caused by a gap in time or culture—of the noun שָבָל, “skirt.” 85 The examples of other types of linguistic change discussed by Abegg—whether grammatical, morphological, or syntactical—undoubtedly illustrate change stemming from a gap in knowledge and time; that is, the readers of some manuscripts would not have understood older Hebrew language, and as such the language was updated.

We should note that these three factors of Zethsen’s all deal with the target audience having a lack of understanding. However, we have argued above that intralingual translation can occur for other reasons, such as cultural or religious pressures. As such, we should not consider Zethsen’s typology to be complete at this point but instead only reflective of her limited corpus. Some readers might object to my comparison of textual transmission and intralingual translation on the basis of the intended reasons for creating these changes in the text. In intralingual translation, they might argue, the point of updating the language is to make the source text comprehensible to the target audience. However, this purpose of understandability is not essential to intralingual translation. The intended reasons for the changes could deal with other cultural, religious, or social pressures (beyond lack of understanding); or, there could be no
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84 See above and Tov, Textual Criticism, 256-257.
85 See Tov, Textual Criticism, 257.
intentional or intended purpose at all for the changes. What defines intralingual translation is a transfer of meaning from a source text to a target text that utilizes different wording (whether different linguistically or different in terms of its contents) from the original.

The variation that we find in Hebrew manuscript transmission seems to fit well into the categories derived from intralingual translation. In other words, given the evidence just discussed, there is significant overlap between the two processes. At the very least, we can say that variation in transmission is very similar to intralingual translation.

2.1.5 – Differences between Transmission and Translation

If intralingual translation and interlingual translation are the same phenomenon, and textual transmission contains intralingual translation, then we must conclude that there is significant overlap between textual transmission and translation. We can further define the relationship of transmission and translation by now considering the ways in which they differ. If we were to look at translations versus transmission documents in general, we would see that there is generally a difference in the degree or frequency of transfer. In other words, a typical translation (like OG) contains more transfers of meaning than a transmission document (like a Hebrew manuscript). There is a spectrum of amount of transfer even within translations themselves (see section 2.1.3): interlingual translations typically contain transfer at every point, while intralingual translations can sometimes retain the exact wording of the original. In manuscripts, retention of the exact words of the original is the norm; there are some cases of translation (variants), but only at points. We might thus say that manuscript transmission contains instances of translation.

These are generalizations, however. When we look at specific translations, we find exceptions. As noted above, some intralingual translations can contain more frequent transfer than some interlingual translations. These exceptions show us that low or high frequency of transfer is a general characteristic of certain types of translation, but not a defining factor. Comparing translation to transmission, we might find examples of translation where there is less transfer than in a HB manuscript. It is not hard to imagine an intralingual translation, for
example, the Harry Potter books, that contained less frequency of transfer than, for example, the SP version of Exodus 1-14. We can say, therefore, that manuscript transmission and translation generally differ with regard to frequency of transfer, but frequency of transfer does not define what is or is not translation.

Regardless of the frequency of transfer in a translation, it is true that with an intralingual translation the text as a whole is intentionally transferred from setting A to setting B. We would suspect, on the other hand, that a scribe made no conscious effort to transfer the meaning of his Vorlage as a whole from one setting to another. This aspect of translation—that an entire work was transferred between two settings—might define translation against textual transmission. Like frequency of transfer, however, this distinction also seems to be a general characteristic, because there are exceptions. Manuscripts for personal use and “luxury” or “de luxe” editions, for example, were created to serve a different purpose in a different setting. In later manuscript transmission (i.e., after the Second Temple period), illuminations and intricate handwriting were added for particular settings to serve different purposes. Like the family picture Bible and children’s picture Bible in Zethsen’s study, these different manuscripts attempted to transfer the meaning of the source in some way to a new setting. Translation always involves the transfer of the work as a whole, while transmission sometimes does and sometimes does not. This aspect, then, cannot define the activity of translation as different from manuscript transmission.

One final, related possibility for defining translation would be the intentionality of the transfer (of the work) or transfers involved. This has to do with the social setting and purposes of the new document, rather than the actual data that we find in the evidence. Translations are intended to transfer meaning across two settings; manuscripts, on the other hand, do not always seem to have this intentionality. The scribe at his work does not necessarily think that he is bridging a gap between the setting of his Vorlage and the setting of his manuscript. Once again, however, this possible definition has weaknesses. First, it says nothing about the nature of the data, only the nature of the people who created the data and the ways in which they viewed the
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documents. Even if this were a defining aspect of translation, we could still say that textual transmission contains the same phenomena as translation, just not intentionally. Second, there are certainly some cases where the scribe intentionally transferred meaning. Examples include the linguistic changes that make older Hebrew language more intelligible; these are clearly changes involving a transfer of meaning from setting A to setting B. Examples involving theological change also reflect a transfer of setting, from setting A where a certain theological outlook is the norm to setting B where that theological outlook has changed in some way. We could also add the examples discussed above—deluxe editions, personal copies, and illuminated manuscripts—to cases where manuscript transmission involves an intentional transfer from one setting to another. Like the notion of transferring a work as a whole, intentionality seems to be an aspect present in every translation, but also present in some instances of transmission. As such, this aspect cannot distinguish the activity of translation from transmission.

In summary, it seems there are three aspects that are more characteristic of translation (including intralingual translation) than manuscript transmission: frequency of transfer, transfer of the work as a whole, and intentionality of transfer. None of these, however, is able to draw a clear line between what constitutes translation and what constitutes transmission.

2.1.6 – Mapping the Phenomena Common to Translation and Transmission

Our consideration of the similarities of translation and transmission suggests a framework within which we can categorize the various aspects of all of the processes under consideration. In the transfer involved in interlingual translation, intralingual translation, textual transmission, and the specific translation of OG, we see both preservation and change of the source text. With respect to preservation, in interlingual translation (including the OG) preservation occurs primarily through isomorphism. In transmission, we see preservation through rote copying. In
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87 Cf. Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition,” 228, where the “scribal ethos” is about “the obligation to preserve and pass on written tradition... conjoined with the didactic obligation to render the tradition responsive to present community contexts.”

88 By “rote” copying, I do not mean a process that is purely rote (i.e., mechanical or unthinking). Since the scribes transmitting the text knew the text, it would have been impossible to look at the text and not read; cf. Jonathan Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors: Haplography and Textual Transmission of the Hebrew
intralingual translation, there is both isomorphism and rote copy. With respect to change, there are three subcategories, three basic ways in which change can occur, that are common to our four processes. First, we see errors (i.e., scribal error) in textual transmission and in the OG; this aspect of translation is nowhere discussed in Translation Studies, yet we suspect given the wealth of evidence in OG that such error could occur in any translation, especially in the ancient world. Second, linguistic barriers between two different linguistic settings result in linguistic changes. Third, translation and HB textual transmission alike result in content changes—changes to the meaning of the text that are not purely linguistic.

Figure 2.4 - Framework for the Phenomena common to Translation and Transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Interlingual Translation</th>
<th>Intralingual Translation</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>HB Textual Transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Isomorphism</td>
<td>Isomorphism and rote copy</td>
<td>Isomorphism&lt;sup&gt;90&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rote copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error</strong></td>
<td>Not discussed in translation studies</td>
<td>Not discussed in translation studies</td>
<td>Scribal error</td>
<td>Scribal error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic change</strong></td>
<td>Translation Technique (including isomorphism)</td>
<td>Zethsen’s lexical and syntactic changes</td>
<td>Translation Technique (including isomorphism)</td>
<td>Linguistic updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content change</strong></td>
<td>Content changes</td>
<td>Zethsen’s additions, restructuring, and omissions</td>
<td>So-called “interpretive” changes</td>
<td>Indicative variants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of these different types of transfers there are ways in which the source is preserved or passed on, errors of sight or hearing or memory, linguistic barriers overcome by linguistic
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Bible,” *JSOT* (forthcoming). However, there were undoubtedly cases where the focus of copying was on mechanical transferral of each word (or letter) to the new manuscript, though memory and contextual reading would have had an impact. This kind of focus in the process of transmission is what I mean by “rote copying.”

<sup>89</sup> See footnote 67 above.

<sup>90</sup> Note that isomorphism is an important aspect of OG translation technique, which is listed under “linguistic change.” Isomorphism is a strategy that is employed to attempt to both preserve the original text and make linguistic changes that transfer meaning to the target language. Thus, isomorphism (and isomorphic translation technique) is involved in both the preservation and change of the source text.
changes, and semantic difficulties overcome by content changes. Note that other documents, such as the Targums or the “rewritten Scripture” texts, could easily be plotted within these four categories as well.

The value of this model is its breadth. There are certainly differences between the processes of interlingual translation, intralingual translation, and textual transmission. However, it is helpful to see the ways in which these processes overlap and resemble one another. It is somewhat striking that this amount of common ground can be found in three different categories of transfer (interlingual translation, intralingual translation, and textual transmission) and work stemming from three different fields (Translation Studies, Septuagint Studies, and Textual Criticism). The overarching patterns highlighted by this model are of some consequence, showing both that the element of transfer is common to all these processes and encouraging us to see new aspects in some of the individual processes.

2.1.7 – Summary

In this section, I have argued that transmission is fundamentally similar to translation in significant ways. I explored the concept of intralingual translation and argued that intralingual translation and interlingual translation are one and the same process. I then showed that much of the variation we find in HB manuscript transmission is intralingual translation. Given that intralingual translation and interlingual translation are the same process, and that aspects of HB manuscript transmission are intralingual translation, I concluded that HB manuscript transmission and interlingual translation involve the same kind of process. Finally, I mapped out corresponding constituent parts of OG translation, HB transmission, interlingual translation, and intralingual translation.

Given the ability of intralingual translation to describe textual phenomena in the Hebrew manuscripts, it seems that transmission involved some of the same processes as translation. One implication of the model given in 2.1.6 above is that isomorphism in OG is mapped to the category of preservation. Whereas the three types of change have already been explored for OG above, we have yet to explore the ways in which OG preserves its source. Note that translation
technique, which obviously involves isomorphism, falls under linguistic change. Isomorphism is what connects text A with text B, thus providing preservation of the source text. Isomorphism is an attempt to overcome the barriers between languages. However, it is not completely successful. The ways in which isomorphism is successful fall under preservation, and the way in which it is not successful fall under linguistic change. In the following section, we will consider isomorphic translation in the OG as transmission—that is, we will consider the ways in which isomorphism falls under the category of preservation in this model.

2.2 – Translation as Transmission

In the previous section, our consideration of transmission as translation led to a conceptual model that suggests, among other things, that there is an aspect of preservation in the translation of OG. What exactly is this aspect of preservation? When we conceptualize textual transmission, the core idea seems to be the preservation of one text as it is passed from one physical document to another. In what ways does translation in the OG resemble this core aspect of transmission? In what follows, we will attempt to answer these questions. First, I will explore what has already been suggested, that the isomorphism of the OG resembles and overlaps with the rote copying of textual transmission. Second, I will connect the dots between isomorphic translation’s resemblance to transmission, textual transmission’s resemblance to intralingual translation, and most importantly the obvious fact of scribal error in the text of OG. What all of these suggest is that in the translation of OG (and any translation, for that matter), there is an intermediary step between the Vorlage or source text and the target text: a mental version, in Hebrew, of the source text.

2.2.1 – Isomorphic Translation as Encoded Hebrew

In Translation Studies there is an acknowledgment that translation involves transmission of the source text. At the core of all translation is the concept of reporting or quoting.91 Brian Mossop notes that typical spoken translation adds a quotative frame around the translation itself,
thus contextualizing the translation primarily as a quotation or a straight reporting of the source. For example, the source text *Je me sens mal* is translated, “*she says she doesn’t feel so good.*”

Beyond this core element of translation, however, we can discern ways in which isomorphic, source oriented translations go further in transmitting or quoting the source text than target oriented translations.

In section 1.3 above we described the typical translation technique found in the OG. One particular school of thought—led by Albert Pietersma, Benjamin Wright, and Cameron Boyd-Taylor—emphasizes heavily the source oriented nature of translation in the OG. In particular, the OG relies on lexical and grammatical isomorphism. The isomorphism in OG goes to such an extent that Pietersma, Wright, and Boyd-Taylor have suggested that its linguistic relationship to the Hebrew *Vorlage* is like that of an interlinear translation to its source text (see section 1.3). These scholars sometimes refer to the OG as “pony” to the Hebrew source. This term suggests the linguistic quality of a cheat-sheet, a “translation” in one’s own language that is extremely wooden to the point that it enables one to comprehend, translate, and/or parse the foreign language source text. These two metaphors for the OG’s linguistic nature suggest that the OG is almost a code text for the *Vorlage*, a virtual transmission of the *Vorlage* where the Hebrew is cyphered into Greek lexicon and grammar. Granted, as a Greek text read by Greek speakers, the Greek of the OG means what it would have meant in any other context in Greek literature. However, this does not entail that, for readers who knew Hebrew and knew that the Greek is a translation of a Hebrew text, the Greek does not somehow reflect or communicate what its Hebrew *Vorlage* contained. The former issue is a matter of meaning if the OG stood alone, whereas the latter is a matter of the meaning of OG as a companion text to the Hebrew.

The more the OG is source oriented and isomorphic, the more it resembles transmission. When the OG is highly isomorphic, it is possible to retrovert with some confidence what the Hebrew of its *Vorlage* contained. Although Tov cautions that we must ask the question of

whether or not such a Vorlage actually existed, he thereby implicitly recognizes that the Greek clearly represents a certain Hebrew source, regardless of the existence of a Vorlage. Although the OG translators did not intend to provide a Hebrew manuscript coded in Greek language to be deciphered by modern scholars, in essence this is what their isomorphic translation technique often provides. Given the source oriented translation technique used in the OG, translation technique itself gets in the way of representation minimally—that is, less than a more target oriented translation (though certainly more than a Hebrew manuscript). Given the linguistic barriers between Greek and Hebrew, the OG necessarily had to introduce change into the source text in order to render it in Greek. However, insofar as it set up standard lexical and grammatical equivalences and represented every morphological item from the source text, it preserved and passed on the source text. Moreover, what it preserved was not merely the meaning of the text, but its structure, word choice, syntax, etc.

In many cases, rigid isomorphism results in Greek that is intelligible, though obviously indebted to Hebrew syntax and lexicon. In some extreme cases, however, where the Hebrew uses idiom not shared in common with Greek, isomorphism results in unintelligible Greek. Although rigid isomorphism is used throughout much of the OG, it is in these particular cases where we can see it most clearly. In these cases, it seems apparent that the Greek of OG is more a code for the Hebrew Vorlage than a natural Greek text. In 2 Sam 24:1, for example, the Hebrew text uses the (common) idiom of a burning nose to communicate God’s anger: ולחרות יהוה אף ויסף is translated, “the anger of the Lord was kindled,” but woodenly something like, “the nose of the Lord was added to burn.” For this idiom, OG translates καὶ προσέθετο ὀργή κυρίου ἐκκαῆναι. Although ὀργή (“wrath”) is used instead of a word meaning “nose,” ὀργή is oddly (for Greek) spoken of as being “added” (προσέθετο) “to burn” (ἐκκαῆναι). The Greek sounds just as awkward as my second, wooden translation above. But each morphological item corresponds to and represents a morphological item in the Hebrew (καὶ for ו, προσέθετο for יסף).
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95 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 58.
96 This and the following examples are taken from Jan Joosten, “Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms,” in “Translation Is Required”: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect (ed. R. Hiebert; Leiden, Brill / Atlanta, SBL), 63-65.
ὀργὴ for אֶרֶנֶגֶה, κυρίου for יהוה, and ἐκκαῆναι for לַחְרֹוט, and each lexical item is known throughout the OG to correspond to the Hebrew word it represents here. The OG text is more code for Hebrew than it is a readable Greek text. For each element (syntactical, lexical, or morphological) of the OG encountered, we could trace our way back, as if using a decipherment key, to the Hebrew element. Certain syntax (e.g., the Greek infinitive) points to Hebrew syntax (lamed plus infinitive); certain vocabulary (e.g., ὀργή) points to Hebrew vocabulary (אֶרֶנֶגֶה).

Similar examples are abundant. In 1 Sam 18:26, the Hebrew text states that “the thing was straight in the eyes of David” (יהושע ה david בעניי דבר וישר, meaning (in decent English) that “David considered the matter to be agreeable” or even more simply that “David was pleased.” OG’s καὶ εὐθύνθη ὁ λόγος ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Δαυίδ offers the Greek audience none of the actual meaning of the Hebrew, but carries through virtually every aspect of the lexicon and grammar of the Hebrew.97 Finally, in Exod 28:41 the Hebrew text uses the idiom “to fill the hand” (Piel מלא plus יד) which has the sense of consecration or ordination to priestly office;98 וַיֵּמָלֵל אָתָם הָיָם essentially means “you will consecrate them.” The OG does not transfer the meaning, but instead encodes each item from the Hebrew into the standard, isomorphic Greek: καὶ ἔμπλήσεις αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας.99 In this case, the cases discussed above, and in most other cases in the OG, it is clear what the Greek of OG represents. In other words, a knowledgeable reader presented with καὶ ἔμπλήσεις αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας would know the Hebrew it represented, without ever having seen or read the Hebrew text of Exod 28:41.

97 The audience is left in the dark, unless they are able to decipher the Hebrew behind the Greek and arrive, through knowledge of the Hebrew language, at the idiomatic meaning. We should note that such knowledge would not only be available to Hebrew speakers. Part of the point of having such a source oriented text was to “bring the reader to the source” and thereby teach the reader the idiom and structure of the original language. In other words, even if the audience knew no Hebrew, if they read or heard the OG frequently they would understand what some of these idioms meant.

98 BDB מלא Pi. 2.

99 Here the OG does not follow the exact order of the Hebrew text. The Greek order is impossible in Hebrew and occurs several times in the OG. The point of the change in order probably deals with emphasis; cf. section section 3.2.1.4 footnote 67.

100 The Greek audience that was unfamiliar with Hebrew might be left asking, “What is he filling their hands with?” Those familiar with Hebrew, or the OG—that is, those who held the appropriate knowledge to decode OG—would be pointed by each element of OG back to the Hebrew Vorlage.
Although there is an element of change to the text when אֶפֶס is rendered as ὀργή, or מִלְאת as ἐμπλήσεις, or בֵּעַ as ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς, there is also an element of preservation. This preservation goes beyond the fact that the Greek has a similar meaning to the Hebrew in each case. Because of the high level of isomorphism, the change from, for example, מִלְאת to πίμπλημι, is mitigated by the fact that in OG, πίμπλημι means see מִלְאת, rather than to be full, to fill. In other words, each Greek element is more a reference to a Hebrew element than it is a reference to some conceptual meaning. To be clear, the Greek word πίμπλημι does not take on the meaning of מִלְאת; but when it is read as Greek in its context and makes little sense, the reader with some knowledge of Hebrew idiom understands that πίμπλημι is a place-holder for מִלְאת.

Given this rigid isomorphism in OG, which would form part of the general context of reading the OG, most of the Greek words would be understood as references to their Hebrew counterparts—whether the words read coherently as Greek or not. In this way, when the OG translates isomorphically, as it often does, the OG is essentially transmitting the text of its Vorlage, in much the same way that a Hebrew text would. We have seen that Hebrew manuscripts contain instances of translation, and that isomorphic OG translation contains a strong element of transmission. What remains to be seen is where exactly we ought to situate the aspects of OG’s translation that fall neither under the category of preservation using rigid isomorphism nor under the category of translation technique instigated by linguistic barriers. It is to this matter that we now turn.

2.2.2 – The Mental Text of the Translator

In this section, I would like to argue for the existence of an intermediate stage in the translation process not typically recognized in the study of translation. Whether the translator was conscious of it or not, there existed a version of the Hebrew text in the mind of the translator, based on the physical Vorlage but not necessarily identical to it. In other words, the

101 Cf. the argument of Boyd-Taylor, “Semantics.”
102 My discussion here focuses on the translation of the Hebrew text into Greek in the OG in history, but I believe applies equally to any translation of any time.
translation process did not involve one single move from the physical Vorlage directly to the physical text of the translation; rather, in the translator’s mind there were additional intermediary stages, appropriately conceived of as texts, through which this move was channeled. One of these stages was a mental version of the created Greek text; scholars in Translation Studies have argued for the existence of this mental text (see below). Because it is less pertinent to my study, we will only consider it insofar as it illuminates the presence of the other mental text, the translator’s decoding of the physical Vorlage—which I will refer to as the “mental Hebrew text” or simply the “mental text” of the translator.

Several phenomena suggest the existence of a Hebrew version of the text residing in the mind of the translator. The most obvious is the presence of simple scribal errors in the OG—that is, scribal errors the translator made involving the Hebrew text. Such errors are widespread in the OG. If the translator misread the Hebrew text and translated accordingly, what exactly was he translating? For example, consider Exodus 1:7:

**וּבּוֹרָבוּ שִׁבְרִים וַיָּרְצוּ פָּרָה וְיִשְּרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**

and the sons of Israel were fruitful and swarmed and multiplied

**οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐηξήθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαίοι ἐγένοντο**

and the sons of Israel grew and multiplied and became common

Let us assume for the sake of the argument that the OG’s Vorlage contained **יוּרְצוּ וְיוֹרֶב** (“they swarmed and multiplied”), as all extant manuscripts do. In the OG, **καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαίοι ἐγένοντο** would typically represent **יוְיִשְׂרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (“they multiplied and swarmed”; see the discussion in section 3.2.2). There are two options for explaining OG’s **καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαίοι ἐγένοντο**: either the translator decided to change the sense of the text subtly by

---

103 Moreover, in the diagrams below I will collapse the mental Greek text and the physical Greek text into one conceptual text, for the sake of simplicity.


105 It is entirely possible and even probable that OG’s Vorlage contained a variant text; however, for the sake of our discussion here, we will assume it did not.
reversing the order of רָבָה and שֵׁרֶץ, or the translator committed the simple scribal error of metathesis, unintentionally reversing the order of the words. Given the isomorphic nature of the OG, the latter is more probable. In this case, it is more accurate to say that the translator is not translating יִרְבּוּ וּיִשְׁרְצֵו, but rather יִשְׁרְצֵו וּיִרְבּוּ. But יִרְבּוּ וּיִשְׁרְצֵו appears in no physical manuscript (again, for the sake of argument). Where, then, does the Hebrew reading יִרְבּוּ וּיִשְׁרְצֵו reside? It resides, whether consciously or not, in the virtual source text that resides in the mind of the translator.106

More evidence of the mental text of the translator can be seen in extended isomorphic pluses in the OG. Consider Exodus 3:12, where God reassures Moses that he will support him in his effort to free the Hebrews:

(1 NRSV) He said, “I will be with you.”
εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσῇ λέγων ὅτι Ἐσομαι μετὰ σοῦ
(2 NETS) But God spoke to Moyses, saying, “I will be with you.”

OG contains the plus ὁ θεὸς Μωυσῇ λέγων. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the translator (not his Vorlage107) added this plus, we might consider how else it could have been written in Greek. Most obviously, the word λέγων is strange Greek. The following direct speech could have been introduced with something more literary, for example, τοιάδε (“as follows”; cf. LSJ τοιόσοδε). The word λέγων is a gloss for the Hebrew frozen infinitive לאמר, which often introduces direct speech in Hebrew.108 In this respect, the addition in OG is very isomorphic (though it supposedly translates nothing) and not idiomatic Greek.109 Although εἶπεν corresponds

106 Cf. Tov, who refers to scribal errors committed by the translator as “existing only in the translator’s mind” (Text Critical Use of the Septuagint, 140-141, 228-229).
107 None of the extant Hebrew manuscripts contain this plus.
109 Several times in Exodus, λέγων is used as a gloss for לאמר but no Hebrew text contains לאמר (Exod 3:12; 6:6; 7:1; 10:1; 12:43; 19:21; 32:13). This set of differences is striking because outside of Exodus this type of difference is rare in OG (e.g., twice in Leviticus: 10:19 and 21:1). Of course, these seven instances may alternatively be interpreted as the result of a variant Vorlage, considering the numerous times where OG λέγων does represent לאמר (found in MT, SP, or a Qumran biblical manuscript). Nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to
to אמר, the translator could have improved the Greek here to go along with his plus. Since God’s speech is a direct response to Moses’s question in verse 11, the verb ἀποκρίνομαι might have been more appropriate (cf. LSJ ἀποκρίνω IV). Finally, the Verb-Subject word order is standard for narrative clauses with preterite verbs in Hebrew, but such word order is not demanded in Greek.

The point is this: although εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσῇ λέγων ὅτι is acceptable Greek (with the exception of λέγων), the translator could have used much different Greek, Greek that would have been more acceptable to the target audience. Why does the plus read εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσῇ λέγων ὅτι instead of something like ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀπεκρίθη Μωυσῇ τοιάδε? If the translator is thinking in Greek when creating such extended pluses, then why does the Greek not reflect this? There are two possible explanations. First, the fact that such pluses continue to use the isomorphic Greek typical of OG suggests that the translator may not be thinking in Greek, but in Hebrew (if in fact he is the one inserting the pluses). Second, the translator may be so immersed in the translation project that, when inserting a plus, he simply continues to use the same sort of highly Hebraised Greek. In either of these scenarios, the OG does not have ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀπεκρίθη Μωυσῇ τοιάδε because there is no possible (grammatical) Hebrew that it could reflect isomorphically. In other words, whether consciously or not, the Greek plus reflects the Hebrew אמר אליהוالمשה אמר ב.110 The translator is either consciously thinking of the Hebrew behind this Greek, or at the least the Greek assumes a particular Hebrew—a fact about which, in the context of his translation, the translator would definitely have been aware. Where do these Hebrew words reside? Assuming for the sake of argument that no physical manuscript ever contained this Hebrew, it can only have resided in the mental text of the translator. Here the point

110 The dative case for the addressee (Μωυσῇ) looks less like isomorphic Greek, but in fact this is a typical rendition of לאמר לאמר (see OG Exodus 1:18; 2:8, 13; 3:14; 5:16; 6:6; 17:2, 10; 19:3; 32:23, 24, 27) and אמר לאמר (see OG Exodus 1:9; 2:20; 3:15; 4:2, 22, 23; 5:1, 4, 21; 7:9, 19; 8:1, 12, 23; 9:27, 29; 10:3, 8; 13:14; 16:9; 19:15, 24, 25; 32:1, 2; 33:5, 12). Although the collocation of אמר (लָאָמר and אמר (לָאָמר) and אמר (לָאָמר (לָאָמר) may seem very odd, in fact אמר is often followed by אמר (לָאָמר) and אמר (לָאָמר (לָאָמר occurs with אמר (לָאָמר) eight times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 32:18; 1 Ki 1:13, 30; 20:5; 2 Ki 7:12; Ezek 33:10; Zech 7:5; 1 Chr 4:9).
of the addition seems to be to clarify the subject of the clause; it seems clear that the translator
did not think the clarification in Greek, but in Hebrew—or, at the least, in a Greek that implicitly
and obviously pointed to some Hebrew source.

The quality such pluses have, that of clearly representing certain Hebrew though no
physical manuscript with that Hebrew may have ever existed, resembles a third phenomenon
giving evidence of a mental Hebrew text in the OG translator’s mind. This is the phenomenon of
“pseudotranslation,” in which an author, who could have written idiomatically in the language of
the text, instead writes as if there were a source text in another language behind her ‘translation.’
Gideon Toury has described this phenomenon.111 For a variety of reasons, an author might want
to “present [or] compose their texts as if they were actually translated.”112 The purpose of
pseudotranslation is often to legitimize one’s text, especially as an ancient and/or authoritative
work. Toury notes that “[Pseudotranslating] has often been one of the only ways open to a writer
to [introduce novelties into a culture] without arousing too much antagonism, especially in
cultures reluctant to deviate from sanctioned models and norms.”113 Pseudotranslators often
...incorporate in their texts features which have come to be associated, in the (target)
culture in question, with translation – more often than not, with the translation of texts of
a specific type and/or from a particular source language and textual tradition. By
enhancing their resemblance to genuine translations they simply make it easier for their
texts to pass as such.114

In fact, backtranslating from a pseudotranslation is even possible, such that “bits and pieces of a
fictitious source text” can be reconstructed.115 These linguistic features of the text point to a
mental version of the pseudo source text, whether consciously constructed by the

111 Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies, 40-52; cf. 41-44 for several examples of known pseudotranslations. Cf.
also James Davila, “(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from
Hebrew or Aramaic?,” Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 15 (2005): 3-61; and Aejmelaeus, On the
Trail, 23-25.

112 Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies, 40.

113 Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies, 41.

114 Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies, 45.

115 Toury, Descriptive Translation Studies, 46.
pseudotranslator or merely assumed by the language he or she uses.

James Davila discusses the large number of early Jewish works—in the apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and New Testament—that imitated the Septuagint’s style of Greek, then notes how close this sort of imitation is to the practice of pseudotranslation.\textsuperscript{116} The difference between the two is found in the latter’s claim, whether explicit or implicit, to be translated from a Hebrew text. Davila discusses several Jewish texts that might be considered pseudotranslation;\textsuperscript{117} in my view, many of the early Jewish texts seemingly written in “Septuagint Greek” (i.e., Hebraistic Greek) could be candidates for the description of pseudotranslation.\textsuperscript{118} Regardless of how widespread the practice of pseudotranslation was in the ancient world, its existence shows that [pseudo]translators worked with a mental source text.

The existence of a virtual mental text of the Hebrew source is also supported by recent developments in our understanding of scribalism (see section 1.2.3). When a text was copied, it was typically read aloud (by the scribe), held in short term memory, and then written on the new manuscript; the text was not copied letter-by-letter or even word-by-word, but according to sense units, in segments.\textsuperscript{119} Often, where a variant reading tradition was already in the scribe’s memory, it played a role in the creation of the new copy; in other words, the physical Vorlage was not the only text influencing the readings of the new manuscript. These facets derive from the roles of orality and memory in ancient scribalism.\textsuperscript{120} Returning to the idea of a mental Hebrew text in the mind of the translator, we can see that the words of the text had an existence in the minds of scribes transmitting manuscripts, whether the sense units of the Vorlage held in short term memory or the entire text according to an oral reading tradition held in long term memory or both. It was on the basis of these mental versions of the text that the new copy was made. It is not hard to imagine the same sorts of mental processes being involved in translation, where the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{116} Davila, “(How) Can We Tell,” 33-34.
\textsuperscript{117} Davila, “(How) Can We Tell,” 34 n.82.
\textsuperscript{118} Essentially, for these texts to be pseudotranslation depends on our judgment of whether or not they present themselves as translation.
source would have been read aloud and sense units would have been held in short term memory until translated.

At this point it will be helpful to offer a definition of what this mental Hebrew text is and to clarify its relationship to oral tradition and texts as memorized by scribes. The mental text of the translator is simply how the translator has read and understood the physical Vorlage. The variables involved in the reading process are numerous, and the way in which this mental text is constructed is complicated; the end result is what I refer to as the “mental text.” For the translator, as for anyone who reads or hears the Hebrew text, elements like one’s prior memorization of the text and their community’s oral tradition of the text affect the way the text was understood. In other words, the translator’s mind was not void of any prior knowledge of the Hebrew text, and the mental Hebrew text—that is, his reading of the Vorlage—was not copied onto some “blank slate.” Rather, prior interactions with the text, memories of the text, and traditions about the text shaped his reading of it, as it shaped anyone’s reading, whether scribe, teacher, public reader, or audience in a religious ceremony. Moreover, mistakes resulting from visual error, aural error, or short term memory failure could also affect the translator’s reading. We cannot be sure how a translator would have gone about the process of translating, just as we cannot be sure how any particular scribe would have gone about the process of copying. Did the translator speak the text aloud as he read? To what extent was the reading process visual, and to what extent was it aural? How large were the reading segments, and to what extent was the translator’s short term memory engaged as he held the text in mind before translating into Greek? The visual, aural, and memory elements of the process complicate it considerably. The messiness of the process, however, does not negate my point, which is that there is a final product of this process, an understanding of the text in Hebrew in the translator’s mind, on which the Greek translation was based. The shared community traditions and the memory and errors of the particular translator all play a role in how the translator read the text; in the end, though, the text

121 A considerable amount of work could be done to understand the role of memory in these processes. Both short term and long term memory play a role in the reading of a text in different ways, and a rigorous understanding of memory—from various perspectives including Anthropology and Neuroscience—would further our understanding of scribalism and translation in the ancient world.
was read and understood as a Hebrew text. This is the “mental text” to which I refer. The existence of this mental Hebrew text has one very significant implication: it was possible for the OG to translate the Hebrew faithfully, *even if the Hebrew being translated was not the Hebrew of the Vorlage*. In other words, we must go beyond considering whether the OG reflects its Vorlage; we must ask whether the Greek represents Hebrew isomorphically, and whether it was possible that the distinctive aspects of OG’s text stem from a mental version of the Hebrew text (rather than translation into Greek).

The evidence from OG scribal errors, isomorphic pluses, pseudotranslation, and orality discussed above suggest that OG translators worked from a mental construction of what the source text was, rather than moving directly from the physical Vorlage to the translation. One significant argument in contradiction to this idea was made by James Barr in a 1967 article on the vocalization of the Hebrew text by ancient translations.¹²² Barr posits that the translator could have proceeded—with respect to vocalization of the consonantal text—in one of two ways. First, he could have moved “from the written form of the Hebrew straight to the variety of meanings which this might have had in Greek (or Latin, Syriac or other language).”¹²³ Having this assortment of target language options, the translator would then choose the best based on context (i.e., within the target text).¹²⁴ Second, “[h]aving the written form in Hebrew,” the translator may instead have “proceed[ed] to ask what is the fully vocalized form in Hebrew. Only after this had been obtained would he consider the variety of possible meanings.”¹²⁵

Barr proceeds to argue, looking at specific examples, that the first option, not the second, is supported by the evidence. In his consideration of the evidence, however, Barr’s method of determining whether or not the OG first vocalized the text (whether or not the translator had a mental Hebrew text) depends on support from other ancient sources (in other versions and Rabbinic sources). If there is no evidence of a tradition of reading מַטּ in Gen 47:31 as מַטּ

---

¹²⁵ Barr, “Vocalization,” 2.
(“staff”; rather than מִטּ, “bed”), then Barr concludes that the OG most likely did not read מִטּ as מִטּ in Gen 47:31. Instead, the translator must have compiled a list of possible glosses for the unpointed מִטּ, one of which was ῥάβδος, and then chosen the best Greek word to suit the meaning of the Greek text at that point. First of all, we should note that this would be an arduous method of translating a text like Exodus. It would be much simpler for the translator to operate (as most translators do) by reading and comprehending the source text, and then encoding that meaning into the target language. Second, what Barr is essentially saying is that we need to have support from other secondary translations or interpretations to view the OG as reading the Hebrew a certain way (i.e., the second method Barr argues against, as opposed to the first method). But the extant evidence from other translations, Rabbinic sources, and the like, is sparse. Furthermore, the possible agreement of other translations with OG would not seem to make any difference: if they agreed, they could just be making the same sort of target oriented decision (that is, not understanding and thus pointing the text first in their minds, but selecting from a variety of lexemes in the target language that could work).

The most difficult aspect of Barr’s argument is the improbability that ancient translators did not read their source text as they translated it. In opposition to Barr’s position, “comprehension of [the source text]” is a crucial aspect of all translation. That is, a text cannot

127 However isomorphic the OG might be, it seems improbably that the translators would go to that much trouble with every single word. Note also that isomorphism operates at the level of the text as understood—vocalization included—not at the level of the unpointed text; in other words, there is no lexical equivalent set for the unpointed Hebrew letters דֶּה, but there is for the noun רֶפֶר and for the verb (however inflected) דֶּרֶפֶר. Simply put, this is not the way people read texts; following this process would be extremely taxing and odd; cf. Stanislas Dehaene, Reading in the Brain: The Science and Evolution of a Human Invention (New York: Viking, 2009), 222-25.
128 I would suggest, instead of looking to other ancient versions, that we ask whether the retroverted Hebrew (e.g., מִטּ instead of מִטּ in the example above) works in context in the Hebrew text; if it does, then it seems likely that this is how the OG read (vocalized) the Hebrew text.
be translated unless it is first understood at the linguistic level; thus, the first and foremost role of any translator is to be a reader of the text. Although the translators of OG certainly proceeded on a morpheme by morpheme basis, this does not necessitate that they did not understand each word in its context in the Hebrew text; if a word remained unvocalized, as Barr would have it, it could not possibly be understood in context. According to Barr,

In method A [the method Barr argues for], it does not make very much difference whether the translator did or did not pronounce to himself the word with the vocalization implied; e.g., in taking אֲכַלָּה as ἔφαγεν, he may or may not have said to himself ‘this is אָכְלָה.’

Here it seems to me that Barr misunderstands the nature of reading altogether. One does not have to “pronounce to himself” or consciously think to oneself “this is אָכְלָה” to have an understanding of that pointing for the word in context. Barr thus falsely portrays the vocalization of the Hebrew as a more involved way of reading and translating unpointed Hebrew, when in fact it would be very natural to read an unpointed text with vocalization implied (that is to say, to simply read the text).131

One further corroboration for the existence of a mental Hebrew text in the mind of the translator is the similar argument for a mental Greek text in the mind of the translator. Albrecht Neubert and Gregory M. Shreve suggest that translation involves a “virtual translation,” an in-process mental model of the translation of the source text.132 This is “a composite of the possible relations between a source text and a range of potential target texts.”133 In other words, the

130 Barr, “Vocalization,” 2.
131 Moreover, tradents in the ancient world would probably have read the text aloud when working through it, as a result of the prevailing orality of the ancient world (see section 1.2.3). Another criticism, though not as strong, of Barr’s argument is that it does not work well with the observable practice of lexical isomorphism in the OG. When translators proceed on a word-for-word basis and use standard equivalencies instead of considering the context of the source text, this tends to be a more “automatic” way of translating that is done faster. In Barr’s model, the translator would have to spend much time considering the context in Greek; what the evidence suggests, however, is a fair amount of disregard for context in both the Hebrew and the Greek. (This is not to say, however, that the translator would not have read and understood the Hebrew source as he translated.) In other words, automatic translations ignore context in both the source text and the target text. Ignoring the context in the source text, while paying much attention in the target text, seems unlikely.
133 Neubert and Shreve, Translation as Text, 14.
translator considers various options and has countless different variables in mind as she does her work; this is the “virtual translation.” The target text is “the linguistic incarnation of a virtual translation that was a work-in-progress until it was delivered to its reader.” Although Neubert and Shreve focus on the entire work being in-progress and mental, the concept clearly applies to discrete units of translation, be they clauses or individual words. In each discrete unit of translation, the translator weighs her options before committing to a particular translation. Prior to the actual translation or target text, then, there is “a mental construct only progressively committed to paper.”

The burden of Neubert and Shreve’s argument is to model better the complexity of the source text to target text transfer. In highlighting the existence of the “virtual translation,” they show that translation is not about an instantaneous transfer; rather, a considerable amount of work occurs mentally, and moreover the translation exists, in some sense, mentally. This concept of a “virtual translation” seems to identify correctly and describe one aspect of the translation process. The idea of a mental Hebrew text is similar. The transfer does not go directly from the physically written manuscript to the virtual translation in the translator’s mind. Rather, the translator has a ‘virtual source text,’ if you will, or mental source text. Neubert and Shreve themselves include the “propositional content and the illocutionary force of the messages underlying the source text”—that is, the meaning of the text divorced from the actual words and language used—within the virtual translation. I would propose we go one step further and maintain that the actual words of the text in the original language also exist virtually or mentally in the mind of the translator.

The common view of the translation process in OG focuses, understandably, on the physical Vorlage or source text (represented, usually, by MT) and its relationship to the target

134 Neubert and Shreve, Translation as Text, 14.
135 Neubert and Shreve, Translation as Text, 15.
136 That is, a considerable amount of work occurs mentally in the entire process of translation, though in certain particulars a translation may be straightforward and essentially instantaneous (e.g., translating Je t’aime as I love you).
137 Neubert and Shreve, Translation as Text, 15.
138 Neubert and Shreve, Translation as Text, 136.
text. The question is asked: how did the translator get from the former to the latter? In light of the preceding discussion, it seems this view compresses the textual stages of translation. In contrast to the traditional view, we should think of translation as having four textual stages: the physical Vorlage, the mental Hebrew text, the mental Greek translation (Neubert and Shreve’s “virtual translation”), and the physical Greek translation. The existence of a mental Hebrew text corresponds well with what we see in other similar processes performed by the literate in the ancient world. Pseudotranslation, as discussed above, clearly involves some mental version of a Hebrew text. Similarly, scribal transmission also involved a mental version of the Hebrew Vorlage; the physical Vorlage was not the only version of the text present to the scribe (see section 1.2.3). Moreover, any oral performances in which the text was memorized would not have involved a physical Vorlage. In figure 2.5 below, I offer models of the textual stages in these various similar processes. Given the focus of this study, and for the sake of space and simplicity, I will refer to and consider both the mental Greek translation and the physical translation as one item, the translation.
Building on this way of looking at translation, when we consider the existence of differences between a particular Hebrew witness (e.g., MT) and the OG, we could locate the introduction of the difference at various stages. Consider, for example, the difference seen between MT and OG Exodus 2:25:

אלהים וידע ישראל בני את אלהים וירא
“And God saw the sons of Israel, and God knew.”

καὶ ἐπείδεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς
“And God saw the sons of Israel, and he was known by them.”

My translation here attempts to highlight a particular difference with the MT by ignoring certain

---

semantic differences that are introduced by the differences in language. It is not the best representation of the Greek (cf. the NETS translation); instead, it highlights that the Greek meant to represent something like the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיּוֹדֵעַ אֲלֵיהֶם. We might locate the difference between these two in one of three places. First, the Vorlage of the OG may have been different from MT. Second, the Vorlage may have agreed with MT, but the translator committed two scribal errors when reading the text. Third, the translator may have understood his Vorlage perfectly well, but decided to change the meaning of the text, and worked out the mental processes of doing so in Greek (with no Hebrew involved mentally).

Figure 2.6 - Possible Textual Stages in which a Difference may Occur (Ex 2:25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario A - Vorlage differs from MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵדֶעַ אֲלֵיהֶם תּוֹבֵן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵדֶעַ אֲלֵיהֶם תּוֹבֵן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario B - Mental text differs from MT and Vorlage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵדֶעַ אֲלֵיהֶם תּוֹבֵן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵדֶעַ אֲלֵיהֶם תּוֹבֵן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario C - The difference occurs at the Greek level of the translation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵדֶעַ אֲלֵיהֶם תּוֹבֵן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵדֶעַ אֲלֵיהֶם תּוֹבֵן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, one of the most popular and most appealed to explanations for a difference in OG is that the translator was “interpretive” or “exegetical” in making his translation.

140 ידיע could be understood as active (יִדֶעַ) or passive (יִדָּע). Note that ידיע could have been written with short orthography in earlier manuscripts, and thus the text could have been read "God" or "to them". 141 I vocalize the “mental text” to reflect the fact that it would have been processed and understood by the tradent.
(Scenario C). The assumption seems to be that the translator had license to be more free, because he was producing a translation rather than another Hebrew text. However, the evidence from the Scrolls manuscripts clearly demonstrates that the scribes who transmitted the Hebrew Bible, though they were very careful and accurate on the whole, at times made “interpretive” and “exegetical” changes to the text. Moreover, evidence from recent studies of OG translation technique and from the Scrolls has strongly suggested that the translators of the OG were highly faithful to the Hebrew text they translated. As a result, we should perhaps change our orientation to the phenomena of OG.

In both scenarios B and C, the change happens because of the translator. However, in scenario B, the change happens before the act of transfer from one language to another. One aim of this study is to explore just how often the data of OG belongs to scenarios A and B. I argue that, when the OG is translating isomorphically, most differences belong to scenarios A and B. That is, these differences stem from a change to the Hebrew text (whether in the Vorlage or in the mind of the translator). When the Greek is not isomorphic, its translation does not point to a Hebrew source text in the same way that most source oriented, overt translation in OG does. In these cases, the difference belongs to Scenario C. However, even in cases where the translator is legitimately seen as “interpretive,” if the translation is isomorphic (and thus representative of a Hebrew source), we can locate his changes at the level of the mental text, under scenario B, since scribes transmitting the text in Hebrew (for whom only scenarios A and B are possible) made the exact same sorts of changes.

Examples from my corpus illustrate the importance of acknowledging a mental Hebrew text. In these cases, when the mental text is considered, it becomes clear that the variation is not an aspect of transfer from one language to another but an aspect of transmission within Hebrew, common to textual transmission and OG translation. Consider an example from Exodus 1:16-17:

---
142 See, for example, Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 71-106.
(NRSV) “When you act as midwives to the Hebrew women, and see them on the birthstool, if it is a boy, kill him; but if it is a girl, she shall live.” 17 But the midwives feared God; they did not do as the king of Egypt commanded them, but they let the boys live.

καὶ εἶπεν Ὅταν μαιοῦσθε τὰς Ἑβραίας καὶ ὄσιν πρὸς τῷ τίκτειν, ἐὰν μὲν ἄρσεν ἦ, ἀποκτείνατε αὐτό, ἐὰν δὲ θῆλυ, περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό. ἔφοβήθησαν δὲ αἱ μαῖαι τὸν θεόν καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησαν καθότι συνέταξεν αὐταῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐξωγόνουν τὰ ἄρσενα.

(NETS) and he said, “Whenever you act as midwives to the Hebrew women and they should be at the birthing stage, if then it be male, kill it, but if female, preserve it alive.” 17 But the midwives feared God, and they did not do as the king of Egypt instructed them and tried to keep the males alive.

Though the English translations do not highlight this difference, OG’s use of συντάσσω for Piel דבר is significant. In their respective contexts in this passage, the two words have different senses; Piel דבר refers generically to “speaking,” while συντάσσω has the specific sense of “ordering.” Moreover, two clear lexical pairings in OG—ἐντέλλομαι and συντάσσω for Piel הצוה, λαλέω and εἶπον for Piel דבר—suggest something is amiss, specifically that OG’s συνέταξεν represents הצוה, not דבר. In Exodus, we often find цוה followed by הצוה when a command of God is mentioned (“according to what God commanded...”). Moreover, the speech of the Pharaoh (from verse 16) that is mentioned in the цוה clause is clearly a command. These two points lead the audience to expect “command” in this цוה clause, not “spoke.” A translator, whether in the ancient or modern world, might not only expect הצוה here but also might consider דבר, when he or she encounters it, to have the sense of “command” in context. In a typical analysis of OG, we would have arrived at our explanation at this point: the OG translator expected цוה and/or understood (perhaps rightly) דבר to have the sense of Greek συντάσσω.

143 For a more in-depth discussion of this case with further evidence, see section 3.2.2.
When we consider, however, the possibility that this change was made in Hebrew either in the OG’s Vorlage or in the translator’s mental Hebrew text, we find those options just as likely. Indicative variations involving harmonization and pressure from context are plentiful in the Hebrew manuscripts. It would not surprise us at all if a Hebrew manuscript changed דבר to צוה because of the parallel in numerous other clauses involving commands. And it would not surprise us if a reader of the text — whether reading for the purpose of translation or for another purpose — accidentally read צוה instead of דבר for the same reasons. As a result, it seems just as likely for the difference to have resulted from a change at the level of OG’s Vorlage or the mental text of the OG as it is to have resulted from considerations on the Greek level of the translation.

At the outset of Chapter One, we noted the striking similarity between explanations for variation in transmission and differences arising in translation. I would suggest that the existence of the mental text of the translator explains these striking similarities. This is because the first parts of the translation process — the reading and decoding of the Hebrew Vorlage and all of the potential impetuses for the creation of variation — are held in common with the process of textual transmission. To what extent is the mental version of the Hebrew, held in the translator’s mind, a valid version of the text? In other words, how does its status compare to the status of a physical text or an oral tradition? My intuition is that this mental version of the text is qualitatively of the same nature to other types of versions of the text, though with two important differences. First, the translator’s mental version of the text is not a continuous version; that is, it comes in segments. The translator would have read a portion of the Hebrew Vorlage (from a small phrase to a short passage consisting of a few clauses), constructing his understanding in Hebrew mentally, and then translated into Greek. He then would have discarded this portion from his short term memory and moved onto the next portion. Though the portions of the text would have been segmented in this way, nevertheless when pieced together (as can be done based on retroversion of the Greek) they constitute a united text. Second, the mental text of the translator could have had no impact on the subsequent transmission history of the text in Hebrew. After

144 Unless we were to imagine specific scenarios, for example, where a lead scribe read the Vorlage aloud to other scribes and then translated into Greek based on his reading.
translating the text into Greek, the mental text would cease to exist, except as represented by Greek in the OG. That is, it could not possibly affect the production of further copies of the text in Hebrew.  

2.2.3 – Summary

We have seen that the translation of the OG resembles textual transmission in several particular ways. Insofar as the Greek isomorphically represents the Hebrew, OG translators were in many ways essentially copying the Hebrew text though doing so using a different linguistic code. Moreover, the act of translation always involves an initial reading and constructing a mental version of the Hebrew text. This initial stage corresponds to a large part of the transmission process, and additionally entails that a new “copy” of the Hebrew Vorlage was involved in OG translation, though it only existed cognitively.

2.3 – Conclusion

The preceding discussions explore the various ways in which translation and transmission overlap. On the one hand, the transmission of Hebrew manuscripts resembles many aspects of translation and can be analyzed fruitfully as involving acts of translation. Instances of intralingual translation can be found in Hebrew manuscripts, and the basic framework of intralingual translation differs little from typologies of how variation arises in textual transmission. On the other hand, aspects of the OG translation process entail the same processes as textual transmission. Isomorphism in the Greek is like unto rote copying, and the translator operates in the same manner as the copyist for the first half of translation, reading the Vorlage and constructing a virtual version of it in his mind, where changes were sometimes made in Hebrew. These significant overlaps suggest ways in which OG translation and Hebrew

---

145 This is a significant difference. Given the difficulty of differentiating between cases where a variant stems from the mental text and cases where a variant stems from the physical Vorlage, however, we should not consider the retroverted Hebrew evidence of the OG inadmissible for text-critical work.

146 We should note, however, that though it was possible in transmission to copy the text letter by letter, translation cannot proceed on this basis. In other words, the smallest unit of segmentation possible in transmission is smaller than in translation. Nevertheless, it is likely that scribes did not copy the text letter by letter; cf. Vroom,
manuscript translation are similar. Moreover, they justify the analysis in Chapters Three and Four, where the specific textual data of OG and Hebrew manuscripts will be compared.

“A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors.”
3 – Individual Variants in the OG and Hebrew Manuscripts in Exodus 1-14

In this chapter, I compare the processes of translation and transmission by examining the individual variants that arise in both. Utilizing a framework that categorizes each variant as scribal error, sense variant, or linguistic variant, I compare the types of variant found in each process, their quantity, and their distribution among various subcategories. The results of this comparative analysis show that translation in the OG and transmission in the Hebrew manuscripts are very similar with respect to individual variants.

The chapter is divided into three main parts. First, I explain the methodology I use to carry out the textual analysis. This includes a description of the main categories of variation and the various subcategories within each main category (section 3.1.1). I also explain the process by which I analyzed all of the data in Exodus 1 (section 3.1.2) and provide some basic hypotheses about what I expect to find in the data (section 3.1.3) based on the theoretical discussions in Chapter Two. Second, I give a number of examples of my textual analysis and the data it creates, using a variety of thematic categories to organize the discussion further (section 3.2). Full data are available in Appendices A and B. Third, I use the data to execute the actual comparative analysis. After explaining how the comparative analysis will proceed (section 3.3.1), I give a general overview of the two data sets in comparison (section 3.3.2). I then move on to specific discussion organized by the subcategories within scribal error (section 3.3.3), sense variation (section 3.3.4), and linguistic variation (section 3.3.5). These discussions use both the frequency of variation and specific examples to compare the data found in the OG and in Hebrew manuscripts.

3.1 – Method of Investigation

In Chapter One, I discussed the methodological bases and theoretical considerations underpinning my approach to the OG and textual criticism. In the following section, I will explain the particular procedures of the textual analysis behind sections 3.2 and 3.3. The main point of the study is to compare variation in OG translation and Hebrew manuscript transmission, to see in what ways they are similar and different, and to what extents. Building on
the theory from Chapter Two—most significantly, the idea of a mental Hebrew text—I will put the OG data and manuscript data on the same plane, as it were, not prejudicing the OG data as somehow inferior because it is found in translation. The study is focused on a particular corpus (see section 1.5), which is analyzed exhaustively; in other words, I will not discriminately choose examples in order to skew the overall picture, and the entirety of the data is included in Appendices A and B. At the outset of Chapter One, we noted the similarities between OG phenomena and text-critical phenomena, reflected, for example, in Tov’s terminology for describing both. In this study, we will move beyond the apparent similarities and consider, based on a large amount of data, exactly what the similarities are and to what extent they are shared.

3.1.1 – Categories of Variation

In this chapter the following main categories will be used to categorize the data, as discussed above in section 1.2.4: scribal error, linguistic variant, and sense variant. The purpose of the categories is to characterize the transmission process and provide a benchmark by which to measure the phenomena of the OG. I avoid pejorative terms like “omission” and “addition” in my categories, though when explaining what may or may not have happened with actual evidence or when describing hypothetical examples, I use these terms because they are descriptive of the actual processes that caused the differences.

When working with the OG data, it is also necessary to identify differences that are the result of translation technique. These are cases where a difference is merely perceived, but when the translator’s method is better understood, there is no difference; or, in other words, these are cases where the virtual Hebrew source text held in the translator’s mind does not disagree with the Hebrew manuscripts. Thus, in addition to the three categories used for Hebrew manuscript data, a fourth category for OG data will be translation technique. Rather than following the traditional model of analysis of OG, in which many types of change are ascribed to the translator and thus eliminated from consideration, I will follow a model where the translator had a mental Hebrew source text. If the OG contains isomorphic Greek that demonstrably represents a Hebrew source, that Hebrew source will be used and considered in a text-critical framework.
At this point it may be unclear why I would like to eliminate some perceived differences in the OG as a result of translation technique and in what cases I would do so. It must be noted that by “translation technique” I do not mean any sort of element that might arise in the process of translation; if we included the entire process of translation, then we would necessarily have to include cases where change occurs between the Vorlage and the mental text. Rather, I use the category of translation technique to eliminate cases where the perceived difference simply results from the way in which Hebrew is encoded into Greek, typically in isomorphic fashion in the OG. Thus, I do not want to eliminate cases on the basis of their arising in translation only; rather, I want to eliminate those cases where the presumed Hebrew source of the isomorphic Greek agrees exactly with the other Hebrew manuscripts. For example, in cases where Greek does not have the same syntactical options as Hebrew and thus must change the syntax, we would categorize this as a case of translation technique. Another example that occurs frequently is when the meaning of a Greek word is not the same, in context, as the Hebrew word it represents, but the word was clearly chosen based on an established lexical pairing; this would not be categorized as some sort of variant but as a case of translation technique.

The purpose of these categories is to give a framework within which we can compare the data of OG translation with the data of Hebrew manuscript transmission. The categories are far from perfect: they tend to simplify what were often very complex processes, and they may not go far enough to integrate orality and the social pressures involved in translation and transmission. However, they serve the purpose of helping us compare the data. If the categories were changed in various ways—for example, using a model oriented around the oral context of textual transmission—in the end the variants found in our data would group in essentially the same ways.

3.1.1.1 – SCRIBAL ERROR

The subcategories for scribal error are summarized as follows.¹ Hypothetical texts (or, in

---

¹ These subcategories are based to an extent on Hendel’s text-critical categories in “Oxford Hebrew Bible: Guide for Editors” (2012 Revision; accessed online at http://ohb.berkeley.edu/).
some cases, actual texts) are given, with the earlier reading on the left and secondary reading on the right. In some cases, of course, it is possible that the direction of change could be reversed (if the texts were actual); the point here, however, is to illustrate the types of change.

(1) **Aural error** denotes a variant arising from an error in hearing.\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earlier reading</th>
<th>secondary reading</th>
<th>note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and now, bring the boy&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;and you, bring the boy&quot;</td>
<td>Ayin is misheard as alef.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **Dittography** refers to “the erroneous doubling of a letter, letters, word, or words.”\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earlier reading</th>
<th>secondary reading</th>
<th>note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the way of the LORD”</td>
<td>“the ways of the LORD”</td>
<td>Yod is read twice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Near dittography** refers to dittography involving different letters that resemble one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earlier reading</th>
<th>secondary reading</th>
<th>note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“and they taught the men there”</td>
<td>“and they brought the men down to there”</td>
<td>Resh is read a second time, as dalet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) **Graphic error** refers to an error arising when similar letters are mistaken or to any graphic error that cannot be more clearly specified (e.g., the mistake of one letter for two or *vice versa*, such as נ and מ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earlier reading</th>
<th>secondary reading</th>
<th>note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“and they praised the name of the king”</td>
<td>“and they profaned the name of the king”</td>
<td>Heh is misread as het.(^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) **Haplography** refers to “the erroneous omission of one or more adjacent letters, clusters of letters, or words that are identical or similar.”\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earlier reading</th>
<th>secondary reading</th>
<th>note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the ones coming from the loins of Jacob”</td>
<td>“the one coming from the loins of Jacob”</td>
<td>The second and third yod are read once instead of twice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Hendel’s term “phonetic” (see Hendel “Guide for Editors”) is correct in distinguishing a different error that could occur outside of an aural context; in my opinion, however, it is nearly impossible to objectively decide whether this type of variant is aural or phonetic. As such, only “aural” is used.

3 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 224.

4 Note the possible overlap here with aural error: we could also understand heh to be misheard as het.

5 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 222.
(6) **Near haplography** is haplography involving different letters that resemble one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>The similar letters resh-daleit in וירדו are read as a single resh (cf. example 3 above).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וירדו לשם的人 down to there</td>
<td>“and they brought the men down to there”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וירדו לשם people</td>
<td>“and they taught the men there”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) **Homoi** refers to homoioteleuton, homoiarchon, etc.: when the scribe’s eye skips a portion of text between two words that look similar (e.g., having similar beginnings or endings).⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>The scribe’s eye skips from הלחם to הלילה, consequently leaving out the words הלחם והלילה.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וירדו שם the people</td>
<td>“and he saw a dream of the night, and behold, there was bread”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וירדו שם the men</td>
<td>“and he saw bread”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) **Metathesis** occurs when the sequence of words or letters is reversed, whether in a visual or aural context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>The order of the letters heh and yod in the word אלהים have been reversed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ויאמר אלהים</td>
<td>“and God said…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ויאמר אליהם</td>
<td>“and he said to them…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) **Misdivision** refers to an error stemming from the division of words (i.e., spaces between words).⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>What was two words has been read as one.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בדר ים</td>
<td>“on the way of the sea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בדר הים</td>
<td>“on the ways/paths”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) **Ocular transfer** refers to cases where an ocular line skip results in the transfer of a phrase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>The scribe’s eye skips from the third line up to the first (both of which begin מקלות) and transfers the phrase מקלות מערער which replaces מערער.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יאמר מקלות מערער הלזר הכתים</td>
<td>“And the king of Egypt said to kill the sons, but they responded, ‘We will not do what you have commanded.’ And Pharaoh said, ‘You will surely die.’”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יאמר מקלות מערער הלזר הכתים</td>
<td>“And the king of Egypt said to kill the sons, but they responded, ‘We will not do what you have commanded.’ And the king of Egypt said, ‘You will surely die.’”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) **Transposition** occurs when the order of letters or words is changed (not necessarily reversed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>The order of the letters alef, yod, peh, and resh is changed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>והילא רפאים</td>
<td>“and their ashes went up”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והילא רפאים</td>
<td>“and the physicians went up”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶ Cf. Tov, Textual Criticism, 222-223. A forthcoming article by Jonathan Vroom (Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors”) significantly qualifies our understanding of where and when homoi can occur, such that even the example given here is improbable.

⁷ Cf. Tov, Textual Criticism, 234.
(12) **Waw variant** refers to the commonly occurring variant where the conjunction *waw* is either added or omitted, often without any discernible reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>תהלל אל ישראל שיר ל שיר</th>
<th>תהלל אל ישראל שיר ל שיר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הדרש</td>
<td>הדרש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“praise the God of Israel and sing to him a new song”</td>
<td>“praise the God of Israel, sing to him a new song”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *waw* at the beginning of the second phrase is omitted.

### 3.1.1.2 – **Sense Variants**

The subcategories for sense variants are as follows.

1. **Conforming variants** occur when the text is revised based on another passage in another text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ייצא ידרע שבעים וחמש</th>
<th>ייצא ידרע שבעים וחמש</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the offspring of Jacob were 70.”</td>
<td>“the offspring of Jacob were 75.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of Jacob’s descendants is changed from 70 to 75 to agree with the number as it should be according to Genesis 46:20, 27.

2. **Expansion** refers to additions that significantly change or shape the meaning of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ראובן סמואל ולואן ויהודה</th>
<th>ראובן סמואל ולואן ויהודה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יושב כל חל ויהודה בן</td>
<td>יושב כל חל ויהודה בן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The change in subject is explicitly signaled by the addition of מצרים, excluding the possibility that it was the “sons of Israel” who were afraid.

3. **Logical variant** refers to a change made because the text does not make sense as it is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ראובן סמואל ולואן ויהודה</th>
<th>ראובן סמואל ולואן ויהודה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יושב כל חל ויהודה בן</td>
<td>יושב כל חל ויהודה בן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two lists in the earlier text are not divided logically for the scribe; *waw* is omitted before יהודה to make the two lists into one list of all the children born to Jacob by his two wives. (Separate lists of the children of concubines follow.)

---

8 A term often used for this type of change is “harmonization” (e.g., Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 258); I avoid this term, given its imprecision and range of possible meaning. Cf. Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible,” 11-16; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 147.

9 Expansions do not necessarily make the text longer; rather, they “expand” the sense of the text.

10 This is distinguished from explication and conforming variants in that the pressure comes from knowledge common to any human (involving ordering and likelihood of events, etc.), rather than pressure from theological concerns or content from other scriptural texts.
(4) Sense normalization is the substitution of a more commonly used and/or expected phrase.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>יואמר פורה</th>
<th>פרעה מזרם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“and the king of Egypt said...”</td>
<td>“and Pharaoh said...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The more frequently occurring term פרעה is used instead of מלך מזרם.

(5) Sense transfer refers to the use of a distinct phrase from elsewhere in the near context (i.e., not merely an expected phrase used often in the text).

| עבדהש_ARRAY Họר עבדיה בבר  |
|----------|------------------|
| “…their service in which they made them work as slaves.” | “…their service in which they made them work as slaves. Thus they multiplied and thus they teemed greatly, and the Egyptians were in dread before the sons of Israel.” |

The scribe (in an actual example from 2QExod⁴) inserts an extended phrase from two verses earlier.

(6) Synonym substitution refers to the use of a synonym to replace a word in the Vorlage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>בחר ואת נער יאמר</th>
<th>ילל ואת ליאמר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“he blessed the boy and said,”</td>
<td>“he blessed the lad and said,”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word נער is used instead of ילל, probably first within an oral context.

3.1.1.3 – Linguistic Variants

Finally, the subcategories of linguistic variants are as follows.

(1) Linguistic modernization refers to a variant in which a more current linguistic element (whether syntax, morphology, or lexicon) is used to replace an older element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אתן חצי מלכותי</th>
<th>אתן חצי מלכותי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I will give you half of my kingdom”</td>
<td>“I will give you half of my kingdom”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scribe replaces the word ממלכה, “kingdom,” with מלכות, “kingdom,” which was used instead of ממלכה in later stages of ancient Hebrew.¹³

11 This type of normalization deals with all non-linguistic uses and expectations; if any grammar or syntax is more commonly used and/or expected in a given situation, and a change is made on that basis, it falls under the category of “linguistic normalization” (see below).

12 Such variants occur because of the orality of texts in the ancient world and subsequently the role of memory (see section 1.2.3); however, I will not classify these using terminology like “oral” or “memory” because orality and memory play a role in numerous other types of variant as well.

13 Note the similarity of this particular change to synonym substitution; the difference here is that the two words are not merely synonyms, but rather that the one replaced the other at some stage in the language. Other cases of linguistic modernization might involve aspects of syntax or morphology, rather than lexicon as in this case.
(2) **Linguistic normalization** refers to a variant in which a more acceptable linguistic element is used to replace a less acceptable element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Normalized</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“And God commanded Moses, saying,”</td>
<td>“And God commanded Moses,”</td>
<td>Although the person who is commanded is sometimes found in an על or אל prepositional phrase in ancient Hebrew, and this is acceptable Hebrew, most often the person commanded is found with את. The scribe changes על to את to conform to the expected grammar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Smoothing** refers to a linguistic change that makes the text more understandable, that is, more easily processed grammatically.\(^\text{14}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Smoothed</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“And they made their lives bitter by hard service, by mortar and by brick and by all kinds of service in the field, in accordance with all their service in which they made them work as slaves.”</td>
<td>“And they made their lives bitter by hard service, by mortar and by brick and by all kinds of service in the field, in accordance with all their service in which they made them work as slaves.”</td>
<td>The use of את in the second occurrence makes little sense, and it is unclear how the following phrase is connected to what precedes; the scribe changes את to כאשר to remove this difficulty and give the text an understandable meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linguistic modernization and linguistic normalization are distinct in that modernization has to do with a diachronic change in the language, whereas normalization has to do with more dominant linguistic elements in synchronic perspective. The difference between smoothing and the sense variant category “logical variant” is that smoothing involves cases where the text as it stands is difficult linguistically, whereas logical variants involve logical or conceptual difficulty. Linguistic normalization differs from smoothing in that it involves two acceptable grammatical forms, one of which is preferred, whereas smoothing involves difficult grammar that is improved. Variants belonging to all three types of linguistic change would have been easily introduced in an oral setting.

3.1.2 – Procedure and Method for Initial Textual Analysis

The data in OG have been analyzed in comparison to all the Hebrew manuscripts, not just the MT, although only cases where there is a difference with MT are included in the OG data set (see Appendix A). The main point of the primary analysis is to isolate cases where OG translates something that is not contained in any Hebrew manuscript; we include also cases where it agrees with a non-MT manuscript against MT, mainly because this is the typical point of departure in Septuagint Studies when considering translation technique. I do not assume that OG was translating MT; instead, I consider whether OG translated the text of another extant manuscript. I determine whether the difference is a result of translation technique, and, if it is not, I give it a specific designation (main category and subcategory). That is, I prioritize translation technique as an explanation for data; if the phenomenon is purely translation (from any Hebrew manuscript), then it will be disqualified from my final analysis.

In my consideration of the OG translation, my inquiry into each datum involves the same processes. First, I investigate whether or not there is a difference in meaning between the Greek and Hebrew; for matters of lexicon, this involves work with the standard lexica (LSJ\textsuperscript{15} for Greek; HALOT,\textsuperscript{16} DCH,\textsuperscript{17} and BDB\textsuperscript{18} for Hebrew) and their examples, determining whether there is semantic overlap or not between the two words in each language; for matters of syntax, this involves consultation of the standard reference works (Smyth\textsuperscript{19} for Greek, WO\textsuperscript{20} and JM\textsuperscript{21} for Hebrew) to see if the structures used can be used for the same reasons. Of course, further investigation of the Hebrew and Greek languages is sometimes required for syntax or for lexica.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, \textit{A Greek-English Lexicon} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, eds., \textit{The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament} (Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 2001).
  \item \textsuperscript{17} David J. A. Clines, \textit{The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew} (8 Volumes; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2012).
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Herbert Weir Smyth, \textit{Greek Grammar} (Harvard University Press, 1956).
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, \textit{An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax} (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990).
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, \textit{A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew} (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Bíblico, 2006).
\end{itemize}
Second, I investigate whether or not there is isomorphism with respect to the features involved. In both lexical and syntactical isomorphism, it is important to keep in mind that two angles must always be explored, one involving the perspective of the Hebrew source, the other involving the perspective of the Greek translation. For example, if a particular Greek word is always used for a particular Hebrew word, this does not necessarily establish that there is lexical isomorphism involved. The Hebrew word must also be translated primarily by that same Greek word, not by a range of possible Greek words. In matters of lexicon, this investigation involves both using Hatch-Redpath\textsuperscript{22} to determine whether a Greek word typically represents one or two Hebrew words (and what words they are, and how often), and determining whether a Hebrew word is typically represented by one or two Greek words (and what words they are, and how often) using EHI,\textsuperscript{23} Muraoka’s “Hebrew/Aramaic Index,”\textsuperscript{24} and Hatch-Redpath. Although I utilize these three concordances extensively when considering translation technique, I often undertake my own investigation of the data using Tov and Polak within Accordance Bible Software.\textsuperscript{25} In matters of syntax, I carry out my own research, often limited in scope (given the length of time such mini-studies inevitably require) to Genesis and Exodus, or even Exodus 1-14, to find out how the Hebrew structure is typically represented in Greek, and what Hebrew structures the Greek structure typically represents.

These two procedures typically flesh out what must be considered in order to understand how translation technique may be involved in the case. Often, further matters come up that must be investigated (e.g., other related Hebrew or Greek words that could have been in the Vorlage instead or used to translate instead), or certain constraints (contexts, etc., that might influence the translator or tell us about typical use in Hebrew Exodus) suggest themselves as explanations for the data. After this analysis, we can usually tell if the difference is a result of translation technique or whether the OG’s mental Hebrew text was different from the Hebrew manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{22} Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, \textit{A concordance to the Septuagint} (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998).
\textsuperscript{23} Elmar Camilo dos Santos, \textit{An expanded Hebrew index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint} (Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, 1973).
\textsuperscript{24} Takamitsu Muraoka, “Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint” in \textit{A concordance to the Septuagint}.
\textsuperscript{25} Emanuel Tov and Frank Polak, \textit{The Revised CATSS Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text} (2009).
If the latter is the case, I then consider the various text-critical explanations to find those that best fit the datum.

Because the nature and categorization of a variant depends on which reading is judged to be earlier, I make a judgment on each case regarding which reading is probably earlier. Consider, for example, Exodus 1:5, where 4QGen-Exod\(a\), 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(b\), SP and MT contain the plus יזוסף בשבעים, a phrase not contained in 4QExod\(b\). Cross correctly suggests that 4QExod\(b\) is earlier, with the plus arising as an expansion.\(^{26}\) If, however, we were to take the plus as earlier, we could not explain and thus categorize the variant as expansion. Instead, the most plausible explanation might be homoiarchon, at the beginning of verse 5 if OG’s placement of the plus were earlier (יודע בֶּשָּׁבֶת וַיִּוסף), or homoioteleuton, at the end of verse 5 if 4QGen-Exod\(b\)/4QpaleoGen-Exod\(b\)/SP/MT’s placement of the plus were earlier (בֶּשָּׁבֶת וַיִּוסף).\(^{27}\) Thus, judgment must be made about which reading is earlier in order to categorize the variants. One consequence of this issue is the question of whether differences where OG is deemed to have an earlier reading should be included in the data. If we are interested in the types of changes that come about in the process of OG translation, and if OG is earlier, then it is not the OG that is causing the change but the other manuscripts. Although it would be interesting to eliminate cases where OG is deemed earlier (and consequently to do the same for the Hebrew manuscripts in the test group), this would cause the results to rest largely on my determinations of earlier readings.\(^{28}\) For each variant, I try to consider all plausible alternative explanations, whether my own or from secondary literature.

There exists a significant amount of grey area between differences in the OG that are clearly the result of translation technique (encoding) and cases that involve elements of

\(^{26}\) DJD XII, 85. This judgment is further supported by the presence of the plus in OG, but at a different point in the verse, making 4QExod\(b\)’s minus the most plausible earlier reading from which the others might arise.

\(^{27}\) Propp, for example, suggests this solution (*Exodus 1-18*, 123); although this type of homoioteleuton is improbable (cf. Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors”), it nevertheless illustrates how various competing explanations interact with judgment concerning the earlier reading(s). We could easily imagine other scenarios where the plus was earlier.

\(^{28}\) Although I do my best to make the best judgments, and although in some cases the correct judgment is fairly obvious, there are several cases where it is difficult to determine which reading is earliest, where multiple options may be just as plausible.
“interpretation,” which we want to categorize using text-critical categories. For example, there are sometimes large differences between OG and the Hebrew manuscripts, differences which could be understood as periphrastic translation. In several examples discussed in section 3.2.1.4 below, where OG replaces “son” and “daughter” with “male” and “female,” the difference derives from the translator using a less isomorphic, more periphrastic translation technique. However, it is theoretically possible that these changes occurred in the Hebrew Vorlage or in the mental text of the translator. On the other hand, there are sometimes small differences that result from linguistic pressures, but for which there is no clear evidence to establish that it is translation technique. For example, in Exodus 1:1 the OG has a plural pronoun (αὐτῶν) though the Hebrew manuscripts have a singular pronoun (וּבְיִתָיו). At first glance this may seem like a good candidate for inclusion into our study: although frequently dismissed as a result of translation, changes in number are exactly the sort of thing that this study wants to include. However, given the evidence in this case, the change in number here is almost certainly a result of translation. Since the singulars “each” and “his” in a phrase like this (וּבְיִתָיו אישו, “each with his household,” or more woodenly, “a man and his household”) is standard in Hebrew, it is essentially impossible that a plural pronoun is behind the OG (whether in its physical Vorlage or in the translator’s mental text). We would therefore categorize this case as translation technique.29

The notion of the mental Hebrew text of the translator greatly clarifies this issue. Rather than trying to sort out, in such unclear cases, which differences stem from a periphrastic translation technique and which differences should be categorized as indicative variants, we will simply reconstruct the mental Hebrew text of the translator based on established lexical and grammatical isomorphism. If the Greek is not isomorphic and Hebrew therefore cannot be retroverted, then the case will be categorized as a difference resulting from translation technique. This would include cases where the Greek syntax cannot be shown from evidence elsewhere to represent possible Hebrew syntax. If Hebrew can be retroverted from the Greek (given evidence of syntactical and/or lexical isomorphism), but that Hebrew is ungrammatical (i.e., impossible linguistically) or even improbable (see examples in 3.2.1.4), again the case will be excluded as a

29 For more examples, see section 3.2.1.4.
difference resulting from translation technique. My procedure will always begin with an attempt to establish syntactical and lexical isomorphism, such that the mental Hebrew text can be reconstructed. If it cannot be reconstructed, or if the reconstructed Hebrew is ungrammatical or improbable, or if the reconstructed Hebrew is identical to the Hebrew in the manuscripts, then it is excluded as a difference arising from translation technique. One minor exception to this rule is if the reconstructed Hebrew does not work linguistically but could have been a result of scribal error; if a scribal error could explain the mental Hebrew text, then it should be categorized as scribal error.

3.1.3 – Hypotheses Based on Theoretical Understanding

The theoretical discussion in Chapter Two above includes a number of points that could be framed as hypotheses about the nature of OG translation and Hebrew manuscript translation. These hypotheses suggest what the results of our comparative analysis should look like; as such, they can be tested using the comparative analysis in section 3.3. The purpose of our comparative analysis, therefore, will be two-fold. First, it will provide a more detailed picture of how OG data and text-critical data compare. Second, it will put the theoretical ideas about translation and transmission from Chapter Two into the context of actual data by testing the results of the data and comparing to the results we would expect based on hypotheses drawn from Chapter Two.

Above we noted the striking similarity of the phenomena found in the OG and the phenomena found in textual criticism. Why are there similarities between OG translation data and text-critical data? The theoretical discussion in Chapter Two provides two related answers to these questions.

Hypothesis One: Translation and transmission use many of the same processes.

---

30 I.e., if the Greek at first glance seems to differ from the Hebrew, but in reality established isomorphic equivalents show otherwise.
31 Such instances are rare but possible.
This hypothesis is suggested by the instances of intralingual translation that occur in textual transmission (see section 2.1), and by the theory that translators, like scribes, must first read and understand the Vorlage—constructing a virtual version of it mentally—before moving on to actual translation (see section 2.2.2).

**Hypothesis Two:** Excepting differences that arise from translation technique, most differences between the OG and the Hebrew witnesses stem from the OG’s Vorlage or the mental Hebrew text of the translator.

This hypothesis is based primarily on the theory that the translator constructs a mental Hebrew text on which his translation is based (see section 2.2.2), but it also stems from the observation that OG seems more concerned to give a source-oriented representation of the Hebrew than to provide a fluid target text (see section 2.2.1).

These hypotheses assume that whether the translator was consciously aware of the Hebrew behind his Greek or whether he simply used Hebraised Greek when adding to the text, he did not add anything that a scribe, working in Hebrew, would not have added. The notion that transmission contains intralingual translation—translation within the same language—shows that the content changes involved in translation (addition, omission, restructuring) can happen within the same language. Thus, when the OG contains content changes, they need not involve any transfer to the Greek language, but they could simply be an instance of intralingual translation within Hebrew, in the mental Hebrew text.

According to these hypotheses, when the OG is translating isomorphically, most differences belong in the OG’s Vorlage or within the mental text of the translator. When the Greek is not isomorphic, his translation does not point to a Hebrew source text in the same way that most source oriented, overt translation in OG does. However, even in cases where the translator is legitimately seen as “interpretive,” if the translation is isomorphic (and thus representative of a Hebrew source), we should locate his changes at the level of the mental text. This is because scribes, who also constructed a mental text but did not translate that text into
another language, made the exact same sorts of changes.

These hypotheses will be tested by the in-depth study of differences between the OG translation’s presumed source (whether an actual Vorlage or a mental Hebrew text) and the Hebrew manuscripts in sections 3.2 and 3.3. As a control, we will also analyze the variation found in the Hebrew manuscripts themselves. In both cases, the analysis will use the same terms, concepts, and categories, all taken from textual criticism. Given our two hypotheses, we expect that the quantity of variants in OG Exodus 1, both in total and when divided among the three main categories, will be similar to the quantity of variants in the Hebrew manuscripts in Exodus 1. Moreover, we expect that the variants in both data sets will be distributed somewhat similarly among the various subcategories of variation. The types of data and their distribution in the OG will fall within an acceptable or “normal” range as established by the control group.

3.1.4 – Summary

Our general framework for categorizing the individual variants in this textual analysis uses the main categories of scribal error, sense variation, and linguistic variation, along with a number of subcategories that reflect the particular quality of each variant more closely. We will follow a rigorous process when analyzing the texts, first asking whether the OG differed in meaning from the Hebrew witnesses, second investigating whether lexical or grammatical isomorphism was involved, and third providing careful text-critical judgments to account for each variant. Through this process, we will get a close look at the similarities and differences between OG translation and manuscript transmission, and moreover we will use specific data to test the hypotheses about these two processes based on the ideas of Chapter Two.
3.2 – Textual Analysis and Data

The data used for my comparative analysis (section 3.3) is based on analysis of Exodus 1 in the OG and the Hebrew manuscripts. The full data can be found in Appendices A and B. I considered, as far as it was possible, every difference between the OG and the Hebrew (whether stemming from a variant Vorlage or from translation). In the lemmas provided below and in the appendices, I use the double-bar divider (||) to separate sets of agreeing readings; in other words, if a Hebrew manuscript agrees with OG, it will be grouped with OG by the divider. In my analysis of the Hebrew manuscripts, I considered every variation. Because a full discussion of every point of data would take far too much space, in this section I will provide examples from my analysis. Whereas the comparative analysis in section 3.3 is organized according to the types of variation (e.g., synonym substitution or graphic error), this section is organized thematically. Specifically, I present cases of difference arising from translation technique, cases where lexical equivalence indicates a true variant, a set of clarifying expansions, variants involving the grammatical number of Israel, a set of related variants involving the placement of יוסף and the number of Jacob’s descendants, the list of Jacob’s children in 1:2-4, and some examples of variation stemming from the role of orality in the ancient world. Further examples corresponding to the various types of variation will be given in the comparative analysis.

3.2.1 – Cases Excluded as Translation Technique

The OG’s translation technique can create differences between the OG and the Hebrew that do not reflect true variants. Four areas of translation technique are prevalent in our corpus: differences that are necessary given the linguistic differences between Hebrew and Greek,32 lexical equivalences, grammatical equivalences, and cases where the Greek does not represent Hebrew (whether in an extant witness or not) isomorphically.

---

32 For a full treatment of these differences, see Wevers, Exodus, vii-xiv.
3.2.1.1 – Differences Necessitated by Linguistic Differences Between Hebrew and Greek

1:1 τῶν εἰσπεπορευμένων εἰς Αἰγύπτον OG □ 4Q11 Heb שָׁם לָכֶם SP MT

In this case, the use of a preposition in Greek (εἰς) introduces different syntax from the Hebrew, which uses a postposition (ל). Such a syntactical difference is essentially unavoidable, since there are no syntactical equivalents available in Greek. Greek does use some postpositions, but none have a directional meaning.33

1:1 ἐκαστὸς πανοικίᾳ αὐτῶν OG □ 4Q11 Heb איש ביתה SP MT

The use of the dative πανοικίᾳ (“with his household”) differs syntactically from the Hebrew, which uses a conjunction (“and his household”). In Hebrew, the conjoining of the two phrases is highly regular and carries the sense of “with,” whereas in Greek such a construction is abnormal.

1:10 κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς OG □ 4Q11 Heb וְנָתַנְתָּם SP MT
1:10 συμβῇ ἡμῖν OG □ 4Q13 Heb וְנָתַנְתָּם SP
1:10 καὶ ἐκπολεμήσαντες ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ 4Q1 SP MT
1:11 ἐφίστημι + dative OG □ 4Q1 SP MT

These four differences all stem from variations in verbal argument structure.34 In any language, each verb takes a certain number of obligatory arguments. For example, compare the somewhat synonymous English verbs “to show” and “to display.” Both demand an agent and a patient; the former, however, typically takes a second object (a recipient) while the latter does not (someone shows someone something versus someone displays something). Although in three of these differences the lexical items in Greek match up semantically with the Hebrew items they represent, they do not in terms of argument structure. Thus, OG’s κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς uses the accusative for Hebrew’s preposition -ל, συμβῇ ἡμῖν uses the dative for Hebrew clitic

33 Smyth, Greek Grammar, §1665.a.
34 Note that I am not discussing here the differences contained in these variants related to grammatical number.
pronoun וּ, and ἐκπολεμήσαντες ἡμᾶς uses the accusative for the Hebrew’s preposition ב.35

The case in 1:11 (ἐφίστημι + dative) is slightly more complicated. In OG, the standard equivalent for ב is ἐπί, and ἐφίστημι + ἐπί is one possible argument structure for ἐφίστημι (LSJ s.v.). Why, then, did OG use the dative? Does the OG here represent -ל or -ב in the Hebrew, both of which are sometimes represented by the dative? We should begin by verifying that ἐφίστημι represents שִׂים here: they have the same meaning, and ἐφίστημι is often used in OG to represent שִׂים is used with various prepositional-phrase complements, including על, על, -ל, and ל. In the context here, על is most appropriate and thus probably the correct reading, carrying the meaning, with שִׂים, of “placing someone in a position over someone” (BDB s.v. Qal 3.d). But -ל and ל are also possible for some other meanings that, though perhaps less likely in this context, could still work well in this passage (cf. BDB s.v. Qal 4.a; “to station someone against someone”). In Greek, however, ἐφίστημι with ἐπί only has the sense of “setting something on something,” but never “someone over someone” (LSJ s.v.). Instead, to indicate “setting someone over someone,” as communicated by על שִׂים, Greek uses ἐφίστημι with the dative (LSJ ἐφίστημι A.II). Therefore, this is a case of differing argument structures between Hebrew שִׂים and Greek ἐφίστημι.

3.2.1.2 – Lexical Equivalences

The lexical equivalences established in the OG between Hebrew and Greek words sometimes result in a translation that seems at odds with the source text.

1:11 ἵνα κακώσωσιν αὐτοὺς OG || לָבֵא עֲנֵה וְעָנֵהַ 4Q1 MT || לָבֵא עֲנֵה SP

OG has ἵνα κακώσωσιν αὐτοὺς for Hebrew לָבֵא עֲנֵהוּ. As in Hebrew (here with לָבֵא, but typically with ב), the Greek infinitive can be used for intent or purpose.37 Why, then, does the OG

35 One exception to this trend can also be found in our corpus: in 1:12 the OG violates the Greek verb’s argument structure by using ἐκτὸς to represent (according to standard lexical equivalence) מפני.
36 Ἐφίστημι translates 20 different Hebrew words in OG (Hatch-Redpath ἐφιστάναι) and שִׂים is translated by over 50 Greek words in OG (Muraoka, “Hebrew/Aramaic Index,” שִׂם I, שִׂים qal).
37 Whether alone (Smyth, Greek Grammar, §§2008-2010), articulated in the genitive (§§1408, 2032), or articulated and following various prepositions (§§1685.2.b, 1686.1.d, 1689.3.d, 1690.2.c, 2034b; cf. Daniel B.
not follow the syntax of Hebrew and use an infinitive after ἵνα? Hebrew לְמַעַן is used to express purpose either with an infinitive (BDB מַﬠַן 1.c) or with a finite verb (BDB מַﬠַן 2.b). The OG has two standard equivalents for לְמַעַן: ὅπως or ἵνα.39 Both ὅπως and ἵνα, however, are used only with subjunctive (or optative) verbs following,40 never an infinitive. Here, εἰς plus infinitive would have worked, but this would have broken the lexical isomorphism set up in OG of ἵνα or ὅπως for לְמַעַן. This difference, then, derives from translation technique.41

1:17 ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ OG ὑπείρασεν SP MT

The verb is active in Hebrew (in the Qal stem with an active sense) but passive in Greek. The difference stems from the equivalence of passive φοβέω with Qal ירא and the varying verbal semantics of the two words in Hebrew and Greek. Greek φοβέω is used in the passive form with a complement, meaning to “stand in awe of” someone or to “dread” someone (LSJ φοβέω B.II.5), clearly overlapping with Qal ירא (cf. HALOT s.v.; DCH s.v.; BDB s.v.). Φοβέω nearly always stands for Qal ירא, most often in the passive (Hatch-Redpath φοβεῖν); Qal ירא is almost always translated by φοβέω.42

3.2.1.3 – Grammatical Equivalences

Standard grammatical equivalences are also established by the OG, similar to lexical equivalences, though harder to identify—since nothing comparable to the Hatch-Redpath concordance exists for the grammar of OG.

40 Smyth, Greek Grammar, §§2193, 2196-2200.
41 Note also the difference in the grammatical number of the suffixed pronoun, addressed in section 3.2.4 below.
42 231 times; EHI ירא; the next closest equivalent is used 10 times, and the rest 3 times or less.
In all of these examples, OG does not include the so-called “waw of apodosis.” Since one grammatically correct option in Hebrew was for the apodosis not to begin with waw, the minus is possible within a Hebrew manuscript. However, there is strong evidence that the removal of waw is a matter of translation technique. In Greek (as in English) the body of the clause following a temporal phrase is not preceded by a conjunction. A survey of OG Exodus 1-14 shows that in the 15 cases where the Hebrew has a waw before an apodosis, only once is it preserved isomorphically in OG. These data show a clear pattern in OG of the waw being dropped before an apodosis. Therefore, the difference is not reflective of a real variant.

Whereas the other examples have finite verbs, in 1:10 καὶ ἐπολεμήσαντες ἡμᾶς ἔξελευσονταί, the OG has a participial clause subsumed within the Hebrew’s second finite verbal clause. Though it is more target oriented, this use of a participle phrase for a Hebrew finite clause occurs very frequently in the OG.

43 There is evidence that waw is just a phrase-edge marker and does not have specific functions such as introducing an apodosis; see Robert D. Holmstedt, “Hypotaxis,” in Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics (ed. Geoffrey Khan; Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2013), 220-22, and “Critical at the Margins: Edge Constituents in Biblical Hebrew,” KUSATU 17 (2014), 141-43.

44 Because such a survey is time intensive, it was limited to this small corpus; nevertheless, the results are still valid, given the size of the example set (15).


46 Thus, I find Davila’s variant list in DJD XII to be incorrect, as well as Cross’s reconstruction of the first few letters of 4QExod’s verb in 1:16 as הָעִבָּד — presumably based on OG, with which it agrees in other features.

47 Some 450 times in the Pentateuch; Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 5.
In these cases, the OG uses plural nouns and adjectives for singular counterparts in the Hebrew. In the first example, ζωή is used as a “distributive singular,” which occurs often in Greek. Of 281 occurrences of ζωή in the Septuagint, 280 are singular (the exception is Ps 62:4); they often represent plural ḥay (Hatch-Redpath ζωή). Clearly, then, this is a matter of translation technique.

In the second and fourth cases, the OG has a plural noun and plural adjective for the Hebrew’s singular noun and singular adjective. The nouns חַטֶם and חָטֶם never appear in the plural in the Hebrew Bible, showing that חַטֶם (work’) is a collective noun. In contrast to the two other popular equivalents for חַטֶם, δουλεία is nearly always plural when representing singular חַטֶם. When OG understands חַטֶם to mean “work,” then, it also understands it collectively, using plural δουλεία. The adjective following (τοῖς σκληροῖς) must agree in number with the word it modifies to be grammatically correct Greek. Thus, both the plural noun and plural adjective in OG are results of translation technique.

Similarly, plural πεδίον is used for singular שדה in this verse. The Hebrew “work in the field” (עבדה בשדה) is a generic statement, referring not to work done in one particular field but to work done in fields in general (i.e., “field work”; cf. NRSV “field labor”). In the Hebrew Bible, שדה occurs most often in the singular, but sometimes in the plural. In nearly synonymous genitive phrases “something of the field” (e.g., ונש㤗משרש in 9:25), in which the genitive word communicates the kind of the construct word, the genitive word is typically singular; we would therefore expect the corresponding ב prepositional phrase to also have a singular. When πεδίον is used in OG it almost always represents שדה, and it is the most

---

48 Smyth, Greek Grammar, §998.
49 The plural חַטֶם appears once in 1QSa 1:16, once in Ben Sira 4:30 [ms C], and once in m. Hag. 1:8.
50 Wevers, Exodus, 7.
51 δουλεία (LSJ “slavery,” “service for hire”; 17 times) and λειτουργία (LSJ “public service”; 381 times).
52 δουλεία (“work”) is used as an equivalent 38 times (According to Hatch-Redpath, the number is 36, but two instances in Num 7:7, 8 and two instances in 1 Chr 24:3, 19, are counted as one).
53 The only exceptions being Num 4:47 (where it also appears in the plural twice) and 2 Chr 29:35 (Hatch-Redpath δουλεία).
54 WO’s “genitive of genus”; §9.5.3i.
55 Hatch-Redpath πεδίον.
frequent equivalent, after ἀγρός, for שדה. Πεδίον is sometimes singular and sometimes plural when used for שדה in OG Exodus. For the Hebrew prepositional phrase שדה (singular) and the genitive שדה (singular), Greek ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ (singular) and ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις (plural) are used. Significantly, the grammatical number of πεδίον corresponds to the grammatical number of the Greek word being modified in every case. In our case here in 1:14, ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις modifies τοῖς ἔργοις, which is plural for reasons discussed above (see discussion of ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς σκληροῖς). This evidence shows that the plural number of τοῖς πεδίοις is a result of translation technique.

1:16 Ὅταν μαιοῦσθε OG || בילדכן 4Q13 SP MT
1:17 καθότι OG || ΜΝ 4Q1 SP MT

OG’s Ὅταν plus a finite verb is a typical representation of temporal ב with an infinitive. OG Genesis and Exodus use a variety of equivalents for שדה depending on its sense in context (i.e., whether it’s overall sense is “when,” “where,” “as much as,” etc.). These include καθα, καθως, ως, καθοτι, ηνια and καθαπερ. When the overall sense is equivalent to English “as much as,” as is the case here, καθότι is often used.

3.2.1.4 – Cases where the Greek does not isomorphically represent Hebrew

In several cases we find Greek that does not isomorphically represent Hebrew. These are cases where we cannot retrovert a grammatically possible Hebrew Vorlage based on OG’s usual isomorphism, or where the Greek demonstrably diverges from an isomorphic representation of the extant witnesses.

56 EHI שדה.
57 Compare ἀγρός for שדה in OG Genesis and Exodus, and πεδίον for שדה in OG Genesis, both of which appear in the singular.
59 When the modified word is a verb, it is singular corresponding to the Hebrew.
62 For more examples of non-isomorphic translation in Exodus, found outside of Exod 1, see Aejmelaeus, On the Trail, 86-87.
In these two cases, OG puts the constituents in an order that is impossible or improbable in Hebrew. In the first example, OG has the complement of the verb (αὐτοὺς, representing אתם) coming before the verb, whereas the four Hebrew manuscripts have the verb followed by the complement. The order XOV (כאמש – object – verb) is not typical of Hebrew, whereas XVO (found in the Hebrew manuscripts) is. More importantly, when a pronoun is suffixed to את and serves as the complement of the verb, it typically follows the verb immediately. The word order of OG is thus highly improbable in Hebrew for two reasons. Considering that ancient Greek was a much more flexible language in terms of word order, this difference results from translation technique. In the second example, OG has the possessive pronoun αὐτῶν before the noun, whereas the Hebrew has the possessive pronoun suffixed (פתח). The difference in word order is a matter of translation technique, because the word order possessive followed by noun is impossible in Hebrew. Moreover, we find similar cases where OG puts the possessive first, throughout the OG (e.g., Ex 4:31 αὐτῶν τὴν θλῖψιν; 9:34 and 10:1 αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν; 28:41 αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας). In Greek, the genitive pronoun is in predicate position, and thus can stand before or after the noun it modifies.

---

63 In the same way that a pronoun suffixed directly to the verb would; JM §155t; Takamitsu Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 44-45; Robert D. Holmstedt, *Ruth: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2010), 63. In Exodus, for example, את with a pronoun never appears before the verb whose complement the pronoun is.

64 I have argued before (Screnock, “Translation Technique”) that the OG tends to preserve the order of high-level constituents (subject, verb, object, and verbal modifiers) of the source text; however, this tendency does not completely preclude such changes, as the data in my previous study shows.


66 Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1185; According to Smyth, the predicate position “often lends emphasis” (§1168). Although Smyth’s comment is most likely directed towards adjectives and not genitive αὐτος as is used here, I suspect that the placement of the genitive pronoun before the word it modifies has something to do with emphasis.
In these three cases, OG does not contain a possessive pronoun to represent a pronoun suffix in the Hebrew. Greek does not need a possessive pronoun when possession is clearly implied in context; in such cases, “[t]he article often takes the place of an unemphatic possessive pronoun.”\(^{67}\) Given the isomorphic tendencies of the OG, however, and the fact that Greek could use a possessive pronoun to reflect the Hebrew more isomorphically, it is not enough merely to point out that the Greek works as a representation of the Hebrew. Rather, we must further investigate the translation technique of OG in similar instances. Beginning with τοὺς ὑπεναντίους, which represents either שָׁנָא or שָׁנָא,\(^{68}\) a Hebrew plural participle of שָׁנָא without a possessive (i.e., שָׁנָא) is very unlikely Hebrew. שָׁנָא, used as a substantive in the Hebrew Bible almost never occurs in the absolute, rather than bound, state.\(^{69}\) Although in the Pentateuch the OG often translates שָׁנָא with pronominal suffix using a possessive pronoun,\(^{70}\) the impossibility of the alternative retroversion together with the Greek’s ability to drop the possessive indicate that the difference here stems from translation technique.

OG has ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις for the Hebrew בּסִיבָה. Note that, in MT and 4QGen-Exod, the plural pronoun in Hebrew is best read as referring to the taskmasters (cf. 6:6, 7), not the Israelites,\(^{71}\) because Israel was just referred to using a singular pronoun two words earlier in שְׁנָה.

---

68 Μισέω is the standard equivalent for the root שָׁנָא (Hatch-Redpath μοιέν; cf. also ἐχθρός), not ὑπεναντίος. However, there is no clear Hebrew equivalent for ὑπεναντίος (Hatch-Redpath s.v.). It more commonly represents איב or צר, but there it is not a standard equivalence such that we could reconstruct a different word behind ὑπεναντίος. Note the שָׁנָא and אָב variant in Gen 24:60 in SP and MT; if ὑπεναντίος clearly represented אָב here, it would be a similar variant.
69 It is bound in over 50 instances, and absolute in just three: Ps 106:10; Prov 26:24; 27:6.
70 Exod 20:5; 23:5; Lev 26:17; Num 10:35; Deut 5:9; 7:15; 30:7; 32:41; 33:11. The pronoun is not represented in only two cases: Gen 24:60; Deut 7:10.
71 Contra Wevers (*Exodus*, 5), who sees the plural pronoun here as referring to Israel and thus being “anomalous” considering the singular reference to שְׁנָא elsewhere in MT. Given this pattern in MT, and the near context in the verse, MT’s plural pronoun is best read as referring to the taskmasters. SP’s text, however, is best read with the plural pronoun referring to the Israelites.
Like the substantive use of סִבְּבָה in that case, סִבְּבָה is always bound when it occurs in the Hebrew Bible (all in Exodus: 1:11; 2:11; 5:4, 5; 6:6, 7). While I do not think this is enough evidence to say that סִבְּבָה (i.e., not bound, without a pronoun) is linguistically improbable, it does suggest that literally the book of Exodus spoke of סִבְּבָה as something definite (i.e., not “oppress them with burdens [of some sort],” but “oppress them with their burdens”). This, together with OG’s dropping of the possessive in verse 10, tips the balance in favor of considering this to be a case of translation technique.

Given the previous two differences, where an isomorphically retroverted Hebrew is impossible or improbable, it seems that there was some linguistic pressure from Greek to drop the pronoun. Thus, the lack of possessive pronoun with plural ἔργα, whereas the Hebrew has singular העבדה with pronominal suffix, also stems from translation technique.72

1:16 ἄρσεν ... αὐτό ... θῆλυν OG || בת ... ابن ב Q1 SP MT
1:17 τὰ ἄρσενα OG || את אולטיס SP MT
1:18 τὰ ἄρσενα OG || את הלידים SP MT
1:22 Πᾶν ἄρσεν... καὶ πᾶν θῆλυν OG || כל הבת...כל הבן SP MT

In these cases, OG uses terminology that refers only to gender—“male” (ἄρσην) and “female” (θῆλυν)—whereas the Hebrew witnesses use terminology that does not focus on gender—“son” (בֵן), “daughter” (בת), and “youth” (יֶלֶד). Though gender is an aspect of the semantics of the Hebrew terms, it is not their sole focus. In OG, ἄρσην typically represents זָכָר and never represents בֵן.73 בֵן is translated by a surprising range of Greek words, several used over 10 times;74 however, γίος is overwhelmingly favored.75 There is an excellent chance, then, that whenever בֵן appeared in OG’s Vorlage, OG would translate with γίος. ἄρσην is similarly treated with lexical isomorphism by OG: it is rendered by the related words ἄρσενων 38 times and

72 The use of plural ἔργα for singular עבדה is also translation technique; see section 3.2.1.3.
73 Except, of course, possibly in this passage; Hatch-Redpath ἄρσην.
74 Including τέκνον 129 times.
75 3,670 times according to EHI; cf. Hatch-Redpath γίος; the 21 page-long entry is almost entirely equivalents of γίος and ב, including 150+ times in Exodus.
ἄρσην 39 times; in only three cases is a different gloss used, two of which are found in Sirach.76 These two sets of lexical-isomorphic pairings—υἱός for בֵן and ἀρσενικός/ἀρσην for זָכָר—seem to suggest that ἀρσην here does not represent בֵן but זָכָר. In similar fashion θῆλυς typically represents בָהנְם and never represents תָב.77 Like בֵן, תָב has a clear equivalent: it is nearly always γυναῖκα.78 Like בֵן, בָהנְמ has a clear equivalent: the only words used to translate it are the related θηλυκός (twice) and θῆλυς (18 times).79 On first glance, these two sets of lexical-isomorphic pairings—θυγάτηρ for בַת and θῆλυς for בָהנְמ—seem to suggest that θῆλυ here does not represent בַת but בָהנְם.

The point of the verse is that the male children are killed. A בֵן here is not merely a child, but a male child. A Hebrew scribe could conceivably have made the same synonym substitution. In 1:17, 18, and 22, OG’s τὰ ἀρσενά (=רֵעֶה) similarly makes clear that the midwives kept the male children alive, not merely “children” in general. יֶלֶד is translated by a number of Greek words,80 but never by ἀρσην except possibly in this passage. Several further points, however, further clarify what is occurring here. Although there is a significant equivalence in the OG for the terms ἀρσην and θῆλυς, in OG Exodus the equivalence is not followed. θῆλυς occurs a handful of times and never represents בָהנְמ in Exodus, and similarly in the 6 cases of ἀρσην it represents only once. OG Exodus, then, may simply be the exception to the overwhelming trend to translate בָהנְמ and בֵן with this pair of terms. Moreover, the fact that this same type of synonym substitution occurs six times in these four verses should cause us to consider translation technique as the best explanation. Although possible, it is not very likely that OG’s Vorlage contained בֵן and בָהנְמ at these six points. The question, then, becomes whether the translator was mentally thinking בֵן and בָהנְמ when translating (i.e., the change occurred in the mental Hebrew text) or whether he kept the Hebrew words בֵן, בָה, and יֶלֶד in mind even while changing the sense to “male” and “female” in the translation. Finally, a similar translational phenomenon

76 ἀνήρ is used in Num 31:35 (EHI רֵעֶה).
77 Except, of course, possibly in this passage; Hatch-Redpath θῆλυς.
78 495 times; the next closest equivalent is κώμη 24 times, and none of the other 11 equivalents appear more than 3 times a piece (EHI תָב).
79 2 and 18 times, respectively; EHI בָהנְמ; cf. Hatch-Redpath θηλυκός and θῆλυς.
80 Most notably νεανίσκος (8 times), παιδάριον (34 times), παιδίον (36 times), and τέκνον (8 times; EHI יֶלֶד).
occurs in OG Exodus, involving the terms used to refer to Israel and Egypt.\textsuperscript{81} These various factors make it most likely that the differences in OG Exodus are a matter of translation technique, and that OG Exodus is not following the isomorphic patterns found elsewhere in the OG.

\textbf{3.2.2 – Cases where Lexical Equivalence Indicates a Real Variant}

Besides helping us eliminate differences that are merely perceived, an understanding of translation technique can also lead to the discovery of real variants. To be clear, the following examples involve study of translation technique, but these are \textit{not} cases that are excluded because of translation technique. Rather, these are cases where our understanding of translation technique demonstrates that there are \textit{real variants}.

At first glance, the OG and the Hebrew here might seem not to differ, since the verbs involved in the Hebrew and the Greek are relatively synonymous. Wevers, however, notes that the second and third verbs in OG are reversed in order from the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{82} There is a high correspondence between $\pi\lambda\rho\theta\nu\mu\nu\omega$ and $\textit{רָבָּה}$,\textsuperscript{83} suggesting that OG’s $\epsilon\pi\lambda\theta\upsilon\theta\zeta\sigma\varsigma\nu\upsilon\omega$ should represent $\textit{וַירֶבּו}$.$\textsuperscript{84}$ There is no standard equivalent for the root $\chi\nu\delta\alpha\iota\iota$, except in Leviticus where $\epsilon\rho\gamma\nu\sigma\tau\omega/\zeta\sigma\tau\sigma\tau\sigma\tau\tau\tau\nu\omicron$ is consistently used for $\chi\nu\delta\alpha\iota\iota$ out of necessity for a standard term for the legal concept. Because it is just as likely for $\chi\nu\delta\alpha\iota\iota$ $\epsilon\gamma\nu\sigma\nu\tau\tau\tau\nu\upsilon\omega$ to represent the root $\chi\nu\delta\alpha\iota\iota$ as it is to represent $\textit{וַירֶבּו}$,\textsuperscript{85} and given the strong lexical isomorphism in OG between $\pi\lambda\theta\nu\mu\nu\omega$ and $\textit{רָבָּה}$, the OG represents $\xi\upsilon\sigma\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu$ as $\textit{וַישֶׁרֶצ}$ as Wevers suggests, not $\textit{וַיַּרְצוּ}$ as found in the Hebrew manuscripts. Note that several OG manuscripts reverse the order of the two verbs (to align with the text as found in MT),

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{81} Two different words are used to distinguish between the Egyptians (called $\dot{\epsilon}\theta\nu\varsigma$) and the Israelites (called $\gamma\dot{e} \nu\varsigma$); Wevers, \textit{Exodus}, 4; cf. Dozeman, \textit{Exodus}, 70.
  \item \textsuperscript{82} Wevers, \textit{Exodus}, 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{83} Cf. Hatch-Redpath $\pi\lambda\theta\nu\mu\nu\omega$.
  \item \textsuperscript{84} Notwithstanding instances involving $\gamma\chi\nu\nu\omicron\nu\mu\omicron\upsilon$ and an adjective to translate $\textit{רָבָּה}$ in Gen 6:1; Ex 1:12; 23:29.
  \item \textsuperscript{85} Propp, \textit{Exodus 1-18}, 123.
\end{itemize}
suggesting that at least some OG scribes were aware of this discrepancy.

1:10 ἐξελεύσονται OG || על cls 4Q1 SP MT
   \[(Categorization – Sense Variant: Synonym Substitution + Linguistic Variant: Smoothing)\]

Though in this context ἐξέρχομαι and על essentially communicate the same thing, the two words have different semantic ranges.\(^{86}\) Moreover, ἐξέρχομαι is an equivalent for יצא (“to go out”) hundreds of times in OG, compared to just four times (not including this time) representing על.\(^{87}\) Therefore, we should understand ἐξέρχομαι to represent the root יצא here. The difference does not appear to be related to anything theological, or to the use of a stock phrase (sense normalization), since the departure of Israel from Egypt can be referred to (in Exodus and numerous other traditions) using either verb, יצא or על.\(^{88}\)

1:8 ἕτερος OG || חדש 4Q1 SP MT
   \[(Categorization – Sense Variant: Synonym Substitution)\]

In this example, OG refers to “another” (הֵטֶרֶך) king, whereas the Hebrew calls the king “new” (חדש). In OG, הֵטֶרֶך almost always represents אחר, and it never represents חדש.\(^{89}\) Conversely, the adjective חדש is very often represented by Greek καινός.\(^{90}\) Wevers notes that the Greek “gives the sense of ‘new king’ exactly,”\(^{91}\) but this, in my opinion, begs the question: it also would give the sense of “another king” exactly, and, moreover, βασιλεὺς καινός would give the sense of “new king” exactly. In other words, the lexical equivalencies are more important than the capabilities of the Greek to render the Hebrew found in the extant witnesses. The generally isomorphic character of the OG and the strong equivalences ἕτερος/ אחר and קָנָוָז/חדש make

---

86 ἐξέρχομαι is to “go or come out of,” “go forth,” “come forth,” or perhaps in this context, “withdraw from the country” (LSJ s.v.), whereas על is to “go up,” “come up,” or “ascend” (BDB s.v.).

87 Hatch-Redpath ἐξέγερσις.

88 Cf. also section 3.2.4, where the grammatical number of the verb in this variant is discussed.

89 Hatch-Redpath הֵטֶרֶך.


91 Wevers, Exodus, 3.
it more probable that βασιλεὺς ἑτερὸς represents מַלֵּךׁ אַחָר. Davila thinks “[i]t is likely that ἑτερὸς is a corruption of νεωτερὸς,” but שׁחָ& is never translated by νεωτερὸς in the OG; neither is יִשָׁר. The best explanation for the variant pair יִשָׁר and יִשָׁר is a synonym substitution, probably arising because of the role of memory in transmission.

1:17 καθότι συντάσσειν αὐταῖς OG || נָאֵשׁ דָּבָר אֲלִיָּהוּ 4Q1 נָאֵשׁ דָּבָר אֲלִיָּהוּ SP MT

(Categorization – Sense Variant: Sense Normalization)

Given lexical equivalences, OG’s συντάσσειν αὐταῖς represents דָּבָר אֲלִיָּהוּ, not as found in the Hebrew witnesses. Whereas συντάσσω in this context must be understood as “ordain, prescribe, order,” Piel דָּבָר involves “speaking” but not any specific sense of “commanding.” The audience of the Hebrew text would understand that the speaking involves command, but this is known because of context (since verse 16 clearly contains a command) rather than the semantics of דָּבָר. In other words, though a command is involved, the command is not “commanded” but merely “spoken” (Piel דָּבָר). Συντάσσω is most often used to represent Piel יִשָׁר, and Piel יִשָׁר is almost always translated by συντάσσω or ἐντέλλομαι. Piel דָּבָר, on

92 Compare OG’s translation of adjectival יִשָׁר elsewhere; e.g., Gen 4:25 σπέρμα ἑτερὸς for יִשָׁר זְרֵע, “another seed”; or Exod 34:14 θεῷ ἑτέρῳ for יִשָׁר אלהי, “another god.”
93 DJD XII, 19.
94 EHI יַחַר.
95 EHI יַחַר.
96 The difference in syntax (a dative verbal complement to represent an ל prepositional phrase complement) is a matter of translation technique; see section 3.2.1.1.
98 Piel דָּבָר with ל is “to speak to” (HALOT דָּבָר II pi 2; BDB s.v. Pi. 3.b). HALOT (דָּבָר II pi 6) gives the gloss “to order,” citing four examples (including Ex 1:17); none of the examples are convincing, however; in every case, Piel דָּבָר can mean simply “to speak,” and the content that is spoken is a command. Similarly, DCH similarly offers “command” as a gloss, providing Ex 23:22 as an additional example (DCH דָּבָר I Pi); again, דָּבָר could mean simply “speak” there, with no reason to add the additional sense of “command.” There is no need to extrapolate a different sense (“to command”) of a word for a handful of cases if the sense found in the overwhelming majority of cases (“to speak”) is adequate. The English verb “to say” provides a parallel example; though one can use the verb with a command (e.g., He said to me, “Put your hands in the air.”), this does not mean that the verb “to say” itself connotes the semantics of “command”. Thus, there is a clear semantic difference between OG’s συντάσσω (“command”) and the Hebrew texts’ Piel דָּבָר (“speak”).
99 Hatch-Redpath συντάσσειν.
100 79 times and 339 times, respectively (EHI יִשָׁר).
the other hand, is mostly translated as λαλέω or εἶπον,101 and συντάσσω is rarely paired with Piel דבר.102 The clear lexical pairings of ἐντέλλομαι/συντάσσω for Piel צוה and λαλέω/εἶπον for Piel דבר strongly suggest that OG represents צוה here, not דבר.103 Whether in OG’s Vorlage, or in the translator’s Hebrew mental text, the scribe/translator substituted דבר צוה for צוה דבר because of the near context—a command is given in 1:16. Moreover, the vocabulary that would be expected (“according to what God commanded [Piel צוה]”) given the near context followed by a clause would also have played a role (i.e., sense normalization). Although this combination of context and expected vocabulary could have influenced the translator to opt for “command” instead of “said” (cf. NRSV’s translation), the difference is just as likely to have occurred through text-critical processes in the Vorlage or in the translator’s mental text.

3.2.3 – Clarifying Expansions

1:1 Ἰακώβ ἀπὸ πατέρων αὐτῶν OG [עקב אביהים] 4Q13 [עקב אביהים] SP MT
(Categorization – Sense Variant: Expansion)

1:12 οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι OG [מצרים] SP MT
(Categorization – Sense Variant: Expansion + Linguistic Variant: Smoothing)

1:22 ὃ ἂν τεχθῇ τοῖς Εβραίοις OG [לעברים] SP MT
(Categorization – Sense Variant: Expansion)

These three variants involve expansions whose purpose is to clarify the text in some way. In 1:1, the phrase “their father,” in apposition to “Jacob,” is found in OG and 4QExod but not in SP or MT. A variety of explanations have been offered to explain the data here. Wevers attributes the

101 Λαλέω seems to be typically reserved for Piel דבר (846 times for Piel דבר; 20 times for Qal אמר), and εἶπον for Qal אמר (80 times for Piel אמר; 3,334 times for Qal אמר). Λέγω is used 1,404 times for Qal אמר as well, but only 5 times for Piel דבר (EHI דבר and אמר).
102 6 times (EHI דבר).
103 According to Wevers, Piel דבר is not usually rendered συντάσσω in clauses; instead, it is usually εἶπον or λαλέω (Exodus, 9). This is not surprising, given the general pairing of εἶπον or λαλέω with Piel דבר, whether in a clause or not. צוה appears to make no difference to OG’s translation of Piel דבר צוה. This suggests that the parallel with the often used phrase “according to what God commanded [Piel צוה]” (which occurs frequently in Exodus) has not influenced the translator to use συντάσσω for Piel דבר in such clauses.
plus in OG to the translator, despite the fact that 4QExod\(^b\) (and probably 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^l\) as well) contain the same reading. Propp suggests homoiarchon: from the earlier reading יָעַכְבָּם אֹבְרֵיהֶם, a scribe may have skipped from the beginning of אֹבְרֵיהֶם to the beginning of the following word, אָישׁ, thereby omitting אֹבְרֵיהֶם;\(^{104}\) Jonathan Vroom shows that this sort of homoiarchon was most likely a non-possibility.\(^{105}\) The most likely explanation is that SP/MT’s reading is earlier, with a scribe adding אֹבְרֵיהֶם for clarification, to show that “sons of Israel” earlier in the verse does not mean Israelis but the actual twelve sons of Jacob (expansion).\(^{106}\) A final explanation is that אֹבְרֵיהֶם could have stemmed from pressure to use the phrase יָעַכְבָּם אֹבְרֵיהֶם instead of יָעַכְבָּם, as often found in the preceding chapters of Genesis (sense normalization).\(^{107}\) Expansion is the best option, perhaps with sense normalization a secondary factor.

In 1:12, the OG has a plus specifying that “the Egyptians” are the subject of the verb.\(^{108}\) The impetus here has to do with the larger text-linguistic context. In OG (and 2QExod\(^d\)) the preceding two verbs are plural whereas in MT the verbs are singular, because OG refers to Israel as plural and MT as singular.\(^{109}\) As a result, the change of subject is clear in MT, but would be unclear in OG without an explicit subject;\(^{110}\) without OG’s explicit subject οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι (מִצְרַיִם), the audience might incorrectly assume that the Israelis are the subject.\(^{111}\) Note that this impetus is just as possible for a Hebrew manuscript that had plural referents all along as it is for a translation; indeed, the spacing of Qumran manuscripts suggests strongly that they too contained מִצְרַיִם.\(^{112}\)

---

\(^{104}\) Propp, Exodus 1-18, 120.

\(^{105}\) Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors.”

\(^{106}\) Cf. Wevers, Exodus, 1; DJD XII, 85; Propp, Exodus 1-18, 120.

\(^{107}\) See Gen 42:29, 36; 45:25, 27; 46:5; 47:7.

\(^{108}\) Davila does not describe why this variant has come about, but calls the מִצְרַיִם plus “obviously secondary” (DJD XII, 18).

\(^{109}\) Cf. section 3.2.4.

\(^{110}\) Cf. Wevers, Exodus, 6.

\(^{111}\) This type of expansion can be compared with purely linguistic smoothing found, for example, in 1:11 (see section 3.3.5); the difference is that in the example of linguistic smoothing, the subject is known but the grammar was cumbersome, whereas here the subject is not known and made explicit as a result. Both expansion and linguistic smoothing are involved in this change.

\(^{112}\) 2QExod\(^d\) is not extant at this point, but the line length suggests there must have been more text than MT and SP.
Although Wevers deems that the plus τοῖς Ἐβραίοις stems from the translator’s concern to make his target text read well,\textsuperscript{113} the SP contains the same plus;\textsuperscript{114} indeed, a translation context is not necessary to postulate the improvement of language in the product text. The expansion here probably has the purpose of clarifying the text: the Pharaoh is not commanding that every child born in Egypt be thrown into the Nile, but rather just those who are born to the Hebrews.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{113} Wevers, \textit{Exodus}, 11.

\textsuperscript{114} In 4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a}, immediately following לִשְׁלֹחַ נְתַנְתָּה the line ends and there is a lacuna at the beginning of the next, but there is not sufficient room for לְעֵבְרֵים (DJD XII, 20).

\textsuperscript{115} So Childs (\textit{Exodus}, 6) and Davila (DJD XII, 20). Although this point is obvious from context, scribes often made what was obvious to a sensible reading even more obvious by way of expansion.
3.2.4 – Variants Involving the Grammatical Number of Israel

In all of these variants, the grammatical number of Israel (whether “Israel,” “the sons of Israel,” or “the people”) is involved, either because the word is a verb that must agree in number with its subject or a pronoun that must agree in number with its referent. Where these variants occur, we often find plural in OG, singular in MT, and a variety of singular and plural in the other Hebrew manuscripts. Taken from the perspective of the OG, these differences in number when referring to a collective noun seem naturally to fall under the category of translation technique. But the same ambivalence involving collective nouns occurs in Hebrew, so it is best not to eliminate it as translation technique. Taking verses 10-11 as an example, the verbs and pronouns in question...
could agree with מִצְרַיִם (grammatically singular, conceptually plural) or בני ישראל (plural) of verse 9. When the Egyptians decide to “deal shrewdly” with the Israelites (נתחכמה, “let us deal shrewdly”), the complement of the verb is לַי in SP and MT (using a singular pronoun), but αὐτούς in OG (reflecting והם, using a plural pronoun). In 1:11 OG has a plural pronoun αὐτούς where 4QGen-Exod⁴ and MT have the singular pronoun וֹ (ענתו), but SP shows that OG’s difference probably results from a variant Vorlage, ענותם as contained in SP; two words later, OG’s plural ἡξοδομημένον (versus singular בֵּית in MT) is supported by SP’s בני.

While none of the witnesses is entirely consistent on the grammatical number of Israel (all contain at least one instance of plural and one of singular), when we consider the instances where the OG and other witnesses disagree two patterns become clear: OG typically uses the plural,¹¹⁷ and MT typically uses the singular. Wherever 2QExod⁴ is extant it agrees with OG (as it does for many variants¹¹⁸); it is probable that it would have also used the plural in earlier variants, where it is unfortunately not extant. 4QGen-Exod⁵ and MT always use singular, whereas SP has a variety (8 singular, 3 plural). Notably, there are cases where the plural is the only way to understand reference to Israel—בהם in 1:14—since there all witnesses agree. Both the OG/2QExod⁴ readings and the 4QGen-Exod⁵/MT readings can be explained as secondary efforts to make the text more consistent; as such, SP may be most reliable with respect to these variants.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 123.
¹¹⁷ Cf. Wevers, Exodus, 5.
¹¹⁸ Cf. DJD III, 49.
The phenomenon of differences involving grammatical number with Israel—and, as we see in other cases, any noun that is grammatically singular but conceptually plural in some way—is not limited to translation. As a result, we should not automatically consider differences in OG involving grammatical number to arise from translation technique.

The issue of whether singular or plural verbs are used with collective nouns like ישראל andעם is not unique to Hebrew. For example, in American English singular verbs are used (“the team is waiting in the locker room”) whereas in British English plural verbs are used (“the team are waiting in the locker room”). Some have proposed a trend in Ancient Hebrew from mixed use to a standardization in later Hebrew where only plural verbs are used with collectives, in which case we would categorize these variants as involving linguistic modernization. However,
the evidence for this trend is uncertain;\textsuperscript{122} moreover, in the case of MT’s leveling, the issue is consistency, not the use of a newer form (i.e., linguistic smoothing). Thus, linguistic smoothing is the best categorization for these variants.

3.2.5 – The Placement of יוסף and the Number of Jacob’s Offspring

| 1:3 | > OG SP MT $|$ יוסף 4Q13  
 | (Categorization – Sense Variant: Conforming Variant) |
| 1:5 | וָוְֶשְׂפָּח בּוֹ זַמְּלַכְּרָם fin 4Q11 וָוְֶשָּפֶק תְּוַאֲרֵץ fin 4Q1  
 | > 4Q13  
 | (Categorization – Sense Variant: Expansion + Scribal Error: Transposition) |
| 1:5 | πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα OG $|$ שהם נשעים נפש 4Q1  
 | 7עונים 4Q11 $|$ שהם נשעים נפש 4Q13  
 | שביעים נשא 4Q13  
 | (Categorization – Sense Variant: Conforming Variant + Scribal Error: Metathesis + Sense Variant: Sense Normalization) |

The variants contained in these verses are related but each have their own particular explanation.

The full text of Exodus 1:2-5 in MT is as follows:

רָאוֹבֶן שֵׁם וְיוֹעָכָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּין תּוֹבָל וַנִּבָּמִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּין תּוֹבָל וַנִּבָּמִי  
שִׁבְעָה נֵפֶשׁ לְיָוִקֶף חֲלוֹא בָּמִּשְׁרוֹן  
2Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, 3Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, 4Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. 5All the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons; Joseph was already in Egypt. (RSV)

In contrast to MT, 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} includes the name just after בּוֹלַל in v. 3, and moreover does not contain the phrase רָוֹסְף היה בָּמִּשְׁרֵי (“Joseph was already in Egypt”) in v. 5.\textsuperscript{123} Cross explains these variants as follows.\textsuperscript{124} The simplest and most sensible form of the text would include Joseph in a list of Jacob’s children in verses 2-4 (i.e., what we find in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b}). When the expansion was added to v. 5, stating that Joseph was in Egypt, Joseph's name was removed.

\textsuperscript{122} So Gary Rendsberg, “Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of P,” JANES 12 (1980), 67.
\textsuperscript{123} The phrase does not appear at the end of the verse in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b}, and there is no room for it in the lacuna preceding (DJD XII, 85).
\textsuperscript{124} DJD XII, 85.
from the list in v. 3. Because it does not make sense for Joseph to be included among those who “came to Egypt” if Joseph “was in Egypt” at that time, it was contradictory to have him mentioned in v. 3 and v. 5; thus the minus of יוסף in v. 3 is a conforming variant. That the plus is found at both the beginning (OG) and end (4QGen-Exod⁴, 4QpaleoGen-Exod⁴, SP, MT) of the verse in other witnesses gives further evidence that the plus is secondary.¹²⁵

Dozeman suggests that the variant in v. 5 involving the number of Jacob’s offspring is related to the presence or absence of Joseph in the list of Jacob’s sons in verses 2-3,¹²⁶ because it is Joseph’s offspring who make up the additional five in verse 5, according to some counts (see below).¹²⁷ However, at least one witness, OG, has the number 75 but does not include Joseph in the list in verses 2-3,¹²⁸ contradicting the connection made by Dozeman. In the OG, as well as in 4QGen-Exod⁴ and 4QExod⁴, Jacob is said to have 75 descendants (cf. Acts 7:14), whereas in SP and MT the number is 70. The numbers here are essentially taken from Genesis 46:27 (a conforming variant), where the tradition behind SP and MT states that Jacob has 70 descendants and the tradition behind OG puts the number at 75.¹²⁹ Cross proposes that the number 70 is earlier, being a “round” and thus “traditional” number.¹³⁰ The later tradition, found in OG, added five descendants in Genesis 46:20 based on evidence elsewhere (Gen 50:23; Num 26:29, 33), and thus corrected the number in 46:27 to 75.¹³¹ This tradition is found in the OG again here in v. 5, supported by 4QGen-Exod⁴ and 4QExod⁴. Though this variant is part of a larger pattern of variants within the Pentateuch, there is not the extent of change to warrant the existence of

¹²５ Cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 123; if the plus in v. 3 were earlier, Propp suggests it could have arisen from homoiarchon from the beginning of verse 5 (יוסף ויהי), or from homoioteleuton from the end of verse 5 (שבעים ויהי; Exodus 1-18, 123. Such cases of homoi are unlikely, however (Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors”). Moreover, the reading of 4QExod⁴ most easily explains the other variants, and it thus preferred (contra Propp, Exodus 1-18, 3, 123).
¹²⁶ Dozeman, Exodus, 63.
¹²⁷ DJD XII, 85; cf. the options given in Wevers, Exodus, 2.
¹²⁸ 4QExod⁴ has Joseph in the earlier list and 75 here, whereas SP and MT do not include Joseph in the earlier list and have 70 here; 4QGen-Exod⁴ is not extant where Joseph would appear in verse 3.
¹²⁹ Cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 121-123 for a helpful summary of the various numerations of Jacob’s offspring and the various options for understanding the histories of these texts.
¹³⁰ DJD XII, 85.
¹³¹ Cf. Wevers, Exodus, 2; Propp, Exodus 1-18, 121-123.
another edition based on that pattern. Thus, this variant is categorized as individual, not large-scale. The numerals שבעים וחמש and חמש ושבעים are transposed in 4QGen-Exod$^a$ (metathesis).\(^{132}\)

In all the Hebrew witnesses, the numeral is followed by a second occurrence of נפש; no equivalent for נפש appears in OG, however. This could conceivably result from translation technique, since the repetition of נפש is somewhat redundant (“all the people were 75 people”). However, given the rarity of the construction found in the Hebrew, there are no other examples in the OG to establish whether such redundancy would be eliminated. One close example is Numbers 31:40, where the second occurrence of נפש is represented in OG. That translation technique is an uncertain explanation for the difference here suggests we should not eliminate this case as translation technique. Furthermore, a Vorlage reading חמש ושבעים without the second occurrence of נפש following works linguistically in Hebrew.\(^{133}\) Given the perceived awkwardness of נפש at the end of the phrase, the change here is sense normalization: the expected form of the phrase is produced. Propp suggests that the reading of Gen 46:27 may have influenced the minus of נפש here,\(^{134}\) but the other preceding numerations in Genesis—Gen 46:15, 22, 25, 26, and once in 27—do not include נפש at the end of the numeration.

3.2.6 – The List of Jacob’s Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>OG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:2 Συμεών</td>
<td>שמעון</td>
<td>4Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 Λευί</td>
<td>לווי</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 Ιούδας</td>
<td>ולוי</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 Ισσαχάר</td>
<td>ויששכר</td>
<td>4Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 Ζαβουλון</td>
<td>זבולון</td>
<td>4Q13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Categorization – Sense Variant: Logical Variant)

The list of Jacob’s children, as found in MT, reads ראובן שמעון לווי יוחנן ויששכר זבולון ויהודה בן בנימין ומנשה.\(^{132}\) (Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, Dan and

\(^{132}\) Both שבעים וחמש and חמש ושבעים are grammatical.

\(^{133}\) Cf. Gen 46:15, 22, 25, 26.

\(^{134}\) Propp, Exodus 1-18, 123.
Naphtali, Gad and Asher”). In this list, the extant Hebrew witnesses have the conjunction waw in various places. According to Waltke and O’Connor, “Phrasal waw is usually found on each item in a series but sometimes only on the last of a series; it is rarely distributed irregularly through the series and still more rarely omitted.” By this criterion, 4QpaleoGen-Exod⁴, 4QExod⁵, SP, and MT, as well as OG’s presumed Vorlage, are all irregular if the names in verses 2-4 are understood as one single list. As a result, we should instead understand the names as split into various sublists.

In MT, there is one sublist in each of verses 2 and 3 (with no apparent reason for the groupings), and two sublists in verse 4 (one for Bilhah’s children and one for Zilpah’s children). In SP and OG, there is one sublist in verses 2-3 (for children of Jacob’s wives), and two sublists in verse 4 (as in MT, one for Bilhah’s children and one for Zilpah’s children).¹³⁶

In MT, the first list contains conjunctions before every item except the initial item. In the OG, the first list contains no conjunctions except for the final item. The Qumran manuscripts do not have enough text extant to speculate on sublists.¹³⁷ SP and OG both have the same list groupings, but each utilizes a different manner specified by WO for placement of the waw in lists.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ WO §39.2.1b.

¹³⁶ Cf. Dozeman, Exodus, 63; Propp, Exodus 1-18, 120. Nahum M. Sarna (Exodus [The Jewish Publication Society, 1991]) argues that the sons are listed in four groups according to mothers (3-4); these groups do not, however, correspond to the four sublists formed in MT by the use of waw.

¹³⁷ On the inclusion of יוסף in v. 3, see section 3.2.5.

¹³⁸ Wevers notes that near-dittography or near-haplography (due to similarity of waw and yod, in the sequence יל ויהודה ששכר בנו ומשה and יל ויהודה ששכר בנו ומשה) could have played a role in OG’s reading יששכר (Wevers, Exodus, 1; cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 120), but the larger set of variants in this list suggest that the logic of the verse (specifically, the division of the sub-lists) is the main motivating factor. The evidence from 4QGen-Exod⁴ on יששכר is “very uncertain” (DJD XII, 18). Cross, in his work on 4QExod⁵, lists 4QGen-Exod⁴ as apparently (“vid”) agreeing with the reading יששכר (DJD XII, 85). However, the text of 4QGen-Exod⁴ at this point isblockquote in DJD XII. Because “[t]he leather is badly damaged at this point [in 4QGen-Exod⁴], and it is very uncertain whether we should read יששכר” (DJD XII, 18), the variant was not included in the variant list for 4QGen-Exod⁴ in DJD XII.
Both SP and OG have sublists that correspond to some sort of logic: one list for children of Jacob’s wives, and one list for each of his concubines. MT’s lists are not entirely logical: the first two of the four lists are not divided among, for example, children of Leah and children of Rebecca, or for any other apparent reason; they are just divided. Moreover, MT is supported by Qumran manuscripts and/or OG in all four variants in verses 2-3. All of this suggests that MT’s division of sublists—the most difficult conceptually—is earliest.

3.2.7 – Cases Dealing with Orality and Memory

A variety of different types of variant would have arisen most easily in an oral context and/or as a result of the role of memory in textual transmission. The following variant sets provide some examples.

1:8 ἕτερος OG || שׁוּד 4Q1 SP MT
1:10 ἐξέλευσονταi ΟG || עלהל 4Q1 SP MT
1:12 πλείους ὑγίνοντο ΟG || יברת 2Q2 || יברת 4Q1 MT || יברת SP
1:12 ἧσχυν ΟG || יפרץ 4Q1 SP MT || יפרץ 2Q2
1:18 ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου ΟG || מְלָךְ מְצָרִים MT || מְלָךְ מְצָרִים SP

(Categorization – Sense Variant: Synonym Substitution)

All of these variants involve the substitution of a synonym, which would have been especially possible in contexts involving orality and memory.

139 Note also that the order of each name has a logic: the list overall moves from oldest to youngest. However, there is no obvious reason to divide the names of Leah and Rebecca’s children where MT does (in the midst of Leah’s children). One possible reason for this division would be the prosody of the text; i.e., breaking up the long list of Jacob’s wives’ children so that the speaker can take a short break between saying them all. However, this element of the text seems less likely to arise as a variant, and more likely to belong to the earlier composition of the text.

140 Note, however, that the absence of Joseph in the list is secondary.

141 Note that orality and memory played a role in the construction of the translator’s mental Hebrew text, just as it played a role in transmission; see section 2.2.2.

142 For a fuller discussion of the variant in 1:18, see below; for a fuller discussion of the variants in 1:8 and 10, see section 3.2.2; for a fuller discussion of 1:12 πλείους ὑγίνοντο ΟG || יברת 2Q2 || יברת 4Q1 MT || יברת SP, see section 3.3.3.1. The second variant set in 1:12, involving יפרץ and יפרץ, is caused by synonym substitution; these
The verb in SP, lacking the *heh* at the end, is cohortative in mood, but not in form (see JM §114b n.3). The verb in 4QGen-Exod⁴ and MT has *heh*.¹⁴³ In context both carry essentially the same sense, and thus the difference is not significant. This slight change could have easily been introduced in an oral context.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, an oral context is one in which metathesis could have occurred: the final syllable *-mā* of the cohortative *nihakkāmā* (נתחכמה) may have been mistaken as *-am* in the imperfect *nihakkam* (נתחכים).

One final example highlights the possible role of memory in transmission. Already at this point in Exodus, the Pharaoh is referred to as both “king of Egypt” (מלך מצרים) and “Pharaoh” (פרעה). A scribe with knowledge of Exodus as a whole may have already had in mind, though only 18 verses into the book, the phrases נחרא פרעה and יאמפר, which are used often in the Ten Plagues narrative.¹⁴⁵ In contrast, יאמפר מלח מצרים is used only in 1:15 and יאמפר מלח מצרים only in 1:18. The variant here, therefore, might involve the substitution of an expected phrase (*sense normalization*).¹⁴⁶

---

¹⁴³ OG’s reading could translate either נתחכמה or נתחכם.
¹⁴⁴ The change would be like unto a synonym substitution, though the substitution is grammatical, not lexical.
¹⁴⁵ Ex 5:2, 5; 8:4, 21, 24; 10:24; 14:3.
¹⁴⁶ On the other hand, we could explain SP as earlier, with MT/OG transferring מלח מצרים from 1:15 (ocular transfer). Verses 15 and 18 are too far apart for the phrases יאמפר מלח מצרים in 1:15 and יאמפר מלח מצרים in 1:18 to have been directly on top of each other; however, they may have appeared a similar distance away from the margin, separated by only a few lines, causing the ocular transfer. For an example where ocular transfer is the best explanation, see elsewhere in this verse, where SP MT and OG have למלדת, but 4QExod⁴ adds המלדת, seemingly from v. 15 (so DJD XII, 86).
3.2.8 – Summary

Though there is not sufficient space to record the full extent of my textual analysis of OG translation and manuscript transmission, the preceding examples illustrate some of the pertinent aspects of my research. These included cases of differences arising from translation technique, cases where lexical equivalence indicates a true variant, a set of clarifying expansions, variants involving the grammatical number of Israel, a set of variants involving the placement of יְסֹפָר and the number of Jacob’s descendants, the list of Jacob’s children in 1:2-4, and examples of variation stemming from an oral context. Some examples highlight my method of consulting Hebrew and Greek lexicons and Septuagint concordances to establish more precisely the relationship of the OG and the Hebrew manuscripts (cf. section 3.1.2), and illustrate the value of doing such preliminary work. We also see that translation data in OG often shows that OG contains a true variant, even though it could suffice as a translation of the Hebrew contained in the Hebrew manuscripts (section 3.2.2). Overall, these examples show the general character of the variants we encounter in Exodus 1. We will now proceed to a comparison of the individual variants in OG and in the Hebrew manuscripts.

3.3 – Comparative Analysis of OG and Hebrew Manuscript Data

In this section, I compare the variants found in the OG and in the Hebrew manuscripts. Through this comparative analysis, the hypotheses (see section 3.1.3) based on the theoretical considerations of Chapter Two are generally confirmed. I hypothesized that non-translation technique differences in the OG occur mostly in OG’s Vorlage or in the mental Hebrew text of the translator, and that most of the processes involved in transmission also occur in translation. The expected result of my study, based on these hypotheses, is that the quantity of variants in OG Exodus 1 and their distribution amongst different subcategories will generally coincide with the variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. What the data show is that the OG does not contain more (or fewer) variants than the Hebrew manuscripts, and the types of variation in both data sets occur in similar frequency. This confirms the similarity of the variants that arise in Hebrew manuscript transmission and the variants involved in OG translation, and thus the similarity of the
translation process in OG and the transmission process in Hebrew manuscripts.

3.3.1 – Procedure for Comparative Analysis

My comparative analysis will begin with general observations about the total number of differences found in OG and in the Hebrew manuscripts, and the presence and frequency of the main categories of variant (i.e., common scribal error, individual indicative variant, large-scale variant) in both the Hebrew witnesses and the OG. These numbers, however, are of limited use, insofar as a simple tally of figures will never adequately reflect the complex reality of the texts. Instead, the appropriate method is to discuss examples that are characteristic of each group, and moreover to provide complete analysis and description of all the data (as represented by sections 3.2, 3.3, and Appendices A and B). Numbers also have a tendency to mislead, as a result of oversimplifying something quite complicated. For example, there are sometimes multiple main categories or subcategories assigned to the same variant, instead of a clear one-to-one ratio between categories and variants. Moreover, the numbers are dependent on how the lemma groups variants. When two or more variants are related, I put them together in one variant set and discuss them together; however, there are two words that have been changed, and they could perhaps be considered two variants instead.

Other issues also complicate the use of numbers to describe and compare these two groups: first, in the case of OG, we are only finding cases from one witness to the Hebrew text, whereas in the test group of Hebrew manuscripts, there are several witnesses. Second, several of these witnesses are fragmentary, and thus we have no idea how many variants they actually would have contained. Third, the mere participation in a variant set is not especially significant; all a manuscript needs to do to be included in a variant set is to be extant at the point of the variant. The OG, SP, and MT, for example, are included in every variant set, and as a result tabulating the amount of variants they contain does not say much at all. We will partially address the first two issues by adjusting the numbers based on the total number of words in a witness, and the third issue by focusing on the number of singly attested or independent readings.

Even these adjusted numbers, however, are not the best way to analyze and compare the
data. Instead, a descriptive analysis is required. As such, after giving an overview of the number of variations, I will give a descriptive comparison, working through each subcategory and discussing examples of that subcategory from both the OG and the Hebrew manuscripts. In these descriptions, I will consider whether the nature of the changes in OG and the Hebrew manuscripts is different or essentially the same. We will find that these descriptions confirm the impression given by the overall numbers.

The data used to compare OG to the Hebrew manuscripts could take one of three forms. First, we could use cases where the OG disagrees with the MT, with or without the support of a Hebrew manuscript. Second, we could use cases where the OG disagrees with any Hebrew manuscript, both with or without support from other Hebrew manuscripts; that is, both unique and non-unique variants. Third, we could use any cases where the OG disagrees with all the Hebrew manuscripts without any Hebrew manuscript support, that is, unique or individual variants. The first form of the data could offer insightful conclusions, but these would be about the nature of OG as it relates to MT, not about the nature of OG translation as compared to manuscript transmission. As such, we will not ultimately focus on the data in that way. The second form is useless for the purposes of comparison with the test group of Hebrew manuscripts: it would necessarily include almost all the cases from the Hebrew manuscript data, since in nearly every case where OG is not independent, it can be seen to translate one of the Hebrew manuscripts.147 As a result, in our overall comparison of the data in section 3.3.2 we will focus on the data as in the third form: the cases where OG attests to a Hebrew reading that disagrees with all extant Hebrew manuscripts.

3.3.2 – Overview of OG and Hebrew Manuscript Data in Comparison

In Exodus 1, OG contains 20 cases where it differs with all extant Hebrew manuscripts of Exodus and the difference is not merely a result of translation technique.148 In other words, 20

147 In other words, the comparison would then be between the manuscript data, on the one hand, and the OG data plus the manuscript data, on the other (i.e., X compared to Y+X).
148 Exod 1:2, 5 twice, 7, 8, 10 six times, 11 four times, 14 twice, 17, 19, 22. Cf. Appendix A.
times the reconstructed Hebrew behind OG—whether it actually existed in a physical Vorlage or in the translator’s mental Hebrew text—disagreed with all extant Hebrew witnesses, whether MT, SP, or a Dead Sea Scroll. By comparison, in the Hebrew manuscripts there are 39 cases where witnesses disagree. When we keep in mind that the 20 cases in OG are limited to the independent readings of one witness to the Hebrew text, whereas the 39 cases in the Hebrew manuscripts include any variants in any witness, we see reason for the Hebrew manuscript number to be higher. If we make a simple adjustment based on the number of words in the witnesses, we can compare the two data sets more accurately. There are 346 morphological items in MT Exodus 1; similarly SP has 350 morphological items. The Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts, when taken together, have 227 morphological items. The OG’s Vorlage would have been close in word-count to MT, since there are no extended pluses or minuses; thus we can consider it to have around 350 morphological items. In the Hebrew manuscripts, then, there are approximately 920 words involved, and in the independent OG disagreements something like 700 involved (350 words in OG plus the 350 words of the Hebrew text generally). OG has 2.86 disagreements per 100 words, while the Hebrew manuscripts have 4.24 per 100 words.

When we break down the disagreements into their general categories—scribal error,

---

149 In this section, I will use the terminology of “disagreement” to refer to the reconstruction of OG into Hebrew differing with Hebrew in a manuscript; in contrast to my use of “difference” above, “disagreement” does not include any cases where OG seems to differ in sense from a Hebrew manuscript but only as a result of translation technique.

150 I am not including here an additional 13 cases where OG disagrees with MT but finds support in an extant Hebrew witness (Exod 1:1 twice, 5 thrice, 10, 11 thrice, 12 five times, 16, 22 twice). As noted above, these cases deal more with the nature of OG’s relationship specifically to MT; if we were to ignore MT’s received priority and treat all manuscripts equally, we would have to add to these 15 cases every case of variation in the Hebrew manuscripts, which would render the comparison pointless (see footnote 147).

151 Exod 1:1 twice, 2 twice, 3 thrice, 5 six times, 9, 10 twice, 11 thrice, 12 eight times, 14 twice, 16 twice, 18 three times, 19, 20, 22 thrice. Cf. Appendix B.

152 These are morphological items as defined by the Accordance search engine, that is, essentially “words” but distinguishing items like pronominal suffixes, prefixed prepositions, etc.

153 I will be using “word” as shorthand for “morphological item” here and following when comparing the frequency of disagreements in OG and among Hebrew manuscripts.

154 Admittedly, this is a bit like comparing apples to oranges, since OG’s independent variants still involve all of the words in all the Hebrew manuscripts; below, I will make a better comparison, between OG and a specific Hebrew manuscript in its independent variants.
indicative variant, and linguistic variant—the two sets of data are again similar. The OG data, including independent and non-independent readings, contain 4 scribal errors (0.57 per 100 words), 13 sense variants (1.86 per 100 words), and 19 linguistic variants (2.71 per 100 words), while the Hebrew manuscripts have 8 scribal errors (0.87 per 100 words), 16 sense variants (1.74 per 100 words), and 15 linguistic variants (1.63 per 100 words). Although the OG data contain a higher level of linguistic variants, in general there is remarkable similarity among the data. All three types of variation occur, and none are absent or overly frequent in OG when compared to the Hebrew manuscripts.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Scribal Error & Sense Variants & Linguistic Variants \\
\hline
OG Total & 4 & 13 & 19 \\
Heb MSS Total & 8 & 16 & 15 \\
OG per 100 wrds & 0.57 & 1.86 & 2.71 \\
Heb MSS per 100 wrds & 0.87 & 1.74 & 1.63 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparison of Types of Variation}
\end{table}

When we compare OG to specific manuscripts, including only cases where those manuscripts have an independent reading in order to make the comparison as close as possible, we find that the OG by no means involves more occurrences of disagreement than the Hebrew manuscripts. If we adjust the OG data to count per 100 words within OG itself, the figures for its independent readings are as follows: 3 scribal errors (0.86 per 100 words), 7 sense variants

---

155 This is not to say that the OG itself committed every one of the scribal errors listed, or created every one of the indicative variants; rather, this is the number of such variants that are contained in the data set.
156 Exod 1:1, 5, 7, 10.
157 Exod 1:1, 2, five times, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 22.
158 Exod 1:10 five times, 11 four times, 12 four times, 14 twice, 16, 19, 22 twice.
159 Exod 1:1, five times, 10, 12, 16, 18.
160 Exod 1:1, twice, twice, 5, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 22.
161 Exod 1:5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 twice.
162 That is, 350 words, instead of 700 words for the words in OG plus the words in the Hebrew text in general.
163 Exod 1:5, 7, 10.
(2.00 per 100 words),\textsuperscript{164} and 10 linguistic variants (2.86 per 100 words).\textsuperscript{165} 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is involved in the following disagreements where it is independent: 1 scribal error (1.79 per 100 words),\textsuperscript{167} and 3 sense variants (5.36 per 100 words).\textsuperscript{168} 2QExod\textsuperscript{a} is involved in 2 sense variants (5.55 per 100 words),\textsuperscript{170} and 1 linguistic variant (2.78 per 100 words)\textsuperscript{171} where it is independent. Although 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} typically has the earlier reading in its examples (i.e., it is not the cause of the data with which it is involved), 2QExod\textsuperscript{a} generally is secondary in its data. Other manuscripts may have independent readings in fewer cases per 100 words, or may have a significantly different ratio of scribal errors and sense variants. For example, the SP has a much lower frequency of sense variants; it has independent readings in 4 cases of scribal error (1.14 per 100 words),\textsuperscript{172} 4 sense variants (1.14 per 100 words),\textsuperscript{173} and 5 linguistic variants (1.43 per 100 words).\textsuperscript{174} Different manuscripts have different profiles; the point is that OG is not abnormal or outside the expected bounds. The data from OG fit within the context of the extant Hebrew manuscripts, and OG could just as well be another Hebrew manuscript.

\textit{Figure 3.3 - Comparison of Independent Variation}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scribal Errors</th>
<th>Per 100 Words</th>
<th>Sense Variants</th>
<th>Per 100 Words</th>
<th>Linguistic Variants</th>
<th>Per 100 Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{164} Exod 1:2, 5, 8, 10, 11\textsuperscript{twice}, 17.
\textsuperscript{165} Exod 1:10\textsuperscript{four times}, 11\textsuperscript{twice}, 14\textsuperscript{twice}, 19, 22.
\textsuperscript{166} 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} has 56 extant words in Exodus 1.
\textsuperscript{167} Exod 1:18.
\textsuperscript{168} Exod 1:3, 5, 19.
\textsuperscript{169} 2QExod\textsuperscript{a} has 36 extant words in Exodus 1.
\textsuperscript{170} Exod 1:12, 14.
\textsuperscript{171} Exod 1:12.
\textsuperscript{172} Exod 1:5, 10, 12, 16.
\textsuperscript{173} Exod 1:2\textsuperscript{twice}, 12, 18.
\textsuperscript{174} Exod 1:9, 16, 18, 20, 22. Note that I am including the OG as a witness here; if I were to include as “independent” cases where SP had no Hebrew witnesses agreeing with it, regardless of the OG, there would be additional cases in all three categories of variation.
Keep in mind that the point here is not about OG’s text-critical alignment or the like; rather, the point is the overall text-critical character of OG if we include every non-translation-technique difference found in OG. The independent variants in OG are those that are disallowed on principle by some, since there is no supporting extant Hebrew evidence. Those who hold such principles might balk at the inclusion of 20 variants in Exodus 1 found only in OG, but in fact this number of variants is about the same as 4QExod⁶ and lower than the number found only in 2QExodα, when the overall size of the witness is considered. Again, keep in mind that in our data from OG we have not excluded any cases on the basis of a scribal error or interpretive change stemming from the translation into Greek. Rather, we have only excluded differences that, when translation technique is considered, are merely perceived differences. Despite the inclusion of more data than would typically be admitted, OG does not exceed the bounds of expected variance for Hebrew manuscripts.

3.3.3 – Comparison of Scribal Error in OG and Hebrew Manuscript Data

It has long been recognized that OG translators committed scribal errors. In my model, the disagreements involving scribal errors found in the OG data stem either from a variant Vorlage or from a variant mental Hebrew text in the translator’s mind. Beyond the mere existence of scribal errors in the OG, however, to what extent do the OG data resemble Hebrew manuscript data with respect to this type of textual variant? In what follows, I compare the examples of scribal error found in the OG and within the Hebrew manuscript tradition.

3.3.3.1 – Aural Error

There is one case of aural scribal error in the OG data (1:10) and two in the Hebrew manuscript data (1:10, 12). In OG Exodus 1:10, OG’s προστεθήσονται καὶ οὗτοι πρὸς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους represents the Hebrew שנאינו אל הם גם נוספו. The plural verb and pronoun reflect a pattern of variants involving reference to the Israelites, discussed in section 3.2.4. In 4QGen-Exod⁶, SP, and MT, the preposition used is על, not אל; however, OG’s πρός ought to represent על.
or על, given data from the rest of OG. The prepositions על and על are sometimes mistaken; for example, in Genesis 50:21 SP reads ידבר על לאב compared to MT’s ידבר על לאב. The similarity (or homophony) of the gutturals ayin and aleph by the time of the transmission of the HB led to this error of hearing. The error may have originated in a setting where multiple manuscripts (one of them OG’s Vorlage) were copied from one master copy that was read, or it may have occurred in the mind of the translator or scribe when reading the text, since the sound of the words is a factor even in individual reading. Whatever the case, it seems clear that the similar sounds of the letters ayin and aleph led to this disagreement. The reading על is preferable given its superior manuscript evidence and given the verbal argument structure of ישן.

In 1:12, SP’s reading יפרה is primarily synonym substitution (פרה for פרה), but a secondary factor involved in this substitution is the aural similarity of the two words. Bet and peh are commonly mistaken in aural contexts and metathesis can occur in aural contexts. Thus, scribal errors helped induce the change פרה → פר. Both OG and the Hebrew manuscripts, then, show evidence of aural factors leading to scribal error. OG’s reading על instead of על is not abnormal in the context of textual transmission.

3.3.3.2 – Dittography, Haplography, Near-Dittography, and Near-Haplography

Dittography and haplography, though resulting from different errors, mirror each other: the former is the accidental repetition of one letter, and the latter is the accidental omission of the

175 Πρός usually represents ל (e.g., Exod 1:19; 2:11, 18, 23; 3:9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 27, 30), and sometimes י (e.g., Exod 2:9, 10; 3:13; 4:25; 5:4; 8:5); it is only rarely used for ה. Where מ appears in Hebrew, it is typically translated by ἐμ (e.g., Exod 1:8; 2:5, 14, 15; 3:22; 4:20; 5:14; 7:5, 15, 17, 19; 28; 13 times; 2, 3, 17, 18).


178 Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 234; these two letters could also be mistaken in visual contexts, depending on the handwriting of the scribe.

179 For linguistic evidence, consider the common error among children of “pasketti” for “spaghetti”; the pressure to make such an error would be stronger if both words were actual (i.e., not a word like “pasketti”), particularly if they were synonymous, as is the case here.

180 Propp’s suggestion that SP’s reading is also influenced by פר in 1:7 and Iowa later in this verse (*Exodus 1-18*, 124) is unrealistic, in my opinion.
first of two repeated letters. The one is the reversal of the other (e.g., ננ → ננ and ננ → ננ). As such, whenever we see a case of one, the other is always a possible alternative explanation. For this reason, I discuss the two phenomena together. In addition, it is more often the case that dittography and haplography occur in conjunction with a graphic error of one letter for another. These cases, which we term near dittography/haplography, are also commonly mirror images of each other. Thus, I discuss all four together.

There are no cases involving any of these phenomena in the OG data, though these explanations are preferred by some scholars in some cases. There are three cases of haplography and near-haplography in the Hebrew manuscript data (1:5 twice, 16). An example of possible near-haplography in the OG comes in the list of names in Exod 1:2-4: OG has יושבας in 1:2 without a conjunction, representing יהודה, whereas SP and MT have ויהודה. The word is preceded by לוי, and the letters waw and yod resembled each other in the square script during the Second Temple period. Thus, a scribe could have seen four very similar letters in a row and erred by dropping one of the letters.\(^{181}\) However, evidence from the rest of the list in Exod 1:2-4 suggests that the conceptual division of the lists is the cause for this variant (see section 3.2.6).

Within the Hebrew manuscripts, an example of haplography is found in Exod 1:5, where SP and MT refer to כל נפש יִצְא עַקָּב "(every soul coming from the thigh of Jacob") but 4QpaleoGen-Exod' has the singular participle יצא. Although the primary factor motivating this change was linguistic (singular to agree with subject נפש כל, the presence of two yods in a row would have aided this change. In other words, the scribe expected to see יִצְא given the linguistic factor, and as a result mistook יִצְא יִד for יִצְא יִד. Although the OG contains zero cases of this type of error, there is not a large amount of them in the Hebrew manuscripts, either; thus, the evidence from both data sets is similar.

3.3.3.3 – Graphic Error

There are no cases categorized as graphic error in our corpus, although cases of near-haplography discussed above involve some element of graphic error (i.e., they involve

\(^{181}\) Cf. Wevers, Exodus, 1; Propp, Exodus 1-18, 120.
haplography between letters that look similar). There are also cases where graphic error is a possible explanation but is not preferred. For example, a case in OG Exodus 1:11 could involve graphic error and metathesis: the difference between ושמ (written short, as in SP) and ושמ (OG’s καὶ ἐπέστησεν) may be the swapping of the final two letters, and the mistaking of waw and yod. However, linguistic smoothing is a more likely explanation.

3.3.3.4 – Metathesis and Transposition

Metathesis and transposition are very similar phenomena, because metathesis is transposition that results in the new reading being the exact reverse of the earlier reading. Metathesis and transposition occur two times in the OG data (1:5, 7) and three times in the Hebrew manuscripts (1:5, 10, 12). The examples of metathesis in OG and the Hebrew manuscripts are remarkably similar. Metathesis can occur at various levels, most of which are attested in both the OG and Hebrew manuscripts. First, entire words can be reversed, as in OG Exod 1:7—where וירבו וישרצו is transposed to וישרצו וירבו (καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο)—and in 4QpaleoGen-Exod a Exod 1:5—where ושבעים is transposed to חמש ושבעים (itself a variant ofשבעים). Second, letters can be reversed, as in SP Exod 1:12—where the earlier reading ירבה (in 4QGen-Exod a and MT) is changed to יפרה, reversing resh and bet (misheard as peh). Third, metathesis can occur at the level of the syllable in oral contexts, where vowels and consonants are reversed. In SP Exod 1:10, נתחכמה is changed to נתחכם; probably what has occurred is that the final syllable mā of nithakkamā (ניתחקם) was mistaken as am in the imperfect nithakkam (ניתחקם) (see section 3.2.7 above). Finally, transposition can occur with entire phrases, as with the placement of Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ at the beginning of v. 5 in OG, versus ווסף היה במצרים at the end in most of the Hebrew manuscripts.

3.3.3.5 – Homoi, Ocular Transfer, and Waw

A handful of other scribal errors deserve mention. Notably, homoi never occurs in our

182 See section 3.3.5.
183 This is a secondary factor; the primary factor is synonym substitution.
corpus. There is one case of ocular transfer in 1:18, where SP, MT, and OG have לֹמֶדְתָּה, but 4QExod b adds הָעָרָיִית, which appears to be transferred from v. 15. Finally, an error involving \textit{waw} occurs in both sets of data; this is the variant at the beginning of Exodus, where 4QpaleoGen-Exod\textsuperscript{d} and OG have אֲלֹהָ, but SP and MT have אֲלֹהָ.

3.3.3.6 – \textit{Summary}

In terms of scribal errors, the OG data and Hebrew manuscript data are similar. The OG contains one aural error, two cases of metathesis or transposition, and one variant involving \textit{waw}. The Hebrew manuscripts, in comparison, contain two aural errors, three cases of metathesis or transposition, one variant involving \textit{waw}, three cases of haplography and near-haplography, and one ocular transfer.

3.3.4 – Comparison of Sense Variants in OG and Hebrew Manuscript Data

Whereas scribal errors in the OG are typically seen as such, the differences in OG that we categorize as indicative changes are usually seen as an interpretive element of translation, occurring because the translator felt greater freedom with the source than did scribes transmitting the text. As I argue throughout this study, this picture is simply inaccurate. The data of our study suggest that there was little difference between translators and scribes when it comes to this type of change.

3.3.4.1 – \textit{Logical Variants}

Disagreements prompted by logical difficulties occur once in the OG (1:2) and four times...
in the Hebrew manuscripts (1:2\textsuperscript{twice}, 3\textsuperscript{twice}). All of these variants occur in the list of Jacob’s children in Exod 1:2-4, which is slightly restructured in OG and SP so that they have a more logical division (see section 3.2.6). The data found in OG are similar to the data contained in the Hebrew manuscripts at this point, and the way in which OG and SP each address MT’s lack of logic is particularly similar.

3.3.4.2 – Conforming Variants

Conforming variants occur once in the OG data (1:5), while in the Hebrew manuscripts there are two conforming variants (1:3, 5). The variants in 1:3 and 1:5 discussed in section 3.2.5 —concerning the mention of יוסף either in the list of names in verse 3 or in a phrase stating his presence in Egypt in verse 5— both involve conforming, since the variation in part deals with ensuring non-contradiction between the verses by only referring to יוסף in one of the two locations. In 1:5, Jacob is said to have 75 descendants in 4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a}, 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} and OG, whereas in SP and MT the number is 70. The number 75 conforms to Gen 46:27, where the tradition behind SP and MT state that Jacob has 70 descendants and the tradition behind OG puts the number at 75.\textsuperscript{187}

3.3.4.3 – Expansion

The OG and the Hebrew manuscripts each contain six cases of expansion (in the OG, 1:1, 5, 11\textsuperscript{twice}, 12, 22; in the Hebrew manuscripts, 1:1, 5, 11, 12, 19, 22). In OG 1:1, the phrase “their father,” in apposition to “Jacob,” is found in OG and 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} but not in SP or MT. The expansion shows that “sons of Israel” earlier in the verse does not mean Israelites but the actual twelve sons of Jacob. An example in the Hebrew manuscripts is the plus מפרץ found in 2QExod\textsuperscript{a} and 4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a} at at Exodus 1:12. These two examples are discussed in section 3.2.3; these and the other cases of expansion are all very similar in both the OG and in the Hebrew manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{187} DJD XII, 85.
3.3.4.4 – Synonym Substitution

The substitution of a synonym can be found two times in the OG (1:8, 10) and three times in the Hebrew manuscripts (1:12, 18). In Exodus 1:10, OG uses ἐξελεύσονται (represented by יצא) whereas the Hebrew manuscripts have עלה. In the context there, the two words are essentially synonymous. That the Greek does not represent the root עלה is established by lexical equivalencies elsewhere in OG (see section 3.2.2). Similarly, in Exodus 1:12, 2QExod\textsuperscript{a} uses the verb שרץ instead of פרץ as found in 4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a}, SP, and MT. Again, the two verbs are essentially synonymous in the context of Exodus 1:12, where the growth of the people of Israel is described. These examples illustrate well that the substitution of synonyms is common to the OG data and the data of the Hebrew manuscripts.

3.3.4.5 – Sense Normalization

Sense normalization occurs three times in the OG data (1:5, 11, 17) and once in the Hebrew manuscript data (1:18). In 1:17, OG’s צוה (συνέταξεν), as opposed to דבר as in the Hebrew manuscripts, results in part from the commonly used phrase יָהָדוּ צוה when found throughout the book of Exodus. Moreover, the near context (1:16) suggests that the thing referred to in the clause is a command, not simple speech. צוה, rather than דבר, was thus the expected phrase (see section 3.2.2). The same type of change can be found in the Hebrew manuscripts in 1:18, where SP uses the expected phrase פרעה ויקרא instead of מלך ויקרא מפורעא found in MT and OG (see section 3.2.7).

3.3.4.6 – Sense Transfer

The OG contains no instances of transfer within our corpus, while the Hebrew contains just one (1:14). At the end of 1:14, 2QExod\textsuperscript{a} inserts an extended plus ויקרא ויתרכו מפורעת found in MT and OG (see section 3.2.7) transferred from Exodus 1:12.

3.3.4.7 – Summary

With regard to sense variants, the data from OG and from the Hebrew manuscripts are
very similar at many points. The OG contains one logical variant, one conforming variant, six expansions, two synonym substitutions, and three cases of sense normalization. In comparison, the Hebrew manuscripts contain four logical variants, two conforming variants, six expansions, three synonym substitutions, one case of sense normalization, and one sense transfer. Besides this similarity of distribution, we noted above that the specific variants involved in three categories—logical variants, expansion, and synonym substitution—were remarkably similar between the two sets of data. Moreover, we saw the same specific process behind the SP’s logical variants and those in the OG—both change the list of Jacob’s children to have the same structure. At the same time, OG used a slightly different method to bring about the same purpose, by removing waw instead of adding waw to form the lists. Thus, OG does not stem from the same parent text as SP for these variants, but the process of change involved is essentially identical to the process at work in SP.

3.3.5 – Comparison of Linguistic Variants in OG and Hebrew Manuscript Data

The two types of linguistic variant that we find in our data, linguistic normalization and smoothing, are similar and at times overlap. Linguistic normalization refers to the use of a more acceptable grammatical structure or form, whereas smoothing refers to the changing of the text’s grammar to make it more easily understood to the audience. Linguistic normalization entails smoothing, then, insofar as a text will be more easily understood when more acceptable grammar is used. Although I reserve the category of smoothing to instances where normalization is not involved, at times it is not entirely clear whether the change is simply about the understandability of the text or whether it moves into the realm of grammar that was more acceptable. Given the relatedness of the two, I will treat them together.

The OG contains two cases of linguistic normalization (1:19, 22) and 17 cases of smoothing (1:10\textsuperscript{five times}, 11\textsuperscript{four times}, 12\textsuperscript{four times}, 14\textsuperscript{twice}, 16, 22), while the Hebrew manuscripts contain

---

188 Note that the “less acceptable” grammar that is replaced is not “unacceptable”; if this were the case, we would instead categorize the change as linguistic modernization.

189 On the issue of whether changes involving the grammatical number of words referring to Israel should be categorized as linguistic modernization or smoothing, see section 3.2.4.
four cases of linguistic normalization (1:9, 18, 22twice) and 11 cases of smoothing (1:5, 10, 11twice, 12four times, 14, 16, 20). An example of linguistic normalization in the OG is found in 1:19, where the first instance of כ, found in all Hebrew witnesses, is not represented in OG. The OG could have used ὅτι to represent causal כ or, if כ was understood as simply introducing direct speech, to introduce the direct speech. This would be perfectly acceptable Greek and would preserve the typical pairing of כ with either ὅτι or γάρ, as is often found in OG Exodus. The absence of ὅτι, therefore, indicates a real difference in the physical or mental Vorlage of the translator. Although direct speech is sometimes introduced with כ, the most expected way of beginning direct speech is without any particle, and the next most expected is with לאמר. Thus, it seems the OG understood כ as introducing direct speech and modified the text to contain the more acceptable linguistic structure for Hebrew (linguistic normalization). An example of linguistic normalization in the Hebrew manuscripts can be found in 1:22, where MT’s ישלךון adds the pronominal suffix to the earlier reading ישלכון (with “energetic nun”). In the earlier text, the dislocated constituent at the beginning of the clause is never resumed: “As for every boy born, into the Nile you shall throw” (היאר התולד כל תשליכו). In MT’s ישלךון, the pronominal suffix resumes this constituent: “As for every boy born, into the Nile you shall throw him.” Although it was acceptable to leave out an explicit resumption of the dislocated element, leaving the audience to fill it in based on context, more often the dislocated element is resumed, and as such this is the expected grammatical structure.

An example of smoothing can be found in the OG in 1:11. OG has וישים for וישימו in the Hebrew manuscripts. In the Hebrew manuscripts, the subject is understood to be the Egyptians. However, the subject of the previous verb in the narrative frame, אמר in v. 9, is Pharaoh; as a result, the OG or its Vorlage may have felt spontaneous pressure to change the verb to singular because there is no explicit new subject (smoothing). A similar example of smoothing in the

190 See Miller, Representation of Speech, 103-104, 145-146.
191 This clause also contains a second case of linguistic normalization: the locative accusative ישלכון, meaning “into the Nile” with שלך, is made more explicitly locative by the addition of the directional postposition heh, in MT’s ישלךון.
192 Note that this is not a case where the grammatical number of Israel prompts a change, since the subject of the verb is either Pharaoh or the Egyptians.
Hebrew manuscripts is found in 1:12, where the explicit subject מַעֲרֵיָם is inserted in 2QExod⁴, 4QGen-Exod⁴, and OG. In OG and 2QExod⁴, the preceding two verbs are plural, whereas in MT the verbs are singular, because OG refers to Israel as plural and MT as singular. As a result, the change of subject is clear in MT, but would be unclear in OG and 2QExod⁴. Thus, the insertion makes the text more understandable linguistically (*smoothing*).¹⁹³ Finally, all of the cases of change involving the grammatical number of Israel, in both the OG and in Hebrew manuscripts, are examples of linguistic smoothing (see section 3.2.4).

The OG and the Hebrew manuscripts contain a similar amount of linguistic variants—19 and 15, respectively. Moreover, the examples above show that the specific types of change involved in the processes of smoothing and linguistic normalization are similar in both data sets. One group of specific variants is remarkably similar: in OG and MT we see the same specific process of leveling the grammatical number of Israel. However, OG used slightly different methods to bring about the same purpose, leveling to plural instead of singular number. Thus, OG does not stem from the same parent text as MT for these variants, but the process of change involved is essentially identical to the process at work in MT.

### 3.4 – Conclusion

The data point clearly to one conclusion: the way in which the OG differs from the Hebrew manuscripts is within the acceptable or expected range and manner of how the Hebrew manuscripts themselves differ among one another. The frequency of the main types of variation in OG is within the range of variation found in the Hebrew manuscripts. The same sorts of variations, including specific subcategories, occur in OG and in the control group of Hebrew manuscripts. Sometimes, these specific types of variation are the same in OG as in the Hebrew manuscripts. We even see OG engaged in precisely the same moves as the Hebrew witnesses, as in the case of variants involving the grammatical number of Israel and the list of Jacob’s children. Though some variations may not be exactly the same between the two data sets, they

¹⁹³ In this case, both linguistic smoothing and expansion are involved, since the change also makes explicit who precisely the subject was (see section 3.2.3).
are nevertheless discernibly of the same nature and result from the same or similar phenomenon.

As we predicted based on our hypotheses in section 3.1.3, the quantity of variants in OG Exodus 1 and their distribution amongst different subcategories generally coincide with the variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. This supports the conclusion that, with regard to individual variants, translation in the OG is equivalent in many ways to transmission in the preserved Hebrew manuscripts.
large-scale variation. As we will see, there are few or no such variants in the OG of Exodus 1-14, but significant large-scale variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. As such, this chapter will focus mainly on the evidence in Hebrew manuscripts. The larger goal of comparing variation in the OG with variation in Hebrew manuscripts will be kept in view, however, and after my analysis of the large-scale variants I will compare variants in the OG that resemble them in section 4.4. After giving a summary of previous research on the issue (section 4.1), I will engage the material in Exodus 1-14 in an attempt to answer the question of why the insertions were made (sections 4.2 and 4.3). If we are to compare large-scale variation in the Hebrew manuscripts with large-scale variation in the OG, this is precisely the sort of consideration that is needed. Thus, in this chapter I will both address the issue of the variants characteristic of the third edition of Exodus and provide an example of what large-scale variation in the Hebrew manuscripts involves.

Although there is little to add to already existing studies by way of analysis of specific data in the large-scale variants, I will offer my own comprehensive analysis that synthesizes elements of previous studies. Moreover, two unique conclusions arise out of this study about the general nature of the insertions in the third edition of Exodus. First, although they are related, we should think of these insertions as belonging to at least two distinct phenomena. Second, the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative are related to the activity of prophecy, involving cases where the prophetic idiom יְהוָה אָמַר כֵּה is used.

---

According to Ulrich, there are five editions of Exodus available in the extant evidence.¹ The first, for which the OG is the only witness, is distinguished based on material outside our

---

¹ See his most recent treatment of Exodus in Ulrich, “Evolutionary Composition,” 31-34. The term “edition” is an etic, not an emic, term. In the ancient world, it is unlikely that any versions were viewed as unique editions; rather, Exodus was Exodus, regardless of its form. Nevertheless, the phenomenon is real; that is, some versions of the text differed from one another significantly and represented distinct stages in the development of the text. The term “edition” is thus a heuristic term that enables us to refer to these stages more precisely.
The second, found in some Qumran manuscripts and the MT, is distinguished from the third edition based in part on material in chapters 6-11; insertions found there in the third edition will form the basis of the study in this chapter. In order to narrow our scope (and to follow the general outline of the problem provided in previous treatments of this issue), we will focus on the large-scale variants that distinguish the second edition (found in MT) from the third edition (found in 4QpaleoExod, 4QExodLev, and SP). Ulrich summarizes the features of the third edition in the following way:

[This edition] intentionally, repeatedly supplement[s] the older narrative with two types of addition. There are frequent word-for-word insertions of pertinent parallel details from Deuteronomy into the Exodus narrative, as well as insertions that explicitly report that Moses and Aaron actually fulfilled God’s commands, where the MT implicitly presumes the fulfillment.

Ulrich touches on three of the most salient aspects of the issues involved in the third edition of Exodus. His observations are specific to the third edition of Exodus and its most pertinent variants, but they belong to wider, less specific phenomena. First, Ulrich refers to the insertion of material from Deuteronomy, which belongs to a much discussed wider phenomenon in SP Exodus and other manuscripts where seemingly missing information is inserted. Second, he notes insertions that make explicit the fulfillment of God’s commands in the Ten Plagues

---

3 The few sectarian variants found in SP, dealing with Mount Gerazim, are the basis for seeing a fourth edition in SP (see Ulrich, “Evolutionary Composition,” 32); we will not consider these. We will, however, consider material found only in SP, but presumably present in earlier manuscripts containing the third edition such as 4QpaleoExod, though unfortunately the manuscript is not extant at those points (for example, in Exod 11:3).
4 On the inclusion of 4QExodLev, see Eugene Ulrich, “The Evolutionary Growth of the Pentateuch in the Second Temple Period,” in Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period (eds. Akio Moriya and Gohei Hata; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 42; see also Emanuel Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and the Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” Dead Sea Discoveries 5/3 (1998), 341, and cf. Zahn, Rethinking, 135. In the portions of Exodus where it is extant, this manuscript contains all (=one, in 39:21) the characteristic insertions of the third edition. One clue in 4QExod, the vacant space on one line at the end of Exodus 7, suggests that it too may have contained the third edition of Exodus (see discussion of 7:29b and 8:1b).
5 Ulrich, “Evolutionary Composition,” 32.
6 Though I refer below to prophecy (see 4.3.3), my term “fulfillment” here does not refer to the fulfillment of a
narrative. Although these are distinguished because of the close proximity of the insertions to their source, they nevertheless resemble the other insertions. Third, Ulrich refers to the lack of detail in MT Exodus, which “presumes the fulfillment” of God’s commands, belonging to the much wider issue of the general character of biblical narrative, which tends to be sparse in detail. In order to introduce the issues at hand in Exodus 1-14, I will briefly unpack these three aspects.

The insertion of material from Deuteronomy—such insertions are found in Exodus 18:25; 20:14, 16, 18, and 32:10—is seen as characteristic of SP and SP-like manuscripts; these insertions and the manuscripts containing them are often described as “harmonistic,” though the term is perhaps not appropriate. In addition to insertions of material from Deuteronomy, this edition of Exodus also inserts material from elsewhere in Exodus, adds prophecy but obeying a command (as is the sense in Ulrich’s statement).

7 In my discussion, I use the term “source” to refer to the material from which an insertion is derived. There is a sense in which, from a narrative or reading perspective that simply considers the third edition, the term “source” could be used to refer to the command or statement that is later fulfilled or quoted; however, there is no need to use “source” in that manner, since I use the specific terms command, statement, and event to refer to the first instance of the passage in the narrative. The term “source,” then, refers to the material found in earlier editions—whether command or fulfillment, statement or quote—to create the “insertion,” the new material found only in the third edition—which, again, could be command or fulfillment, statement or quote, etc. In other words, “source” is about logical and historical priority, whereas “command,” “statement,” and “event” are about temporal priority within the narrative.

8 That is, there is less detail when compared to the third edition.

9 Material from Deut 1:9-18 is inserted; both 4QpaleoExod⁷ and SP witness to this insertion. Note that I use the chapter and verse numbering of SP throughout this chapter.

10 Verse 14 in SP, numbered 17 in MT; material from Deut 11:30 and 27:2-7 is inserted; SP contains this insertion.

11 Verse 16 in SP, numbered 19 in MT; Deut 5:24-27 is inserted; both 4QpaleoExod⁷ and SP contain this insertion.

12 Verse 18 in SP, numbered 21 in MT; material from Deut 5:28-31 and 18:17-22 is inserted; SP contains this insertion. See also 4QTestimonia; cf. Magnar Kartveit, The Origin of the Samaritans (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 281-282.

13 Material from Deut 9:20 is inserted; both 4QpaleoExod⁷ and SP contain this insertion.

14 Note, however, that not all of the books contained in the SP are characterized by such insertions (for example, SP Leviticus); it thus seems inaccurate to classify the entire SP as this type of witness (as, for example, Segal does in “The Text of the Hebrew Bible”).

15 See, for example, Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions,” 340.


17 In 20:17 (verse 14 in MT), material from Exod 13:11 is used along with the material from Deuteronomy mentioned above. In Exod 6:9, the original statement quoted in Exod 14:12 is provided (see Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions,” 342 n. 18). In Exod 11:3, material in 12:36 prompts an insertion stating that the Egyptians “granted the requests of” the Israelites. SP contains the first two insertions; both OG and SP contain the third insertion.
details to fulfill previous statements in Exodus,\textsuperscript{18} restructures the text,\textsuperscript{19} and may make a slight changes (rather than an insertion) based on material in Deuteronomy.\textsuperscript{20} Often, these insertions add text so that “in those instances in which Deuteronomy\textsuperscript{21} refers to an earlier source... and the source for those [references] is ‘missing’ in the earlier material,”\textsuperscript{22} the third edition now contains the source at the appropriate point.

These insertions involve specifically the following four pairings: (1) command-fulfillment, (2) statement-quote, (3) event-recall, and possibly (4) foretelling-event;\textsuperscript{23} if one of the two in any of these pairs is missing, the third edition of Exodus and similar editions of Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, insert the corresponding element in the appropriate place. Besides insertions relating to these pairings, one other major insertion involves a case where details about an event found in another passage are inserted to give a fuller account.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} In the third edition, and insertion in Exod 28:29 (extant only in SP) provides a command to make the Urim and Thummim— in prior editions the Urim and Thummim are referenced but their origins are not explained; then, in Exod 39:21, an insertion (extant in 4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{f} and SP) recounts the actual creation of the Urim and Thummim.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Exod 29:21 is moved to follow verse 28, in order to agree with the order of events in Lev 8:22-30; SP is the only witness to this restructuring. The passage in Exodus contains God’s prescription to Moses of how the [Aaronide] priests were to be ordained, whereas the passage in Leviticus recounts the actual ordination ceremony. The third edition also moved 30:1-10 to a position after 26:35; 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and SP are witnesses of this restructuring.
\item \textsuperscript{20} In the third edition, Exod 20:8 commands to “observe” the Sabbath (שַׁמָּר יָמִים יִשְׁרָאֵל), rather than to “remember” it (רָבָע יָמִים יִשְׁרָאֵל), as in Deut 5:12. Given the larger pattern of variation based on material in Deuteronomy, there is a possibility that the same phenomenon is at work here; the variant may, however, be unrelated, instead arising because of synonym substitution resulting from orality and memory.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Or any other text, such as Leviticus or Exodus.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible,” 16.
\item \textsuperscript{23} See figure 4.1.
\end{itemize}
Figure 4.1 - Insertions in the Third Edition of Exodus (insertion underlined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Fulfillment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 4:22-23</td>
<td>Exod 11:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 7:15-18</td>
<td>Exod 7:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 7:26-29a</td>
<td>Exod 7:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 8:1a</td>
<td>Exod 8:1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 8:16-19</td>
<td>Exod 8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 9:1-5</td>
<td>Exod 9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 9:13-19</td>
<td>Exod 9:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 10:2</td>
<td>Exod 10:3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 11:3</td>
<td>Exod 11:4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 28:29</td>
<td>Exod 39:21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 6:9</td>
<td>Exod 14:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 18:25</td>
<td>Deut 1:9-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 20:16 (MT 19)</td>
<td>Deut 5:24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 20:18 (MT 21)</td>
<td>Deut 5:28-9; 18:17-22; 5:30-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 32:10</td>
<td>Deut 9:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foretelling</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 11:3 [26]</td>
<td>Exod 12:36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 20:14 (MT 17)</td>
<td>Deut 27:2-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What typifies the first “type of addition” mentioned by Ulrich is that each example occurs at a significant distance from the passage prompting the addition. When a “pertinent parallel [detail] from Deuteronomy” [27] is inserted, or when the wording from the fulfillment of a

---

24 Cf. Kartveit, Origin, 310-312. Note that Kartveit includes another insertion, made in Exod 27:19 based on Exod 39:1. That insertion does not follow a source word-for-word; rather, the dependence on 39:1 is conceptual. As a result, I do not include it here.

25 Both of these insertions appear to stem from 28:30, where the Urim and Thummim are mentioned in earlier editions; however, they correspond to one another as a command-fulfillment pair.

26 This insertion may or may not be part of the third edition, as discussed in sections 4.2.4 and 4.3.3 below.

27 Ulrich, “Evolutionary Composition,” 32.
command is inserted as a command, the location of the insertion is separated by chapters from the source material, often occurring in different books of the Pentateuch. These at-a-distance insertions are the “harmonizations” that scholars often discuss when trying to characterize the SP and similar manuscripts from Qumran. In the third edition of Exodus, however, we find other insertions of a slightly different sort, insertions that occur immediately following or preceding the source of the insertion. Apart from their close proximity to their source, these insertions seem to be of the same type as the at-a-distance insertions discussion above. In our corpus, these insertions are specifically “insertions that explicitly report that Moses and Aaron actually fulfilled God’s commands.” In addition, there are two cases where God’s command is inserted, based on the account of Moses’s and Aaron’s fulfillment of that command that is already present in the text. These insertions, with one exception, occur immediately before or after the source command or fulfillment. When read as a discrete narrative account of the Ten Plagues and the initial deliverance of Israel from the Pharaoh, the impetus for these systematic changes could plausibly be God’s command to Moses in 6:29 to “speak to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, everything that I speak to you” (דובר אלה פוגת מלך מצרים את כל אשת אנא דבר אליך; cf. also 7:2). In the earlier editions of Exodus, this command is seemingly unfulfilled as God’s commands of how Moses

---

28 See figure 4.1, where they pattern with the other insertions.
29 Ulrich, “Evolutionary Composition,” 32; see Exod 7:18, 29; 8:1, 19; 9:5, 19; 11:3.
31 The fulfillment of God’s command in 4:22-23 is found in 11:3. Note also the command-fulfillment pair in 28:29 and 39:21, neither of which is clearly the source for the other, since both arise in the third edition.
32 I.e., Exodus 1-14.
33 That is, if the audience expects the text to spell out every action of the story exactly; see the brief discussion of biblical narrative below.
should speak to Pharaoh are often not explicitly repeated. Thus, Ulrich finds that “[t]he purpose of that revision [=the revision found in the third edition] was... to show Moses’ obedience by reporting that he actually carried out the commands of the Lord.”

The third important aspect Ulrich points out about this complex of issues is that the second and first editions of Exodus “implicitly [presume]” the elements added in the third edition. That is, the supposedly missing details, commands, and fulfillments inserted by the scribe of the third edition were no less obvious to readers of the previous editions. As Robert Alter and others have noted, one of the defining characteristics of biblical narrative is its “laconic,” “tersely expressive” manner of recounting of events. The audience is often left with gaps to fill in; perhaps the point was to leave certain aspects of the story ambiguous in order to engage and involve the audience. Often, however, the omission of detail serves to maintain the pace of the narrative and speed the reader along. These aspects of the earlier editions of Exodus were apparently difficult for the creators of the third edition—for what reason we do not know—and elicited the insertions under consideration here. In the third edition of Exodus, such gaps in the story were not to be filled in by the audience; instead, they were explicitly given in the text.

4.1 – Status Quaestionis

Our corpus, Exodus 1-14, provides excellent examples of large-scale variation within the Hebrew manuscripts. The development of the text observable in this evidence is one of the best examples of how literary production and textual transmission overlap (see section 1.2.2). The insertions here are not accidental or random; rather, they reflect a significant shaping of the text

34 Note that, when read with the following verses in chapter 7, the command of 6:29 is possibly fulfilled by Moses and Aaron in 7:6.
35 Ulrich, “Crossing the Borders,” 86.
37 Cf. Alter, Art of Biblical Narrative, 12.
38 Cf. Auerbach, Mimesis, 7; Alter, Art of Biblical Narrative, 172.
resulting in a different edition\textsuperscript{39} of the text. Because the variants involved have been studied together for some time, and moreover because they are often classified with more variants from the rest of Exodus and Numbers, we must fully engage the discussion of the ‘proto-Samaritan’ texts of the Pentateuch. Much of the debate over these variants has involved their precise nature, that is, how exactly they relate to each other and why they were created.

Why were the insertions found in the third edition of Exodus made? Answers to this question come in three varieties: some answers provide a reason for all of the proto-SP insertions (in Exodus and in other books), others for the insertions in Exodus and Numbers that derive from material in Deuteronomy, and still others for the insertions found in the Ten Plagues narrative in Exodus. Beginning with the first type, the traditional way of describing the insertions in general is that they serve the purpose of “harmonizing” the text.\textsuperscript{40} The SP and related manuscripts are thus sometimes referred to as a “harmonizing” text-type. The idea of “harmonization” is often invoked as a way to introduce the character of the manuscripts in view.\textsuperscript{41} For Crawford, the point of the insertions is “to bring two parallel texts into accord with one another.”\textsuperscript{42} For Tov, it is “incongruence within and between stories of Scripture” that prompts the insertions;\textsuperscript{43} the insertions give the text an “internally consistent structure” and remove “imperfections within units or between units.”\textsuperscript{44} Although Tov does not use the term “harmonization,”\textsuperscript{45} the idea here is

\textsuperscript{39} On my use of the term “edition,” see footnote 1.
\textsuperscript{40} Cf. Judith E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{a} and the Samaritan Tradition} (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. 1986), 203; Lemmelijn, \textit{A Plague of Texts?}, 199. The term “harmonization” is problematic, as are some of the notions to which it refers when used to describe the third edition insertions; see Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible,” 11-16; Zahn, \textit{Rethinking}, 147; Kartveit, \textit{Origin}, 275-276; and section 4.3.2 below. I will not attempt to offer a precise definition of “harmonization” because, for the task at hand, it is not crucial; what is important is to understand the way that scholars like Tov and Crawford view the text, whether they speak of “harmonization” or use other terms.
\textsuperscript{41} See, for example, Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll}, 257; Robert T. Anderson and Terry Giles, \textit{The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Introduction to Its Origin, History, and Significance for Biblical Studies} (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 66.
\textsuperscript{43} Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 80.
\textsuperscript{44} Emanuel Tov, \textit{Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran} (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 61.
\textsuperscript{45} Tov reserves the idea of “harmonization” for small-scale harmonistic variants, instead preferring to speak of
essentially the same.

Tov specifies that the speech of God (and Moses) is of particular concern for the scribe responsible for these insertions. Moreover, he isolates two sections of the Pentateuch as being of particular concern: Exod 7-11, where numerous insertions occur, and Deut 1-3, which served as the impetus for numerous insertions in Exodus and Numbers. He describes the insertions in Exod 7-11 as “systematic,” with the purpose of “balanc[ing] the description of God’s commands to Moses and Aaron.” The insertions related to Deut 1-3, on the other hand, came about when the scribe “scrutinized” Deut 1-3 and made sure that every detail occurred “explicitly” in Exodus and Numbers, “with exactly the same wording.”

Tov provides a typology for the Deuteronomy-related insertions, categorizing them in one of these four categories: “an account of events,” “direct quote of speeches by Moses,” “direct quote of speeches by God,” or “historical and geographical digressions.”

Zahn, following Segal, finds the notion of harmonization, in the usual text-critical sense of “removing contradictions or tensions,” inaccurate. She instead focuses on the fact that most of the insertions involve “speech events like commands and recollections.” She therefore proposes that the “majority” of the insertions “result from a single concern: to increase the consistency of speech events.” This helpful way of viewing the issue is both specific to what we find in the data and general enough to encompass most of the examples in the data. Zahn fills out the details of the general idea somewhat: “If a command is given, it must be fulfilled” (as in the

“editing” for the large-scale variants; Textual Criticism, 80.

46 Tov, Hebrew Bible, 61.
47 As in Tov, Textual Criticism, 80.
48 Tov, Textual Criticism, 81.
49 Tov, Textual Criticism, 81.
50 Tov, Hebrew Bible, 65. These four categories overlap somewhat with my typology: the first corresponds to the event-recall pairing, the second and third to the statement-quote pairing, and the fourth to the detail-detail pairing.
52 Zahn, Rethinking, 147.
53 Zahn, Rethinking, 148; cf. 174.
54 Zahn, Rethinking, 173.
Ten Plagues narrative), “and if someone reports that something was done or said at an earlier point, there must be a record of that event” (as in the Deuteronomy-related insertions).\footnote{Zahn, Rethinking, 174.}

In a recently published article, Jonathan Ben-Dov makes the unique argument that the insertions in the third edition of Exodus and related editions of other books parallel the development of textual criticism of Homeric literature in Alexandria.\footnote{Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Early Texts of the Torah,” Journal of Ancient Judaism 4/2 (2013), 210-34.} The new edition is not “vulgar” but “academic,” stemming from disciplined study of the text. He argues that the “strictly academic aim” of the revisions was “the smoothness of the narrative,”\footnote{Cf. Childs’s remark on the insertion in 11:3, which he calls “an attempt to smooth out the narrative”; Childs, Exodus, 130.} specifically, “the perfection of reflective speech acts in the narrative.”\footnote{Ben-Dov, “Early Texts,” 219-220.} For Ben-Dov, the scribe behind the third edition did not try to correct problems with the text as such, but with the transmission of the text, making “explicit what was already there,” and what to his mind should have been there but had been lost through textual corruption.\footnote{Ben-Dov, “Early Texts,” 223. Given the significance of Ben-Dov’s assertion, I quote him on this point at length: The corrections in the pre-Samaritan version remain in the same conceptual level of the academic editions of Homer: the text of the original author might have suffered mistakes, and these should be corrected; but there is little place for the corrector’s creative work in this process. In the absence of any explicit justification for the revision, I may speculate what was in the reviser’s mind. He thought that the missing command or the missing report on previous speech are a flaw in previous transmission, which he now aims to correct; he did not conceive of these flaws as contaminations in Moses’s original writings. In other words, he made explicit what was already there, exposing the implicit coherence in the mosaic magnum opus. (Ben-Dov, “Early Texts,” 223, my emphasis) Although the comparison to Homeric textual criticism is helpful, Ben-Dov has perhaps gone too far in asserting that the changes in the third edition of Exodus have the purpose of correcting “a flaw in previous transmission.”} Notwithstanding Ben-Dov’s textually based arguments, which highlight parallels with practices involving Homeric literature and thus support his thesis well, in the end it is difficult to say with much certainty whether such a social setting was behind the third edition of Exodus.

Moving on to studies that focus on insertions derived from Deuteronomy, Michael Segal goes to great lengths to argue that the characterization of the SP and “proto-SP” manuscripts as a “harmonistic” textual family is misguided. These manuscripts do indeed make up a textual
family because they share unique secondary readings (that is, large-scale variants); the purpose of these secondary readings, however, is not to combine two different versions of the same story by placing them side-by-side and editing them to make all the details consistent. Although the different versions of a story are placed side-by-side in the texts in question, their details are hardly consistent. Segal also points out that if the point of the insertions was to bring disagreeing texts into agreement, then the legal material would seem to be a perfect candidate for such revision; it is not touched, however, by the redactor. What, then, unites these manuscripts so that they can be considered a textual family? Or, in other words, what is the exact impetus behind the insertions? Unlike the aforementioned scholars, Segal focuses primarily on the evidence stemming from Deuteronomy 1-3. He includes some other examples, but none from the Ten Plagues narrative. On the basis of this evidence, Segal suggests a much more narrow impetus for the insertions in the third edition of Exodus: to “provide a ‘source’ for the material presented as ‘quotations’ in the final book of the Pentateuch.” Because Segal’s study focuses on the insertions related to Deut 1-3 (but not those in the Ten Plagues narrative), his explanation is specific to those insertions and does not apply to the majority of insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative.

Whereas Tov and others give general explanations relating to all of the evidence, and Segal gives a specific explanation relating to the insertions stemming from Deuteronomy, several studies focus on the insertions in the Ten Plagues narratives, which are of a slightly

63 Note that I use the term “source” to refer to a portion of text in an earlier edition on which a later insertion is based, whereas Segal uses the term to refer to a portion of text that should be in Exodus (according to the scribe) on which a quote in Deuteronomy is supposedly based; cf. footnote 7.
64 Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible,” 16. Memory is not considered as a possible factor by Segal, though it may have played a role in these insertions.
different character from the other insertions. Before considering these studies, we should note that commentaries on Exodus, along with those discussed above who treat the phenomena in the third edition of Exodus as a whole, make the observation that the insertions in Exodus 7-11 generally change the text so that “the actual delivery of a divine speech to Pharaoh” is delivered to Pharaoh, whereas in earlier editions it is not delivered but “only commanded.”66 Or, put another way, “[t]he intent is to make explicit that Moses did exactly as told.”67 Beyond these observations, little is said in the commentaries beyond a note that the SP (and at points 4QpaleoExodm) contain an insertion.68

Judith Sanderson’s study of 4QpaleoExodm unearthed most of what can be noted about the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative.69 The following is a brief summary. There are expansions in each of the episodes, except for the third, sixth, and ninth (as well as the preceding sign in 7:1-13); the second plague episode has two insertions, as does the tenth.70 4QpaleoExodm is not extant for every insertion, but there is ample evidence to suppose it contained each insertion (given column length and its agreement with SP when extant).71 Sanderson sees three kinds of insertion in the Ten Plagues narrative. First, there are cases where the third edition explicitly shows that “Moses fulfilled [God’s] command word for word.”72 Second, there are cases where the third edition explicitly shows that the words spoken to Pharaoh on behalf of God were indeed commanded by God.73 Both of these first two types involve insertions that occur in immediate proximity to the command/fulfillment they draw from. The third type “harks back” to

66 Childs, Exodus, 128.
67 Propp, Exodus 1-18, 293; cf. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 197.
69 Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll.
70 Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 197.
71 Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 197.
72 Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 197.
73 Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 198.
an earlier part of Exodus, at some distance. Sanderson calls the last “qualitatively different [in] nature.”

Although she begins with “harmonization” terminology, she quickly moves into a specific description of how and why the insertions are occurring. Like Tov and Zahn, Sanderson notes that the insertions in the Ten Plagues are primarily about God’s command to speak and not necessarily about the other parts of the command that precede it, because the command to speak is the aspect of the command that is repeated word-for-word in the insertion. She observes that all of the insertions involve the command of God to relay a message; where there is no expansion, there is no command to relay a message. Sanderson also highlights the insertion in 8:1b, which does not follow this pattern. Importantly, she points out that several places where we might think insertions would occur (e.g., in the third, sixth, and ninth plagues) do not occur because the fulfillment of God’s command is already related—often in the form of a summary “they did so” statement—in the earlier editions. Sanderson acknowledges that the idea of Moses strictly following God’s command is compelling. However, she suggests a different impetus: the insertions create repetition that is used for dramatic or liturgical effect, “to emphasize Yahweh’s threats to Pharaoh.” We should note that such use of repetition is already present in, and even characteristic of, HB narrative. Possible settings in which this new text would be used include the “instruction of children” or “public recitation” (possibly “the celebration of the Exodus”). This notion is attractive because it acknowledges the performative aspects of the text and the text’s goal to have some effect on those who read or heard it. This

75 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 198.
76 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 257.
77 And, I would add, other commands not involving speech in other passages.
78 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 200-201.
79 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 204-205.
80 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 205.
81 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 203.
82 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 204.
84 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 204.
contrasts sharply with other theories which are purely textual and which seem to imagine the
scribe in a vacuum, isolated from the communities that use the text, following specific principles
to create a better text. Nevertheless, given our lack of access to the social setting behind the text,
it is hard to know for certain that this was the point of the insertions.85

In her three studies on the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative, Bénédicte Lemmelijn
makes extensive use of Sanderson’s detailed study.86 In the first and second study, Lemmelijn’s
explanation of the purposes of the insertions is straightforward. She argues that the insertions
“can be explained and evaluated on the basis of contextual argument,” pointing out, rightly, that
the “(immediate or broader) literary context in which [the insertions occur] plays a large role in
the creation of the insertions (both their impetus and the way in which they are carried out).87 In
her third study, however, Lemmelijn offers a unique view on the creation of these insertions.
There, she bases her argument on cases where insertions do not occur.88 Following Sanderson,
she notes that in none of those cases is there “direct address by YHWH to Pharaoh”; moreover,
in all of these cases, the fulfillment of the command is already present in all editions.89 Although
either of these points is a “plausible” way of explaining the absence of the insertion there,
Lemmelijn nevertheless suggests a third reason. In all of those instances, Aaron was already
involved in the activity of mediating between God and Pharaoh;90 in the cases where insertions
occur, Aaron is not mentioned in earlier editions. Thus, the point of the expansions is the
“insertion of Aaron,”91 extending the concerns of the P redaction in Exodus. According to
Lemmelijn, then, the expansions occur in the episodes where Aaron does not appear (the non-P
material), and do not occur where Aaron already appears (the P material). Although Sanderson

85  Moreover, this social setting and potential impetus could work with the explanations I offer in section 4.3.3.
88  The third, sixth, and ninth plague; 7:8-14; and smaller commands occurring within plague episodes in 7:19,
9:22, and 10:12.
89  Lemmelijn, “P-Redaction,” 216.
90  See below for a critique of Lemmelijn’s position, coming in part from Sanderson.
had already noted this aspect of the text. Lemmelijn makes it into the primary reason for the insertions, and points out the overlap with P concerns.

Two more studies deserve extended consideration. These studies are not specific to the Deuteronomy-related insertions or the Ten Plagues insertions; instead, they try to account for all of the data. Unlike the explanations of Tov, Crawford, and Zahn, their explanations are quite specific and suggest a unique theological impetus for the insertions. Magnar Kartveit’s extensive discussion of the large-scale variants in SP and related manuscripts offers an attractive theory for their origins. For Kartveit, what draws the insertions together is that in all “the authority of Moses is strengthened.” These insertions “[highlight] Moses as prophet and [define] later prophecy as fundamentally a preaching of the law.” In the command-fulfillment insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative, “Moses emerges as an accurate mediator of divine message to Pharaoh and Aaron.” in the statement-quote insertions derived from Deuteronomy, Moses’s “history-telling” abilities are bolstered, since he is given “the necessary background for appearing as a narrator of historical truth.” Anderson and Giles, following Kartveit, see the point of the insertions as “the elevation of Moses as a faithful representative of God.” Both Kartveit and Anderson and Giles point to the presence of the prophetic idiom יְהוֹה אָמַר כֹּה, found throughout the HB when prophets speak on behalf of God, in many of the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative. Moreover, the insertion of the “prophet like Moses” passage from Deuteronomy in Exodus 20:22 is conspicuous, and perhaps provides a clue to the point of the insertions in the third edition of Exodus. According to these three scholars, the idea of Moses as prophet is the

92 Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 203.
93 Kartveit, Origin, 279-280.
94 Kartveit, Origin, 299.
95 Kartveit, Origin, 284.
96 Kartveit, Origin, 280.
97 Kartveit, Origin, 284.
98 Anderson and Giles, The Samaritan Pentateuch, 68; cf. 66-69.
99 Both in prophetic literature and narrative.
100 Cf. Kartveit, Origin, 282-284; Anderson and Giles, The Samaritan Pentateuch, 84. Cf. 4QTestimonia and 4Q158.
key to understanding all of the insertions in Exodus. Moses is not merely elevated in this edition according to Kartveit, Anderson, and Giles; he is the prophet *par excellence*.

Notably, the phrase נֶאֶמֶר יְהוָה, though used extensively outside the Pentateuch, occurs only in Exodus within the Pentateuch. Of the ten occurrences (in the earlier editions of Exodus), nine appear in the Ten Plagues narrative; of these, eight appear in passages that are coupled with insertions, bringing the number of נֶאֶמֶר יְהוָה occurrences in SP to 17 (two of the eight—4:22 and 11:4—are coupled with the same insertion in 11:3). We will return to these data and their significance below.

Although scholarship on this issue has focused on the reasons for and quality of the insertions, a less discussed but related facet is the question of who created the insertions. Of specific interest for this study is the question of whether one or multiple people were responsible for the insertions. Tov believes that one editor is behind the insertions found in the third edition of Exodus.101 Crawford, on the other hand, refers to a group of scribes.102 Zahn maintains that it is “likel[y] that all [SP’s] unique features did not come about at the same time”; however, the third edition changes specifically (and the similar changes in Numbers) are “the product of a single redactor.”103 Speaking specifically about the Ten Plagues narrative, Sanderson admits the possibility that multiple “scribes” were responsible for the insertions,104 but finds it “probable that only one person was involved,” since the insertions are “so uniform and in such a restricted section of Exodus.”105 The question of one versus many scribes/editors intersects interestingly with the various theories for why the insertions were made. As we saw above, there are a variety of theories, and some of this variety stems from whether a scholar is trying to define the Deuteronomy-related insertions, the Ten Plagues insertions, or all of the insertions together. To my knowledge, no one has suggested that different people were responsible for the various

104 Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 257.
categories of insertion evident in the third edition of Exodus. Although scholars like Segal and Sanderson have focused on a particular subset of the data, they did not do so because they thought the evidence under consideration was from a different phenomenon from the other insertions. The question of whether all these insertions come from the same person or multiple people is important. Moreover, we must recognize that, even if one person was responsible for all the insertions, there may have been different reasons for different groups of insertions. If the insertions stem from one person for one reason, primary importance should be placed on finding an explanation that takes all the insertions into account. If, however, the insertions stem from multiple people, or from one person but as a result of different impetuses, it may be better to “divide and conquer,” proposing theories specific to the insertions from Deut 1-3 (à la Segal) or to the Ten Plagues insertions (à la Sanderson).

One final overlapping point is discussed by Tov (and several other studies): it seems likely that the scribe (or multiple scribes) was not entirely consistent in his editing. Since theories often try to account for all or most of the data, this is a significant point. As Tov notes, the editing seems to be “inconsistent, that is, certain details were changed, while others, similar in nature, were left untouched.”

Similarly, when considering the often noted fact that numerous opportunities to expand the text were not taken by the third edition, Tov appeals to the idiosyncrasy of the scribe, stating, “It is hard to know why certain units were altered... while others were not, and the only explanation for this phenomenon is the personal taste of the editor.”

As I will argue, none of the theories perfectly accounts for every single insertion. Was this because the person or people responsible did not employ their method(s) with complete consistency? This seems likely. Yet, an appeal to inconsistency can only go so far; in the end, a theory that explains much of the evidence is necessary. These three aspects—the question of one or multiple scribes/editors, the questions of one or multiple impetuses for revision, and the question of extent of inconsistency—play into how we divide and use the evidence, and therefore

106 Tov, Hebrew Bible, 61.
107 Tov, Hebrew Bible, 62.
what sort of theory we end up with.

4.2 – Description of Large-Scale Variants in Exodus 1-14

In the following section, I describe each of the variants belonging to this pattern of variation characteristic of the third edition of Exodus. I will give the readings of each major witness and describe the context and content of the insertions. The variants include insertions belonging to the command-fulfillment pairing, the statement-quote pairing, and the foretelling-event pairing; command-fulfillment insertions are further divided into those in which the command is inserted and those in which the fulfillment is inserted. Most of the insertions occur within immediate proximity of the source; three, however, occur with some distance between source and insertion—the statement-quote insertion found in Exod 6:9, the second command-fulfillment insertion found in Exod 11:3, and the foretelling-event insertion in Exod 11:3.

Each section below begins with the text and translation of the insertion’s source followed by the text and translation of the insertion; discussion of the insertion follows. Several features of the insertions are held in common, and as such will be discussed together in section 4.3.1. Most insertions use the quote from the source verbatim, are near their sources, and use an introductory phrase mirroring that of its source; for most insertions, there are grammatical changes to the verbs to account for the change in voice, and the phrase יְהוָה אָמְר כֵּן appears. My presentation of the source passage always follows the text of SP, as the insertions often reflect SP’s form of the text; variants in other witnesses are given in footnotes. The various witnesses typically agree, in large part, on the text of each source passage.

4.2.1 – Command-Fulfillment Insertions where the Missing Fulfillment is Inserted

The majority of the expansions in the third edition of Exodus occur when the fulfillment to a command, missing in earlier editions, is inserted on the basis of the corresponding
command. Of the seven in Exodus 1-14, five involve an episode’s initial statement describing the plague that will occur in that episode: 7:18b (par. 7:15-18), 7:29 (par. 7:26-29a), 8:19b (par. 8:16-19), 9:5b (par. 9:1-5), and 9:19b (par. 9:13-19). A sixth involves a command of God within an episode after the main command—when God commands Moses to tell Aaron to stretch out his hand over the water of Egypt in 8:1. The seventh involves the fulfillment of God’s command in 4:22-23, which, though referring to the death of the firstborn sons in Egypt (the tenth plague), nevertheless serves to introduce and frame the entire Ten Plagues narrative.

4.2.1.1 – Exodus 7:15-18 (Water Turned to Blood)

SOURCE – 7:15-18 (COMMAND-fulfillment)

Go to Pharaoh in the morning, as he is going out to the water; wait for him by the river’s brink, and take in your hand the rod which was turned into a serpent. And you shall say to him, ‘The LORD, the God of the Hebrews, sent me to you, saying, “Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness; and behold, you have not yet obeyed.” Thus says the LORD, “By this you shall know that I am the LORD: behold, I will strike the water that is in the Nile with the rod that is in my hand, and it shall be turned to blood, and the fish in the Nile shall die, and the Nile shall become foul, and the Egyptians will loathe to drink water from the Nile.”’ (based on RSV)
And Moses went, with Aaron, to Pharaoh, and they said to him, ‘The LORD, the God of the Hebrews, sent us to you, saying, “Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness; and behold, you have not yet obeyed.” Thus says the LORD, “By this you shall know that I am the LORD: behold, I will strike the water that is in the Nile with the rod that is in my hand, and it shall be turned to blood, and the fish in the Nile shall die, and the Nile shall become foul, and the Egyptians will loathe to drink water from the Nile.”’

Large portions of the insertion are extant in 4QpaleoExod. Though 4QGen-Exod is not extant for all of verse 18, the lacuna is not large enough to contain the insertion. The extant words in 4QExod corresponding to the passage could belong to the insertion of v. 18b or to the initial command in vv. 15-18, though the latter is more probable.

In the preceding chapters of Exodus, Moses and Aaron were called by God to deliver Israel, and they made contact with Pharaoh several times, relaying God’s message and performing signs to authenticate themselves; Pharaoh, however, has hardened his heart. 7:14-25 is the first plague episode in the Ten Plagues narrative; the command in 7:15-18 introduces the

110 The text and reconstruction of manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from the “Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Corpus” module in Accordance Bible Software, which is itself based on the DJD volumes; I indicate when my understanding (and reconstruction) differs from these sources.
111 See DJD XII, 28.
112 See DJD XII, 105.
episode.

This insertion shares most of the common elements found in the other insertions (see section 4.3.1). The words of the quote, however, are not entirely *verbatim*: "שלחני" ("he sent me") in the source (in both MT and SP) is changed to "שלחנו" ("he sent us"),\(^{113}\) reflecting the change in speaker, from Moses (presumed in the command in 7:16-18) to Moses and Aaron (in the fulfillment in 7:18b). This *command-fulfillment* pair is the only case where God’s statement includes a reference to the speakers relaying the statement; as such, we see no similar changes in pronouns in any of the other insertions. This change and the change in number to אמר in many of the insertions (see section 4.3.1) shows that the creator of the third edition of Exodus wanted to be consistent in representing Moses as the recipient of God’s command but Moses and Aaron as the ones fulfilling God’s command. Notably, the third edition is more concerned with the change in number from singular (recipient of command) to plural (executor of fulfillment) than it is to repeat God’s quote exactly. We should note that in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) the verb is וְיִאמר, a singular form implying Moses as the subject;\(^{114}\) none of the other cases where the verb is changed from its source (as noted above) are extant in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\). This inclusion of Aaron as co-mediator with Moses may thus be a SP specific phenomenon, that is, not part of the third edition of Exodus; below, however, I argue that Aaron was included in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) (and thus the third edition).\(^{115}\) In all other respects, the quote is *verbatim*.

---

114 Note, also, that 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) reads הָיָה instead of בָּיָה as in SP and SP/MT 7:18a.
115 See the extended discussion on 4QpaleoExod\(^m\)'s reading in section 4.3.1 below.
Then the LORD said to Moses, “Go in to Pharaoh and speak to him, ‘Thus says the LORD, “Let my people go, that they may serve me. But if you refuse to let them go, behold, I will plague all your country with frogs; the Nile shall swarm with frogs which shall come up into your houses, and into the rooms of your beds and on your beds, and into the houses of your servants and of your people, and into your ovens and your kneading bowls; the frogs shall come up on you and on your people and on all your servants.’” (Based on RSV)

And Moses went in, with Aaron, to Pharaoh and they spoke to him, “Thus says the LORD, “Let my people go, that they may serve me. But if you refuse to let them go, behold, I will plague all your country with frogs; the Nile shall swarm with frogs which shall come up into your houses, and into the rooms of your beds and on your beds, and into the houses of your servants and of your people, and into your ovens and your kneading bowls; the frogs shall come up on you and on your people and on all your servants.’”’” (Based on RSV)

Although fragmentary, 4QExod cannot contain the insertion, given the amount of space between verses 7:26 and 8:1. Although the two words extant in 4QpaleoExod also occur in the initial

116 MT has ואמרת, whereas SP has ודברת, reflected in the insertion in 7:29b; cf. similar variant in 9:1.
117 MT has singular nouns ובתי, whereas SP uses plural, reflected in the insertion.
118 See DJD XII, 105.
command, they belong to the insertion given the length of the manuscript at this point.\footnote{119}{See DJD IX, 77.}

4QExod\textsuperscript{c} could be reconstructed to include the insertion or not to include the insertion, but the former is more likely given the interval in line 4.\footnote{120}{See DJD XII, 149; the relevant text is [צפרדעםׄ הה, which could belong to 29a (no insertion) or the insertion.}

This \textit{command-fulfillment} pair comes at the beginning of the plague of frogs episode, which follows immediately after the preceding plague (water turned to blood). This command gives the content of the plague. Within the \textit{בָּא} clause, מֶשֶׁה אָהֳרֶן is added; otherwise, it shares the common elements found in the other insertions (see section 4.3.1).

4.2.1.3 – \textsc{Exodus 8:1} (Frogs)

\textbf{SOURCE} – Exod 8:1a (\textit{COMMAND-fulfillment})

And the LORD said to Moses, “Say to Aaron, ‘Stretch out your hand with your rod over the rivers, and over the canals, and over the pools, \textit{and cause frogs to come up upon the land of Egypt!’}” (based on RSV)

\textbf{INSERTION} – Exod 8:1b (\textit{command-FULFILLMENT})

\textit{SP}

And Moses said to Aaron, “Stretch out your hand with your rod!” \textit{And the frog came up upon the land of Egypt.}

Minus in 4QExod\textsuperscript{c}, MT, and OG

The spacing of 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} entails that the insertion must have been included there.\footnote{122}{DJD IX, 77.}

4QExod\textsuperscript{c} does not contain the insertion, given the large interval (probably the entire line was
172

blank) where it would otherwise occur. As in the preceding insertion in 7:29b, 4QExod could be reconstructed to include this insertion or not to include it, though the former is more likely.

Unlike the majority of command-fulfillment insertions, in 8:1 the command fulfilled is not the main description of the plague of frogs (for which, see the discussion of the preceding insertion), but a subsumed action within the plague episode. In order to bring about the plague, God tells Moses to tell Aaron to raise his hand over the various bodies of water in Egypt. In the earlier editions, the audience assumes that Moses tells Aaron, and that Aaron does so; in the third edition, Moses follows God’s command immediately, telling Aaron to raise his hand.

In this insertion, we see some of the typical elements observed elsewhere: imperative in the source is changed to second person past tense (with explicit subject because of the change of subject from the previous clause), and the complement is retained. There is no preceding imperative in the source (e.g., “go to Pharaoh”), unlike the main plague commands (see section 4.3.1), and as such it cannot be repeated in the insertion. There are also several elements that make this insertion unique from the others. Most importantly, the phrase does not appear. Moreover, whereas the quote (i.e., what God tells Moses to say) given in the source is typically repeated verbatim or nearly verbatim in the insertion, here it is not. The places “over” which Aaron is to stretch his hand are omitted, thereby abbreviating the quote significantly when Moses repeats it to Aaron. Within the insertion of material from the source, there is a change from Hifil imperative (“and cause frogs to go up”) to preterite Qal (“and she [= the frog] went up”). Because of this change, the final clause of the insertion breaks out of the quotative frame; instead of Moses giving the full message to Aaron, including the command to cause frogs to go up (in the narrator resumes and recounts that the

123 See DJD XII, 105, 106.
124 See DJD XII, 149: the relevant text is [ך], which could belong to the insertion or to 8:2.
125 Or, perhaps, that Aaron could hear God’s command alongside Moses, and did not need Moses to tell him.
126 Plural “frogs” is also changed to singular “frog,” reflected in the grammatical number of the verb. is often used in the plural to denote “frogs,” but is also used in the singular as a collective (BDB). Though a collective, I translate with the singular “frog” to make the difference and grammar clear, though the English is awkward.
plague actually occurs. The exact phrase is perhaps borrowed from 8:2b (ותעל הצפרדע ותכם את ארמי מצרים).

4.2.1.4 – Exodus 8:16-19 (Flies)

SOURCE – Exod 8:16-19a (COMMAND-fulfillment)

Then the LORD said to Moses, “Rise up early in the morning and wait for Pharaoh, as he goes out to the water, and say to him, ‘Thus says the LORD, “Let my people go, that they may serve me. Else, if you will not let my people go, behold, I will send swarms of flies on you and your servants and your people, and into your houses; and the houses of the Egyptians shall be filled with swarms of flies, and also the ground on which they stand. But on that day I will set apart the land of Goshen, where my people dwell, so that no swarms of flies shall be there; that you may know that I am the LORD in the midst of the earth. Thus I will put a division between my people and your people. By tomorrow shall this sign be.”’” (Based on RSV)

127 The exact phrase could perhaps be taken as an apocopated imperfect (instead of preterite), meaning “let [the frog] go up,” thereby preserving the quotative frame to the end of the insertion; this might make more sense in context, since the narrator recounts in 8:2 that the frogs go up (הצפרדע והעל). However, if the creator of the insertion wanted to continue the quote and its irreal sense (pertaining to matters that the speaker wants to occur in the future), then the original imperative והעל would have sufficed. Thus, והעל is preterite, “[the frog] came up.”
128 4QpaleoExod adds לאמר here, not found in SP or MT.
129 SP has את, whereas MT has simply את, cf. the same variant in 7:15.
130 MT has והעל, with the directional postfix, whereas SP does not; with את, both have the same meaning.
131 MT does not use the “sign of the accusative,” whereas SP does (reflected in the insertion in 19b).
132 MT has the Hifil participle שליח, whereas 4QExod and SP have Piel participle שלח, as previously in the verse in all witnesses. If MT is correct, this would be the only case of Hifil participle שלח; cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 297.
And Moses, with Aaron, went in to Pharaoh, and they said to him, “Thus says the LORD, Let my people go, that they may serve me. Else, if you will not let my people go, behold, I will send swarms of flies on you and your servants and your people, and into your houses; and the houses of the Egyptians shall be filled with swarms of flies, and also the ground on which they stand. But on that day I will set apart the land of Goshen, where my people dwell, so that no swarms of flies shall be there; that you may know that I am the LORD in the midst of the earth. Thus I will put a division between my people and your people. By tomorrow shall this sign be.”

There is insufficient evidence to determine whether the extant reading of 4QpaleoGen-Exod⁴, twins בָּשָׂם אַבָּן, אֱלֹהִים אֶלְּי, which is not preserved in 4QpaleoExod⁵, it is possible that the text extant in column IV lines 4-9 belongs to 8:16-19a or 19b; given the character of 4QpaleoExod⁶ elsewhere, it likely stems from 19b.¹³³

This insertion occurs at the start of the fourth plague, the plague of flies, following the plague of gnats in which there is no insertion in the third edition of Exodus. As in 7:15, Moses is told to meet Pharaoh as is he going to the water, then he instructs him regarding what he should say to Pharaoh. This insertion shares most of the common elements found in the other insertions (see section 4.3.1). The introductory actions are not repeated (as in 9:13ff; see section 4.3.1); given the character of the insertions in the third edition of Exodus, it may seem out of place for

¹³³ Cf. DJD IX, 77-78.
the creator of the insertion to leave the audience to fill in details that are only implied in the narrative—for this is the very aspect of the text eliminated in the insertions. However, this seems to be what the third edition is doing in these cases, showing that the terseness of Hebrew narrative is still employed in this revision.134

4.2.1.5 – Exodus 9:1-5 (Pestilence)

SOURCE – Exod 9:1-5a (COMMAND-fulfillment)

ויאמר יהוה אל משה אל פרעה ואמר התלخيص שלח את עמי ויעבדני כי אם מאם אתות לש売れ מתחתיו מסה יוהד וחיה בתוקף ובבמות ההימיים ובכמה יוכין בבא ובבב_different ויהיו לבר נאך נאם נאם ההימאים ההיה את המקמה שישיא ובין המקמה מפורים ולא יוהו לבר עני ישראל矣ו יהוד שלח את עמי וחיה ונאמר

Then the LORD said to Moses, “Go in to Pharaoh, and say to him, ‘Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that they may serve me. For if you refuse to let them go and still hold them, behold, the hand of the LORD will fall with a very severe plague upon your cattle which are in the field, the horses and the asses and the camels, the herds, and the flocks. But the LORD will act wondrously between the cattle of Israel and the cattle of Egypt, so that nothing shall die of all that belongs to the people of Israel.’” And the LORD set a time, saying, “Tomorrow the LORD will do this thing in the land.” (Based on NRSV)

134 See Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 201, who points out the precedent in earlier editions for abbreviating to בא.
135 MT has דבר, whereas SP has אמר, reflected in the insertion in 5b; cf. the similar variant in 7:26.
136 MT has the feminine participle היה with full spelling, whereas SP has היה (here and in the insertion); although SP’s היה could be a qatal in form, the gender of the subject (ד), the word order (subject-verb), and parallel texts in the Ten Plagues narrative where participles are used, all suggest that this is a feminine participle with short spelling, i.e., היה.
137 MT has singular ב окру, whereas SP has the plural; since מקמה, “cattle,” is collective, the difference is negligible.
138 MT does not use the conjunction ו in this list (במות היימה נאך נאם ההימאים); SP does, here and in the insertion.
139 MT has היפל, “he will distinguish” (Hifil פהל), whereas SP has היפל, “he will act wondrously” (Hifil פהל), reflected in the insertion. The former reading is preferred, since היפל with ו is awkward (“to act wondrously between X and Y’’?). Although היפל could have arisen through aural or memory error, it also occurs for היפל in 11:7 and 33:16, the point of the exchange in SP is perhaps theological.
140 SP has also in the insertion, whereas MT does not use also in the insertion. 4QpaleoExod has also in the insertion.
And Moses, with Aaron, went in to Pharaoh, and they said to him, “Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, ‘Let my people go, that they may serve me. For if you refuse to let them go and still hold them, behold, the hand of the LORD will fall with a very severe plague upon your cattle which are in the field, the horses and the asses and the camels, the herds, and the flocks. But the LORD will act wondrously between the cattle of Israel and the cattle of Egypt, so that nothing shall die of all that belongs to the people of Israel.’ Tomorrow the LORD will do this thing in the land.”

Given the character of 4QpaleoExod⁴⁴, the editors of DJD IX maintain that the words preserved at the top of column V belong to the expansion in 5b. Additionally, the spacing on line 2 requires that the words belong to the expansion, because there is not sufficient room for the phrase י […], which is found in 5a but not in the parallel portion of 5b.

This command-fulfillment pair comes at the beginning of the fifth plague, pestilence, which follows immediately after the plague of flies (whose opening command-fulfillment pair is discussed above). This insertion shares most of the common elements found in the other insertions (see section 4.3.1).

There is one significant departure from the insertion’s source: Moses and Aaron do not tell Pharaoh that God has “set a time” for the plague to occur (י […]). They certainly could have done so, but perhaps since it is not part of the words of God in the source (that is, it belongs to the narrator’s voice), it is not to be included in Moses’s and

---

141 DJD IX, 78-79.
Aaron’s words to Pharaoh. The words God spoke, by which he set a time, are included in Moses’s and Aaron’s words to Pharaoh, understanding the quote at the end of 9:5a to still be part of the message God commanded Moses to give to Pharaoh. Because of the removal of יהוהו ישם לאמר, Moses’s and Aaron’s speech continues uninterrupted in the insertion (the narrator’s voice does not resume).

4.2.1.6 – EXODUS 9:13-19 (HAIL)

SOURCE – 9:13-19a (COMMAND-fulfillment)

Then the LORD said to Moses, “Rise up early in the morning and stand before Pharaoh, and say to him, ‘Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, “Let my people go, that they may serve me. For this time I will send all my plagues against your heart, and upon your servants and your people, that you may know that there is none like me in all the earth. But for this purpose have I let you live: I have shown you my power; and so that my name may be declared throughout the earth, in order to gather your servants and your people, that they may know that there is none like me in all the earth."

MT has היסדה, whereas SP has היסדה, reflected in the insertion in 19b; the linguistic tradition behind SP seems to have leveled the paradigm of יסדה so that the historic first radical, waw, no longer appears.

142 MT has lain, whereas SP has הָעֲפָר (also in the insertion). Though there may be a slight difference in nuance between lain and הָעֲפָר, here the sense must be adversative: “I will send all my plagues against your heart.”

143 4QExod⁶ (contra Propp, Exodus 1-18, 301; cf. DJD XII, 107, 109) and MT have a Hifil infinitive with pronominal suffix, ראהתיך (“to show you”), whereas SP has a Hifil first singular qatal with pronominal suffix, ראתיך (“I showed you”). While in the MT the Hifil qatal forms with ה as the third radical always have long hireq-yod after ה (e.g., ראותיך), this is not the case in SP (e.g., Deut 34:4, הראתיך); thus, SP’s reading is first person qatal, not infinitive.

144 MT has למן, but SP’s version of the insertion. In its version of the insertion, 4QpaleoExod⁶ has למן. The joining of both ל and מן to the noun occurs in places in MT (e.g., Exod 11:7; Num 18:7) and SP (as here). More significantly, SP’s reading lacks the article.

145 MT has singular, for SP’s plural מַכָּבִים, but as a collective noun the difference is negligible.

146 See the discussion of אֱלֹהִים versus אלהים in the SP manuscript tradition below.
all the earth. You are still exalting yourself against my people, and will not let them go. Behold, tomorrow about this time I will cause very heavy hail to fall, such as never has been in Egypt from the day it was founded until now. Now therefore send, get your cattle and all that you have in the field into safe shelter; for the hail shall come down upon every man and beast that is in the field and is not brought home, and they shall die.”

**INSERTION – 9:19b (command-FULFILLMENT)**

And Moses, with Aaron, went in to Pharaoh, and they said to him, “Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that they may serve me. For this time I will send all my plagues against your heart, and upon your servants and your people, that you may know that there is none like me in all the earth. For by now I could have put forth my hand and struck you and your people with pestilence, and you would have been cut off from the earth. But for this purpose have I let you live: I have shown you my power; and so that my name may be declared throughout all the earth. You are still exalting yourself against my people, and will not let them go. Behold, tomorrow about this time I will cause very heavy hail to fall, such as never has been in Egypt from the day it was founded until now. Now therefore send, get your cattle and all that you have in the field into safe shelter; for the hail shall come down upon every man and beast that is in the field and is not brought home, and they shall die.”

4QpaleoExod could be reconstructed as containing or not containing the insertion, though the latter is probable given its character elsewhere. Since portions of verses 13-16 are extant in column V of 4QpaleoExod on lines 15-18, it is clear that the text of lines 27-31 belongs to the insertion.

---

149 See DJD XII, 108.
150 Cf. DJD IX, 79.
This insertion occurs at the start of the seventh plague, the plague of hail, following the plague of boils in which there is no insertion in the third edition of Exodus. This insertion shares most of the common elements found in the other insertions (see section 4.3.1). There is one minor difference within the quote itself (God’s message to Pharaoh): in SP, the source reads לא יאסף, but in the insertion we find לא יאסף ולא in insertion. However, when Tal’s manuscript of SP is compared to other evidence, we find that all of Von Gall’s manuscripts read ולא in 19a; Moreover, the sense of לא יאסף is awkward in context without the conjunction waw. Therefore, there is probably a textual corruption in Tal’s manuscript. Understanding ולא to be the correct reading, the entirety of God’s message is repeated verbatim from the source.

4.2.1.7 – Exodus 11:3 par. 4:22-23 (Death of Firstborn)

This insertion was coupled with a second and possibly third insertion (discussed below in sections 4.2.2.2 and 4.2.4). Because the text here is slightly more complicated, the various aspects of the passage containing the insertion are color coded (see the key after the SP reading). The source of the insertion is Exodus 4:22-23.

SOURCE – Exod 4:22-23 (Command-fulfillment)

And you shall say to Pharaoh, ‘Thus says the LORD, Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, “Let my son go that he may serve me”; if you refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay your first-born son.’"


Words retained from Exod 11:3 in the earlier edition
Parallel version of the first phrase of Exod 11:3, from source in 3:21
Material from source (Exod 4:22-23)
Material based on source (Exod 4:22-23) but modified
First insertion based on a different source, discussed in section 4.2.2
Third insertion, discussed in 4.2.4

“And I will give this people favor in the sight of the Egyptians and they will let them have what they ask. And about midnight I will go forth in the midst of the land of Egypt; and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh who sits upon his throne, even to the first-born of the maidservant who is behind the mill, and to the first-born of all the cattle. And there shall be a great cry in Egypt, such as there has never been, nor ever shall be again. But against any of the people of Israel, either man or beast, not a dog shall growl; that you may know that the LORD acts wondrously between the Egyptians and Israel.” Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people. And Moses said to Pharaoh, “Thus says the LORD, Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, Let my son go that he may serve me; if you refuse to let him go, behold, the LORD will slay your first-born son.”
lines is from verse 5, showing that this is a variant plus from verse 4 (SP and MT have יאמר משה, not the insertion from 11:3d as found in SP. For a discussion of the ways in which the other insertions in 11:3 are fit into the existing text from the previous editions, see the discussion of the insertion in 11:3 in sections 4.2.2.2 and 4.2.4. However, in SP is not part of either of the larger insertions, because it does not stem from Exod 4:22-23 or 11:4-7.

Unlike the other command-fulfillment insertions found in the Ten Plagues narrative, this insertion in 11:3 is found at quite a distance from its source in 4:22-23; in this regard, it is more like the statement-quote insertion found in 6:9. Though this insertion is found at the beginning of the tenth plague, its frame of reference is the entire Ten Plagues narrative, as it is coupled with God’s words to Moses early in the narrative (see below). In most other regards, however, it resembles the other command-fulfillment insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative where the fulfillment is inserted (see section 4.3.1).

Within God’s message itself, one significant change occurs from source to insertion: אנכי becomes יהוה. In the other messages God sends to Pharaoh, references to God are usually in the third person (e.g., “thus says the LORD” throughout; 7:15-18; 9:1-5), both when God gives Moses the command, and when Moses and Aaron relay the message. In this case, however, God refers to himself in the first person when giving Moses the message initially. In 8:16-19 a first person pronoun is used to refer to God, in the phrase יאני יהוה (“I am the LORD”); while a change there to יהוה was not possible (יהוה יהוה), a third person pronoun could have been used (הוא יהוה, “he is the LORD”). Moreover, earlier in 11:3 we see the use of אנכי to refer to God. In contrast, in this case it seems that Moses and Aaron do not use the first person pronoun, even within their quotation of God, probably because they themselves are not God. In all other respects, the words of the message from the source are given verbatim in the insertion. Note that this fulfillment is inserted after the insertion of the missing command corresponding to the fulfillment in verses 4-7 (see discussion in section 4.2.2.2). In the third edition, then, the fulfillment of God’s command in 4:22-23 comes before the fulfillment of his command in 11:3;
that is, Moses first says “let my firstborn son go,” and then says “about midnight I will go forth...,” relaying the content of the tenth plague.

Both the location of this insertion and the fact that the command in 4:22-23 was considered unfulfilled, deserve further discussion. First, the inserted fulfillment could have been placed in a variety of locations, including the following: here in 11:3; in 11:7 or 8, at the end of the description of the plague; in 4:23, immediately following the command; shortly after the command, when Moses and Aaron first approach Pharaoh, whether in 5:1 or 9. The third option—immediately following the command—does not work very well; though it would fit with the pattern of the majority of command-fulfillment insertions, where the insertion is in close proximity to the source, the insertion would not work well at all in the narrative, since Moses and Aaron do not go to Pharaoh until chapter 5, several verses after 4:22-23. The insertion also would not work as well in 11:7 or 8 (the second option), since then the impact of the statement—let my son go, or your son dies—would be mitigated by the amount of text already discussing the death of the firstborn in 11:3b-7. The best option besides the one actually chosen, then, would be chapter 5, whether verse 1 or 9; we will return to this option below, in the discussion of whether or not the command was fulfilled in the earlier editions.

The actual choice of the third edition, at the beginning of the final plague episode in 11:3, works well because of the structure and flow of the Ten Plagues narrative. As noted above in the brief discussion of the structure of the Ten Plagues narrative, the tenth plague is structurally set apart. Moreover, the narrative has begun, in 4:22-23, with the theologically pregnant statement that God will kill Pharaoh’s son if his son is not released. Furthermore, the tenth plague episode comes near the end of the narrative, where the climax of a plot is typically located. For these reasons, it seems clear that the tenth plague is marked as the culmination (or beginning of the culmination, at least) of the Ten Plagues narrative. By inserting the fulfillment to 4:22-23 in 11:3, the third edition highlights this culmination by its reference to 4:22-23; as it stands, the third edition has two theological statements about Israel’s sonship bookending the Ten Plagues.
narrative. Although in earlier editions the command in 4:22-23 could already be understood as framing the entire narrative, in the third edition this framing is reinforced and unmistakable. The *sonship* of Israel thereby comes to the fore, since the reason for the plague is repeated again in 11:3; whereas one could miss this theology in the earlier editions, in the third edition the theological point that Israel is God’s son—and its corollaries, for example, that God will act on Israel’s behalf—is unmistakably clear. “Israel is my son” rings clear from the voice of God; every action on behalf of Israel in the Ten Plagues story is thus seen as originating in this intimate relationship of God to Israel.154

Second, the command of 4:22-23 could be considered fulfilled, either by 7:6, which states that Moses and Aaron “did so,” that is, acted in accordance with God’s commands (משה ויעש עשה ויהוה אתם כעשה). We find this sort of fulfillment for commands in the third, sixth, and ninth plague episodes (see 8:12-15; 9:8-10; and 10:21-22). The “did so” statement is perhaps too far away from the command in 4:22-23, leaving it unclear how much or which of God’s commands are covered by the statement (only 7:1-5, or more of the preceding context155?).

The much closer statement in 5:1 might also be considered the fulfillment of 4:22-23:

Afterward Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said, “Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast to me in the wilderness.” (RSV)

The command in 4:22-23 includes that Moses should tell Pharaoh to “let [God’s] people go,” and this is what Moses and Aaron say to Pharaoh in 5:1. Thus, the command is at least partially fulfilled. However, the exact language—in particular, the sonship language—of 4:22-23 is not used in 5:1. The audience of the first two editions, whose members were accustomed to the terse narrative of Exodus and its gaps in detail meant to be filled in, would have easilyforgone the fact that the sonship bit was not included and would have been rewarded when the final plague

---

154 Moreover, the sonship of mankind in Genesis 1-2, and thereby ancient Near Eastern imagery of the king as God’s son, is probably evoked; cf. Propp, Exodus, 217-218.
155 E.g., 6:28-29, 6:11, 6:6-8, etc., going back into chapter 4.
fulfilled (albeit only intuitively, not explicitly) the thrust of 4:22-23. The creator of the third edition, however, did not allow such gaps to remain and thus felt a need to state explicitly that the words of 4:22-23 were repeated to Pharaoh. For the first two editions, then, 5:1 seems to contain the fulfillment of the command in 4:22-23; in the third edition, the fulfillment is found in 11:3. Returning again to the question of the location of the fulfillment insertion corresponding to the command in 4:22-23, the insertion could have been added to 5:1, or 5:1 could have been altered, to make 5:1 a completely correspondent fulfillment of 4:22-23. Perhaps the creator of the third edition attempted primarily to insert fulfillments immediately after their corresponding commands, and since that option was unavailable given the flow of the narrative, he preferred to delay the fulfillment until a more distant point in the plot. Or, perhaps he preferred to work at such distances (as seen in the insertions based on material in Deuteronomy), only using closely proximal insertions in the episodes of the Ten Plagues narrative—in which case the insertion of material from 4:22-23 into 11:3 would have been the norm.

If 5:1 is not the fulfillment of 4:22-23, why is there no command insertion in the third edition to correspond to 5:1? In 5:1, God’s message to Pharaoh includes the notion that Israel will hold a feast for God in the wilderness; in 4:22-23, no such notion is part of God’s message. 5:1 only fulfilled half of 4:22-23, at best; it’s request was that Pharaoh let the people go temporarily in order to have a feast, not that Pharaoh send the Israelites away permanently. Clearly, then, from the detail-oriented perspective of the third edition of Exodus, it seems that the fulfillment of 5:1 is left unpaired with a command. This fulfillment and the fulfillment in Exodus 32:27 which similarly lacks a corresponding command are the only cases where ("thus says the LORD") does not elicit an insertion in the third edition.

156 As such, the third edition of Exodus at least partially extends the aspects of the preceding editions where gaps in the narrative are allowed to stand: the audience is left to wonder about the fulfillment of 4:22-23 until chapter 11.
4.2.2 – Command-Fulfillment Insertions where the Missing Command is Inserted

There are two command-fulfillment insertions where the command, not the fulfillment, is inserted.

4.2.2.1 – EXODUS 10:2-6 (LOCUSTS)

SOURCE – Exod 10:3-6 (command-FULFILLMENT)

There are two command-fulfillment insertions where the command, not the fulfillment, is inserted.

EXODUS 10:2-6 (LOCUSTS)

So Moses and Aaron went in to Pharaoh, and said to him, “Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, ‘How long will you refuse to humble yourself before me? Let my people go, that they may serve me. For if you refuse to let my people go, behold, tomorrow I will bring locusts into your country, and they shall cover the face of the land, so that no one can see the land; and they shall eat what is left to you after the hail, and they shall eat all the grass of the earth, and every fruit of the tree that grows for you in the field, and they shall fill your houses, and the houses of all your servants and of all the Egyptians; as neither your fathers nor your grandfathers have seen, from the day they came on earth to this day.’” Then he turned and went out from Pharaoh. (based on RSV)

INSERTION – Exod 10:2b (COMMAND-fulfillment)

And you will say to Pharaoh, “Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, ‘How long will you refuse to humble yourself before me? Let my people go, that they may serve me. For if you refuse to let my people go, behold, tomorrow I will bring locusts into your country, and they shall cover the face of the land, so that no one can see the land; and they shall eat what is left to you after the hail, and they shall eat all the grass of the earth, and every fruit of the tree that grows for you in the field, and they shall fill your houses, and the houses of all your servants and of all the Egyptians; as neither your fathers nor your grandfathers have seen, from the day they came on earth to this day.’” Then he turned and went out from Pharaoh. (based on RSV)

---

157 4QExod4 has | במצר, presumably for MT and SP’s במצרים פְרָעָה.
158 MT has כל העץ, while 4QpaleoExod6 and SP have כל פרי העץ, reflected in the insertion.
and the houses of all your servants and of all the Egyptians; as neither your fathers nor your grandfathers have seen, from the day they came on earth to this day."

4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>

ימֶלֶךְ וְאָבֹה[א] -- נוֹאָב[ת]

Minus in 4QExod<sup>c</sup>, MT, OG.

4QExod<sup>c</sup>, 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>l</sup>, and 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> contain portions of Exodus 10 but are fragmentary. 4QExod<sup>c</sup> could not have included the insertion in verse 2,<sup>159</sup> while 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>l</sup> may or may not have included the insertion.<sup>160</sup> In the case of 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, it is clear that the insertion was present.<sup>161</sup>

In Exodus 10, a new episode begins with God speaking to Moses (verses 1-2), as with the preceding episodes describing each of the Ten Plagues. Unlike the preceding episodes, however, in this episode God’s statement to Moses includes no description of the plague he will send if Pharaoh fails to send Israel out of Egypt. In Moses’s and Aaron’s speech to Pharaoh (verses 3-6) immediately following God’s speech, the plague is described, and the audience is easily able to infer that this is the essence of what God commanded Moses and Aaron to say. God’s only command to Moses and Aaron in 10:1-2 is to “go to Pharaoh” (<em>כִּבְרֹא הָאֵלֶּה</em>); yet, in 10:3 we find the phrase “thus says the LORD” (<em>כִּכְלַמְרַע הַיְהוָה</em>), which, elsewhere in Exodus, implies that Moses (and Aaron) was commanded by God to relate the following speech. This insertion shares most of the common elements found in the other insertions (see section 4.3.1). The change in addressee results from the near context given in the first half of verse 2: unlike in 10:3 where Pharaoh has already been mentioned, in verse 2 he has not been mentioned, thus <em>אָלָיו</em> must become <em>אָלֶּה</em>. The rest of the insertion follows the source word-for-word.

---

<sup>159</sup> DJD XII, 111.
<sup>160</sup> See DJD IX, 30-31.
<sup>161</sup> Following the end of the insertion in line 29, we see remnants of the words of verse 3 (see DJD IX, 81); in other words, the words found on the fragments in lines 27-29 (given above) are not from the parallel verses 3-6 but from the insertion in verse 2.
This insertion was coupled with a second insertion (discussed above in section 4.2.1.7), and moreover was framed in a different manner from other insertions. Whereas the insertion occurring in 11:3 and discussed in section 4.2.1.7 draws from Exodus 4:22-23 as its source, this insertion’s source is Exodus 11:4-7.

**SOURCE - Exod 11:4-7 (command-FULFILLMENT)**

And Moses said, “Thus says the LORD: About midnight I will go forth in the midst of the land of Egypt; and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh who sits upon his throne, even to the first-born of the maidservant who is behind the mill, and to the first-born of all the cattle. And there shall be a great cry in Egypt, such as there has never been, nor ever shall be again. But against any of the people of Israel, either man or beast, not a dog shall growl; that you may know that the LORD acts wondrously between the Egyptians and Israel.” (Based on RSV)

---

162 MT has חצת, while SP has חצית. reflected in the insertion in 11:3.
163 SP has אינָי מַעַרִים, reflected in the insertion in 11:3; whereas MT has אֵין מַעַרִים (it seems for בָּאֵרִים or בָּאֵרִים in verse 3; cf. DJD III:50-51).
164 MT has דּוּ, while SP has דּוּ, reflected in the insertion in 11:3.
165 MT has דּוּ, while SP has דּוּ, reflected in the insertion in 11:3.
166 MT has בַּל אֵין מַעַרִים, reflected in the insertion in 11:3.
167 SP’s דּוּ (on this form, cf. 30:38) has a feminine pronoun ("like her") to reflect the feminine verbs והיָה, whereas MT has masculine pronouns, חָפֵץ and חָפֵץ: the change could have begun with metathesis (ַחָפֵץ → חָפֵץ or vice versa) in one of the words, with the other word changed for consistency later.
168 MT has plural והיָה, implying that all of the Israelites will “know”; SP’s והיָה is reflected in the insertion in 11:3.
169 MT has פֵּלָל, whereas SP has פֵּלָל; See footnote 139.
“And I will give this people favor in the sight of the Egyptians and they will let them have what they ask. And about midnight I will go forth in the midst of the land of Egypt; and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh who sits upon his throne, even to the first-born of the maidservant who is behind the mill, and to the first-born of all the cattle. And there shall be a great cry in Egypt, such as there has never been, nor ever shall be again. But against any of the people of Israel, either man or beast, not a dog shall growl; that you may know that the LORD acts wondrously between the Egyptians and Israel.” Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people. And Moses said to Pharaoh, “Thus says the LORD, Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, Let my son go that he may serve me; if you refuse to let him go, behold, the LORD will slay your first-born son.”

Although 2QExod\* provides evidence on the second insertion in this verse, it begins just after the location of the first insertion, so we cannot tell if the insertion was present.

Exodus 11 contains the first half of the final episode in which God plagues Egypt. This

---

170 For notes on the retroversion of OG’s Vorlage, see the discussion in section 4.2.1.7 above.
episode is the climax of the Ten Plagues narrative, where God’s ultimate weapon, first alluded to in Exodus 4:23, is finally enacted: the killing of all firstborn sons, including Pharaoh’s. As in previous plague episodes, this episode begins with God speaking to Moses. Similar to the passage discussed above, 10:1-6, here God does not command Moses to relay a message to Pharaoh, but the account includes Moses relaying a message from God (11:4).

Unlike all previous plague episodes, in this passage God’s words to Moses are followed by a somewhat out of place detail about the Israelites gaining favor with the Egyptians (11:3): “And the LORD gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people.” Although the detail is certainly important to the plot—since it implies the acquisition of precious materials from the Egyptians mentioned in 11:2—it interrupts the typical narrative flow of a plague episode: usually, God’s command is followed immediately either by Moses’s and Aaron’s relaying the message to Pharaoh or by the actual enactment of the plague; but this is not the case in Exodus 11:1-7.

This difference between the final plague episode and the previous episodes results in a slightly more complicated change to the text in the third edition. There is no addition of a phrase to introduce the quote (such as, “you will say to Pharaoh” in the 10:2 insertion); instead, the opening phrase of the verse is exchanged with a parallel phrase from 3:21, so that God, who was speaking in verse 2, continues to speak. The earlier editions reads, “Speak now in the hearing of the people […].” The LORD gave the people favor (יתן היהו את העם) […]; the third edition, using material from Exod 3:21, now reads, “Speak now in the hearing of the people […], and I will give this people favor (ונתתי היהו את העם) […].” The result is that the insertion is already in the mouth of God; the subtle change allows the third edition to insert material without an introductory phrase. The text that is inserted in the third edition, beginning

---

172 Exod 3:21 reads, נתתי היהו את העם ותנו את העם, and I will give this people favor. Childs sees this as “an attempt to smooth out the narrative” (Exodus, 130).
follows its source (Exodus 11:4-7) word-for-word. After the insertion, the third edition includes the statement already present in preceding editions about the greatness of Moses in Egypt, and then it inserts yet another passage, this time the missing fulfillment to the command given in 4:22-23; this final insertion is discussed in section 4.2.4.

4.2.3 – Statement-Quote Insertions

The only statement-quote insertion in Exodus 1-14 is found in 6:9, where the missing statement is inserted to correspond to the quote in 14:12.

SOURCE – Exod 14:12 (statement-QUOTE)

ילהו הז הרבר אשי דברנו אליך במצרים לאמר חהל תא קצל ממון ונעבדה את מצרים יא טובLnעל

Is not this what we said to you in Egypt, “Let us alone and let us serve the Egyptians, for it would be better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the wilderness”? (based on RSV)

INSERTION – Exod 6:9b (STATEMENT-quote)

יאמרו אל משה חהל נא ממון ונעבדה את מצרי כי טובLnעל אוח מצרין ממונת מבדבר

And they said to Moses, “Let us alone and let us serve the Egyptians, for it would be better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the wilderness.”

Minus in 4QGen-Exod⁴, MurExod, MT, OG.

Given the line spacing in 4QGen-Exod⁴ there is no room for the insertion.¹⁷⁵ 4QpaleoExod⁵ is not extant at this point in Exodus.

In Exodus 5, Moses and Aaron make their initial contact with Pharaoh, commanding him on behalf of God to send the Israelites away to hold a feast to God (Exod 5:1-3). Pharaoh does

---

¹⁷⁴ 4QExod⁴ and MT have חלהל, while SP reads נא, reflected in the insertion in 6:9.
¹⁷⁵ DJD XII, 26.
not comply, but instead responds by increasing the labor of the Israelites (Exod 5:4-18). The Israelites, in turn, become upset with Moses and Aaron for causing this situation (Exod 5:19-21). In chapter 6, God reaffirms the original plan with Moses and gives him a reassuring message for the Israelites: God has made a covenant with them and will deliver them from Egypt (Exod 6:1-8). Moses relays this message to the Israelites in 6:9, but they do not listen (וַיָּשָׁמֶר אֵלֵּא מֵשֶׁה). At this point, the third edition inserts the complaint of the Israelites, “Let us alone and let us serve the Egyptians.” The insertion works well in 6:9, but we should note that it could have been placed elsewhere, perhaps near or within 5:19-21, where the Israelites are first upset with Moses.

Why did the creator of edition three decide to insert the statement here? The decision possibly had to do with literary features: this position of the statement serves to sum up the situation and reaction of the Israelites in 5:1-6:9. We should also note, as with other insertions, that the insertion is not entirely necessary from a literary point of view. The quote in 14:12 refers to a time when the Israelites were in Egypt, were upset, and did not want to leave Egypt. Exodus 5-6:9 fits well, and the audience of editions one and two probably would have inferred this scene as the setting of the quoted statement.

The insertion is accomplished by adding a simple אמר clause in typical narrative fashion: וַיָּשָׁמֶר אֵלֵּא מֵשֶׁה, “and they said to Moses,” with a direct speech complement, the statement consisting of the words from 14:12. Although this introductory phrase does not mirror the introduction to the quote in 14:12 exactly—there, the main verb is דבר,176 and the direct speech is introduced by לאמר—this is apparently of no concern to the third edition. What matters is that a clear antecedent to the quote in 14:12 is introduced; the statement itself, however, is taken word-for-word from the source.

176 Cf. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 228-230 on variations involving אמר and דבר in SP.
4.2.4 – Foretelling-Event Insertions

There is only one foretelling-event insertion. The variant seems to pattern with the other variants that are characteristic of the third edition of Exodus: something referred to in the text is missing from the earlier portion of the narrative where it should reasonably be. In this case, the earlier element is God’s foretelling of the event, and the later element is the event.

**SOURCE – Exod 12:36 (foretelling-EVENT)**

יהוה נתן את הם בעיני מצרים יישאלים ועיניו חן את מצרימים

And the LORD had given the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they let them have what they asked. Thus they despoiled the Egyptians. (RSV)

**INSERTION – Exod 11:3 (FORETELLING-event)**

נתתי את הם בעיני מצרים יישאלים ועיניו חן את מצררים

And I will give this people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, and they will let them have what they ask. Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people. And Moses said to Pharaoh, “Thus says the LORD, Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, Let my son...

| Words retained from Exod 11:3 in the earlier edition |
| Parallel version of the first phrase of Exod 11:3, from source 3:21 |
| Words from 11:3 that parallel 12:36 |
| Material inserted based on source (Exod 12:36) |
| Other insertions based on a different sources (see 4.2.2 and 4.2.1) |
go that he may serve me; if you refuse to let him go, behold, the LORD will slay your first-born son.”

“And the LORD gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians and they let them have what they asked. Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people.

At the end of the tenth plague episode (death of the firstborn), it is related that God caused the Israelites to be seen favorably by the Egyptians, such that they gave the Israelites precious possessions if only they asked (12:36). The context seems to imply that this plundering of the Egyptians provided resources to the Israelites to be used after their departure. The phrase "they will grant their requests" parallels a statement in 11:3, at the beginning of this plague episode, almost exactly. It seems that a scribe, having intimate knowledge of the text and thus 12:36, read 11:3 and added the slightly modified clause ("and they will grant their requests") from memory. In both the source and the insertion, the verb is a Hifil of the root שָאַל; in the Qal, שָאַל means “to request”; in the Hifil, the meaning is not a simple causative (e.g., “to cause to request”) but “to grant a request.” With the third person plural pronoun suffixes—used in both the source and the insertion—the idea is that the Egyptians (subject of the verb) granted the Israelites (complement of the verb) their requests. The difference between the source and the insertion results from the difference in speaker in the two contexts: in the source, the narrator relates what has happened, and thus uses a preterite (past

177 For notes on the retroversion of the OG’s Vorlage, see the discussion in section 4.2.1.7 above.
178 In OG, a pronoun is added to בּוּעָית; in SP, a demonstrative pronoun occurs at the same location; moreover, in SP וְהָשָּׁאְלָה is first person modal qatal in order to reflect the change in speaker and context (see section 4.2.2.2).
179 Propp suggests that the reading והשאילום could be earlier, perhaps omitted in MT due to homoi (מְצֶיה והשאילום שָאָל; Exodus 1-18, 308. This is, however, improbable; see Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors.”
tense) verb; in the insertion, God foretells what will occur when he grants the Israelites favor in the eyes of the Egyptians, and thus a modal qatal (future tense) verb is used. In the OG, the context is different because some of the changes that reshape the passage have not been made; as such, the qatal is read not as modal, but as past tense, in the voice of the narrator (“and he granted their requests”). As with the insertions discussed above in 6:9 and 11:3d, and also with the insertions in other parts of Exodus stemming from Deuteronomy, here the insertion is found at some distance from the source. The insertion reinforces the inclusio already existing between 11:3 at the beginning of the plague episode and 12:36 at the end, adding an additional verbal parallel (ויהוה נתי וحسن משים מאורים).

Notably, both SP and OG contain a related variant in 11:2; whereas 3:21 and 12:35 refer to the Israelites taking “vessels of silver and vessels of gold and clothing” (כולי כלים של זהב וכסף) from the Egyptians, in the MT 11:2 only mentions “vessels of silver and vessels of gold” (כולי כלים של זהב ושמלת). SP and OG instead read (σκεύη ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ καὶ ἱματισμόν). Thus it seems clear that SP and OG both witness to a text that was concerned to connect the beginning of the tenth plague to the end in 12:35ff. While obviously the OG does not follow the text of the third edition, even in this one verse where it has a much shorter text, it is nevertheless notable that OG agrees with SP regarding a variant that can easily be seen as patterning with the other insertions of the third edition of Exodus. When we consider the presence of multiple other minor content-mirroring insertions like this one, found in various witnesses (see section 4.4.3), we note a clear trend of insertions like this, which are based on other passages in Exodus, that arose independently of one another. Though they are similar to those characterizing the third edition of Exodus, they can be found in various witnesses; the practice of content-mirroring, then, was not unique to the creator of the third edition of Exodus.

As with the insertion in 11:3 corresponding to 4:22-23, we might ask why the foretelling

180 Cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 343.
182 For the implications of this, see section 4.3.3.
of this event was inserted in 11:3 and not in 3:21, where the text reads, "The insertion of והשאולום could work there, instead. It is unclear why the insertion was placed in 11:3 instead of 3:21."

4.2.5 – Summary

The various insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative can be categorized as involving various conceptual pairings: command-fulfillment, event-recall, and foretelling-event. The majority of insertions involve command-fulfillment pairs, and within that category some insertions provide a missing fulfillment, while others provide a missing command. In all of these types, the insertion can occur in immediate proximity to its source, or it can occur at some distance from it. Moreover, in one case (11:3) several insertions are placed together, corresponding to and drawing from different sources (some near, some far) in the text. Despite these differences, the insertions share similar profiles in many ways. In the following section, we will examine the similarities and proceed to a refined understanding of these insertions.

4.3 – Analysis of Large-Scale Variants in Exodus 1-14

Whereas the preceding section involved minute description of every insertion in the Ten Plagues narrative, in this section I attempt to draw the evidence together and to address larger questions. After outlining the important common elements in the Ten Plagues insertions, I reconsider the theories of prior studies and their ability to account for the data in the third edition of Exodus. Finding them lacking for their inability to address both the Ten Plagues insertions and the Deuteronomy-related insertions, I propose a new element that helps to resolve this major issue: these two types of insertion, though similar, are in fact two distinct phenomena that arise for different reasons. With respect to the Ten Plagues insertions, it seems they stem from the rise

---

183 The fact that only one location was chosen is suggestive, if the scribe was working deliberately: perhaps the scribe responsible did not want to fill out every point of the narrative with as much detail as possible (as is often suggested); instead, he may only have wanted to supply the (=one) corresponding element to complete the foretelling-event pair implied by 12:36.
in literary developments involving prophecy in the Second Temple period.

4.3.1 – Common Elements in the Ten Plagues Insertions

The majority of the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative share several common elements. Most belong to the command-fulfillment pairing, where either a command or more often a fulfillment is missing. Most are placed in immediate proximity to their source, either following the command (if the insertion is the fulfillment) or preceding the fulfillment (if the insertion is the command). Moreover, the quote from the source (that is, the message that God gives Moses to repeat) is typically inserted verbatim. Three further commonalities are significant and deserve further discussion. These are the use of the phrase הָיָה אָמַר יהוה, the impact of the existing structure of the narrative on the ways in which each insertion is introduced, and a consistent change in grammar to the verb of speaking involved.

Seven specific insertions, in places where a plague is given its primary description—two where the command is missing (10:2; 11:3) and five where the fulfillment is missing (7:18, 29; 8:19; 9:5, 19)—significantly affect the shape of the Ten Plagues narrative. Notably, all of these insertions involving the main statement of a plague occur when the language “thus says the LORD” (דְּהַ אָמַר יהוה) is used. For example, in 7:26 we read the following:

וַיִּאמֶר יהוה אל פַּרְעֹה אָלֶֽיךָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אָמַרְתָּנָּו אֲלֵֽיכֶם הָיָה אָמַר יהוה אֲלֵֽיכֶם וְיָשַׂרֵאֲלֵֽיכֶם וְיָשַׂרֵאֲלֵֽיכֶם

Then the LORD said to Moses, “Go in to Pharaoh and speak to him, ‘Thus says the LORD, “Let my people go, that they may serve me … ” ’”

The same language is repeated in the parallel insertion in 7:29b. In these cases, הָיָה אָמַר יהוה is present in the earlier editions of Exodus, whether in the command or its fulfillment, and the third edition includes this phrase in its insertion, with the exception of 11:3. In the case of the three plagues where there is no insertion, Moses is not told to repeat a message God has given, and the phrase הָיָה אָמַר יהוה is not used. In the last two plagues, where the command—not the fulfillment
—is missing, the fact that Moses tells Pharaoh יְהֹוָה (see 10:3; 11:4) implies in the first two editions that his statement is a repeat of something God has commanded him to say.

**Figure 4.2 – Main Commands and Fulfillments in the Ten Plagues Episodes**

(Insertions in the third edition underlined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Fulfillment</th>
<th>? יְהֹוָה?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:14-25 (water to blood)</td>
<td>7:15-18</td>
<td>7:18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26-8:11 (frogs)</td>
<td>7:26-29a</td>
<td>7:29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:12-15 (gnats)</td>
<td>8:12</td>
<td>8:13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16-28 (flies)</td>
<td>8:16-19</td>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1-7 (pestilence)</td>
<td>9:1-5</td>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:8-12 (boils)</td>
<td>9:8-9</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:1-20 (locusts)</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>10:3-6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21-29 (darkness)</td>
<td>10:21</td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11:1-12:36 (death of firstborn) | 11:3 | 11:4-7 | Yes

In the earlier editions of Exodus, all of these command-fulfillment pairs involving יְהֹוָה language are missing one half of the pairing. In other words, leaving the fulfillment or initial command unspoken was the norm until the third edition made its changes. In earlier editions, the mention of either the command or its fulfillment sufficed, representing for the audience that both command and fulfillment have occurred. The third edition of Exodus, by adding these lengthy insertions, significantly alters the character and pace of the narrative, from terse and swiftly moving, to slow and more detailed.

The structure of the Ten Plagues narrative is also notable because it determines how several elements of the insertions work. Structural cues are given at the beginning of each plague...

---

185 יְהֹוָה is found in the fulfillment of the command, but unlike the other cases, not in the command itself, which is where the insertion occurs; this is probably because of how the redactor used existing material in 11:3 to insert the missing command into a statement of God’s (see discussion in 4.2.2.2).
187 Cf. Propp, Exodus 1-18, 293.
188 To give a rough idea, counting morphological items using Accordance software to compare the MT and SP, this narrative is lengthened by about 30% by the additions made in the third edition.
episode; the first nine plagues occur in a cycle of three, repeated three times. The tenth plague episode does not contain such a structural cue.

Figure 4.3 – Structure of the Ten Plagues Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Structural Cue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:14-25 (water to blood)</td>
<td>Imperative then speech commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26-8:11 (frogs)</td>
<td>Imperative then speech commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:12-15 (gnats)</td>
<td>Immediate action commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16-28 (flies)</td>
<td>Imperative then speech commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1-7 (pestilence)</td>
<td>Imperative then speech commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:8-12 (boils)</td>
<td>Immediate action commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:13-35 (hail)</td>
<td>Imperative then speech commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:1-20 (locusts)</td>
<td>Imperative then speech commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21-29 (darkness)</td>
<td>Immediate action commanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:1-12:36 (death of firstborn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the third edition of Exodus, there are no insertions needed for “immediate action” plague episodes whether because no message from God is given, and/or because the fulfillment (either an enactment of the commands given, as in 9:8-10 and 10:21-22, or a summary phrase like “they did so,” as in 8:12-15) is included in the earlier editions. Besides influencing where insertions were made, the structure also influences the way the insertions relate to their sources. Two of the three types of structural cue involve imperatives given by God before the message for Pharaoh. In 7:26-29, for example, the structural cues are found in verse 26:

189 Whether or not this structure stems from the combination of difference sources/documents is of no concern to this study; in all likelihood, the scribe responsible for the third edition of Exodus encountered the text in essentially this format, with this structure in place. Although Lemmelijn finds that the third edition insertions align with concerns of the P source, I do not find this analysis compelling (see below). For an excellent overview of source-critical data and various source-critical analyses of the Ten Plagues narrative, see Propp, *Exodus*, 310-317.

190 Cf. 12:3//12:28; and cf. 6:6-9 where “he spoke thus” suffices to fulfill God’s command to speak.

Then the LORD said to Moses, “Go in to Pharaoh and speak to him, ‘Thus says the LORD, “Let my people go, that they may serve me … ” ’”

These cues are mirrored in the insertion in 7:29b:

And Moses went in, with Aaron, to Pharaoh and they spoke to him, “Thus says the LORD, ‘Let my people go, that they may serve me … ’”

In most of the insertions, the initially commanded actions are mirrored closely. In the episodes introduced by והתיצב…השלכמן, however, the insertions do not mirror the two initial actions exactly but instead summarize usingבוא. In 8:16, for example, neither the first action (השכם, “rise early”) nor the subsequent actions (with the exception of the imperative to “say” something to Pharaoh) are repeated in the insertion. Instead, Moses is said to “go in” to Pharaoh (בוא אל), a phrase that mirrors no language of the source. In context, this is easily read as a summary of the initial actions commanded by God, that is, “Moses went” means that he rose early and waited for Pharaoh by the water. Given this use of בא in 8:16 and 9:13, the following pattern emerges: הלך is used with the first insertion, and בא with the rest.

192 Cf. Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 201; Zahn, Rethinking, 145.
193 See Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 201, who points out the precedent in earlier editions for abbreviating to בא.
Figure 4.4 – Quotative Frames in the Ten Plagues Narrative

(insertions are underlined; parallel preliminary actions; parallel verb-phrase of speaking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame of Quote in Command</th>
<th>Frame of Quote in Fulfillment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:15-18</td>
<td>יוהי משה ארצה אל פרעה יאמר אלי ולך משה את הברך הנהאה צא המילה ונתבך לך אלהים על שפת יוהוא ו 회원 נוחר לנהותיך בך יחיאל פרעה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26-29</td>
<td>ובא משה ואחרים אל פרעה ודברו אלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16-19</td>
<td>Hữu ישראל ונתבך/socket לftime פרעה הנהוה צא המילת אמורא אלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1-5</td>
<td>ובא משה ואחרים אל פרעה יאמר אלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:2-6</td>
<td>אמורא אל פרעה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:3-7</td>
<td>reshapes earlier edition so that there is no need for frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:22-23//11:3</td>
<td>יהיו אמר משה אל פרעה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4 shows how the existing structure of the Ten Plagues narrative has shaped the relationship of each insertion to its source. What also becomes apparent are consistent grammatical changes to the verb of speaking, in tense, person, and number. In the command, God speaks directly to Moses, whereas in the fulfillment, the narrator speaks about events. This entails a change in person and tense: the command to speak comes in direct speech from God (thus the modal “you shall speak”) whereas the fulfillment is done in the past (since the main frame of the narrative is past tense); moreover, the subject “you” (spoken by God) becomes “they” (spoken by the narrator). For example, in 7:26, the verb דבר is second person modal (weqatal, continuing the imperative sense of בָּא):

"ויבא משה וארבעים אל פרעה ודברו אליו: "ויבא פרעה אל אליו ודברו אליו:"

Then the L ORD said to Moses, “Go in to Pharaoh and speak to him, ‘Thus says the L ORD, “Let my people go, that they may serve me … ’’”
In the insertion in 7:29b, the verb דבר is third person preterite (wayyiqtol):

ויבא פרעה אל אהרן ומשה וידברו עמו את שלח יהוה אמר אלהי

And Moses went in, with Aaron, to Pharaoh and they spoke to him, “Thus says the LORD, ‘Let my people go, that they may serve me … ’”

More significant than these contextual changes is the change in the grammatical number of the verbs of speaking, which is not demanded by the change in speaker. The subject is singular in the commands (implying Moses alone), but plural in the fulfillments (implying Moses and Aaron). This is consistent throughout, even where it is the command that is inserted and thus the change needs to be in the other direction (Exod 10:2), in which case a plural verb from the source is changed to a singular in the insertion. That is, the scribe did not have one standard form of the verb that he always used, but he actually wanted to have Moses as the would-be speaker when God gives the command and Moses with Aaron as the speakers when God’s message is relayed.195 God’s commands are always given to Moses but executed by Moses and Aaron,196 perhaps reflecting 7:2 where God tells Moses that he will “speak all that I command you” but in the same breath that “Aaron your brother shall tell Pharaoh to let the people of Israel go.” The change in pronoun in 7:18b (“me” to “us”; see discussion in section 4.2.1.1) further supports the intentionality of these changes.

Two theories about the origins of the Ten Plagues insertions are especially affected by this phenomenon. First, Lemmelijn’s proposal, that the insertions in Exodus have as their primary purpose to involve Aaron in the activities of mediating between God and Pharaoh (as discussed in section 4.1 above), is based on this phenomenon. Second, the theory shared by Kartveit, Anderson and Giles—that the insertions are primarily about Moses—is challenged by this pattern of the inclusion of Aaron. For both of these two theories, the evidence from 4QpaleoExodm for the insertion in 7:18b is a key element. If Aaron was not present in the

---

195 The change to plural may be secondary, as well as the inclusion of Aaron. Below, I argue that the former is secondary, but not the latter.
insertions in this early manuscript, Lemmelijn’s thesis is undermined and the problem for Kartveit et al. disappears. If, on the other hand, Aaron was present in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\), the theory of the elevation of Moses is seriously challenged.

Lemmelijn argues that the change to plural verbs has to do with the inclusion of Aaron in the mediation between God and Pharaoh.\(^{197}\) However, she does not discuss the implications of the evidence in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\). As noted in the discussion of 7:18b above, 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) reads יאמרו, a singular form of the verb implying Moses as the subject, rather than the plural ויאמרו as in SP. None of the other cases where the verb is changed from its source, or 7:18b where the pronoun is changed, are extant in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\). The inclusion of Aaron as co-mediator with Moses, therefore, may not have been included in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) and thus the third edition of Exodus. This is not, however, why I ultimately disagree with Lemmelijn, since I find it probable that Aaron was included in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) (see below where I return to this issue).

I also find Lemmelijn’s theory difficult because alternative explanations are preferable—both for the change to plural verbs, and for the insertions. In the earlier editions we already find reference to Aaron as co-mediator with Moses, in the use of the plural ויאמרו in 10:3-6. While 11:4 has Moses alone as the relayer of God’s message, 10:3 could have set a precedent for the creator of the third edition of Exodus. Moreover, Aaron is included as an agent in the relay of God’s messages in 5:1 and 6:27, 7:2, and 7:6; in other words, there was already a clear pattern in Exodus about who relayed God’s message.\(^{198}\) The creator of the third edition of Exodus may have observed that Moses receives God’s command to speak to Pharaoh, but Moses and Aaron actually speak to Pharaoh. This would explain why the expansion in 10:2b does not use a second plural verb and thereby include Aaron. The insertion in 10:2b would thus not be an “exception to the rule” as Lemmelijn—considering the inclusion of Aaron to be the impetus of the insertions—states\(^{199}\) but the proof of the rule that Moses and Aaron always relay God’s message, as in other

---

198 See Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll, 201-203.
199 Lemmelijn, “P-Redaction,” 212.
verses in earlier editions. Before Lemmelijn’s study, Sanderson anticipated this sort of argument, asking, “Was the scribe deliberately enhancing the prestige of Aaron?” She responded in the negative, pointing out that the singular/plural “pattern had already been set before our scribe set to work,” entailing that “there was no Tendenz on the part of the scribe who created the major expansions.” In my opinion, Sanderson’s initial study interpreted the data correctly in this regard.

Besides this alternative explanation for the change to plural verb in many of the insertions, there are several other plausible explanations for the insertions (and non-insertions) in the Ten Plagues narrative. As discussed above in section 4.1, Lemmelijn considers places where no insertion is made; though she notes two very plausible reasons for the non-insertions—in none of those cases does God give Moses a message for Pharaoh, and in all of these cases a fulfillment is already present—she nevertheless suggests that the inclusion of Aaron is the primary impetus for the insertions. Given the pattern established in earlier editions regarding Aaron’s activity in delivering God’s messages and given the other plausible explanations for the insertions and non-insertions, I find the notion that the scribe wanted to include Aaron unnecessary.

Above I note that Lemmelijn does not adequately account for the reading וָמר in 4QpaleoExod; moreover, I stated that this evidence may entail that Aaron was not part of the insertions in the earliest version of the third edition. I do think, however, that there is good reason to suppose that 4QpaleoExod, and thus the third edition of Exodus, included Aaron as a co-mediator. Sanderson suggests three possible explanations for the reading in 4QpaleoExod. First, the inclusion of Aaron may just be a later stage of development, not included in 4QpaleoExod. Second, Aaron’s name may have been inserted without a corresponding change in verb number; the verb number would then have been changed to plural in a later stage. If this
were the case, we would assume 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}, as a witness to the earlier stage, to have Aaron included in all the insertions, but with singular verbs from the earlier editions. Third, 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} may simply contain an error here, with the plural verb being the correct reading of the third edition. I would suggest that the second option given by Sanderson is the best, for two reasons. First, given the length of the preceding lines in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} column II, the interval on line 5—before the start of the insertion—would have to have been irregularly long for the first phrase of the insertion to read \( \text{פרעה אל משה ואהרן משלך,} \) without Aaron mentioned; even if the interval were as long as 2 cm (the longest extant inline interval in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}) the additional word \( \text{ואהרן} \) is needed to make the line as long as the 40-45 letter lines preceding. Thus, the reconstruction \( \text{פרעה אל משה ואהרן משלך} \) seems likely, even though line 6 has the singular \( \text{וֶֹֽיָּ֝רְעַה.} \) Second, there are other cases where this phenomenon— the change from singular to plural agents in an initial stage, followed by a second stage where the verbs are changed in accordance—can be found. For example, in the sacrificial instructions of Leviticus, the use of plural “the sons of Aaron, the priests” instead of a single priest results in a two-stage process of development: in the earlier witness, MT, the plural subject is used with plural verbs when explicit but with singular verbs in following clauses; in the later witnesses, OG and SP, plural verbs are used throughout.\textsuperscript{205}

How does all of this evidence bear on the theory of Kartveit, Anderson and Giles, that the purpose of the insertions was to highlight Moses as a prophet? I find that neither of their studies account well for this pattern whereby Aaron is included. The addition of Aaron in the Ten Plagues insertions may contradict the highlighting-Moses-as-prophet theory, or at least modify it so that Aaron must also be included as another character whose image is being supported.

Kartveit’s statement that “Moses emerges as an accurate mediator of divine message to Pharaoh

\textsuperscript{204} DJD IX, 58.

\textsuperscript{205} John Screnock, “The Use of the Old Greek in Textual Criticism after Qumran: Verb Number Variants in Leviticus as a Case Study” (unpublished paper delivered at the Scrollery Colloquium in Toronto; March 25, 2013).
and Aaron” highlights this underlying issue with his thesis. Aaron is more often portrayed as one of the mediators than as a recipient of a command. However, the fact that Aaron as co-mediator is already an established pattern in the text in the earlier editions, suggesting that the third edition merely kept to this pattern, could keep Aaron’s inclusion from harming their thesis. That is, they could argue that Aaron is included incidentally, not as a result of any of the theological or ideological intensions of the redactor. In spite of this possible argument, in the end I find that the inclusion of Aaron in the insertions undermines their argument. If the point was, as Kartveit, Anderson, and Giles maintain, to enhance Moses’s image, one might think the redactor would have left Aaron out of the insertions. Even if the inclusion of Aaron was a pattern established in several places in earlier editions, why would it be important to follow that pattern, particularly when the pattern mitigates the goal of the insertions? If the redactor wanted to highlight Moses as prophet, we would think it would be more important to have Moses deliver God’s message alone than to follow a pattern observed in the earlier edition. This is one reason why I will suggest below that the focus of the insertions was not Moses as prophet, but the act of prophecy itself. In summary, the inclusion of Aaron in the insertions makes the theory of Kartveit, Anderson, and Giles unlikely, but it does not support the contrary theory of Lemmelijn, given the established pattern in the earlier editions.

4.3.2 – Previous Explanations of the Third Edition and Their Difficulties

At this point in my analysis, I would like to return briefly to the question of the motivation or reason behind these insertions. Again, the ultimate purpose is to establish a baseline to which we can compare the evidence from the OG. While I am particularly interested in explaining the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative, at this point I must broaden my scope, since it has been assumed that the insertions there are part of a larger phenomenon including all the insertions in the third edition of Exodus. In this section, I will note each of the previously

206 Kartveit, Origin, 284, emphasis mine.
proposed explanations for all of the insertions (summarized in section 4.1 above) and discuss their ability to account for all of the evidence. I will then comment on the state in which we find ourselves—without an explanation that adequately accounts for all the evidence. It should be noted from the outset that all of the explanations are evaluated on the basis of their ability to account for all of the insertions in the third edition of Exodus. Shortly, I will suggest that no such explanation is necessary because we are dealing with separate phenomena; however, since this is the way the issue has been framed (i.e., as one phenomenon), I will here evaluate the explanations on that basis.

First, the notion of “harmonization” and related ideas, proposed by many including Tov and Crawford, has been critiqued by Segal and others.\textsuperscript{207} What we find in the third edition in Exodus is not an attempt to smooth out difficulties or contradictions. Second, Zahn’s idea of “[increasing] the consistency of speech events” is broad enough to include almost all the insertions, but as a result it cannot account for the non-insertions. That is, if the purpose of the insertions was to make “speech events” more consistent between an initial statement and its repetition (or lack thereof), we cannot explain the numerous occasions in which an insertion could have accomplished this (for particular examples, see figure 4.6 below) but was not added. This element of the issue—explaining why insertions did not occur at other places—is discussed in most previous studies\textsuperscript{208} and is crucial for developing a theory of why the insertions were added. Although we might expect some inconsistency on the part of the reviser, in my opinion there are too many non-insertions not fitting this pattern for Zahn’s theory to be correct. Third, Segal’s idea that the insertions function to provide an expected (but missing) source for a later passage accounts for the Deuteronomy-related insertions but not for most of the Ten Plagues insertions, which work in the opposite direction of the examples treated by Segal. Fourth, Sanderson’s proposal that the insertions stem from dramatic or liturgical features (specifically

\textsuperscript{207} See the summary of Segal above; cf. Zahn, \textit{Rethinking}, 147; Kartveit, \textit{Origin}, 275-276.

that heighten the conflict between God and Pharaoh) accounts well for the Ten Plagues insertions but not for the Deuteronomy-related insertions. Fifth, Lemmelijn’s proposal, like Sanderson’s, does not explain the Deuteronomy-related insertions. Her notion that the point of the insertions is to include Aaron, moreover, is untenable given the already established pattern in earlier editions in Exodus where Aaron is included in Moses’s mediation between God and Pharaoh (as argued above in section 4.3.1). Sixth, the suggestion of Kartveit, Anderson, and Giles, that the point of the insertions is to elevate Moses’s status as a prophet, is able to account for most of the data. This theory does not, however, work well with the fact that Aaron is often included in the Ten Plagues insertions (see section 4.3.1); moreover, Moses appears to have elevated status already in earlier editions of Exodus. Numerous non-insertions involve a divine message to someone else, as, for example, to the people of Israel; while these non-insertions thus work with what Kartveit says, one wonders why the elevation of Moses as prophet did not include his fidelity to the task when the message was for Israel. The following chart provides a summary of whether each explanation accounts for each insertion (figure 4.5); a second chart notes whether each proposal can account for the fact that no insertion was made in a place where it perhaps could have been made according to some theories (e.g., a command or a speech act) or where some have theorized as to why no insertion occurred (figure 4.6).


210 In this theory, because insertions cluster around the prophetic idiom יהוה אמר לה in the Ten Plagues narrative, many of the non-insertions within are explained. Moreover, the explicit fulfillment of God’s instructions in the account of the tabernacle construction and the heightening of Moses’s ability to truthfully recount history in Deuteronomy 1-3 are both accounted for.

211 Cf. especially Lemmelijn, “P-Redaction,” 214-218, who asks why there was no insertion for several cases where every theory easily accounts for the lack of an insertion (e.g., 6:6-9; 7:8-14).
### Figure 4.5 - Whether Previous Proposals account for Insertions

* = accounted for  
? = questionable  
~ = accounted for according to theory, but I disagree (see critique above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harmonization</th>
<th>Consistency of Speech Events</th>
<th>Providing source for quote</th>
<th>Dramatic or Liturgical</th>
<th>Inclusion of Aaron</th>
<th>Elevation of Moses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:18</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:29</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1b</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:3//ff</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:3//4:22-23</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:25</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:14 (MT 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:16 (MT 19)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:18 (MT 21)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:18 (MT 21)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:35</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:19</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:29</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:28</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:10</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.6 - Whether Previous Proposals account for Non-insertions

- = accounted for
~ = accounted for according to theory, but I disagree (see critique above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistency of Speech Events</th>
<th>Providing source for quote</th>
<th>Dramatic or Liturgical</th>
<th>Inclusion of Aaron</th>
<th>Elevation of Moses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:14</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:6-9</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:8-14</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:19-20</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:12-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:8-10</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21-22</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:2 “speak”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:3/12:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3-7</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We should not expect any of these theories to account perfectly for all of the data, because humans (such as those responsible for the third edition of Exodus) are not consistent all of the time. That is, we should expect to see some inconsistency. This point is invoked, rightly, by many who have worked on this issue. However, almost none of the theories (the exception being Kartveit et al.’s), even taken on their own terms, has only a few points of inconsistency; rather, large sets of the data are left unaccounted for. Sanderson’s and Lemmelijn’s theories cannot explain the insertions from Deuteronomy; Segal’s theory cannot explain the Ten Plagues

---

212 If the specific words of a speech act are given, but not repeated verbatim (or vice versa), we consider the non-insertion unaccounted for.
213 If Moses is given a message to Aaron or Pharaoh and it is not given (or vice versa), whether verbatim or using “do so,” we consider the non-insertion unaccounted for; if it is a message for Israel, we mark it with ~ (accounted for in theory, but point critiqued).
insertions; Zahn’s theory cannot explain why in so many places insertions were *not* made. The traditional explanations are difficult as well: the idea of Moses fulfilling all of God’s commands can explain the Ten Plagues and tabernacles insertions but not the Deuteronomy-related insertions, whereas the idea of providing fuller detail can explain the Deuteronomy-related insertions but not the Ten Plagues insertions. For almost all of these theories, inconsistency on the part of the scribe cannot explain away the remaining evidence. In the case of Zahn’s theory, one might argue that the scribe was exceptionally inconsistent. For the other theories, however, the existence of a whole body of systematically worked material (either the Ten Plagues narrative or Deuteronomy 1-3) that *does not fit* undermines that theory’s explanatory power. The one exception is the theory of Kartveit, Anderson, and Giles, which, taken on its own terms, applies to nearly all of the data. However, as I argued above in section 4.3.1, the fact that Aaron is included in most insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative is contrary to their theory.

This divide between the Ten Plagues insertions and the Deuteronomy-related insertions seemingly puts us at an impasse. A theory can account for the one or the other, but not both; or, if a theory accounts for both, it is too broad and new problems arise.

4.3.3 – *Two Types of Insertion in the Third Edition of Exodus*

One solution, mentioned above, would be to view the various groups of insertions, which characterize the SP and the third edition of Exodus, as resulting from distinct (albeit similar) phenomena. If we had not one process but two involved in the creation of the third edition of Exodus, we could utilize several of the explanations previously given in tandem to account for the majority of the evidence. The purpose of the Deuteronomy-related insertions could be to provide more details or probably, as Segal has argued, to provide the “source” material for a quote later in the Pentateuch; the purpose of the Ten Plagues insertions could be to show Moses as obedient to God’s commands or to heighten the conflict between God and Pharaoh in a liturgical setting, etc. Although there was probably one scribe behind most or all of these
insertions,\textsuperscript{215} he could easily have had different reasons or motivations for different insertions. The two major sets of insertions simply reflect two different ways of modifying or “improving” (in the scribe’s mind) the text. It is also quite possible that the concerns and practices of the broader community were a driving force in these changes. The scribe who first put these insertions into a written medium may have simply been recording how the text was read in public performance in the community. Moreover, the reasons for the insertions—for example, to show that Moses was obedient to God’s commands—may have stemmed more from the concerns of the community than from the concerns of an individual scribe. To my knowledge, no one has explicitly suggested that there are two separate phenomena at work in the third edition of Exodus—though it seems to be assumed in some places.\textsuperscript{216} This idea solves the aforementioned problem cause by the two related but different sets of evidence.

The handful of other insertions that do not fit the two basic categories simply show that the entwined processes of textual transmission and the textual production was complicated. The distinction between some of these insertions in the third edition of Exodus—for example, in 8:1—and numerous other supposedly minor insertions not included in the third edition—such as those given in figure 4.7 below or those discussed in section 4.4.3—is not entirely clear. Similar insertions found in witnesses not containing the third edition of Exodus show that insertions of this general stripe can arise from different sources. For various reasons that we may never know, some are specific to the third edition of Exodus—being found only in SP and 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}—and others are not. This suggests that some of the insertions found only in SP and 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} may nevertheless be minor and peripheral (i.e., not part of the core of changes constituting the third edition). Figure 4.7 lists the insertions found in other witnesses that overlap with our pattern of large-scale variation.\textsuperscript{217}

\textsuperscript{215} It is possible that multiple scribes were responsible for what we find in the third edition: one for the majority of the Ten Plagues insertions and one for the Deuteronomy-related insertions.

\textsuperscript{216} Ulrich, for example, refers to “two types of addition” and nowhere tries to describe one main factor or phenomenon behind the two types (“Evolutionary Composition,” 32).

\textsuperscript{217} Cf. also Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 216-217 and Tov, Textual Criticism, 82 on overlapping minor “harmonizations.”
Table: Insertions in Various Witnesses Similar to the Third Edition Insertions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insertion</th>
<th>Parallels</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Witnesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:2218 καὶ ἀνήγαγεν τοὺς βατράχους - “and he brought up the frogs”</td>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>command-FULFILLMENT (followed immediately by the corresponding event)</td>
<td>OG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13 תעש ב - “and they did so”</td>
<td>8:12</td>
<td>command-FULFILLMENT</td>
<td>SP, MT, 4QExod?, 4QpaleoExodm?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:3 והשאילום - “and they will grant their requests”</td>
<td>12:26</td>
<td>FORETELLING-event</td>
<td>SP, OG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:21-28220 (description of the ordination of priests)</td>
<td>Lev 8:22-30</td>
<td>COMMAND-fulfilment</td>
<td>4QpaleoExodm, SP, MT, OG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:9 ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראותי את השם הזה هنا את קשת ערך הזה - “The LORD said to Moses, I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are.”</td>
<td>Deut 9:13</td>
<td>STATEMENT-quote</td>
<td>4QpaleoExodm, SP, MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These insertions are not typically considered to be the work of the one scribe responsible for the third edition of Exodus, because they are not found solely in SP or “proto-SP” manuscripts. In addition to this evidence, we also find similar changes in other Hebrew manuscripts (the formerly-titled “4QRP” manuscripts) that are not present in the first three editions of Exodus or in the witnesses SP, MT, or OG.220 In these cases, a different redaction produced similar types of large-scale variants. For this reason, Crawford wisely considers all of the insertions that seem to follow a similar pattern, both in the third edition of Exodus and in various other editions/traditions, in her attempt to characterize them.221 The idea of multiple impetuses behind these types of insertions is already recognized based on external evidence. Why, then, must we view all of the third edition of Exodus insertions—including the Deuteronomy-related expansions and the Ten Plagues expansions—as resulting from the same impetus?

---

218 For a discussion, see Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts?*, 154-156, whose reasoning I find convincing on this point.
221 Crawford, “Pentateuch.”
The notion of two distinct phenomena is not merely a convenient way to account for all of the insertions in Exodus; rather, it is the logical way to account for the discrepancies between them, based on both internal and external evidence. If two separate phenomena were at work, whether produced by a single scribe or by multiple scribes, we could account for most of the insertions in Exodus. When we add in the factor of scribal inconsistency and when we consider the overlap of some supposedly third edition insertions with other insertions found in non-third edition witnesses like MT and OG, the various other insertions that do not belong to one of these two groups (for example, the insertion in 8:1) are logically accounted for. This theory greatly simplifies the issues and allows us to “divide and conquer” in our accounts of the data.

For the Deuteronomy-related insertions, I find Segal’s explanation compelling, that the insertions make up for missing material mentioned in Deuteronomy. For the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative, the key seems to be the presence of the phrase יְהוָה אָמַר הַכָּה ("thus says the Lord"). This phrase is a hallmark of prophetic utterance, found throughout the prophetic literature and in narrative sections of the Hebrew Bible describing prophetic activity. Because of the place of Aaron in the third edition, the insertions do not have the purpose of elevating Moses as an ideal prophet. Aaron is the one designated as God’s prophet in Exodus 7:1-2. There, God tells Moses, “See, I have made you like God to Pharaoh, and your brother Aaron shall be your prophet.” Moreover, Aaron is included in almost all of the insertions. However, the insertions do not have the purpose of elevating Aaron, either: there was already an established pattern in Exodus where Moses was said to receive God’s command to relay a message, but Moses and Aaron were described as delivering it.

Given these considerations, I find that the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative have something to do with prophecy (given the presence of יְהוָה אָמַר הַכָּה but not with any individual as a prophet. Perhaps these insertions are about the prominence of prophecy itself. There seems to be a trend in late Second Temple literature to identify earlier Scriptures as prophetic; for example, the Psalms are read as prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. This
trend corresponds to the shift in notions of prophecy from delivery of God’s message in an oral context to inspired interpretation of Scripture in a literary context. In other words, literary developments related to the idea of prophecy were on the rise during the late Second Temple period. As such, it is not surprising to see textual development related to prophecy in the Ten Plagues narrative in Third Exodus.

4.3.4 – Summary

In this section, we noted some important shared aspects of the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative, namely the absence of a command or more often a fulfillment, the use of the phrase הוה אמר, the impact of the existing structure of the narrative on the ways in which each insertion is introduced, and a consistent change in grammar to the verb of speaking involved. We then stepped back and evaluated the explanatory power of previous theories on the entire third edition of Exodus. Finding them lacking, I proposed that multiple phenomena were actually at work in the third edition, and therefore it is appropriate to attempt to address them separately. The Ten Plagues insertions are related to the increase of literary developments involving prophecy in the Second Temple period.

4.4 – Comparison to OG Evidence and Phenomena

The preceding sections fleshed out the contours and character of large-scale variation within the Hebrew manuscripts, focusing on the insertions that entail a third edition of Exodus. In this section, I will compare data in the OG to these insertions and the overall pattern of variation. As we will see, there is little in the OG of Exodus 1-14 that resembles the large-scale variants in the third edition of Exodus. Even looking for any sort of difference in OG that might be similar in any way, there are few candidates. The comparable data from OG considered below include one extended insertion in 4:18, command-fulfillment insertions, and content mirroring

insertions. A few of the insertions have the same level of significance as one insertion in the third edition of Exodus might have, but they do not together make up a systematic change to the book. In other words, these are “isolated interpretive insertions,” not large-scale variants. Therefore, OG does not contain the sort of change found in the third edition. Unlike the individual variants investigated in Chapter Three, where the OG was comparable to the Hebrew manuscript evidence, the OG is not comparable to the Hebrew manuscripts at the level of large-scale variation. The difference, however, goes in the opposite manner than some might expect—the OG translation is a more exact representation of its parent text.

4.4.1 – The Isolated Extended Insertion in OG Exodus 4:18

In the Ten Plagues narrative, there is only one isolated insertion in OG longer than four words. At the end of 4:18 (in the Gottingen numbering; in Rahlfs, at the beginning of 4:19), OG inserts, “and after these many days the king of Egypt died” (μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς πολλὰς ἐκεῖνας ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου). It is not entirely clear why this clause, seemingly taken from 2:23, was inserted at this point. Wevers suggests that it helps transition from verse 18 to verse 19, while Daniel Gurtner sees the insertion as creating a “thematic tie to [2:23].” What is clear enough is that this insertion, the only extended plus in the OG Ten Plagues narrative, does not resemble the insertions in the third edition of Exodus discussed above. It does not involve a command, fulfillment, statement, or quote, and there are no contextual or structural clues that prompted the insertion. Moreover, it does not belong to a larger pattern of variants. Therefore, we must look elsewhere, at shorter changes and insertions in OG, for evidence comparable to the third edition of Exodus.

225 Wevers, Exodus, 51.
226 Gurtner, Exodus, 226.
4.4.2 - Command-Fulfillment Insertions in OG

Like the third edition of Exodus, the OG contains some insertions providing the missing fulfillment of a command (or the missing command for an existing fulfillment). Moreover, command-fulfillment insertions are found in other Hebrew witnesses as well. The OG insertions and the non-third edition insertions are detailed in figure 4.7 above. At the most, OG contains two of these insertions; one of these, in Exodus 29:21-28, is a very early insertion (typically considered to occur prior to the stage of textual transmission, though the distinction is dubious), since it is contained in all extant manuscripts. The other case, in 8:2, occurs only in OG. The following is the text of Exodus 8:1-2 in the shortest version, represented in MT:

1And the LORD said to Moses, “Say to Aaron, ‘Stretch out your hand with your rod over the rivers, over the canals, and over the pools, and cause frogs to come upon the land of Egypt!’” 2So Aaron stretched out his hand over the waters of Egypt; and the frogs came up and covered the land of Egypt. (RSV)

In this passage, God commands Moses to tell Aaron to perform an action in 8:1. In the third edition of Exodus, in an insertion at the end of 8:1, Moses fulfills this command, but in all other witnesses the narrative moves immediately to 8:2a, where Aaron performs the action. In 8:2b, the result of the action—that frogs come up on the land of Egypt—occurs. OG inserts a short phrase at the end of 8:2a filling out the parallel of Aaron’s action to Moses’s command: καὶ ἀνήγαγεν τοὺς βατράχους (or ἀνήγαγεν τοὺς βατράχους ἤτοι τοὺς βατράχους) and he brought up the

---

227 Or, the parallel passage in Leviticus 8 may be secondary, based on the primary passage in Exod 29:21-28; cf. Durham, Exodus, 394.
228 8:5 in the OG.
229 The third edition of Exodus inserts here.
230 OG inserts_here.
231 OG has a small minus at the end of verse one: it lacks (or) here.
232 Reconstructing a preterite verb, which is grammatically preferable.
233 Reconstructing a qatal verb, which is perhaps more likely from a text-critical standpoint.
frogs”); the similar phrase at the beginning of 8:2b, καὶ ἀνεβιβάσθη ὁ βάτραχος (ותעל הצפרדע), seems redundant, but when seen as part of the corresponding event this redundancy makes sense:234 within the command-fulfillment framework of God’s command to Moses in 8:1, this insertion in 8:2a is part of the event following the fulfillment (i.e., what happens as a result of Moses imparting God’s command); however, in the framework of Moses’s command to Aaron, this is the fulfillment of the command. In this way, the OG insertion in 8:2a parallels the insertion in 8:1b found in SP.

Comparing these data to what we see in the transmission of the Hebrew text, there are obviously many more insertions of this type in the Hebrew manuscripts. In SP and 4QpaleoExodm, there are numerous insertions like this (discussed above in section 4.2). Even excluding the third edition of Exodus, we find a command-fulfillment insertion in the Hebrew manuscripts in 8:13 (not in OG), and a similar statement-quote insertion in 32:9 (again, not in OG). Thus, the OG contains fewer significant insertions of this sort than the Hebrew manuscripts.

4.4.3 - Content Mirroring Insertions in OG

Lemmelijn’s study offers several good examples of content mirroring insertions in Exodus 7:14-11:10.235 By “content mirroring,” I mean a small insertion that serves to make two parallel passages—that is, passages, usually near each other, that relate essentially the same thing within different frameworks—exactly the same, or at least more nearly the same.236 These content mirroring insertions are similar to the insertions in the third edition of Exodus discussed above, although they are isolated, not carried out consistently, and not distinctive or

---

234 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 154-156.
235 Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 150-196.
236 In 10:12, for example, SP and OG insert פִּרְי מִדְרַדְרָא ἀντί (“all of that which the hail allowed to remain”: found in MT) resulting in פִּרְי מִדְרַדְרָא (“every fruit of the tree which the hail allowed to remain”), in order to reflect 10:15’s פִּרְי מִדְרַדְרָא (“every fruit of the tree which the hail left”).
characteristic of any one witness. First, two cases are found solely in OG: 8:12 (mirroring 8:13), 237 and 9:29 (mirroring 9:18, 23). 238 Second, three cases are found in OG and other textual witnesses: 9:28 (found in OG and 2QExoda; mirroring 9:23-24), 239 10:12 (found in OG and SP; mirroring 10:13-15), 240 and 11:2 (found in OG and SP; mirroring 3:22 and 12:35; discussed briefly in section 4.2.4 above). 241 Third, there are three cases where OG preserves the earlier reading but Hebrew manuscripts have the content-mirroring insertion: 9:25 (found in MT and SP; mirroring 9:18-19), 242 10:5 (found in SP and 4QpaleoExodm; mirroring 10:13-15), 243 and 10:13 (found in SP; mirroring 10:12). 244 Comparing the OG and the Hebrew witnesses in terms of these minor content-mirroring insertions in Lemmelijn’s corpus, we see that there is little difference between the translation and the transmitted manuscripts. Of the eight cases of minor content-mirroring, five are present in OG compared to six in Hebrew manuscripts. Comparing OG to a single Hebrew manuscript witness, there are five total occurrences in OG (three of which most likely stem from a variant Vorlage) and five total occurrences in SP and two uniquely attested instances in OG compared to one uniquely attested in SP.

Another instance of content-mirroring was discussed above, where SP and OG have והשאילום (“they will let them have what they ask”) to mirror the recollection of the event in 12:36. In our discussion above (see section 4.2.4), we asked whether this variant patterned with the rest of the large-scale variants found only in SP and 4QpaleoExodm. Although it contains a significant detail for the narrative and its insertion highly resembles the distinctive third edition insertions, it is not necessarily aligned with the third edition; instead, it is an isolated minor insertion. If we consider this variant, then, to be a minor content mirroring insertion, we would

237 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 163-164.
238 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 178.
239 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 177.
240 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 184.
241 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 191-192.
242 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 176.
244 See Lemmelijn, A Plague of Texts?, 185.
add to our numbers above one occurrence for total occurrences in OG, for total occurrences in the Hebrew manuscripts, and for total occurrences in SP, none of which would alter the fact that little difference exists between the OG and the Hebrew manuscripts. When the minor content-mirroring insertions are considered, therefore, we find little difference between the data in the OG translation and the data in the Hebrew manuscripts. More importantly, none of these variants are part of a large-scale variant pattern, and therefore none of these data in the OG are comparable to the changes found in the third edition of Exodus in the Hebrew manuscripts.

4.4.4 – Summary

The large-scale variant pattern found in the third edition of Exodus is systematic and introduces significant change to the content of the book. OG contains some isolated insertions resembling the impactful changes in the third edition insertions, but these are not added systematically or consistently. Thus, the few examples contained in OG Exodus 1-14 are hardly comparable to the widespread and systematic change effected by the insertions in the third edition of Exodus; there are no variants that qualify as a large-scale variant pattern. There are many fewer command-fulfillment insertions, no statement-quote insertions, and around the same number of minor content-mirroring insertions.

This point—that the OG contains no large-scale variation comparable to the third edition of Exodus—is true not only of the presumed Vorlage of the OG but also of the OG as a translation, including any elements that arose in translation. It should be noted that, if we were to look beyond our corpus to the account of the tabernacle construction later in Exodus, we would see an example of large-scale variance between the OG and the Hebrew manuscripts, while among the Hebrew manuscripts themselves there is no large-scale variance. In that case, however, the OG contains the earlier version of the text; in other words, it is the tradition behind all of the Hebrew evidence that is responsible for the large-scale differences with OG found
there.\textsuperscript{245} Returning to our corpus, Exod 1-14, the translation in OG contains \textit{less} large-scale variation than several of the Hebrew manuscripts; whereas the \textit{translator} is often dismissed as an untrustworthy producer of change, in fact the \textit{scribes} involved in this case study are much less likely to reproduce the parent text exactly. Of course, there are Hebrew manuscripts that are just as conservative as OG with regard to large-scale variants; thus, it is more accurate to say that OG resembles these witnesses and is dissimilar to 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and SP specifically. From that perspective, we see that OG falls within the range of the levels of variation found in Hebrew manuscripts.

\textbf{4.5 - Conclusion}

The variant pattern found primarily in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and SP provides an excellent example of large-scale, or edition level, variation. My analysis sought both to present the data—the actual text and changes of the 11 insertions—and to provide an account of these data, by answering the \textit{why} and \textit{by whom} questions. We saw that the insertions in the third edition of Exodus almost always involve the pairing of two parts of the text, whether \textit{command} and \textit{fulfillment}, \textit{statement} and \textit{quote}, or \textit{event} and \textit{recall}. Often, these pairings involve speech acts (e.g., many, but not all, of the \textit{command-fulfillment} pairs involve God’s command to Moses \textit{to say something}). The effect of the insertions is to provide the missing half of the given pair. Digging deeper into the data, we saw that some particular aspects of the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative were not shared by the insertions based on material in Deuteronomy and, moreover, that accounts of the third edition of Exodus by-and-large fail to account for both of these sets of data. As a result, I proposed that at least two different phenomena are actually at work in the data. Being thus freed to focus on an explanation particular to the Ten Plagues insertions, I suggested that notions of prophecy were behind these insertions. From generalities to specifics, then, this is the shape and character of the large-scale variant pattern found in

\textsuperscript{245} Aejmelaeus, \textit{On the Trail}, 107-121.
Exodus 1-14 in the Hebrew manuscripts.

Armed with this understanding of the variation present in the Hebrew manuscripts, I then considered how the OG evidence might compare. I found that there is little to compare with the third edition of Exodus. Considering several types of data—an extended insertion, command-fulfillment insertions, and content mirroring insertions—I found that no large-scale variation exists in the OG data, and thus there is no parallel to what we find in the Hebrew manuscripts. I concluded, therefore, that in these types of variants in my corpus, the OG translation is not just as “faithful” to its parent text as the Hebrew manuscripts, it is actually more faithful. If our measuring stick for success is accurate representation of the parent text, the process of translation surpasses the process of transmission in this corpus.
5 – Conclusion

The text-critic is in many senses a historian, taking the evidence available and attempting to understand an object from the past—the text and its various iterations through the transmission process. As with all areas of history, the evidence is not complete, and as such a certain amount of reconstruction is necessary. Working from the observable and verifiable facts from our physical evidence, the historian constructs a reasonable version of how these points of evidence fit together, along with corollary points that are arguably true given the overall reconstruction. At the same time, however, the text-critic attempts to establish and follow certain methodological guidelines. In other words, reconstruction of the transmission history of a text should not be done *ad hoc* with no regard to previous scholarship and basic logical principles.

The issue of the use of the OG in textual criticism of the HB falls at the intersection of these two concerns, at a point of tension between maximal reconstruction and methodological constraint. On the one hand, the OG presents a wealth of evidence that could be used to reconstruct the history of the text. On the other hand, the fact that the OG is a translation raises red flags for many scholars—traditionally, the mainstream of scholars. These often articulate or implicitly follow rules like the following: that the OG should not be used when no existing Hebrew manuscript has the same reading or that the OG should be presumed to translate the MT if the MT is possible as a source text. There is tension, then, between scholars who want to use the OG to its fullest potential in reconstruction of the text and those for whom rigid methodological constraints should be followed. In this study, I have attempted to shift the balance in the direction of fuller use of OG to reconstruct the history of the text.

5.1 – The Argument of This Study

The present study enters into this struggle between the value of OG evidence and the limits imposed by translation. Rather than providing a comprehensive, final statement on the methodology of using the OG in textual criticism, I have brought a particular set of questions, the answers to which I hope will re-orient the discussion and challenge the resistance that some maintain concerning the OG as a translation. The questions I have posed revolve around a few
basic concepts: the extent of the affinity between differences arising in translation and textual variants, the methodological difficulty of distinguishing between a variant Vorlage and translator change, and the significance of a version of the Hebrew text existing in the mind of the translator.

Scholars agree that scribes and OG translators made similar changes to the text, but did they do so to the same extent and for the same reasons? The results of this study suggest a likely response, based on a theoretical comparison of translation and transmission (Chapter Two), an in-depth textual comparison of individual variants in OG Exodus and the Hebrew manuscripts (Chapter Three), and a consideration of the presence or absence of large-scale variants in Exodus 1-14 in the OG and the Hebrew manuscripts (Chapter Four). When the basic aspects of translation from Greek to Hebrew—that is, translation technique—are excluded, scribes and OG translators can be seen to do the same things with the text, to the same extent and for the same reasons. Translation does not entail more variation than transmission, and there are no particular types of variation or difference that characterize either process more than the other.

How are we to know whether a variant in OG stems from the translator or the Vorlage? Often, decisions about the source of differences like scribal errors, insertions, or “interpretive” variants belong to the intuition and biases of the scholar making the decision. Since all these types of variants, however, can be found in isomorphic translation and transmission and, moreover, appear with similar distribution, we cannot tell if scribal error, sense variation, or linguistic variation reflected in the OG stems from the translator or from his Vorlage. We cannot really distinguish between the activities of translators and scribes in this regard, and thus we should not attempt to do so.¹ Does the translator construct an idea of what the Hebrew is in his mind before translating into Greek? Like the reader of any text, the audience of a text, and scribes transmitting a text, the translator reads and comprehends the Hebrew Vorlage as he goes about his task, and as such a version of the Hebrew text is constructed in his mind.

¹ Notable in this regard is Aejmelaeus’s study on Exodus, where she attempts to differentiate whether changes stem from translation or from a variant Vorlage (On the Trail, 93-103). Her primary criteria, however, deal with translation technique; that is, she attributes change to the translator when clear translation technique evidence points in that direction, as I have done in this study. If there is no translation technique evidence pointing to translator change, Aejmelaeus instead considers text-critical explanations of the data (i.e., considering whether there was a variant Vorlage).
One final question elicits the central thesis of this study. Why do we see the same types of changes in the OG and in Hebrew Bible manuscripts? We see the same types of change because the translation that occurs in the OG and the transmission of Hebrew manuscripts are fundamentally similar processes. Each of the chapters of this study contributes to this thesis in one way or another. Chapter One laid a methodological foundation in understanding textual criticism, translation technique, the use of the Septuagint for textual criticism, and other prolegomena. Chapter Two considered the possible similarities of translation and transmission through several theoretical angles, specifically, a consideration of transmission as translation and a consideration of translation as transmission, applying intralingual translation and the idea of a mental Hebrew text to the Hebrew manuscripts and OG. In both considerations, I found that the one process could be conceived of as an instance of the other, showing their similarity. Chapter Three first executed an in-depth analysis of the individual variants in OG and the Hebrew manuscripts, and then undertook a comparative analysis of this data. I found that the frequency and distribution of variants in translation and transmission correspond to a high degree, again showing the similarity of translation and transmission. Finally, Chapter Four investigated large-scale variants in Exodus 1-14, chiefly the insertions that characterize the “third edition” of Exodus. This investigation showed a low level of similarity between OG and some of the Hebrew manuscripts, because nothing comparable to the Third Edition insertions can be found in OG. Given that other Hebrew witnesses do not contain the large-scale variations, however, in the context of our main question we can see that OG falls within the range of what is found in the Hebrew manuscripts.

In what follows, I will briefly summarize in greater detail the arguments of the comparisons found in Chapters Two, Three, and Four, and highlight their contribution to the establishment of my thesis—that translation and transmission are significantly similar.

5.1.1 – Theoretical Comparisons of Translation and Transmission

Chapter Two discusses the various ways in which transmission and translation—and in particular, the transmission of HB manuscripts and the isomorphic translation of the OG—are
similar. This discussion justifies the main angle of this study (a comparison of OG translation to Hebrew manuscript transmission), independently shows the overlap of translation and transmission, and generates the hypotheses of what we will expect to find in the comparative analysis in Chapter Three. In Chapter Two, I first consider the transmission of the HB as an instance of intralingual translation. Since intralingual translation and interlingual translation are essentially the same kind of process, the intralingual translation found within HB manuscript transmission is fundamentally similar to interlingual translation such as that found in OG. This consideration of transmission as intralingual translation led to a conceptual mapping of OG phenomena, HB transmission phenomena, interlingual translation, and intralingual translation, in which the constituent parts of all four correspond with one another. Building on this conceptual mapping, I consider the isomorphic character of translation in OG as an instance of transmission, corresponding to the rote copying found (at points) in transmission. Apart from the transfer of meaning necessitated by linguistic barriers between Greek and Hebrew, isomorphism is essentially rote copying. Finally, I propose another way in which OG translation resembles HB transmission: the OG translator, as part of his reading of the text, constructs a mental text in Hebrew—a mid-point between the physical Vorlage and the translation—that is then translated into Greek. The presence of such a mental text seems self-evident when the process of translation is considered, and moreover it helps explain why so many of the same types of change occur in both translation and transmission.

The consideration of transmission as translation relies on the authoritative work of Karen Zethsen on intralingual translation. After introducing the concept, I argue that intralingual translation and interlingual translation are one and the same process. I then show that much of the variation we find in HB manuscript transmission is intralingual translation. The implication is clear: if intralingual translation and interlingual translation are the same kind of process and aspects of HB manuscript transmission are intralingual translation, then HB manuscript transmission and an interlingual translation like the OG to some extent involve the same kind of process. I then present a conceptual model that suggests, among other things, that there is an aspect of preservation in the translation of OG.
In the consideration of transmission as translation, I explore what exactly this aspect of preservation is. When we conceptualize textual transmission, the core idea seems to be the preservation of one text as it is passes from one physical document to another. Translation in the OG resembles this core aspect of transmission in several ways. First, I explore how the isomorphism of the OG resembles and overlaps with the rote copying of textual transmission. Second, I connect the dots between isomorphic translation’s resemblance to transmission, textual transmission’s resemblance to intralingual translation, and most importantly the obvious fact of scribal error in the text of OG. What all of these factors suggest is that in the translation of OG (and any translation, for that matter), there is an intermediary step between the Vorlage or source text and the target text: a mental version, in Hebrew, of the source text. Whether the translator was aware of it or not, there existed a version of the Hebrew text in the mind of the translator, based on the physical Vorlage but not necessarily identical to it. In other words, the translation process does not involve one single move from the physical Vorlage directly to the physical text of the translation; rather, in the translator’s mind there are additional intermediary stages, appropriately conceived of as texts, through which this move is channeled. Insofar as translators read and understood the Hebrew Vorlage before translating, constructing a virtual Hebrew text in their minds, they resemble the scribes who also read and understood their Hebrew Vorlage before copying their mental Hebrew text onto a new manuscript.

Chapter Two shows that translation can be thought of as transmission and that transmission can be thought of as translation. The ways in which the framework of one works to describe the other are the ways in which these two processes overlap.

5.1.2 – Comparative Analysis of Individual Variants in Translation and Transmission

In Chapter Three, I compare the processes of translation and transmission by looking at the individual variants that arise in both. Utilizing a framework that categorizes variants as scribal error, sense variants, or linguistic variants, I compare the types of variant found in each process, their quantity, and their distribution among various subcategories. The results of this comparative analysis show that translation in the OG and transmission in the Hebrew
manuscripts are very similar with respect to individual variants. After explaining the methodology I use to carry out the comparative analysis, I give a number of examples of my textual analysis and the data it creates, using a variety of thematic categories to further organize the discussion. The full data for this analysis are also presented in appendices A and B.

I then use these data in a comparative analysis. In the methodology section of this chapter, I hypothesize that non-translation technique differences in the OG occur mostly in OG’s Vorlage or in the mental Hebrew text of the translator and that most the processes involved in transmission also occur in translation. The expected result of my study, based on these hypotheses, is that the quantity of variants in OG Exodus 1 and their distribution among different subcategories will generally coincide with the variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. What our data show is that the OG does not contain more (or fewer) variants than the Hebrew manuscripts, and the types of variation in both data sets occur in similar frequency, showing the similarity of the translation process in OG and the transmission process in Hebrew manuscripts. In Exodus 1, OG contains 20 cases of unique, unsupported difference (2.86 per 100 words); the extant Hebrew manuscripts contain 39 cases (4.24 per 100 words) where witnesses disagree. Seeking to make the most accurate comparison possible, I compare the number of uniquely attested readings in OG to the number of uniquely attested readings in 2QExodᵃ, 4QExodᵇ, and SP. When the OG is plotted on the same axis as the Hebrew manuscripts, it falls within the range of what is present in the Hebrew manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scribal Errors</th>
<th>Per 100 Words</th>
<th>Sense Variants</th>
<th>Per 100 Words</th>
<th>Linguistic Variants</th>
<th>Per 100 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExodᵃ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExodᵇ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OG data and Hebrew manuscripts data are quite similar in terms of their particular scribal errors, sense variants, and linguistic variants. They contain the same types of variation in similar quantities. Besides this similarity of distribution, I note that the specific variants involved
in three types of sense variation—logic, expansion, and synonym substitution—and one type of
linguistic variation—smoothing—are particularly similar between the two sets of data.
Moreover, we see the same specific processes behind the OG’s smoothing variants as we see in
the MT—both level the grammatical number of Israel—and behind the OG’s logic variants and
those in the SP—both change the list of Jacob’s children to have the same structure. At the same
time, OG uses slightly different methods to bring about the same purpose: plural instead of
singular number and removing waw instead of adding waw to form the lists. Thus, OG does not
stem from the same parent text as MT and SP in these two areas, but the processes of change
involved are essentially identical to the processes at work in MT and SP.

The data point clearly to one conclusion: the way in which the OG differs from the
Hebrew manuscripts is within the acceptable or expected range and manner of how the Hebrew
manuscripts themselves differ among one another. As I predicted based on my hypotheses, the
quantity of variants in OG Exodus 1 and their distribution amongst different subcategories
generally coincide with the variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. This supports the conclusion
that, with regard to individual variants, translation in the OG is equivalent in many ways to
transmission in the Hebrew manuscripts.

5.1.3 – Comparison of Large-Scale Variation in Translation and Transmission

Chapter Four focuses on large-scale variation. There are no large-scale variants in the OG
of Exodus 1-14, but significant large-scale variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. As such, Chapter
Four focuses mainly on the evidence in Hebrew manuscripts, returning to a comparison with the
OG at the end. I seek to understand why the insertions in Exodus 1-14 were made, in order to
have a fuller idea of what exactly to contrast with the OG. Thus, in Chapter Four I both address
the issue of the variants characteristic of the third edition of Exodus and provide an example of
what large-scale variation in the Hebrew manuscripts involves.

My analysis seeks both to present the data—the actual text and changes of the 11
insertions—and provide an account of these data. The insertions in the third edition of Exodus
almost always involve the pairing of two parts of the text, whether command and fulfillment,
statement and quote, or event and recall. Often, these pairings involve speech acts (e.g., many, but not all, of the command-fulfillment pairs involve God’s command to Moses to say something). The effect of the insertions is to provide the missing half of the given pair. Digging deeper into the data, I show that some particular aspects of the insertions in the Ten Plagues narrative were not shared by the insertions based on material in Deuteronomy and, moreover, that accounts of the third edition of Exodus by-and-large fail to account for both of these sets of data. As a result, I propose that at least two different phenomena are actually at work in the data. Focusing on an explanation particular to the Ten Plagues insertions, I find that הוהי statements are typically paired with insertions.

I then move on to a comparison with the OG, noting that there is little in the OG of Exodus 1-14 that resembles the large-scale variants in the third edition of Exodus. Considering several types of data—an extended insertion in 4:18, command-fulfillment insertions, and content mirroring insertions—I find that no large-scale variation exists in the OG data, and thus there is no parallel to what we find in the Hebrew manuscripts. OG contains some isolated insertions resembling the changes in the third edition insertions, but these are not added systematically or consistently. Thus, the few examples contained in OG Exodus 1-14 are hardly comparable to the widespread and systematic change effected by the insertions in the third edition of Exodus; there are no variants that qualify as a large-scale variant pattern. This point—that the OG contains no large-scale variation comparable to the third edition of Exodus—is true not only of the presumed Vorlage of the OG but also of the OG as a translation, including any elements that arose in translation. The OG resembles the more “conservative” witnesses, such as the MT, that do not contain the insertions, falling within the range of the levels of variation found in Hebrew manuscripts.

5.1.4 – Summary

Though the methods and procedures involved in each differ, the results of the comparisons in Chapters Two, Three, and Four all point in the same direction: translation and transmission are remarkably similar. Both seek to change the text in light of their target
audiences; both begin by reading and comprehending the Vorlage; and both contain the same amount of individual variants in the same distribution. Moreover, significant and widespread change is not more characteristic of translation than transmission; rather, in Exodus 1-14 we find the opposite to be true.

5.2 – Implications

If I have argued successfully that OG translation and Hebrew manuscript transmission are fundamentally similar in important ways, there are significant implications. First, my study calls for a more nuanced idea of the processes involved in translation. The simple comparison of the Hebrew text with the OG text is not sufficient. Numerous steps occurred between these two stages. Most notable in this study is the step wherein the translator reads the Hebrew and holds the Hebrew text in his mind before transferring to Greek. This study suggests that we need to re-orient how we think about translation in the OG.

Second, there are a host of implications for how we use the OG in textual criticism of the HB. In general, we should be more liberal in our use of OG evidence. By this I do not mean taking greater liberality in reconstructing the Hebrew Vorlage, where thorough research in translation technique should be done to provide a solid basis for the reconstruction. Rather, I refer to the question of whether any particular change was made in translation or in the Vorlage. When the Greek of OG can be isomorphically mapped onto grammatical Hebrew, we should seriously consider that the Greek represents that Hebrew. So long as the OG isomorphically represents grammatical Hebrew, it is nearly impossible to determine whether the insertion or change derives from the Vorlage’s scribe or the translator. Since we cannot tell whether OG’s Vorlage contained the reading or whether it existed only in the mind of the translator, I suggest that we use the Hebrew represented in OG for textual criticism. Moreover, the assumption that translation necessitates more change—and the corollary notion that, as a result, we can seldom use OG—should be abandoned, because translation does not necessitate greater change. The evidence drawn from my case study of Exodus 1-14 shows that this is not the case: those who translated were, on average, just as faithful as those who transmitted the text. Their activity falls
within the range of the activity of scribes evidence in the Hebrew evidence. As a result, our
default position should perhaps be that the OG reading reflects Hebrew,² taking the view that it
arose in the transfer to Greek only when there are significant reasons to do so.³

Third, I see some practical implications for methodology used in various fields. In
general, I find that this study illustrates the need for OG scholars to be highly informed on HB
text-critical issues. In addition to being aware of the extant text-critical data, Septuagintalists
should also be aware of the quality and types of change that occur in manuscript tradition, in
order to have a better feel for what might stem from the OG’s Vorlage, even if the OG reading is
not supported in any physical evidence. Similarly, text-critics benefit from a rigorous
understanding of Septuagint Studies. Particularly essential is an understanding of the study of
translation technique.⁴ If a scholar proposes a reconstruction the Vorlage of the OG, he or she
must first establish the translation technique of the OG and follow it carefully. Finally, in
systematic treatments of HB textual criticism, the various phenomena in manuscript transmission
should be treated simultaneously with translation. In other words, there should not be two, but
only one, section on phenomena like “extended insertions” or “contextual exegesis,” treating
both Hebrew manuscripts and translations simultaneously.

In addition to Textual Criticism and Septuagint Studies, Biblical Studies in general would
benefit from a more open view of the OG. When a book or passage is studied, the OG version of
that passage should be included in the study. For example, in studies on scribalism in the ancient
world, the OG is only considered insofar as it witnesses to a Hebrew Vorlage. Considered on its
own, however, the processes involved in the production of the OG could illuminate new aspects
of scribal activity.⁵ Moreover, focusing a study on the Hebrew text behind an OG book, even if
we are not sure that text had a physical existence (i.e., it was a mental text or pseudo text), would

² This position is promoted, though for slightly different reasons, by Aejmelaus: “All in all, the scholar who
wishes to attribute deliberate changes, harmonizations, completion of details and new accents to the translator is
under the obligation to prove his thesis with weighty arguments and also to show why the divergences cannot
have originated with the Vorlage” (On the Trail, 85; cf. also 82 and 103).
³ Note that this only entails we admit the presumed OG Vorlage as evidence in the text critical endeavor;
determining the place of that reading in the textual history, for example whether it is an early reading or not, is a
different process.
⁴ So Aejmelaus, On the Trail, 72-74, 76-77.
⁵ As can be seen in Wright, “Scribes, Translators and the Formation of Authoritative Scripture.”
be of value. Just as the OG is of value as a Greek text without reference to a Hebrew source text,\textsuperscript{6} the presumed Hebrew source behind its isomorphic Greek is of value as a Hebrew text without reference to its text-critical value.

Fourth, my study calls for further research in related areas. While this study offers a variety of different arguments based on a significant amount of data, further work could be done to verify the conclusions reached here. Specifically, the sort of comparative analysis carried out in Chapter Three could be fruitfully applied to several other texts, both to add more data to our knowledge and to explore how less isomorphic texts—such as OG Isaiah—compare to OG Exodus. Moving beyond translation in OG, similar analyses could be performed on other ancient versions, for example the Latin, Syriac, and Aramaic translations of the HB. Finally, the theoretical advancements offered in Chapter Two are in no way comprehensive portrayals of the texts involved. Much further work could be done to integrate the insights there with traditional text-critical approaches, the more recent models that emphasize orality, and other new frameworks for doing textual criticism,\textsuperscript{7} to portray Hebrew and Greek texts and the various aspects of their development more accurately.

In addition to research that would employ the same methods I have used here, further study that extends the range of comparison would be valuable. Here I have compared the processes of translation and transmission and the data involved in both. A further exploration of the actual people involved, translators and scribes, would be insightful.\textsuperscript{8} Such a study would consider whether translators belonged to the same social and vocational communities as scribes, and, moreover, whether translators were scribes, as suggested recently by Wright.\textsuperscript{9} A close reading of ancient Jewish texts that mention translators, a comparison to translators in the Greco-Roman world, and a comparison of ancient scribal culture with what we know about translation

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. Wevers, Exodus, xvi.
\textsuperscript{7} For example, in Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors.”
\textsuperscript{8} To be clear, I do not consider these two groups of people to be mutually exclusive; this study suggests, and I think further research would corroborate, that scribes were the people who translated texts in the ancient Jewish world (that is, translators were scribes).
\textsuperscript{9} Wright, “Scribes, Translators and the Formation of Authoritative Scripture.” If scribes were the translators of the day, this would explain why translation and transmission seem to contain about the same amount of editorial activity, as shown in the present study.
culture in the premodern and modern world, would provide possible avenues for exploring this issue. Regarding ancient scribal culture and translation culture, Person’s description of the norms involved in scribalism, stemming from the scribe’s professional community, highly resembles Toury’s description of norms in translation (regardless of time and culture). In both settings, norms stem from community concerns and are learned from colleagues in the same profession. A study focusing on these aspects of translators, scribes, and their social settings would complement Wright’s discussion of translation and scribalism.

Finally, one specific aspect of scribalism, what is referred to as “rewriting,” presents itself as the alter ego of intralingual translation. Like rewriting, translation involves elements of change beyond mere linguistic updates: additions, omissions, and restructuring of content typify intralingual translation. Moreover, the identifiable strategies and motivations of rewriting are similar to those of translation. Some excellent questions could be asked to explore the nature of rewriting vis a vis translation. Is part or all of the process of rewriting one and the same with intralingual translation? Are “rewritten” texts cases of ancient intralingual translation? Such a consideration of rewriting in the framework of translation would develop our knowledge of translation, rewriting, and scribalism. I have begun exploring the relationship of translation and rewriting in several forthcoming publications.

The translation found in OG Exodus 1-14 provides evidence that, when translation technique is isomorphic and source-oriented, the process of translation bears many affinities with transmission. We find in translation the elements that are at work in scribalism and the types of changes made in the transmission of the text. As a result, the OG should be used more liberally in textual criticism, should be used as an example of scribalism, and should be considered as evidence in all branches of textual studies.

---

11 See chapter two of Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*.
# Appendix A – Old Greek Data, Individual Variants in Exodus 1

Note: in the lemmata, OG’s reading is always given first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1 Ταῦτα OG ἄναλη 4Q11 ἄναλ SP MT</td>
<td>Scribal Error</td>
<td>Waw Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 Ἰσαώβι τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῶν OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[עָכָבָב] אָבָה</td>
<td>4Q13</td>
<td>[עָכָבָב אָבָה] SP MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 Ἰακὼβ OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Logical Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[אַבֵּיהם]יעקב 4Q13</td>
<td></td>
<td>[אַבֵּיהם]יעקב 4Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5 Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ init OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scribal Error</td>
<td>Transposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4Q13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5 πέντε καὶ ἐβδομήκοντα OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Conforming Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תִּשָּׁעִים</td>
<td>4Q13</td>
<td>תִּשָּׁעִים SP MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5 &gt; OGogle</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Sense Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q11 4Q13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:7 καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο OG</td>
<td>Scribal Error</td>
<td>Metathesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֹשֶׁה</td>
<td>4Q13</td>
<td>מֹשֶׁה SP MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8 ἔτερος OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תָּשָׁד 4Q1 MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 αὐτοῖς OG</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
<td>Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל SP MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 συμβῆ ἤμαν πόλεμος OG</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
<td>Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τὰκράνατο μελήμα</td>
<td>SP MT</td>
<td>Τὰκράνατο μελήμα MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 προστεθήσονται OG</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
<td>Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גָּנָס</td>
<td>4Q13</td>
<td>גָּנָס SP MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 οὔτωι OG</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
<td>Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄναλ 4Q1 SP MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 πρὸς OG</td>
<td>Scribal Error</td>
<td>Aural Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄναλ 4Q1 SP MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 ἐξελεύσονται OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
<td>Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄναλ 4Q1 SP MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
<td>Smoothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Variant Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπέστησεν OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>αὐτοῖς OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>ἐκακώσασιν αὐτοῖς OG UNO SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>καὶ ὑψοδόμησαν OG UNO βραχ SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>πόλεις όχυρές OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>καὶ Ὑν OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>ἤ ἔστιν Ὁλίου πόλις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>αὐτοὺς ἐταπείνουν OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>πλείους ἐγίνοντο OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>Ἰσχυν ΟG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι OG [מערים] 2Q2 4Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>κατὰ πάντα... κατεδουλοῦντο αὐτοὺς OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό OG מִן 4Q13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:17</td>
<td>συνέταξεν αὐταῖς OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>&gt; OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>ὃ ἂν τεχθῇ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις OG ἦλθεν לעברית SP ἦλθεν יד 4Q1 MT</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>ἑψιστε OG תשליכו SP תשליכו MT</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>ζωογονεῖτε αὐτό OG תחיון SP MT</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Hebrew Manuscript Data, Individual Variants in Exodus 1

Note: in the lemmata, the preferred reading is always given first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1 אֵלָה 4Q11</td>
<td>Ἰακώβ OG</td>
<td>Scribal Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 עֹכֶב MT</td>
<td>Ἰακώβ 4Q13</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1זְבּוּלִון [4Q11]</td>
<td>זבּוּלִון 4Q1</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1זָבֹלִון [4Q11]</td>
<td>זבּוּלִון 4Q11</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1וּשֶׁמֶן MT</td>
<td>Ἰακώβ 4Q11</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 יִשֶׁר</td>
<td>יִשֶׁר 4Q11</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 יַעֲקֹב MT</td>
<td>Ἰακώβ OG</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 עַמּוֹן SP</td>
<td>שִׂמְעָן MT</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 לֹוי MT</td>
<td>לֹוי Ἰακώβ</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 יִשֶׁר MT</td>
<td>Ἰσσαχάρ 4Q13</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 שַׁבְעַים MT</td>
<td>שַׁבְעַים 4Q13</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5 יִשֶּׁר MT</td>
<td>יִשֶּׁר 4Q13</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Hebrew MT // SP</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9</td>
<td>הנה</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Linguistic Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>סמביה כمحاוגה</td>
<td>Scribal Error // Aural Error/Metathesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>תקרנאנ מלחמה</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>ינתחכם</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>κατασοφισώμεθα</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>מלחמה</td>
<td>Sense Variant // Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>ענותם</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>ענותם</td>
<td>Sense Variant // Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>יפרץ</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>יפרץ</td>
<td>Sense Variant // Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>מצרים</td>
<td>Sense Variant // Sense Normalization/Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>וימררו</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>וימררו</td>
<td>Sense Variant // Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>ניחה</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant // Smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>י olacaktır</td>
<td>Sense Variant // Sense Normalization/Synonym Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Type of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>לַמֵּלָדָה SP MT: τὰς μαίας OG 4Q13</td>
<td>Scribal Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>וְהָדָר MT: ὑπὸν SP</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>וְהָדוֹת MT: τίστουσιν γὰρ πρὶν ἢ OG 4Q13</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>וּרְבֵי הָעֵם MT</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>הִילָדָה SP 4Q1</td>
<td>Sense Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>הָיוֹר SP: ὃ ἄν τεχθῇ τοῖς Ἑβραίοῖς OG</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>מַשְׁלָכָה SP: ῥίψατε OG MT</td>
<td>Linguistic Variant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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