

An Introduction & Experiment in Pluriform Textual Studies: Numbers 10.1-10ff.

1. Introduction:

The study of the Old Testament has faced many challenges and changes throughout the years. The advent of Enlightenment based critical-analytical methodologies was thought to be a Kuhn-like paradigm shift of major proportions.¹ However, once fully analyzed and integrated into text critical investigations, the art of exegesis and translations of the Bible, the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other manuscripts from the Judean desert will supersede all others shifts.

At the forefront of the Qumran studies has been Emanuel Tov, who through many articles and books² has presented a new perspective on the biblical texts. Tov argues that the standard "three textual traditions,"³ is no longer a viable approach. The Qumran scrolls have shown us that the "three" are "just three texts of the O.T., similar to other texts which were current in the Second Temple period⁴ and that there was a "great variety of texts for each book"⁵ during this period. Language⁶ such as "recensions," and "text-types," should give way to such "minimal terms . . . as source, textual witness or simply text."⁷ However, Tov does give a grouping of these texts instead of an infinite

¹ See M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth," *JBL* 102, 3 (1983), 365-399 and James A. Sanders, "Hebrew Bible and Old Testament: Textual Criticism in Service of Biblical Studies," in *Hebrew Bible or Old Testament?*, Roger Books and John J. Collins (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University, 1990), 41-68.

² Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Bible Research*, (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3, 1981); Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

³ Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982), 13. The three refer to Masoretic, Samaritan and LXX type when dealing with the Pentateuch while it is only the Masoretic and the LXX when dealing with the rest of the Hebrew Bible. Note that Tov's lack of coverage of the "Vulgar Texts" has been pointed out at a weakness in his work. See James Adair's review of *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* at <http://rosetta.atla-cetr.org/TC/extras/Adair-TovRev-CRBR.html> and his summary of the panel discussion at the 1992 SBL Annual Meeting at <http://rosetta.atla-cetr.org/TC/extras/Adair-SBL1992.html>.

⁴ Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," 24.

⁵ Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," 25.

⁶ Gooding had given this challenge back in 1976 in response especially to Frank M. Cross. See D. W. Gooding, "An Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21 (1976), 15-25.

⁷ Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls"; See the early challenge of D. W. Gooding, "An Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *JSS* 21 (1976), 15-25 and the recent responses by James R. Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Case," *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993), 3-37 and Eugene Ulrich's summary on page 94-95 of Eugene Ulrich,

number of isolated "texts." For example a proto-Masoretic⁸ group was extant at Qumran. This group is characterized as being one in which changes were not made after a certain period. Similarly there were texts that link closely with the LXX at Qumran which were also conservative when it came to emendations.⁹ Finally, 4QpaleoEx^m and 4QNum^b can be linked with the Samaritan Pentateuch¹⁰, and represents a "free approach to the biblical text," which "allowed for orthographic modernization, as well as contextual and grammatical changes, including harmonizations of various types."¹¹ Tov and others have also identified two other groups of significance. One group was written in the Qumran style of orthography and morphology,¹² while the other found at Qumran is called the "Non-Aligned Texts." Tov describes these as those texts that "agree sometimes significantly, with MT against the other texts, or they agree with SP and/or LXX against the other texts, but the non-aligned texts also disagree with the other texts to the same extent. They furthermore contain readings not known from one of the other texts or groups."¹³

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible, (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, U.K.: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing and Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill Academic Publishers), 1999.

⁸ Some have suggested proto-Rabbinic or prae-Masoretic.

⁹ See Sebastian Brock, "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Writings*, eds., George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 301-338.

¹⁰ These are now called "Pre-Samaritan Texts" by Tov in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 115.

¹¹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 26. Further work on the harmonistic texts are found in: Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "The So-Called "Major Expansions" in SamP, 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QExod^j of Exod 7:14-11:10: On the Edge between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism, in Bernard A. Taylor, ed. *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 429-439; Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in Adrian Schenker, ed. *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2003), 121-143; Emanuel Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch." *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 5 (1998), 334-354; Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," *Emanuel*, (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2003), 215-240; Esther Eshel, "4QDeutⁿ – A Text that Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991), 117-154.

¹² Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 114.

¹³ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 116. See also Elizabeth Owen, "4QDeutⁿ: A Pre-Samaritan Text?," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4:2 (July, 1997), 162-178 and Sidnie White Crawford, "A Response to Elizabeth Owen's "4QDeutⁿ: A Pre-Samaritan Text?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1996), 92-94.

Eugene Ulrich has emphasized this pluriformity¹⁴ found at Qumran and has summarized the salient points and its significance for biblical studies in the following theses:

1. Virtually all the biblical books are the result of a lengthy compositional process . . . which developed over centuries at the hands of multiple authors and creative scribes and editors.
2. The scrolls of the Scriptures from Qumran have shown us many surprising differences from the Masoretic *textus receptus*.
3. The present situation in scholarship is that there is a need for a revised mentality and for a paradigmatic revision in our categories and criteria. . . . The common default mentality of biblical scholars is that the Masoretic Text is the standard text and canon of the Hebrew Bible, and that texts which are not identical to the Masoretic Text are sectarian, or vulgar, or nonbiblical. . . .
4. The scrolls fit neatly and coherently into the picture of the scriptural text painted by the other ancient sources available prior to their discovery: the SP, the LXX, the quotations in the NT, and Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities*.
5. The Qumran scriptural scrolls show no sign of alleged "sectarian" influences. They are representative of the text of the Scriptures of general Palestinian Judaism in the late Second Temple period. . . .
6. There was no standard text of the Bible in the late Second Temple period. The Masoretic Text is not the central text of the Hebrew Bible . . . though it long appeared to be. The Masoretic Text is a chance collection from a wide pool of circulating texts.
7. The scrolls of the Scriptures from Qumran provide manuscript evidence for the latter stages of the lengthy compositional process elaborated by critics and commentators for the various books since the Enlightenment.
8. There were two main periods of the biblical text: the first period is that of the composition and growth of the biblical text, which continued at least up to the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. or up to the end of the first century, or perhaps up to the Second Revolt in 132-135. The second period is that of the uniform text from each book that perdured to become the consonantal text of the Masoretic collection.
9. Some manuscripts may be biblical that we were told were not biblical.¹⁵

Although one may not be willing to accept all of Ulrich's points, they will influence the shape of biblical studies to come.

First of all, Ulrich's theses have reminded us of the traditional historical-literary critical arena. For over a hundred years the Documentary Hypothesis has dominated this

¹⁴ See his articles in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, U.K.: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing and Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill Academic Publishers), 1999.

¹⁵ Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the time of Hillel and Jesus," in A. Lemaire, ed., *Congress Volume: Basel, 2001*, International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002), 105-107.

category in the study of the Torah.¹⁶ New perspectives from such scholars as: Rendtorff,¹⁷ Van Seters,¹⁸ Whybray,¹⁹ Blum,²⁰ to name just a few, have challenged the standard JEDP formula. It is possible that a pluriform analysis may shed new light on the "excavative" approaches beyond or in support of these new theorizings.

Second, Ulrich's point 2-8 will have a monumental effect on textual criticism of the Old Testament. The age old standard was that text criticism had as its goal to recover the original text, the *Urtext* or at least the best Masoretic text possible. Bruce Waltke, has modified it slightly, but still continues the old line when he proffers the goal of textual criticism as "that of recovering the original text that lies behind the Proto-MT recension."²¹ However, Tov epitomizes the challenge when he states unequivocally that, "the Qumran biblical MSS have taught us no longer to posit MT at the centre of our textual thinking. If, in spite of this, they are still compared with MT, this is due to a scholarly convention derived from the central status of that text in Judaism and its availability in good editions."²²

Where does this leave us when it comes to textual criticism? It has been the wont to argue that the textual criticism of the Old Testament and New Testament differ

¹⁶ Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

¹⁷ R. Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 147, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977); Eng. trans., *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, JSOT Supplement Series, 89, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

¹⁸ J. Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers*, (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994) and *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

¹⁹ R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*, JSOT Monograph Series 53, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987) and *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995).

²⁰ E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990).

²¹ Bruce K. Waltke, "How We Got the Hebrew Bible: The Text and Canon of the Old Testament," in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, Peter W. Flint (Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, U.K: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), 42.

²² Emanuel Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," in *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic – Roman Period*, Shemaryahu Talmon, ed., Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 10 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 109. See also the earlier form of the same article in *JJS* 39 (1988), 5-37.

fundamentally.²³ However, new developments in the field of New Testament text criticism, I believe can be of help. Helmut Koester, Bart D. Ehrman,²⁴ David C. Parker²⁵ and E. Jay Epps²⁶ along with others have paved the way to sidestep the *Urtext* impasse.²⁷ Epps proffers the following working definition for textual criticism:

Any search for textual *preformulations* or *reformulations* of a literary nature, such as *prior* compositional levels, versions, or formulations, or *later* textual alteration, revision, division, combination, rearrangement, interpolation, or forming a collection of writings, legitimately falls within the sphere of text-critical activity *if such an exploration is initiated on the basis of some appropriate textual variation or other manuscript evidence.*²⁸

This would imply that major textual groups or trajectories should be analyzed horizontally rather than in the hit-or-miss vertical fashion which has characterized the critical apparatuses that have accompanied the critical editions of the Hebrew Bible.²⁹ In this way significant variants can be the basis for a more comprehensive picture of the pluriform textual dynamism that existed before the fixation of the rabbinic text.

Two pioneering works that have dealt with Pentateuchal texts that have taken seriously a non-Masoretic priority perspective have been William P. Brown³⁰ and Andrew E. Steinmann.³¹ Brown analyzed Genesis 1.1-2.3 utilizing an "ideological

²³ See James R. Adair, Jr., "Old and New in Textual Criticism: Similarities, Differences, and Prospects for Cooperation," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 1 (1996) <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol01/vol01.html>.

²⁴ See especially Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) and "The Text of Mark in the Hands of the Orthodox," in *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective*, Mark Burrows and Paul Rorem (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991), 19-31.

²⁵ David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

²⁶ E. Jay Epps, "The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism," *HTR* 92, 3 (1999), 245-281.

²⁷ See Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "What are we looking for in doing Old Testament Text-critical Research?" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 23/2 (1997), 69-80.

²⁸ Epps, "The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism," 268.

²⁹ See the criticism of the apparatuses by H. M. Orlinsky, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," reprinted in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations, Selected Essays with a Prolegomena* by Sidney Jellicoe, Sidney Jellicoe, ed. (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1974), 239-58 and John William Wevers, "Text History and Textual Criticism of the Septuagint," *Vetus Testamentum Supplemental Volume* 27 (1982), 392.

³⁰ William P. Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3*, SBL Dissertation Series 132 (Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1993).

³¹ Andrew E. Steinmann, "Jacob's Family Goes to Egypt: Varying Portraits of Unity and Disunity in the Textual Traditions of Exodus 1:1-5," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 2 (1997), <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol02/Steinmann1997.html:1997>.

criticism that recognizes the subtle structural and verbal nuances of texts and the ideological interests and values that shape them."³² The LXX (with reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlage*) and MT were thus compared and Brown concludes that the LXX is the *lectio difficilior* and therefore the older text, whereas the MT reflects a Hasmonean period reworking of the pericope that he associates with the rededication of the Jerusalem temple in 164 BCE. Steinmann on the other hand has scrutinized the text of Exodus 1.1-5. He has worked through the pluriform textual material and concludes that:

It may be impossible to decide which tradition is older. However, one fact is clear. The numerous variants in these five verses may have originated for different reasons, but they did not arise in a vacuum. The message of the two basic traditions concerns the degree of unity or disunity in Jacob's family affected most of the variants that arose in the textual traditions of Exod 1:1-5. When read in context, variants can have a synergistic effect on the meaning of the text. Therefore, while differing explanations for the rise of the individual variants is useful, a single variant should never be viewed in isolation from other variants in the same context.³³

Brown has leaned heavily on the principle of *lectio difficilior*, while Steinmann has been equally sensitive to the principle of *utrum in alterum abiturum erat?* that is "which would have been more likely to give rise to the other?" Both studies have utilized the pluriform textual attestation and are moving in a new direction for text critical and biblical studies.

An issue that both of these studies calls into question is the nature of text critical reasoning in light of pluriformity. Tov, for example, has questioned most standard "rules" and instead concludes that, ". . . the choice of the contextually most appropriate reading is the main task of the textual critic. This procedure is as subjective as subjective can be. *Common sense* is his main guide, and not abstract rules. This is not to say that the rules must be abandoned. They will always be used, but one must recognize their limitations."³⁴

In the following I will analyze Numbers 10 as an experiment in pluriform text studies.

³² Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3*, 249.

³³ Steinmann, "Jacob's Family Goes to Egypt: Varying Portraits of Unity and Disunity in the Textual Traditions of Exodus 1:1-5," §27.

³⁴ Enamuel Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: the limitations of textual rules," *HTR* 75 (1982), 446-447.

2. A Summary of the Literary and Text Critical Analysis of Numbers 10.1-10ff.

The analysis of Numbers 10, which has traditionally been isolated to the MT, has been considered to be both the source critical and structural turning point in the book of Numbers.

Source critically, the so-called priestly source, which has been followed throughout the first nine chapters of the book of Numbers gets ready to integrate with the so-called Yahwist or J/E epic source in verses 29ff. Scholars have had to deal with the uncomfortable shifting of the 2 person plural to the 3 person plural in verses 3-10 (2nd-pl. in 10.5-6a, 7, 9-10 and 3rd -pl in 10.3-4, 6b, 8), seeing a possible redactional work on the text. Also 10.17, 21 elaborates on 2.17, thereby fomenting questions as to the exact nature of the priestly source, while the onset of J from verse 29 is awkward in both the insertion of the ark sayings (MT 10.35-36=LXX 10.34-35) and the Hobab account (10.29-32/33).

Structurally, Won Lee has crystallized the major division of the Masoretic edition of the book of Numbers between verses 10 and 11. He writes:

. . . most publications designate Numbers 1:1-10:10 as a coherent literary unit and thus 10:11 as the beginning of a major unit in Numbers at the highest level. Textual evidence provided in Numbers itself affirms this conclusion. Numbers is to be subdivided between 10:10 and 10:11 because of chronological, topographical/geographical, and conceptual aspects signaled in 10:11 and 12, the programmatic statement for Israel's departure from the wilderness of Sinai.³⁵

This means that the major break in the book of Numbers takes place towards the end of the so-called priestly source, leaving a small portion of it to dangle before the so-called Yahwist version takes over. Needless to say the inverted-*nuns* of verses 34 and 36 make the inserted ark sayings and the Hobab pericope a rough contextual transition, unless a larger structural dynamic is at play.

³⁵ Won W. Lee, *Punishment and Forgiveness in Israel's Migratory Campaign* (Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), 90.

At this point, I would like to focus on the Greek and Samaritan Pentateuch materials, which have not been fully utilized in the study of this area of the book of Numbers to see if they provide a different perspective from the Masoretic version.

3. The "Septuagint" Studies

Utilizing Septuagintal manuscripts and citational evidence, Ulrich has argued that the Greek translation of the Torah was made by the late third century B.C.E.³⁶ Nina Collins, on the other hand, focuses primarily on text critical and comparative analysis of the *Letter of Aristeas*, concludes that the Septuagint³⁷ was translated in 281 B.C.E.³⁸ These dates identify the early Greek texts as valuable witnesses to the biblical textual traditions and were extant during the pluriform era.

The Judean Desert has provided us with a total of 9 Greek biblical manuscripts, 8 at Qumran and the important Minor Prophets scroll (8HevXIIgr) at Naḥal Ḥever. Some of the Qumran manuscripts reflect an Old Greek textual tradition better than the later majuscules³⁹ manuscripts, while others vary,⁴⁰ while the Naḥal Ḥever manuscript represents the *kaige*-Th group. The significance of these differences has been summarized by Tov:

³⁶ Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 207-208. This is a reprint of "Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century C.E.," in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, edited by Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 1, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988). It has been in large part reproduced in "The Old Testament Text of Eusebius: The Heritage of Origen."

³⁷ Septuagint technically refers only to the Torah/Pentateuch and actually to the "original" translation, while the "Old Greek" is the term that is used to identify each "original" translation of the books or parts of the books of Greek Bible. These were followed by transmissionally developed "early Greek text/s." Which were further developed as "early recensions" and the "hexaplaric recension (Origen's fifth column, i.e., ó). The term "Septuagint" however has become generally attached to the whole Greek Bible canon.

³⁸ Nina L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and The Bible in Greek*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 82, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2000).

³⁹ See David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 9 where Parker reserves the use of the more standard "uncial" for Latin manuscripts of the same.

⁴⁰ See Emanuel Tov, "The Greek Biblical Texts From the Judean Desert," in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, Scot Mckendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan, eds., (London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 97-121; Eugene Ulrich, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings*, G. J. Brooke and B. Lindar, eds, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 49-80, reprinted in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 165-183.

. . . at least some of the Greek texts from Qumran probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8HevXIIgr reflects a later Jewish revision deriving from proto-rabbinic Jewish circles. Both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran thus reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level, without being tied down to MT, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles that adhered to the proto-rabbinic (proto-Masoretic) text in Hebrew and the Jewish revisions of LXX towards that Hebrew text. The difference between the texts and sites derives from their different chronological background, but more so from their different socio-religious background.⁴¹

Although one cannot utilize this early material for most pericopes,⁴² it attests to the importance of the Greek witness.

Several problems exist in the analysis of the Greek texts which cannot be dealt with at this time. First, the original readership⁴³ and the role that it has played in the development of Christianity have been debated along with its value today.⁴⁴ Both of these issues are yet to be decided and they interact with the pluriform era of textual development. Second, the Septuagint is a translation;⁴⁵ therefore one must deal with retroversion⁴⁶ and translational style and technique.⁴⁷

⁴¹ Tov, "The Greek Biblical Texts From the Judean Desert," 118.

⁴² I will be using the Göttingen edition of the Greek text edited by John Wevers, which is an eclectic text, attempting to establish the early Greek or Old Greek text. John William Wevers, ed., *Numeri*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, III, 1, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

⁴³ Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and The Bible in Greek*, argues that the translation was not for the Hellenistic Jews in Alexandria, but rather raise the status of Ptolemy and his library.

⁴⁴ Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint*, JSOT Supplement Series 206, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). Müller argues that the Septuagint should be used in the Christian faith, especially in light of the origins of Christianity in the period of pluriformity. However, his choice of the Septuagint leaves the question of the New Testament usage of the pluriform witnesses is problematic. See also Eugene Ulrich, "Jewish, Christian, and Empirical Perspectives on the Text of Our Scriptures," in *Hebrew Bible or Old Testament?*, Roger Books and John J. Collins, eds. (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University, 1990), 69-85.

⁴⁵ See John William Wevers, "Text History and Text Criticism of the Septuagint," 393, who writes, "Proper use of the Septuagint for text critical purposes presupposes the fact that it is a translation document."

⁴⁶ This is the thesis of Emanuel Tov's *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 2nd edition, revised and enlarged, (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1997).

⁴⁷ Many authors have contributed to this area. A good summary of the "objective" criteria and examples of its usage are found in John A. Beck, *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique*, (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2000). See Anssi Voitila, "The Translator of the Greek Numbers," Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Cambridge, 1995, Bernard A. Taylor, ed., (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 109-121 and Trevor V. Evans, "Some Alleged Confusions in Translation from Hebrew to Greek," *Biblica* 83 (2002), 238-248. This last article is online at <http://www.bsw.org/?l=71831&a=Ani05.html>.

John Wevers has given a concise list of 4 presuppositions that will assist in our investigation of the Greek traditions in the Pentateuch, without solving conclusively the aforementioned problems:

. . . first . . . the translators were aware that they were translating a canonical text, the word of God in Greek. Second, it is presupposed that the parent text was in the main much like the consonantal text of MT. . . . A third presupposition made is that the Alexandrian translators of the Pentateuch made sense. . . . And finally, it is suggested that the Greek Pentateuch is a humanistic document of interest by and for itself, i.e. without reference to its parent text.⁴⁸

Each of the books of the Pentateuch have been translated by different translators and each have their own translational characteristics. John Wevers introduces his study of the Greek text of Numbers with the following paragraph.

The Greek translation of Numbers is without a doubt by far the weakest volume in the Greek Pentateuch. What makes work on the book so frustrating is that side by side one can find gross failures to follow ordinary rules of grammar, i.e. of apparent incompetence, as well as acute and even subtle distinctions betraying an active mind engaged in the interpretation of sacred scripture, ready not only to clarify obscure passages, but even to correct what might appear to be factual errors or contradictions within the text.⁴⁹

The LXX, in Num 10.1-10, shows just such coloration in several unique translations and a plus. First, verses 3-4 stand out in the pluriform witnesses. Here we may translate, "and you will sound with them and all the congregation will be gathered at the door of the tent of witness. But if they sound with one, all the chiefs, the princes of Israel will come to you." Here it is not before Moses (אלֹהִים),⁵⁰ but implicitly before the Lord that the people gather in response to the sounding of both trumpets. It is noteworthy that in v. 4 the LXX has the προς σε, indicating that the leadership, represented by the chiefs (ἀρχοντες), the princes (ἀρχηγοί) of Israel are subject to Moses' leadership. LXX's "ἀρχηγοί" is interesting since it is also used in 13.3 and 16.2 to designate leaders of rank that do not follow the leadership of Moses. The Hebrew versions have ראשי אלפי here,

⁴⁸ John William Wevers, "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*, Volume 1:1, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 95.

⁴⁹ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Texts of Numbers*. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), ix.

⁵⁰ The Hexapla has an asterick by προς σε recognizing its lack. (p. 235)

however in 1:16, χιλίαρχος which we would have thought more appropriate unless the LXX is applying an interpretative color here.

In verse 5-6, the LXX has a chosen to enumerate the signals for the communal embarkment. The text reads, "And you will sound a signal,⁵¹ and camps that are encamped eastward will rise up. And you will sound a second signal and the camps that are encamped southward will rise up. And you will sound a third signal and the camps that are encamped westward will rise up. And you will sound a fourth signal and the camps that are encamped northward will rise up. They will sound a signal at their departure."

Highlighting the parallels of listing the four directions of the encampments and the use of πρῶτοι ἑξαροῦσιν . . . δεῦτεροι . . . τρίτοι . . . ἔσχατοι ἑξαροῦσιν, John Wevers argues that the LXX has been influenced by Num 2. He further postulates that, "the translator must have felt that the breaking up of the camp could hardly be limited to half the camp, i.e. to the two camps given in MT. Undoubtedly the amplification by Num is not incorrect – it just does not obtain in MT; it is the creation of Num."⁵²

However this plus version has been utilized by Josephus in *Judean Antiquities* 3:293-294.⁵³ Feldman has offered the following translation:

293. When the tent was moved, the following took place. When it gave the signal, first of all those who were encamped on the east rose up, and at the second those who were on the south, in turn. Then the Tent, being dismantled, was carried midway between the six tribes going in front and the six following, and all the Levites were around the Tent.

294. When it gave the signal for the third time, the part of those encamped in the southwestern direction moved, and at the fourth [signal] the part in the north. They used the trumpets also for the sacrificial rites, when leading the victims both on the Sabbaths and on the remaining days. Then, for the first time after the departure from Egypt, he offered the sacrifice called the Pascha in the wilderness.⁵⁴

Feldman then commentates that, "Josephus is in accord with the LXX (Num. 10:6) in adding the third and fourth signal . . ."⁵⁵ However Josephus' text itself is at best a

⁵¹ The LXX has σημασία, "giving a signal, command" throughout verses 5 and 6.

⁵² Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Texts of Numbers*, 148.

⁵³ See Addendum 1

⁵⁴ Louis H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities 1-4*, Boston & Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2004, 321.

⁵⁵ Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities 1-4*, 321.

paraphrasing of the material. It is interesting to note that in an article by É. Nodet, it has been argued that Josephus utilized a Hebrew source that could have been similar to the Vorlage of the LXX, along with a Greek text, which we may consider as part of the pluriform witnesses, for his work on the Pentateuch and that it could have been one that came from the Jerusalem Temple.⁵⁶

Ibn Ezra argued against a third and fourth trumpeting because, "the family of Kohath and with them the *kohanim* who blew the trumpets journeyed before the standard of Ephraim."⁵⁷ Although, Jacob Milgrom indicates that this obstacle could be cleared by having the "priestly trumpeters" remain behind and thereby answering Ibn Ezra,⁵⁸ it is interesting that the problem in the MT continued to be debated, probably because of the truncated nature of the text. Text critically, do we resort to the *lectio brevior* "rule" and argue that the MT is a superior reading? Is the MT the *lectio difficilior* reading since it ends the movement mid-stream and therefore more difficult? Is there an ellipsis involved in the MT that the Greek texts have missed? These questions are hard to answer.

Is it possible that the LXX's longer reading in contrast to the shorter forms in the Hebrew and Aramaic, point not just to a mechanical filling out of the text, harmonizing it with chapter 2, but to its application by the readers of the Greek text? Two further textual peculiarities point in this direction. First, in verse 7, the Greek text has καὶ ὅταν συναγάγητε τὴν συναγωγὴν in contrast to the Hebrew ובהקהל את הקהל. The Greek version has the same words as it used in verse 3, where the Hebrew versions had העדה. Wevers explains that the Greek text therefore, "calls attention to the fact that it is exactly the same group and action in both places. What is new is calling attention to the

⁵⁶ E. Nodet, "Josephus and the Pentateuch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 28:2 (1997), 154-194. The issue of Josephus' sources have been a source of controversy. See: Louis H. Feldman, "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," in *Mikra* (CRINT 2/1; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 455-518, who argues for Greek, Hebrew and even Aramaic sources; Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*, Harvard Ph.D. Dissertation series 7, (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 29-38, who writes, "Josephus apparently drew on a variety of traditions and used them all with some flexibility." (p. 37).

⁵⁷ Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir, *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch*, translated and annotated by Norman H. Strickman and Arthur M. Silver, (New York: Menorah Publishing Company, 1999), 68.

⁵⁸ Milgrom, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Numbers*, 73.

difference in the trumpet call"⁵⁹ The "signaling" distinguishes the trumpets' usage. The decampment signal is for the journey in the ἐρῆμος, it will no longer be applicable once this journey is completed; however the Greek text seems to highlight the gathering of the assembly before the Tent of Witness, in worship.

The second point is the way that the Greek text⁶⁰ has rendered verse 9αα, ἐὰν δὲ ἐξέλθῃτε εἰς πόλεμον ("If you go into battle"), while the Hebrew versions have מלחמה וכי תבאו ("When you go into battle"). Is there a slight innuendo that would make the text more palatable in a diaspora context?

What can the above distinctive readings offer the exegete? I would suggest that the Greek text has placed greater emphasis on the centrality of the worshiping assembly as a continuing image of the people of Israel. The decampment was a historical event that followed a detailed pattern that was not intended to be repeated. The Greek version has also de-emphasized Moses' role in worship and in battle, while establishing his importance in leadership.

One other significant variant, a "sequence difference"⁶¹ must be commented on, and that is the Hebrew and Aramaic texts have verse 34 before the ark saying, while the Greek text has it located at verse 36 and the ark saying right after verse 33. Tov writes:

"From the point of view of its content, v. 34 could indeed be placed either before or after the song, although one would probably prefer its location in the LXX, since the sequence 33, 35 is more natural. For v. 35 starts off with the words 'and whenever *the ark* set out . . .' and *the ark*, הַאֲרוֹן, is mentioned in the previous sentence, while in Hebrew composition the definite article should refer to something mentioned in the immediate vicinity. Thus, the ark in v. 35 points back to v. 33 where 'the ark of the covenant of the Lord' is mentioned, while v. 34 of MT disturbs the logical sequence 33, 35."⁶²

⁵⁹ Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Texts of Numbers*, 148.

⁶⁰ N.B. verse 8b is also differs from the Hebrew translations by the singular ἕσται rather than the strange plural form ויהיו. Many English translations have followed the LXX here.

⁶¹ Emanuel Tov, "Some Sequence Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and Their Ramifications for Literary Criticism," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999), 411.

⁶² Tov, "Some Sequence Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and Their Ramifications for Literary Criticism," 414.

The MT has supplied the inverted-*nun* to identify a problem in its text, most likely a "dislocation."⁶³ Israel Yeivin's full explanation may be helpful here:

In two places in the Bible, a symbol like an inverted *nun* is used – a total of nine times in all. In the sources this is referred to as *nun menuzzeret*, נון מניזזרת, נקוד, *naqud*, סימנייה, *simaniyyot*, שיפור *shippur*, etc. In Nu 10.35-36 this sign is used at the beginning and end of the *pisqah* starting הארו בנסע. Thus it is stated in *Sifre* on Numbers (section 84) "the section הארו בנסע is *naqud* (dotted) before it and after it because this is not its place. The opinion of Rabbis is that it forms a book itself." The second passage is Ps. 107.23-28 and 40, where the sign is used seven times. Printed editions and manuscripts – including Babylonian manuscripts – agree on the marking of this sign in the Torah, but not in the Psalms. Many Tiberian MSS do not mark inverted *nun* in Ps 107 at all, and where it is marked, it is not always put in the same place. Thus in L the sign is put at verses 21-26 and 40. In two Babylonian MSS which contain this passage inverted *nun* is not used.

Krauss and Liebermann explain the inverted *nun* as corresponding to a sign used by the Greek textual critics to indicate that a space should be left between two passages, or to mark passages included in the wrong place – exactly the two reasons for the use of inverted *nun* suggested in *Sifre*. These suggestions suit the passage in numbers, but it is difficult to see how they would apply to the Psalms verses, and no satisfactory explanation for their use here has yet been offered.

The inverted *nun* sign is similar to form to the Babylonian accent "half *tet*" which represents a major disjunctive accent. In a few Geniza fragments signs like these are used at the ends of sentences. Possibly the form of these signs was influenced by the *simaniyyot*.⁶⁴

Thus both grammatically and in terms of the Masoretic notations, the Greek sequence is to be preferred. It is interesting to note that both the Hebrew and the Greek traditions have Moses making his statement in concurrence with the move of the ark rather than Moses initiating it with the ark saying. This would be in line with the Greek text's de-emphasizing Moses over against God's centrality. Is it possible that the Greek text's placement leans in this direction, while the Hebrew texts have focused more on Moses?

Now I want to turn to the so-called "Samaritan Pentateuch."

4. Samaritan Pentateuch & the Proto-Samaritan / Expansionistic Texts

In a 1970 article written by Bruce K. Waltke, the contributions of the Samaritan Pentateuch were summarized as follows:

⁶³ Christian D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, (London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897), 343.

⁶⁴ Israel Yeivin, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*, *Masoretic Studies* 5, trans. E. J. Revell, (no loc.: The Scholars Press, 1980), 46-47.

The Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) has two primary values for the literary critic of the Old Testament: (1) it points up the relative purity of the Massoretic Text (MT); and (2) when used in conjunction with the Septuagint (LXX) it can be a useful, though limited, tool in the hand of the critic as he seeks to restore the original text. In the field of higher criticism, the SP helps to establish the antiquity of the Pentateuch.⁶⁵

Although Waltke's relatively negative conclusions were based on his own investigation, his views align with the academic consensus before him in which it was said that the SP differed with the MT in 6000 details and in those differences the SP agreed with the LXX on 1600 occasions. Kyung-Rae Kim, in his 1994 doctoral dissertation, collated this material once again and concludes that:

According to my own data, in 964 cases the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Septuagint against the Massoretic Text. Of these, in 471 instances the readings are possibly irrelevant (independent), leaving only 493 cases in which the Septuagint almost certainly reflects a reading which is also found in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Of the 493 agreements, according to my calculations 328 cases reflect common harmonizations. Many such harmonizations could have occurred independently, since these textual alterations were made under the influence of the context or a parallel text. . . . the Septuagint contains many more harmonizations than the Samaritan Pentateuch. Therefore, the 493 (or possibly 964) agreements do not prove any close relationship between the two texts.⁶⁶

This means that the Samaritan Pentateuch could be recognized as a separate witness, while the agreement with the Greek texts can be understood as being "common exegesis."⁶⁷

At the same time in the wake of a pluriform understanding of the Bible in the second period of textual transmission, the Samaritan Pentateuch has been further re-evaluated. The discovery of texts at Qumran that show similar characteristics to the Samaritan Pentateuch but without the sectarian additions,⁶⁸ the so-called proto-Samaritan, has renewed scholarly interest in this area. The works of Judith Sanderson on the

⁶⁵ Bruce K. Waltke, "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament," in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. Payne, (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1970), 212. Waltke adds a canonical critical and religious studies value in his Anchor Bible Dictionary article. See Bruce K Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, D. N. Freedman, ed., (New York: Doubleday, c1992, CD-Rom Edition, 1996).

⁶⁶ Kyung-Rae Kim, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, (Hebrew University Ph.D. Dissertation: Israel, 1994), 1-2.

⁶⁷ Kim, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, 7-8.

⁶⁸ Kim has conveniently listed these sectarian additions in his, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, 12-14. I have included them as Addendum 1.

4QPaleoExod^m scroll⁶⁹ and Nathan Jastram on the 4QNum^b scroll⁷⁰ have further refined our understanding of this "pre-Samaritan group" in relations to the texts of Exodus and Numbers.

Esther and Hanan Eshel, labeling this group as harmonistic text, classified the Qumran material that tends to show this harmonization into two groups.

". . . we can conclude that that harmonistic editing reflected in 4QPaleoExod^m, 8QPhyl, XQPhyl 3, 4QNum^b, 4QTest, 4Q364, and 4QPhyl J - has the same scope as that of the SP and most of the harmonistic changes documented in these scrolls also exist in the SP. However 4QDeutⁿ, 4QDeut^j, 4QDeut^{kl}, 4Q158, the Nash Papyrus, 8QPhyl, 4QMez A, 4QPhyl G, and 8QMez have a more comprehensive editing than what is documented in the SP.⁷¹

This leads them to conclude:

In our opinion, this distinction had a crucial impact upon the issue of the SP's chronological development. The scrolls pertaining to the second group reflect a more comprehensive harmonistic editing than the SP, and were written in either late Hasmonean or Herodian script. On the other hand, scrolls featuring harmonistic editing, with the same additions and scope as the SP, were dated to the end of the second century B.C.E. or the beginning of the first century B.C.E.⁷²

This proto-Samaritan group and along with the extant Samaritan Pentateuch can be characterized as having harmonistic expansions, general linguistic corrections, content variants of several types, phonological changes, the use of a fuller orthography. The specific character of the book of Numbers in the Samaritan Pentateuch has been conveniently summarized by Kim:

The Samaritan text of Numbers is expansionistic, as indicated by 14 *long pluses* of SAM against the joint text of LXX and MT. LXX is moderately expansionistic in Numbers. LXX has 6 long pluses and 192 short pluses in contrast to 3 long minuses and 146 short

⁶⁹ Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll From Qumran: 4QPaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) and Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, James R. Davila, Nathan Jastram, Judith E. Sanderson and Emanuel Tov, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XII: Qumran Cave 4 VII Genesis to Numbers*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

⁷⁰ Nathan Jastram, *The Book of Numbers from Qumran, Cave IV (4QNum^b)*, (Harvard University Ph.D. Dissertation: Cambridge, MA, 1990); Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, James R. Davila, Nathan Jastram, Judith E. Sanderson and Emanuel Tov, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XII: Qumran Cave 4 VII Genesis to Numbers*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) and Nathan Jastram, "A Comparison of two "Proto-Samaritan" Texts From Qumran: 4QPaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998), 264-89.

⁷¹ Eshel & Eshel, "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," 237.

⁷² Eshel & Eshel, "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," 237-238.

minuses against the joint text of SAM and MT. The fact that SAM and LXX do not agree in their *long pluses*, except for one case (4:14), indicates that they did not derive from a common source. The expansionistic nature of SAM in Numbers mainly derives from its harmonizations with Deuteronomy.⁷³

Turning to the text of Numbers 10, we will be investigating two examples from the Samaritan Pentateuch. We will first of all look at the text of Numbers 10:6, a passage that we have already looked at in terms of the Septuagint. The second will be the long harmonistic plus that SP has added from Deuteronomy 1:6-8 after Numbers 10:10.

Whereas the MT of 10:6⁷⁴ reads: "And when you blow a second blast, the camps encamped southward (תימנה) shall set out. They will blow a blast for their journey." The SP has ". . . the camps encamped northward (צפונה) shall set out" George Buchanan Gray has summarily solved these antithetical readings by claiming that the SP version has "mistakenly"⁷⁵ emended the text. Kim in a similar fashion lists 10:6 as one of the ten corruptions of the SP in Numbers.⁷⁶ He argues, "MT fits the context (see the order in 2:1-31, 9:18-20). Sam possibly reflects a mistake."⁷⁷ It is true that the MT reading can be understood to make some sense in itself, however, both the Greek bible and the Samaritan Pentateuch have found it wanting. The sound of the "blast" for the decampment of the northern based tribes, which would move out last, makes sense as a notification of when the last group would set out. Like the Greek version, the Samaritan Pentateuch places emphasis on the whole assembly. If this is the case, what would the MT be emphasizing, beyond being a possible truncated or clipped version? Could it be that it was only interested in the notification of the movement of the second group, since it would relate to the movement of the tent of meeting? In other word the MT has presented its version in which the cult paraphernalia is emphasized. If this is the case the placement of 10:34-36 may have the same impact.

The long harmonistic expansion placed after 10:10 stands out in an analysis of the Samaritan Pentateuchal reading. This passage is one of many that has reworked

⁷³ Kim, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, 201.

⁷⁴ N.B. I have already covered the Septuagint expansion in section 3.

⁷⁵ Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*, 89

⁷⁶ Kim, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, 233.

⁷⁷ Kim, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, 234.

Deuteronomy 1-3 and inserted portions of it into strategic locations throughout Exodus and Numbers.⁷⁸ Following the text of Deuteronomy we may track the quotations as follows:

Deut	Inserted After
Deut 1.6-8	Num 10.10
Deut 1.9-18	Exod 18.24, 25
Deut 1.20-23a	Num 12.16
Deut 1.27-33	Num 13.33
Deut 1.42	Num 14.40
Deut 1.44b	Num 14:45
Deut 2.2-6	Num 20.13
Deut 2.9	Num 21.11
Deut 2.17-19	Num 21.12
Deut 2.24-25	Num 21.20
Deut 2.26-29	Num 21.22
Deut 2.31	Num 21.23
Deut 3.21-22	Num 27.23
Deut 3.23-26	Num 20.13

Tigay commenting on the Exod 18 expansion and others, argues that, "the main task of the redactor in these pericopes was to reconcile dissimilar accounts of the same events. By interweaving their details in sequence, he facilitated their harmonious coexistence. He accommodated their differing details by having them refer to different moments of those events."⁷⁹ However, in this specific pericope there does not seem to be any dissimilarities that needed to be reconciled. Tov, on the other hand, sees the main reason for the harmonizations provide the material that Deuteronomy is suppose to be repeating. He writes:

According to Deut. 1.5, Moses told the people what had happened to the Israelites from the theophany of Sinai until the time of their stay in the plains of Moab. Even if the exact nature of that retelling is not clear, tradition took Deut. as a repetition (משנה תורה = Δευτερολόγιον) of the Tetrateuch. In the light of this view of Deut., the relationship between the narrative chapters of Deut. (Deut 1-9) and their 'sources' in Ex. and Num. was much scrutinized. After all, when the story of the history of the Israelites is 'repeated' in

⁷⁸ See "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with special attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," 344-336, where Tov charts out the additions based on Deut 1-3.

⁷⁹ Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 76

Deut., each detail in that book should actually be covered by a parallel detail in its 'sources', Ex. and Num. (The reverse covering is not necessary, since Moses, when repeating the history of the Israelites, could have abbreviated the account, so that not every detail in Ex. and Num. needs to be paralleled by a detail in Deut.) Accordingly, the Sam. Pent. added in many places in Ex. and Num. small sections from Deut. . . .⁸⁰

I would argue that the larger context of the book of Numbers and the immediate contexts in which the harmonistic expansions have been added should be the focus of our attention. As to Deut 1.6-8 being adjusted and inserted between verses 10 and 11, it serves as an important bridge to the linking 1.1-10:10 to 10.11ff. This is accomplished by linking הארץ ("the land", 2x) with בארצכם ("in your land") of verse 9. Verse 9 is the first time in Numbers (except for 9:14) that the word ארץ is used to designate the Levant region.⁸¹ Since this term will play a significant role in chapters 13-14, its introduction here in the SP shapes the contours of the narratives. Furthermore, the "oath" or "promise" (נשבע) which also plays a significant role in the up-coming narratives⁸² is introduced here.

Both of these terms enter the narratives through a divine speech, intensifying their importance. In fact the call to leave "this mountain" by Yhwh's speech, which in verse 11 is accompanied by the "cloud lifting," puts emphasis on the oracular communication of Yhwh's message, a point that will be crucial to the understanding of Num 11.29b and 12.6-8 and the centrality of Moses. Earlier expansions in Exodus 20 in which both Deut 18:18-22 and selections from Deut 5:24-28, 30 have been added to the SP text, highlighted Moses as the authoritative prophet. Here also Moses plays a greater role than is seen in either the Greek or the MT tradition.

5. Preliminary Conclusions & Reflections

Although I have not been able to deal as thoroughly as I would have liked with the Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch to say nothing of the lack of work on the MT, both

⁸⁰ Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts," 8

⁸¹ Num 1.1; 3.13; 8.17; 9.1 are used to refer to Egypt. 9.14 is an exception.

⁸² See especially 11.12; 12.14 (2x), 15; 13:22; 14.16, 23.

Samaritan and Jewish Targumim, Syriac and the Latin textual material, I need to come to a conclusion for this paper

I hope that I have presented the case for the importance of dealing with what has been called the pluriform nature of the biblical witness. The so-called "proto-Masoretic" texts of Qumran were not the only recognized biblical texts at that time, nor is the Masoretic text of the medieval period a text without interpretation of its own. The paragraphing, the accentuation and Massorahs, all "translate" the material presented.

I hope to deal with the narrative block 10.11-14.45 in the near future in the context of the pluriform witnesses and Narratology.

What are the ramifications and advantages/disadvantages of dealing both text critically and exegetically with pluriformity? As this study may have shown, the question of which reading should be taken is not answered. I would argue that this was the state of the Bible during the beginnings of Christianity and the New Testament. Is it possible that the age old problem of discontinuity between the "Old Testament" and the "New Testament" can be partially eased by recognizing this pluriformity?

Although pluriformity is a manuscripts/scrolls phenomenon, is there a relationship to post-modernism in terms of its understanding? Some recent scholars have argued for just this.

Addendum 1: Josephus, *Judean Antiquities* 3:293-294

Josephus	LXX – Num 10.6
<p>[293] τῆς δὲ σκηνῆς μετακινουμένης ταῦτα ἐγένετο· ἀποσημήναντος γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον οἱ παρὰ ταῖς ἀνατολαῖς ἔσκηνωκότες ἀνίσταντο, καὶ πρὸς τὴν δευτέραν οἱ πρὸς τὸν νότον αὐθις καθεστῶτες. εἴθ' ἡ σκηνὴ λυομένη μέση τῶν προϊουσῶν ἐξ φυλῶν ἐκομίζετο καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων ἕξ, Λευῖται δὲ περὶ τὴν σκηνὴν πάντες ἦσαν. [294] τρίτον δὲ σημήναντος τὸ κατὰ λίβα τετραμμένον τῶν ἔσκηνωκόντων μέρος ἐκινεῖτο, καὶ τέταρτον τὸ κατὰ βορρᾶν. ταῖς δὲ βυκάναις ἐχρῶντο καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἱερουργίαις προσάγοντες τὰς θυσίας καὶ τοῖς σαββάτοις καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἡμέραις. θύει δὲ τότε πρῶτον μετὰ τὴν ἀναχώρησιν τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὴν πάσχα λεγομένην ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου.</p>	<p>καὶ σαλπιεῖτε σημασίαν δευτέραν καὶ ἔξαροῦσιν αἱ παρεμβολαὶ αἱ παρεμβάλλουσαι λίβα καὶ σαλπιεῖτε σημασίαν τρίτην καὶ ἔξαροῦσιν αἱ παρεμβολαὶ αἱ παρεμβάλλουσαι παρὰ θάλασσαν καὶ σαλπιεῖτε σημασίαν τετάρτην καὶ ἔξαροῦσιν αἱ παρεμβολαὶ αἱ παρεμβάλλουσαι πρὸς βορρᾶν σημασίαν σαλπιούσιν ἐν τῇ ἐξάρσει αὐτῶν</p>

Addendum 2: Kyung-Rae Kim, *Studies in the Relationship Between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, 12-14.

Sam, diverging from the pre-Samaritan texts, also includes theological alterations which clearly show its sectarian character. These changes were introduced in defence of the legitimacy of the Samaritan cultic center, Mount Gerizim, and their worship. None of these alterations is supported by the other biblical witnesses. The following probably sectarian elements are recognized in SAM.

1) In order to enhance the prestige of their cultic center, Mount Gerizim, the Samaritans added at the end of the Ten Commandments (after Ex 20:17 and Dt 5:21) passages reproducing substantially Dt 27:2, 3a, 4-7; 11:30.

2) For the same reason, "Ebal" was changed into "Gerizim" in Dt 27:4.

3) In all the twenty-one occurrences of the phrase "the place which YHWH your God *will choose*" (Dt 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 26:2; 31:11) SAM reads "... *has chosen*" (changing the imperfect יבחר into perfect בחר). The reading of MT envisions Jerusalem as the future cultic center; but from the Samaritan point of view, Shechem had already been chosen as the cultic center in the time of the Patriarchs.

4) For the same reason, the reading of Ex 20:24 has been changed in SAM (from MT במקום אשר אזכרתני את שמי to בכל המקום אשר אזכיר את שמי).

5) In Gen 22:2, of MT has been altered into המוראה in order to avoid mentioning Jerusalem as the cultic center. "Mount Moriah" (הר המוריה) is mentioned here as the site on which the temple of Solomon has been built (2 Chron 3:1 ביהודים בירושלם בהר המוריה). The Samaritan reading המוראה may have been pronounced similarly to מורה, which was a place located at Shechem (Gen 12:6).

6) In Lev 26:31, the plural form has been altered into singular: from "lay waste your *sanctuaries*" to "lay waste your *sanctuary*": The Samaritans could not tolerate other sanctuaries than the one on Mount Gerizim.

Addendum 3: A Comparison of the SP addition to Num 10.10 and the MT of Deut 1.6-8:

SP	MT Deut 1.6-8
<p>וידבר יהוה אל משה לאמר רב לכם שבת בהר הזה</p>	<p>יהוה אלהינו דבר אלינו בחרב לאמר רב־לכם שבת בהר הזה:</p>
<p>פנו וסעו לכם ובאו הר האמרי ואל כל שכניו בערבה בהר ובשפלה בנגף ובחוף הים ארץ הכנעני והלבנון עד הנהר הגדול נהר פרת</p>	<p>פְּנוּ וּסְעוּ לָכֶם וּבְאוּ הַר הָאֲמֹרִי וְאֶל־כָּל־שְׁכֵנָיו בְּעֶרְבָה בְּהַר וּבִשְׁפֵלָה וּבִנְגֹף וּבְחֹף הַיָּם אֶרֶץ הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַלְבָּנוֹן עַד־הַנָּהָר הַגָּדוֹל נְהַר־פְּרָת:</p>
<p>ראו נתתי לפניכם את הארץ באו ורשו את הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבותיכם לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לתת לזרעם אחריהם:</p>	<p>רְאוּ נָתַתִּי לִפְנֵיכֶם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ בְּאוּ וּרְשׁוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לְאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק וּלְיַעֲקֹב לְתַת לָהֶם וּלְזֶרְעָם אַחֲרֵיהֶם:</p>

Numbers 10.1-10+

Text	MT	SP	LXX
10.1	And Yhwh spoke to Moses, saying:	And Yhwh spoke to Moses, saying	And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying
10.2	"Make for yourself two silver trumpets, of hammered works you shall make them. And they will be for you a convocation of the community and the setting out of the camps.	"Make for yourself two silver trumpets, of hammered works you shall make them. And they will be for you a convocation of the community and the setting out of the camps.	"Make for yourself two silver trumpets; of beaten works you shall make them. And they will be for you to convoke the assembly and to lift up the camps.
10.3	And when they are blown into, the whole community will be assembled to you at the entrance of the tent of meeting.	And when they are blown into, the whole community will be assembled to you at the entrance of the tent of meeting.	And you shall blow in them, and the whole assembly will be assembled at the entrance of the tent of meeting
10.4	But if one is blown into, the chieftains, the heads of Israel's Thousands will be assembled to you.	But if one is blown into, the chieftains, the heads of Israel's Thousands will be assembled to you.	But if they blow on one, all the rulers, the princes of Israel will come to you.
10.5	When you (pl.) blow an alarm, the encampments, those encamped eastward shall set out	When you (pl.) blow an alarm, the encampments, those encamped eastward shall set out	And you will blow a signal and camps that are encamped eastward will rise up.
10.6	And when you (pl.) blow a second alarm, the encampments, those encamped southward shall set out. They will blow an alarm for their setting out.	And when you (pl.) blow a second alarm, the encampments, those encamped northward shall set out. They will blow an alarm for their setting out.	And you will sound a second signal And the camps that encamped southward will rise up. And you will sound a third signal and the camps that are encamped westward will rise up. And you will sound a forth signal and the camps that are encamped northward will rise up. They will sound a signal at their departure.
10.7	While to convoke the congregation, You (pl.) will blow, but you (pl.) will not alarm.	While to convoke the congregation, You (pl.) will blow, but you (pl.) will not alarm.	And whenever you (pl.) should assemble the assembly, You (pl.) shall blow, but not a signal.
10.8	Aaron's sons, the priests will blow into the trumpets.	Aaron's sons, the priests will blow into the trumpets.	And the priests, the sons of Aaron shall sound with the trumpets,

	And they shall be for you (pl.) a perpetual statute throughout your (pl.) generations.	And they shall be for you (pl.) a perpetual statute throughout your (pl.) generations.	and it shall be a perpetual ordinance for you (pl.) throughout your generations.
10.9	For when you go into battle in your land against the aggressor who aggresses against you, you shall alarm with the trumpets, so that you may be remembered before Yahweh your God, and be delivered from your enemies.	For when you go into battle in your land against the aggressor who aggresses against you, you shall alarm with the trumpets, so that you may be remembered before Yahweh your God, and be delivered from your enemies.	But if you should go into battle in your land against hostile forces that are opposed to you, and you will blow the trumpets and you will be remembered before the Lord, and you will be delivered from your enemies.
10.10	And on your joyous occasions – your appointed festivals, your new moon celebrations – you shall blow into the trumpets over your burnt offerings and over your sacrifices of well-being. They shall be a reminder to you before Yhwh your God. I am Yhwh your God.	And on your joyous occasions your appointed festivals, your new moon celebrations you shall blow into the trumpets over your burnt offerings and over your sacrifices of well-being. They shall be a reminder to you before Yhwh your God. I am Yhwh your God.	And in the days of your gladness, and in your feasts, and in your new moons, you shall sound the trumpets over the whole burnt offerings and at the sacrifice of you thanksgiving offerings. And it will be to you a memorial for your God. I am the Lord your God
Dt 1.6	Now Yhwh our God spoke to us at Horeb, saying: "You have stayed long enough at this mountain.	Now Yhwh spoke to Moses, saying: "You have stayed long enough at this mountain.	
Dt 1.7	Start out and make your way to the hill country of the Amorites and to all their neighbors in the Arabah, the hill country, the Shephelah, the Negeb, the seacoast, the land of the Canaanites, and the Lebanon, as far as the Great River, the river Euphrates.	Start out and make your way to the hill country of the Amorites and to all their neighbors in the Arabah, the hill country, and the Shephelah, the Negeb, and the seacoast, the land of the Canaanites, and the Lebanon, as far as the Great River, the river Euphrates.	
Dt 1.8	See, I place the land at your disposal. Go, take possession of the land that the LORD swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to assign to them and to their heirs after them.	See, I place the land at your disposal. Go, take possession of the land that the LORD swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to assign to them and to their heirs after them.	