University of Pennsylvania Libraries

2

Conflation as a Redactional Technique

JEFFREY H. TIGAY

Editor's Note

One important aspect of biblical criticism not paralleled in the evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic* is the theory, best known from the documentary hypothesis, that many biblical texts are not only *composite* but *conflate*. That is, they are composed of two (or more) variant versions of the same event, spliced or woven together by a redactor. Skeptics have considered this approach especially vulnerable, arguing that such a phenomenon is unheard of in the history of literature. The present chapter shows that conflation is a well-attested practice of redactors from ancient times down to our own day. Examples are brought from the Qumran scrolls, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, postbiblical Jewish literature, and modern works. The ancient examples display the kinds of inconsistencies which critics take as signs of conflation; they confirm that such phenomena do sometimes result from the conflation of sources. By enabling us to compare conflate texts with their sources, these examples also reveal the techniques and aims of the redactors. The chapter concludes with citations from the writings of two modern redactors, H. N. Bialik and Y. J. Rawnitzki, who describe their own assumptions and procedures in terms that are strikingly similar to those which critics have used in describing the work of ancient redactors.

• • • •

Conflation in Pentateuchal Criticism

One of the most important techniques of redaction posited by Pentateuchal criticism is the combination of different texts—often variants of one and the same text or tradition—into a single text, that is, *conflation*. In the simplest form, a redactor might simply place two versions of an event side by side, treating the second as an amplification of the first (such as the accounts of creation in Gen. 1:1–2:4a[P] and 2:4b–24[J]), or he might keep the accounts separate and treat them as different events (such as the wife-sister stories, Gen. 12:10–20[J]; 20[E]; 26:6–11[J]). In other circumstances the redactor would insert one version of an event into another (e.g., Abram's migration, with Gen. 12:1–4a[J] inserted between Gen. 11:31–32 and 12:4b–5[P]),[1] or would fully interweave two versions, suggesting that their conflicting details represent different stages of a process or different aspects of an event[2] (e.g., the J and P accounts of the flood in Gen. 6:5–8:17). The procedure of the Pentateuchal redactor has been characterized by M. Greenberg as follows:

[He] seems to have been intent on forging a continuous narrative. He therefore incorporated significant, complementary variants side by side, attempting to elaborate a single, reasonably effective narrative out of them. At times we suspect he may have regarded the result as a restoration of the true complexity of the event—a complexity dissolved into its elements among the various traditions he received.[3]

It is this aspect of Pentateuchal criticism which a number of its critics have found hard to believe is realistic, as we have seen.[4] But conflation is in fact a well-attested technique in Hebrew and related literature from antiquity down to modern times. Although G. F. Moore's analogy from the *Diatessaron* was resisted by some on the ground of its lateness, we shall see in this and the next chapter that the technique of conflation is attested much earlier.

1. For the logic of the redactor's arrangement, see Friedman, "Sacred History," pp. 29–30.
2. See Chapter 1, nn. 9 and 10.
3. Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, p. 196. This aspect of redaction is described by Friedman as "mechanical," by which he means that the order in which the redactor arranges details is dictated by the contents of the elements: certain elements are presupposed by others and must therefore precede them, etc. (Friedman, "Sacred History," pp. 28–34; note that Friedman does not use "mechanical" pejoratively). Cf. the description of Tatian's work in the *Diatessaron* by Abd-Isho bar Berika (d. 1318): "he preserved with all care the accurate order of the sayings and deeds" of Jesus (Stenning, "Diatessaron," p. 454), a description that may capture what Tatian himself thought he was doing. Both Friedman and Greenberg show that the redactors are sometimes motivated by literary and theological considerations as well as mechanical ones; see Friedman, "Sacred History"; Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*; idem, "Thematic Unity"; idem, "Redaction."
4. See Introduction, pp. 2–3.

Conflation is most familiar as a phenomenon in textual history, where a scribe, confronted with variant readings, refuses to choose one over the other but presents them both (usually producing a redundant text). A number of redundant biblical passages are presumed to have come about in this way, and the process is demonstrably present in biblical manuscripts and translations.[5] In principle, the "scribal" preservation of double readings does not differ from the "redactorial" practice of presenting two variant accounts of the same theme or event.[6] In cuneiform literature the practice can be seen in an inscription of Ashurbanipal in which two versions of the mission of an envoy to Ashurbanipal have been preserved side by side (see below, Chapter 5, pp. 154–55).[7] The practice is well attested in biblical manuscripts and translations, and in postbiblical Jewish literature. We shall examine several cases in this chapter.

Texts of the Sabbath Command

The Qumran manuscript 4QDeut[n] presents a composite version of the motive clause for the Sabbath command, adding the version found in Exod. 20:11 (citing the creation) after that found in Deut. 5:15 (citing the exodus). The same combination appears in the Codex Vaticanus of the LXX (LXX[B]), where the passage from Exodus is added in Deut. 5:14.[8] Note the redundancy produced by the conflation (the passage from Exodus is italicized):

4QDeut[n] 5:12–15[9]

[12]Observe the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, as the Lord your God commanded you. [13]Six days you shall labor and do all your work; [14]but on the seventh day, the

5. Perles, *Analekten*, p. 82; idem, *Analekten*, N.F., pp. 109–12; Gordis, *Biblical Text*, pp. liv–lvi, 41–43; Talmon, "Double Readings"; idem, "Synonymous Readings"; idem, "Conflate Readings"; Janzen, "Double Readings." Talmon's articles include many examples from the ancient translations, as do the following: Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 375, 480; Driver, *Samuel*, pp. lv–lvii; Komlosh, *Bible*, pp. 154–55, 365–66, 377; Weiss, *Aramaic Targum*, pp. 191–92, 288–93; Shinan, *Aggadah*, pp. 202–5; for further bibliography, see Talmon, "Conflate Readings," bibliography, and Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 189–90 n. 6. For Sumero-Akkadian examples, see Kutscher, *Angry Sea*, pp. 121, 132, 138–39, 141–42; Krecher, "Glossen," pp. 435–36. For an Egyptian example, see Gilula, "Smiting," p. 94.

6. Cf. Seeligmann, Review of Elliger, *Studien*, p. 39, col. 2; Talmon, "Conflate Readings," p. 132, sec. 8.

7. For a possibly conflate cuneiform creation story, see *EGE*, p. 104 n. 79.

8. Skehan, "Scrolls," p. 102.

9. Text in Cross, *Scrolls*, plate 19 (where the old siglum 4QDeut[m] is used); trans. based on pp. 31–32 there. Note also the phylactery text 8Q3, where Deut. 5:1–14 is followed by Exod. 20:11 (DJD 3, p. 154, fig. 10).

Sabbath to the Lord your God, you shall do no work in it, you, your son, your daughter, your manservant, your ox, or your ass, or your cattle, the sojourners who are within your gates, that your manservant and your maidservant may rest as well as you. [15]You shall remember that you were a servant in the land of Egypt and the Lord your God brought you out thence with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore the Lord your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day to keep it holy; *for in six days the Lord made the heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them; and He rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day to keep it holy.*

LXX^B, Deut. 5:12–15[10]

[12]Observe the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, as the Lord your God commanded you. [13]Six days you shall labor and do all your work; [14]but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God; you shall do no work in it, you, and your son, and your daughter, your manservant and your maidservant, your ox, and your ass, and all your cattle, the sojourner who dwells among you, *for in six days the Lord made the heaven and earth and the sea and all that is in them*; that your manservant and your maidservant and your cattle may rest as well as you. [15]You shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out thence with a mighty hand and a raised arm; therefore the Lord commanded you to observe the Sabbath day and keep it holy.

Of the two texts,[11] that from Qumran has the longer interpolation from Exodus, and the redundancy is blatant. Two clauses, each beginning with "therefore," explain the sanctity of the Sabbath in different ways. On the face of it a fine distinction could be drawn between the two clauses: the first explains why God commanded *Israel* to observe the Sabbath and keep it holy, while the second explains why God *himself* blessed the day to keep it holy. Possibly the interpolator made such a distinction in his own mind. But such a distinction would be forced. The presence of "to make it holy" in both clauses indicates that they explain the same thing, and it would be difficult to show that, in the context of the Decalogue, God's blessing the

10. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 1:295, last note.
11. Since Exod. 20:11 is inserted in different verses in the two texts, 4QDeut[n] clearly does not reflect the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Vaticanus. The latter interrupts the Deuteronomic version of the command by inserting Exod. 20:11a$_1$ in Deut. 5:14 after "the stranger within your gates," which is precisely where it appears in Exodus 20; this has the effect of making the reference to creation precede the reference to the exodus, as it should historically, but it creates a non sequitur (see below). The Qumran text adds Exod. 20:11 at the end of Deuteronomy's Sabbath command, thus preserving the unity of the Deuteronomic version and avoiding separation of the logically connected references to letting servants rest and to Israel's past servitude in verses 14 and 15.

day means something other than commanding Israel to observe it. We have here two different views of the reason for the sanctity of the Sabbath, the kind of inconsistency which figures prominently in source-criticism.[12] In LXX[B] the interpolation from Exod. 20:11 omits the first clause, which begins with "therefore," and thereby eliminates the explicit clash of competing explanations of the sanctity of the Sabbath. But the inconsistency is not fully eliminated: the remaining part of the interpolation still explains the command to observe the Sabbath on the basis of creation, while verse 15 explains it by the exodus. What is more, in LXX[B] the location of the interpolation is awkward, interrupting the natural continuity between those who are to refrain from work and the explanation that the command is for the benefit of some of them. The resulting sequence—the Lord created everything in six days so that your servants, etc., may rest—is a non sequitur. Indeed, God's six days of creating would seem to justify man's weekday labors better than his Sabbath rest. In any case, here too is the kind of awkwardness with which critical analysis begins.[13] In both cases it seems likely that, even without knowledge of the Masoretic Text of Exodus and Deuteronomy, the redundancy and awkwardness of the passages from Exodus in these manuscripts would have led critics to recognize them as interpolations from elsewhere.

A Doublet in the Septuagint of Esther

A narrative doublet resulting from conflation is found in the LXX of Esther, in one of the six additional passages not found in the Hebrew text. One of these describes an incident that duplicates another found later in both the Hebrew and LXX, at 2:21–23. In the LXX these are presented as two separate episodes. Their similarities are such that source criticism of the LXX would recognize them as two variants of the same episode even if we did not have documentary evidence to that effect. Translations of the two episodes, along with a translation of the Hebrew text of the second, are on the following pages.

The two episodes differ from each other in the following details (only the relevant ones are noted): in A:12 the conspirators are named, while in 2:21 they are not; in A:13 Mordecai personally informs the king of the plot, while in 2:22 he reports through Esther; and in A:16 the king rewards Mordecai for his actions, while he was not rewarded for the incident in

---

12. See, e.g., Driver, *ILOT*, pp. 8–9, for double explanations of one phenomenon.
13. See, e.g., Eissfeldt, *OTI*, pp. 187–88.

LXX Est. Addition A:12–16[14]	*LXX Est. 2:21–23*[15]	*Hebrew Est. 2:21–23*
12And Mordecai was resting in the court with Gabatha and Tharra, two of the king's eunuchs who guarded the court, 13and he overheard their discussion and investigated their concerns, and learned that they were preparing to lay hands on King Artaxerxes.	21And two of the king's eunuchs, the chiefs of the body-guard, became angry because Mordecai was promoted,	21At that time, when Mordecai was sitting in the King's Gate, Bigtan and Teresh, two of the king's eunuchs who guarded the threshhold, became angry
So he informed the king about it.	and they sought to kill King Artaxerxes. 22The matter, however, became known to Mordecai, and he made it known to Esther, and she reported the matter of the conspiracy to the king. 23And the king interrogated the two eunuchs,	and they sought to kill King Ahasueros. 22The matter, however, became known to Mordecai, and he told Queen Esther, and Esther informed the king in Mordecai's name. 23The matter was investigated
14The king then interrogated the two eunuchs, and when they had confessed, they were led off (to execution). 15The king wrote these matters down as a record,	and hanged them. And the king gave orders to make an entry as a record in the royal archives about Mordecai's benefaction, as a commendation.	and confirmed, and the two (conspirators) were impaled on stakes, and (the affair) was recorded in the daily record in the king's presence.

and Mordecai wrote about this matter. [16]The king ordered Mordecai to serve in the court, and bestowed gifts upon him for this.

14. Text in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 1:952; trans. based on C. A. Moore, *Additions*, p. 174 (modified for greater literalness).
15. Text in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 1:956.

2:21–23 (see 6:2–3). In the context of the LXX these differences do not make the episodes contradictory because they are placed at different points in the story and appear as two different incidents, between which differences are to be expected. The one detail that would have made the episodes mutually exclusive is the names of the eunuchs in 2:21. We know from the Hebrew text of 2:21 and 6:2 that these were Bigtan and Teresh, the same two who were executed after the incident in A:12–16.[16] This confirms that the two episodes were originally variants of one and the same episode. However, the other differences between the two versions must have convinced the Greek translator (or the redactor of his Hebrew *Vorlage*) that these were separate incidents.[17] He must have inferred from this that the conspirators in 2:21–23 could not have been Bigtan and Teresh[18] and eliminated their names there. Since 6:2–3 indicated that Mordecai still remained unrewarded for the incident in 2:21–23, the incident for which he *was* rewarded must have been earlier; accordingly, that incident was moved up to an earlier location. The redactor of this version thus did a satisfactory job of smoothing out discrepancies within his material.[19] However, the surviving similarities would have led a critic to classify the two stories as variants of each other, much as the wife-sister stories or the accounts of Hagar's flight/expulsion in Genesis are classified.[20] Indeed, in the "Lucianic" revision of the LXX of Esther the entire incident in 2:21–23 is omitted,

16. Their names are still recognizable in the corrupt Greek forms Gabatha (metathesized form of Bagatha, cf. 1:10) and Tharra.

17. Bickerman's comments on the doublets are worth quoting: "Why, then, two parallel stories in the Greek Esther? When an ancient author, particularly an Oriental historian, had before him two or more variants of the same story, he rarely ventured to make a choice. He rather supposed that the different versions were narrations of different events, and tried to co-ordinate the variants to the best of his knowledge and ability. Everybody knows how the same incidents are reported twice or three times in mutually exclusive parallel narratives in the historical parts of Scripture. In the Hellenistic East, Jews told various stories with considerable difference in detail about Queen Esther and the vizir Mordecai. A mural in the Synagogue at Dura-Europos shows the king and Esther together in a scene that seems to be unknown in the extant written sources. The author of the Hebrew Book of Esther collected and edited only a part of this lore. Lysimachus [the Greek translator], however, also heard another version of the conspiracy of eunuchs. It seems that a dream led Mordecai to discover the criminal plot [see A:1–17]. Conspiracies hatched by royal eunuchs being no rare occurrence in the East, Lysimachus conjectured that his hero had saved the king twice. Accordingly, he re-arranged his sources." (Bickerman, *Four Strange Books*, pp. 224–25)

18. Or, that they were two other eunuchs with the same names, which would confuse his readers.

19. Moore, *Additions*, p. 168.

20. Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 285, 325, on the Hagar stories, and pp. 315, 364–65, on the wife-sister stories; more generally Gunkel, *Legends*, pp. 99–100; Eissfeldt, *OTI*, pp. 186–87; Driver, *ILOT*, pp. 8, 9, etc. (see his Index s.v. "Double narratives"); Cassuto, *Documentary Hypothesis*, chaps. 6–7.

along with a number of other details of the Hebrew text which are paralleled in the LXX's additions.[21] This implies that 2:21–23 was already recognized in antiquity as a doublet of A:12–16, just as the other dropped details were recognized as repetitions of matters covered in the additions.

Our ability to check the redactor's sources shows us more than the fact that his text is composite. When we can compare the combined form with the original, uncombined forms, we can see what changes, if any, the redactor made to effect the join and accommodate the texts to each other. The ideal situation is represented in the case of the Qumran and Codex Vaticanus texts of the Sabbath command, where we have the uncombined source texts in the Masoretic Text of Exodus and Deuteronomy as well as the combined forms in the Qumran and Greek manuscripts. We can see that both manuscripts left the text of Deuteronomy essentially intact, and that Vaticanus included less of the Exodus version than 4QDeut[n] did and thereby avoided an explicit clash of motive clauses, but at the price of a non sequitur in the text. The evidence for the story of the eunuchs' conspiracy in the Septuagint of Esther is not quite as clear. There only one of the components is known to us in its original form (2:21–23, known from the Masoretic Text), while the version in Addition A:12–16 is known to us only in the form in which it is found in the Septuagint of Esther. While a comparison of the Septuagint's 2:21–23 with its Hebrew original enabled us to see that the Septuagint dropped the names of the conspirators in order to avoid an out-and-out conflict with A:12–16, we cannot tell whether the latter was incorporated intact or also underwent adjustment.

The Samaritan Pentateuch: Jethro's Advice to Moses

Another case where we have both sources of a conflate text is in the Samaritan Pentateuch.[22] The Samaritan version of the Torah is part of a group of expansive, synthesizing manuscripts classified by P. Kahle and others as vulgar or popular[23] and by F. M. Cross as Palestinian.[24] These

21. See Tov, "The 'Lucianic' Text," pp. 11–12.

22. For characterizations of the Samaritan Pentateuch, see Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch"; Weiss, *Studies*, pp. 63–189; Purvis, *EM* 8:173–77.

23. Kahle, "Untersuchungen," pp. 5–12; idem, *Cairo Geniza*, pp. 147–48; Gaster, *Samaritans*, pp. 123–28; Gerleman, *Synoptic Studies*, pp. 3–8; Talmon, "Samaritan Pentateuch"; Greenberg, "Stabilization." For these designations, note the reference to "village people" in the *ʿĀrûk* passage cited by Greenberg, "Stabilization," p. 159, and to *hedyôṭôt*, "common folk," in *b. Sanh.* 21b, cited by Talmon, "Samaritan Pentateuch," pp. 149–50. The designations are rejected by Cross, followed by Purvis; see the next note.

24. Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch*, pp. 69–87; Cross, "Evolution," and his earlier studies cited by Purvis, pp. 79–80; see also the very useful study of Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch"

manuscripts, well attested at Qumran and best exemplified in the Samaritan Pentateuch, are characterized by expansion of the basic text with variant readings or with material imported from related passages elsewhere in Scripture,[25] in other words, by "double" or "conflate" readings such as those mentioned above.

In Pentateuchal manuscripts a number of the expansions involve material from Deuteronomy, since Deuteronomy contains variant accounts of several earlier narratives. Because of its full preservation, the Samaritan Torah is the best witness to such synthesizing, and it will serve as the basis of the following discussion. However, the practice is not exclusively Samaritan.[26] The Samaritan Pentateuch itself is not an exclusively Samaritan text, apart from a few sectarian additions and changes; rather, it is essentially an early Hebrew text-type which is sometimes reflected in early manuscripts of the Mishna,[27] a decidedly non-Samaritan composition, as well as in the proto-Samaritan manuscripts from Qumran.[28] These characteristics are

---

(reference courtesy of Edward M. Curtis). A brief demurrer to the geographic classification was registered by Skehan, "Two Books," p. 77 with n. 2; a comprehensive survey and critique are presented by Talmon, "Old Testament Text," esp. pp. 193–99.

25. Cf. Skehan, "Scrolls." On p. 102 Skehan notes the exegetical character of such synoptic additions, "explaining the Bible by the Bible, within the Bible itself." Similarly, A. Toeg noted the exegetical character of the conflate Samaritan version of the Sinai theophany (see below) by comparing it to a medieval Karaite commentary: "The interpretation is identical; only the exegetical technique differs, owing to the [intervening] santification of the wording of the text" (Toeg, *Lawgiving*, pp. 44–46; reference courtesy of Professors J. Licht and S. E. Loewenstamm). Likewise Rashi, in his commentary at Num. 13:1 (in *MG*), refers to Deut. 1:22, whereas SP inserts Deut. 1:20–23, slightly modified, into the text right before Num. 13:1. The same point is made in Talmudic sources with reference to the Samaritan plus "near Shechem" in Deut. 11:30; in *y. Soṭa* 7:3, 21c, and parallels it is observed that what the Samaritans make explicit in the text itself the Jews do externally by exegesis (see E. S. Rosenthal, *Lĕšônôt*, pp. 319–20 n. 186 [reference courtesy of Professor Shamma Friedman]).

26. Kahle, "Untersuchungen," pp. 7–12; idem, *Cairo Geniza*, pp. 144–48.

27. Weiss, *Studies*, pp. 206–9.

28. Skehan, "Scrolls," pp. 101–3. 4QpaleoEx^m (Skehan, "Exodus") preserves a bit of the conflate text, and Skehan showed that the size of the lacuna in the ms. leaves no doubt that the rest of the interpolation from Deuteronomy was present ("Qumran," pp. 22–23; cf. idem, "Exodus," p. 187). Elsewhere Skehan pointed out that the conflate text is reflected in 4Q175 ("Testimonia") as well ("Period," p. 435; cf. idem, "Exodus," p. 187; 4Q175 was edited by Allegro, "Further," pp. 182–87). The same is true of 4Q158, frag. 6, though it is debated whether this is part of a proto-Samaritan biblical ms. (Weiss, *Studies*, pp. 209 n. 17, 330–31) or a paraphrase (Allegro, DJD 5, p. 3; Tov, "Harmonizations," pp. 16–18); the term "paraphrase" is questioned by Strugnell, "Notes," p. 168). (M. Baillet, "Texte samaritaine," suggested that the "proto-Samaritan" mss. are actually Samaritan, but the absence of the Samaritan tenth commandment—the most distinctive Samaritan feature—from 4QpaleoEx^m [see below, n. 42] argues against this view). F. M. Cross kindly informed me that the unpublished 4QEx^a has all the pluses from Deuteronomy that the Samaritan Exodus has, as well as affinities with the LXX (cf. the fragment transliterated in Cross, *Ancient Library*, pp. 184–85 n. 31). On 4QNum^b, see ibid., p. 186.

well known but have not been brought to bear on the documentary hypothesis.[29]

In a number of pericopes the Samaritan presents a conflate text. This conflateness is secondary compared with the shortness of the Masoretic Text.[30] Apart from the question of precise recensional relationships,[31] the "conservative, often pristine"[32] Masoretic Text reflects a stage anterior to the expansion which produced the Samaritan. Therefore, by a comparison of the Masoretic and Samaritan texts of these pericopes, we can disentangle the component parts of the latter and view the methods by which they were combined, just as G. F. Moore did with the *Diatessaron* and the Gospels. In following this procedure below, we will for convenience refer somewhat anachronistically to the Masoretic Text as the source of the Samaritan, though in fact in its present form the Masoretic Text merely reflects that source.

An example that shows the harmonistic purpose of conflation is found in the story of Jethro's advice to Moses as it is presented in the Samaritan's Exodus 18 and the proto-Samaritan Exodus manuscript from Qumran.[33] On the following pages is the text of the Samaritan version, in the center column, flanked by the "sources" of that version: the Masoretic Exodus (left-hand column, in Roman type) and the Masoretic Deuteronomy (right-hand column, in italics); the components of the Samaritan text are printed in typefaces corresponding to their sources. Material found in neither source, and thus inferably by the redactor, is underlined. To facilitate comparison with the Masoretic Text, verses in the Samaritan are given the same numbers as their MT counterparts, and the interpolated verses are designated by letters added to the number of the verse they follow (thus: 24, 24a, 24b, etc.). As we can see, the Masoretic text of Exodus 18 has Moses institute Israel's judicial administration at Jethro's suggestion, which is addressed to Moses (Exod. 18:19–24). Deuteronomy, however, speaks

---

29. That a "pleonasm" similar to the Samaritan's may underlie parts of the MT has been alluded to before: König, "Samaritan Pentateuch," p. 70b; Skehan, "Scrolls," p. 103 (cf. Levine, "Descriptive," though Levine and Skehan posit different orders of development); regarding Jeremiah, see Cross, "Contribution," p. 82, and Tov, below, Chapter 8, pp. 229–30, 233. On Num. 21:33–35 (called to my attention by A. Rofé) see Gray, *Numbers*, p. 306. That inferences have not been drawn from the synthetic techniques for the documentary hypothesis is probably due to preoccupation with the Samaritan and Qumran biblical manuscripts as aids in text criticism, which is generally kept separate from literary criticism; cf. the opening paragraph of Roberts, *O.T. Text*, p. 1.

30. Cf. Cross, "Contribution," p. 86, and Talmon, "O.T. Text," pp. 194–96.

31. Note the remark of Kahle, "Untersuchungen," p. 7, par. 3: the Urtext presupposed by the Samaritan is not to be confused with the Jewish *textus receptus*.

32. Cross, "Contribution," p. 86.

33. For the proto-Samaritan text see Skehen, "Qumran," p. 22, on col. 26; for the Masoretic and Samaritan texts, see Appendix A to this chapter.

Samaritan Exodus 18

²¹You shall seek out for
yourself from among all
the people capable men
who fear God, trustwor-
thy men who spurn ill-
gotten gain; and set
these over them as chiefs
of thousands, chiefs of hundreds,
chiefs of fifties and
chiefs of tens. ²²Let
them exercise authority
over the people at all
times; let them bring
every major matter to
you, but decide every
minor matter themselves.
Make it easier for your-
self, and let them share
the burden with you. ²³If
you do this—and God so
commands you—you will be
able to bear up; and all
these people will go home
content." ²⁴Moses heeded
his father-in-law and did
all that he had said. ²⁴ᵃ*Mo-*

Masoretic Exodus 18

²¹You shall seek out for
yourself from among all
the people capable men
who fear God, trustwor-
thy men who spurn ill-
gotten gain; and set
these over them as chiefs
of thousands, chiefs of hundreds,
chiefs of fifties and
chiefs of tens. ²²Let
them exercise authority
over the people at all
times; let them bring
every major matter to
you, but decide every
minor matter themselves.
Make it easier for your-
self, and let them share
the burden with you. ²³If
you do this—and God so
commands you—you will be
able to bear up; and all
these people will go home
content." ²⁴Moses heeded
his father-in-law and did
all that he had said.

9 I said to you at that time, "I cannot bear the burden of you alone. 10 The Lord your God has multiplied you until you are today as numerous as the stars in the sky. 11 May the Lord, the God of your fathers, increase your numbers a thousandfold, and bless you as He promised you. 12 How can I alone bear the trouble of you, and the burden, and the bickering! 13 Pick from each of your tribes men who are wise, discerning, and experienced, and I will appoint them as your heads." 14 You answered me and said, "What you propose to do is good." 15 So I took your tribal leaders, wise and experienced men, and I appointed them heads over you: chiefs of thousands, chiefs of hundreds, chiefs of fifties, and chiefs of tens, and

ses said to the people, "I myself cannot bear the burden of you alone. 24b The Lord your God has multiplied you until you are today as numerous as the stars in the sky. 24c May the Lord, the God of your fathers, increase your numbers a thousandfold, and bless you as He promised you. 24d How can I alone bear the trouble of you, and the burden, and the bickering! 24e Pick from each of your tribes men who are wise, discerning, and experienced, and I will appoint them as your heads." 24f They answered and said, "What you propose to do is good." 24g So he took their tribal leaders, wise and experienced men, and he appointed them heads over them: chiefs of thousands, chiefs of hundreds, chiefs of fifties, and chiefs of tens, and

25 Moses chose capable men out of all Israel, and appointed them heads over the people: chiefs of thousands, chiefs of hundreds, chiefs of fifties, and chiefs of tens.

officials for your tribes. ¹⁶*I charged your magistrates at that time as follows:*

"Hear out your fellow men, and decide justly between any man and a fellow Israelite or a stranger. ¹⁷*You shall not be partial in judgment; hear out high and low alike. Fear no man, for judgment is God's. And any matter that is too difficult for you, you shall bring to me and I will hear it."* ¹⁸*Thus I commanded you at that time about the various things that you should do.*

officials for their tribes. ²⁴ᴴ*He charged their magistrates as follows:*

"Hear out your fellow men, and decide justly between any man and a fellow Israelite or a stranger. ²⁴ᴵ*You shall not be partial in judgment; hear out high and low alike. Fear no man, for judgment is God's. And any matter that is too difficult for you, you shall bring near to me and I will hear it.* ²⁴ᴶ*Thus He commanded them   about the various things that they should do.* ²⁶*And they would exercise authority over the people at all times: the major matters they would bring to Moses, and all the minor matters they would decide themselves.* ²⁷*Then Moses bade his father-in-law farewell, and he went his way to his own land.*

²⁶And they   exercised authority over the people at all times: the difficult matters they would bring to Moses, and all the minor matters they would decide themselves. ²⁷Then Moses bade his father-in-law farewell, and he went his way to his own land.

only of Moses' initiative, addressed to the people (Deut. 1:9–18). The Samaritan Exodus resolves this by arranging the conflicting details in sequence. First come Jethro's advice and Moses' compliance, from Exodus; then, from Deuteronomy, Moses broaches the idea to the people, the people approve, Moses appoints the chiefs and charges them. All this is absent from the Masoretic Exodus save the appointment, which comes about halfway through the Deuteronomic insert; rather than interrupt the insert momentarily for the sake of a variant which offers nothing substantially different from Deuteronomy's description, the Samaritan preserves Deuteronomy's version and drops that of Exodus. The hand of the redactor is visible in the change from first and second person, which befits the insert's Deuteronomic home, to third person where necessary, as suits the narrative context of its new home in the Samaritan Exodus; and in the dropping of Deuteronomy's *bā‘ēt hahî*, which fits Deuteronomy's retrospective stance but not Exodus.

How much of this could have been recognized by source criticism if the Masoretic Exodus and Deuteronomy were not available to guide the analysis? Clearly, some omissions, such as "at that time," and changes such as that from first to third person, would have eluded detection, and the stance of Deuteronomy as a retrospective speech by Moses could not have been surmised from this pericope. On the whole, however, the Samaritan pericope is full of signs of compositeness which would have led critics to unravel its components rather accurately. The analysis would have begun with inconsistencies between the proposal and its execution. Jethro advises *Moses* to seek out men "from among all the people" (18:21, from Exodus), but in complying Moses asks *the people* to do the choosing (24e, from Deuteronomy). He then takes (on the people's recommendation?) not men "from among all the people" but "the tribal leaders" (24g, from Deuteronomy). Jethro recommends "capable men who fear God, trustworthy men who spurn ill-gotten gain" (21, from Exodus), but Moses asks for and appoints "wise, discerning, and experienced men" (24e and 24g, from Deuteronomy).[34] Jethro speaks only of "chiefs of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens" (21, from Exodus), but Moses adds "magistrates" (*šōṭerîm*, 24g, from Deuteronomy). These inconsistencies would have suggested that Jethro's proposal and Moses' execution of it are from different sources. Vocabulary differences would have supported the suggestion and carried it further: Jethro had used the verb "bring" (*yebî᾿ûn*, 22, from Exodus) with major matters, but Moses used "bring near" (*taqrîbûn*, 24i, from Deuteronomy); Jethro had differentiated between major and minor matters (*gādôl, qāṭôn*, 22, from Exodus), whereas Moses spoke only of any

---

34. On these differences between Exodus and Deuteronomy, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 244–45. *yedū‘îm* is a *pā‘ûl* active participle; see *GKC* sec. 50f; Hoffman, *Sēfer Devārîm*, 1:31; E. Y. Kutscher, *Language*, p. 268; Yalon, *Pirqê Lāšôn*, pp. 323–24.

matter that is "too difficult" (*yiqšeh mi-*, 24i, from Deuteronomy). The reversion to "bring," "major," and "minor" in verse 26 would have indicated that the redactor had now returned to the first source.[35] Harmonistic exegesis might regard such variation as an attempt to avoid monotony. The redactor may have told himself the same, and there is no denying that the differences have such an effect and that Hebrew writers sometimes strove for variety.[36] But having seen the sources of the Samaritan pericope, we know that in this case the variation stems from differences between the sources.

The particular vocabulary differences we have mentioned are not characteristic of the sources in which they appear in this case[37] and would not have enabled critics to assign the components of this pericope to the larger literary entities to which they belong, that is, Exodus and Deuteronomy. But other terms, phrases, and themes in verses 24a–24j are characteristic of Deuteronomy, and assuming that much of Deuteronomy had been reconstructed by critics, these would have facilitated its identification as the source of those verses. These include: "YHWH the God of your fathers" (24c), "as He promised you" (24c), the long form *'êkâ* for "how" (24d),[38] the intellectual qualifications for judges (24e and 24g),[39] and the idiom *hikkîr pānîm* for judicial partiality (24i).[40]

The Samaritan Pentateuch: The Theophany at Mount Sinai

The best-known composite pericope in the Samaritan Torah is the theophany at Mount Sinai in Exodus 20. In the Samaritan and in the

35. This verse might have been misleading, since it would suggest that verse 26 in the source read "major," whereas in the MT of Exodus it reads "difficult." The reading in the Samaritan is probably a harmonization to verse 22, abetted by the awkwardness of the contrast "difficult ... minor" in the MT of verse 26 (see Weiss, *Studies*, p. 151). Conceivably this harmonization was already made in the *Vorlage* on which the Samaritan version was based.

36. Note, e.g., the different vocabulary of the suggestion and execution in Exod. 18:21–22 and 24–25: "seek out ... set ... major" (*teḥĕzeh ... wĕśamtā ... haggādōl*) vs. "chose ... appointed ... difficult" (*wayyibḥar ... wayyittēn ... haqqāšeh*). For another example, see Kaufman, "Temple Scroll," p. 41 and n. 33.

37. Thus *hēbî'* is used not only in Exodus (18:22) but also in Deuteronomy (e.g., 7:26; 12:6, 11; 23:19; 26:10; 29:26), and *hiqrîb* is used in a judicial context not only in Deuteronomy (1:7), but also in Num. 27:5.

38. On these three items, see Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. lxxx–lxxxi, nos. 16, 29, 19; on the second, see, further, Milgrom, "Profane Slaughter."

39. Compare Deut. 16:19 to Exod. 23:8, and see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 244–47.

40. Cf. Deut. 16:19; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 18, 201; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, p. 245.

proto-Samaritan biblical fragments and reflexes from Qumran, the variant account of Deuteronomy 5, supplemented by Deuteronomy 18, is fully spliced into the Exodus version.[41] The Qumran attestations show that the expansion is not an exclusively Samaritan feature. Only the law of the altar on Mount Gerizim, imported from Deuteronomy 11 and 27, which the Samaritan treats as the tenth commandment, is absent at Qumran and appears to be an exclusively Samaritan item.[42] On the following pages are the texts of the Samaritan version and its "sources," presented in the same format we followed for Exod. 18:21–27 above: the Masoretic Exodus is on the left in Roman type, the Masoretic Deuteronomy 5 is on the right in italics, and the Masoretic Deuteronomy 18 is also on the right, in boldface.[43] Material presumably by the redactor is underlined.

Just as we suppose with texts built up from J, E, and P, one finds the Samaritan Exodus here flitting back and forth between the Masoretic Exodus and Deuteronomy, adding or dropping a phrase or detail here and there in an attempt to merge and reconcile the conflicting accounts. Immediately after the Masoretic Decalogue (Exod. 20:2–17),[44] the Samaritan adds its own tenth commandment (vv. 17a–h), to which we shall return below. Following this the Samaritan text returns to where it left off in the Masoretic Exodus, whose description of the people's fright at the theophany is slightly reworded to avoid the awkward "seeing" the sounds and perhaps to avoid separating the sounds of the *šôpār* from the other sounds (v. 18).[45] The text then introduces the people's plea to Moses, but suddenly shifts after the first three words of verse 19 to Deuteronomy's version of that plea, after which it places the shorter Exodus version of the same as its conclusion (the second half of Exod. 20:19). The Masoretic Exodus is followed through Moses' response to the people, his approach to God, and the introduction to God's speech (beginning of v. 22). But before Exodus' version of God's speech (remainder of v. 22 through v. 26, concerning the altar, etc.), the text shifts to Deuteronomy 5's very different divine speech, into which is inserted Deuteronomy 18's promise of a future prophet, which promise Deuteronomy 18:16 stated was indeed first voiced on this occasion. After this interpolation the divine speech of Deuteronomy 5 is concluded from the point of interruption, and the text then returns to where it left off in Exodus 20. Exodus' introduction to its divine speech (beginning

41. See n. 28; cf. Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, pp. 144–45; Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 128.
42. Skehan, "Qumran," pp. 22–23, shows that the Samaritan tenth commandment could not have been present in 4QpaleoEx^m; the same is true of 4Q158, nos. 7–8.
43. For the Hebrew texts, see Appendix B to this chapter.
44. The Samaritan Exodus Decalogue begins by adding, from Deut. 5:21, the neighbor's field to the list of items not to be coveted (see below; so LXX and some Hebrew mss.).
45. Weiss, *Studies*, pp. 119–21.

Masoretic Exodus 20

18All the people saw the thunderclaps and the torches, the sound of the horn and the mountain smoking, and when all the people saw it, they fell back and stood at a distance. 19And they said to Moses:

Samaritan Exodus 20

18All the people heard the thunderclaps and the sound of the horn, and saw the torches and the mountain smoking, and when all the people saw it, they fell back and stood at a distance. 19And they said to Moses: 19aThe Lord our God has just shown us His presence and His greatness, and we have heard His voice from out of the fire; we have seen this day that man may live, though God has spoken to him. 19bLet us not die, then, for this great fire will consume us; if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any longer, we shall die. 19cFor what mortal ever heard the voice of the living God speak out of

Masoretic Deuteronomy

5:22The Lord spoke those words— those and no more—to your whole congregation at the mountain, with a mighty voice out of the fire, the cloud, and the thick cloud. He inscribed them on two tablets of stone, which He gave to me. 23When you heard the voice out of the darkness, while the mountain was ablaze with fire, you came up to me, all your tribal heads and elders,

24and said:
"The Lord our God has just shown us His presence and His greatness, and we have heard His voice from out of the fire; we have seen this day that man may live, though God has spoken to him. 25Let us not die, then, for this great fire will consume us; if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any longer, we shall die. 26For what mortal ever heard the voice of the living God speak out of

"You speak with us

and we will listen,
but let not God speak to us,
lest we die." 20 Moses answered
the people: "Be not afraid, for
The God has come only in order
to test you, and in order that
the fear of Him may be ever with
you, so that you do not go
astray." 21 So the people remained
at a distance, while Moses approached the thick cloud where The
God was.

22 The Lord said to Moses:

---

the fire, as we did, and lived?
19d You go closer and hear all
that the Lord our God says;
then you speak to us everything
that the Lord our God tells you,
and we will listen and obey,
19b but let not The God speak to us,
lest we die." 20 Moses answered
the people: "Be not afraid, for
The God has come only in order
to test you, and in order that
the fear of Him may be ever with
you, so that you do not go
astray." 21 So the people remained
at a distance, while Moses approached the thick cloud where The
God was.

22 The Lord spoke to Moses,
saying: 22a "I have heard the sound
of this people's words which
they spoke to you; they did
well to speak thus. 22b May
they always be of such a mind,
to revere Me and follow all My
commandments, that it may go
well with them and with their

---

the fire, as we did, and lived?
27 You go closer and hear all
that the Lord our God says;
then you speak to us everything
that the Lord our God tells you,
and we will listen and obey.

28 The Lord heard the
sound of your words
as you spoke to me,
and the Lord said to me:
"I have heard the sound
of this people's words which
they spoke to you; they did
well to speak thus. 29 May
they always be of such a mind,
to revere Me and follow all My
commandments, that it may go
well with them and with their

children forever. [18:18]I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own people, like yourself: I will put My words in his mouth and he will speak to them all that I command him; [19]and if anybody fails to heed the words he speaks in My name, I Myself will call him to account. [20]But any prophet who presumes to speak in My name an oracle which I did not command him to utter, or who speaks in the name of other gods—that prophet shall die. [21]And should you ask yourself: 'How can we recognize an oracle which the Lord did not utter?'—[22]if the prophet speaks in the name of the Lord and the word does not come true, that word was not spoken by the Lord; the prophet has uttered it presumptuously: do not stand in dread of him. *[5:30]Go, say to them, 'Return to your tents.' [5:31]But you remain here with Me, and I will speak to you the whole instruction—*

children forever. [22c]I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own people, like yourself: I will put My words in his mouth and he will speak to them all that I command him; [22d]and if anybody fails to heed the words he speaks in My name, I Myself will call him to account. [22e]But any prophet who presumes to speak in My name an oracle which I did not command him to utter, or who speaks in the name of other gods—that prophet shall die. [22f]And should you ask yourself: "How can we recognize an oracle which the Lord did not utter?"—[22g]if the prophet speaks in the name of the Lord and the word does not come true, that word was not spoken by the Lord; the prophet has uttered it presumptuously: do not stand in dread of him. *[22h]Go, say to them, 'Return to your tents.' [22i]But you remain here with Me, and I will speak to you the whole instruction—*

"Thus shall you say to the Israelites: 'You yourselves saw that I spoke to you from the very heavens: ²³With Me, therefore, you shall not make any gods of silver, nor shall you make for yourselves any gods of gold. ²⁴Make for Me an altar of earth and sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your sacrifices of well-being, from your sheep and your oxen; in every place where I shall cause My name to be mentioned, I will come to you and bless you. ²⁵And if you make for Me an altar of stones, do not build it of hewn stones; for by wielding your tool upon them you have profaned them. ²⁶Do not ascend My altar by steps, that your nakedness may not be exposed upon it.'"

the laws and the norms—which you will teach them, for them to observe in the land that I am giving them to possess." ²²The Lord spoke to Moses, saying: "Speak to the Israelites: 'You yourselves saw that I spoke to you from the very heavens: ²³With Me, therefore, you shall not make any gods of silver, nor shall you make for yourselves any gods of gold. ²⁴Make for Me an altar of earth and sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your sacrifices of well-being, your sheep and your oxen; in the place where I have caused My name to be mentioned, there I will come to you and bless you. ²⁵And if you make for Me an altar of stones, do not build it of hewn stones; for by wielding your tool upon them you have profaned them. ²⁶Do not ascend My altar by steps, that your nakedness may not be exposed upon it.'"

the laws and the norms—which you will teach them, for them to observe in the land that I am giving them to possess."

of v. 22) is repeated (resumptive repetition),[46] and the speech itself now appears as the conclusion of a long speech.

This pericope does not display the same kind of obvious inconsistencies we observed in the Jethro pericope, for the Exodus and Deuteronomy accounts of the Sinai theophany were very similar in the first place.[47] But a degree of unevenness which could have attracted the attention of the source critic is still visible. In the description of the theophany in 19:16–19 and 20:18, fire had been only one among several phenomena accompanying God's appearance; the narrator's description in 20:18 of what frightened the people mentioned fire only in the form of torches, and it gave them no more conspicuous a place than the thunderclaps ($q\bar{o}l\hat{o}t$, plural), the ram's horn, and the smoking mountain. But in the people's speech in 19a–c it is only the fire and God's voice ($q\hat{o}l$, singular) within it which terrify the people. These differences are by no means irreconcilable, since fire is the most dangerous phenomenon mentioned in the earlier passages, and 19:18 did say that God had come down in fire. But as an introduction to 19a–c, 18 is at least partly pointless. Not one of the items listed in verse 18 is identical to one in 19a–c. Only if one allows that verse 18's torches are 19b's "great fire," and that 18's thunderclaps ($q\bar{o}l\hat{o}t$) are 19a–c's "voice of God" ($q\hat{o}l\ YHWH/\ ^{\circ}el\bar{o}h\hat{i}m$) could one produce a partial congruence between the introduction and the speech, and even then the sequence would be: when the people heard A, B, C, and D, they were frightened and said "we are afraid of C' and A'." Furthermore, after the stress on God speaking from within the fire, one is unprepared for verse 21's reference to "the thick cloud ($^{c}\bar{a}rapel$) where God was." This reference seems more in keeping with 19:16, which refers to a "heavy cloud" ($^{c}\bar{a}n\bar{a}n\ k\bar{a}b\bar{e}d$). The critic might thus have come to the working hypothesis that 19:16–19 and 20:18 and 21 represent one strand in the text, and 20:19a–c another. The hypothesis

46. In other words, a composite of Deut. 5:28-29 + 18:18-22 + 5:30-31 is interpolated in Exod. 20:22-26; following the interpolation, Exodus resumes by first repeating the last sentence before the interpolation. The repetition is clearly the interpolator's creation, for the MT (which reads *wayyō²mer* for the Samaritan's *wayyĕdabbēr*) has the sentence only once. For the redactorial technique of resumptive repetition (or *Wiederaufnahme*), see above, pp. 48–49; Seeligmann, "Hebräische Erzählung," pp. 314–24; Talmon and Fishbane, "Aspects," pp. 35–38. For Akkadian examples, see *GE* III, i, 1–10, and iii, ?–11; II, v, 1–2 and 5 (see *EGE*, pp. 75–76, 95), and *VTE*, sec. 4 (Reiner, in *ANET*, p. 535a; see Frankena, "Vassal Treaties," pp. 128, 132–33). For the technique as an author's device, see Rashi at Exod. 6:29 and 30 and cf. the resumptions after digressions in Erman, *Literature*, p. 32, par. 1 end and p. 33, par. 1 end; cf. p. 29; and the *Odyssey*, book 19:393–466. Cf. also the looser recapitulations noted by J. Licht in 1QS: "Analysis," pp. 92–93, 94–95.

47. See Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. xiv–xix for the dependence of Deuteronomy on JE. A closer affinity with E has been stressed by some; see Wright, "Deuteronomy. Introduction," pp. 319–20; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, p. 34; Haran, "Methodological Observations," p. 139, considers D dependent on E alone, not JE.

would have been nudged forward by some observations about verses 19e–21. Verse 19e is mildly redundant, since it merely makes explicit the request that God not speak to the people, a request implicit in 19b and 19d. There is nothing inherently unacceptable about the people's request being made explicit, given their anxiety. But this mild redundancy goes along with a sudden shift in the terms for God. In 19a–d the people had called him "YHWH our God,"[48] but in 19e–21 they, Moses, and the narrator refer only to "The God" (*hā-ᵉlōhîm*). The shift is particularly noticeable in 19e, where it comes in midsentence: "You go close and hear all that YHWH our God tells you . . . but let not The God speak with us. . . ." Based on these different terms for God, the working hypothesis would have identified verses 19a–d as one unit and 19e–21 as another. The shift back to YHWH in verse 22 would then have suggested that the text had again changed sources, but this would have been misleading because for this redactor the proximate source of verse 22 was the same as that of 19e–21 (Exodus). Verses 22c–g would most likely have been recognized as out of place: God has approved the people's request that Moses serve as intermediary but then digresses to speak of future intermediaries, their authentication, and what will happen to those who disobey them, before getting to the point of what Moses should do. The digression interrupts the natural connection of verses 22a–b and 22h–i and produces a glaring non sequitur in which instructions on how to respond to a future false prophet (v. 22g) are followed by instructions on how Moses is to proceed immediately (v. 22h). The recognition of 22c–g as belonging to another context would have been substantiated by a shift in the audience in 22f–g, where Moses addresses future generations of Israelites who will encounter his successor prophets; this audience is appropriate in a passage from Deuteronomy, Moses' farewell speech, but not in the theophany narrative of Exodus, where that generation is unborn and Moses is not the speaker. The original unit would thus have been identified as verses 22–22b and 22h–i, with verses 22c–g recognized as an interpolation of uncertain provenance. That the unit ends with 22i would have been recognized from 22j, where God is introduced; since God has been speaking since verse 22, the introduction is superfluous in the present context. Thus it would have been recognized that verses 22j ff. were taken from a context in which God had not just been speaking.

How much of this unevenness would really have been recognized without the benefit of the Masoretic Exodus and Deuteronomy is difficult to

---

48. If "God" (*ᵉlōhîm*) is taken as referring to YHWH in the second half of verse 19a and in verse 19c, this would still be different from "The God" (*hā-ᵉlōhîm*) in verses 19e–21. Possibly, however, the people are referring to any god(s) (as in the similar context of Deut. 4:7, 33–34), their point being that nobody has ever heard a god speaking and lived, but they have just learned it is possible.

say. Many of the incongruities noted above could have been rationalized and the exercise dismissed as hypercritical. As noted, the unevenness is certainly not as blatant as in the Samaritan Jethro pericope. It is quite possible that critics would have regarded the Sinai pericope as one of those which show some signs of composition but are difficult to unravel due to great similarity between the original sources, and/or skillful blending by the redactor, a situation which in the Masoretic Torah is found especially in passages from JE.[49] Assuming that some degree of compositeness was recognized, it would have been possible to recognize several details characteristic of Deuteronomy in one of the main strands: "YHWH our God"[50] and "from the midst of the fire"[51] (vv. 19a–c), God's "greatness" (*gōdel*, v. 19a),[52] "to fear" (*lĕyirʾâ*) Him,[53] "that it may be well for them,"[54] and "all the days"[55] (v. 22b); and, in the digression: "from the midst of" (*miqqereb*) their brethren (v. 22c),[56] "presume" (*hēzîd*, v. 22e),[57] and "dread" (*gûr*, v. 22g).[58] On the other hand, verses 22j–26 would not have been recognized as coming from a non-Deuteronomic source. Although this is clear in the Masoretic Text, where verse 24 permits sacrifice "in every place where I shall cause/allow my name to be invoked," contrasting with Deuteronomy's restriction of sacrifice to a single site (Deut. 12), the Samaritan (not proto-Samaritan) revision of this verse completely hides this fact (see below).

The redaction of the Jethro and Sinai pericopes in the Samaritan Pentateuch is as fine an example as one could wish of scissors-and-paste composition, a "patchwork." But the patchwork is not "crazy." 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. He has also drawn in material (vv. 22c–22g) from outside the parallel accounts which purported to belong to the theophany pericope. This illustration of the redactor's procedure, in sum, supports Greenberg's characterization of the (Masoretic) Pentateuchal redactor's method, cited above (p. 54).

As instructive as his inclusions from Deuteronomy are the redactor's omissions. He was essentially interested in filling in speeches in places

49. See, e.g., Gunkel, *Legends*, pp. 125–26.
50. See Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. lxxix–lxxx, no. 15.
51. Ibid., no. 69 (cf. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 206–8).
52. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, no. 26 (contrast Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 1–2, 329, no. 16).
53. Driver, no. 45 (cf. Weinfeld, pp. 332–33, nos. 3–3b).
54. Driver, no. 42 (cf. Weinfeld, p. 345, no. 4).
55. Driver, no. 41 (cf. Weinfeld, p. 333, no. 3b).
56. Driver, no. 58 (contrast Weinfeld, pp. 1–2).
57. Driver, p. lxxxiv (list of unusual words).
58. Ibid.

where they purported to have been uttered, and in reconciling conflicting versions of speeches by treating them as parts of a sequence rather than variants.[59] He had little interest in nonverbal action. In this, his aims differ from those attributed to the redactor of the Torah. But in handling the speeches his methods are the same as those attributed to the latter. His omissions are minimal and insubstantial. Clearly, he aimed to use as much of his source material as possible, and he incorporated every significant detail of his parallel sources. In the Jethro pericope, he brought in everything Deuteronomy had to offer save the phrase "at that time," which was unnecessary now that the story had been brought back to its contextually proper place in Exodus; he preserved everything from the Masoretic Exodus except a verse covered by the Deuteronomic insert. In the Sinai pericope, what he dropped from one source was either covered in the parallel source, unnecessary, or out of place in the theophany scene. A good example is Deut. 5:22. The first half of this verse reads: "The Lord spoke those words—those and no more—to your whole congregation at the mountain, with a mighty voice out of the fire and dense clouds." Since the redactor preserved Exod. 20:18, which includes most of this information, the Deuteronomy version could be dispensed with. The second part of Deut. 5:22 reads: "He inscribed them on two tablets of stone, which He gave to me." Since this refers to a later event (see Exod. 24:12, 18; 32:15–16; Deut. 9:9–10), it is out of place in the theophany pericope. This is typical of the redactor's omissions: what he drops is either substantially covered in parallel material which he preserves, or dispensable on other grounds. This procedure comports with a tendency which has been observed in the redaction of the Pentateuch. Building on an observation of Albright's, Greenberg concludes: "What has not been preserved of a given source may the more confidently be supposed to have differed from our text only insubstantially."[60] In the cases we have examined, this observation is borne out.

---

59. This interest is also seen in other passages where the Samaritan has filled in gaps by adding speeches where later passages say they belong. For example, in Gen. 31:11–13 Jacob refers to an oracle he had previously received from an angel. The MT had not mentioned this oracle, but the Samaritan supplies it in Genesis 30 after verse 36, with wording based on 31:11–13 (for lists of such synoptic additions in SP, see Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch*, pp. 71–72; Gray, *Numbers*, p. xl). In the present examples, however, the Deuteronomic material that goes with these pericopes in Exodus is not simply absent from Exodus, needing merely to be added at the appropriate place. Rather, something else is already there in its place, so that a redactor needs not only to add what is missing but to adjust the two versions to facilitate their coexistence.

60. Greenberg, "Thematic Unity," p. 154; cf. idem, "Redaction," p. 243. Greenberg cites Albright, *FSAC*, p. 46 (2d ed., p. 80); cf. Dillmann, *Genesis* (Eng. trans.), p. 249; Bright, *History*, pp. 71–72.

The redactor's aim of full utilization of his source material was not fully compatible with the aim of reconciling inconsistencies. In the examples surveyed so far in this chapter, different redactors have resolved this problem in different ways. The editor of the Codex Vaticanus text of the Decalogue dropped "Therefore the Lord your God blessed the Sabbath day . . ." and avoided an explicit clash with another motive clause. The editor of the Septuagint Esther dropped the names of the eunuchs in Est. 2:21–23 and avoided conflict with A:12–16. To these editors, clearly, consistency was more important than full utilization of source material. To the redactor whose work underlies the Samaritan Pentateuch, the aim of full utilization overrode the demands of consistency. The result, as we have seen, is a text that displays, albeit in relatively minor forms, just such internal discrepancies as are at the core of Pentateuchal source criticism. That Pentateuchal source criticism would have arisen, let alone triumphed, had all internal discrepancies been as minor as these seems unlikely. However, the material used by the redactors who produced the Pentateuch seems to have been much more discrepant, and the result was a text with greater inconsistencies and therefore more amenable to critical unraveling.[61]

The Samaritan Pentateuch: The Tenth Commandment

The conflate accounts of the Jethro and theophany episodes are, as mentioned, already present in the proto-Samaritan Exodus manuscripts from Qumran. There is nothing sectarian about these accounts or the redactional techniques by which they were composed.[62] Only the Samaritan tenth commandment (Exod. 20:17a–h) and certain related tendentious features are exclusively Samaritan characteristics. That commandment has been shown by Skehan to have been absent from the Qumran manuscript, since there is insufficient space for it.[63] In other words, the Samaritan tenth commandment represents a tendentious supplement beyond the stage of redaction represented in the proto-Samaritan recension from Qumran. On the following pages, in the center column, is a translation of the commandment (preceded by the ninth), flanked by its sources. Roman type is used for material from the Masoretic Exodus 20, italics for material from the Masoretic Deuteronomy 11, boldface for material from the Masoretic Deuteronomy 27, and underlining for redactional material.

61. See further n. 71, and Chapter 1, p. 51, Chapter 5, p. 172.
62. See above, n. 26.
63. See above, n. 42. For the Hebrew texts of this commandment and its sources, see Appendix C to this chapter.

Masoretic Deuteronomy 11

Samaritan Exodus 20

17You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, his field, his male or his female slave, his ox or his ass, or anything that is your neighbor's. 17a*And when the Lord your God brings you into the land of the Canaanites which you are about to invade and occupy,* 17bYou shall set up large stones and coat them with plaster. 17cAnd you shall inscribe upon the stones all the words of this teaching.

17dAnd, upon crossing the Jordan, you shall set up these stones, about which I charge you this day, on Mount Gerizim. 17eAnd you shall build an altar there to the Lord your God, an

29*And when the Lord your God brings you into the land which you are about to invade and occupy, you shall pronounce the blessing at Mount Gerizim and the curse at Mount Ebal.*

2And as soon as you cross the Jordan into the land which the Lord your God is giving you, you shall set up large stones and coat them with plaster. 3And you shall inscribe upon them all the words of this teaching when you cross over, so that you may invade the land which the Lord your God is giving you, a land oozing milk and honey, as the Lord, the God of your fathers, promised you. 4And, upon crossing the Jordan, you shall set up these stones, about which I charge you this day, on Mount Ebal, and coat them with plaster. 5And you shall build an altar there to the Lord your God, an

altar of stones. Do not wield an iron tool over them; [6]You must build the altar of the Lord your God of unhewn stones. You shall offer on it burnt offerings to the Lord your God, [7]and you shall sacrifice sacrifices of well-being and eat them there, rejoicing before the Lord your God. [8]And on those stones you shall inscribe every word of this teaching most distinctly.

altar of stones. Do not wield an iron tool over them; [17f]you must build the altar of the Lord your God of unhewn stones. You shall offer on it burnt offerings to the Lord your God, [17g]and you shall sacrifice sacrifices of well-being and eat them there, rejoicing before the Lord your God. [17h] *That mountain is across the Jordan, beyond the west road which is in the land of the Canaanites who dwell in the Arabah—near Gilgal, by the terebinth of Mora, near Shechem.*

[30]*Both are across the Jordan, beyond the west road which is in the land of the Canaanites who dwell in the Arabah—near Gilgal, by the terebinths of Moreh.*

Unlike the Jethro and Sinai pericopes, the Samaritan tenth commandment is not a conflation of variant accounts of the same thing. It is rather a pastiche or mosaic. It consists of verses and partial verses from Deuteronomy 11 and 27, originally dealing with the same place (Shechem) but with different subjects, brought together here to create something new. Since the author of this pastiche was not trying to preserve and reconcile variants of the same text, he took greater liberty in dropping parts of his sources and using only what suited his purposes. Nonetheless, even this tendentious supplement is composed in almost every detail, save the presumed change from Ebal to Gerizim,[64] of elements already present in the Masoretic Torah and thus admittedly divine. Nor is the interpolation of this commandment at the end of the Decalogue without logic, for this law about an altar of uncut stone is thereby brought into the same context as Exodus' law, which includes an altar of uncut stone (Exod. 20:25). In this way the Samaritan interpolator endowed his religion's central dogma with Sinaitic, Decalogue authority.[65] In order to accommodate this interpolation and his dogma, it was necessary to emend verse 24b: the Masoretic "in every place where I cause/allow my name to be mentioned," which contemplates several places as yet unnamed, becomes "in the place where I have caused/allowed my name to be mentioned [*ʾzkrty*, a hybrid form],[66] there I will come and bless you," referring to the just-named site of Gerizim (and not the as-yet-unnamed Jerusalem).

What is noteworthy about the interpolator's technique is that actual changes in substance are remarkably few. On the whole he accomplished his tendentious purpose with material already present somewhere in his sources. Nonetheless, the interpolation creates a telltale inconsistency in the pericope. It requires the construction of a *stone* altar on Mount Gerizim for the purpose of sacrificing whole and peace offerings. But the reworded altar law of verse 24 (see above) requires construction of an *earthen* altar in the same place for that purpose; permission to build a *stone* altar is merely a concession (v. 25). The interpolator, who was willing to drop half-verses in his own interpolation, could not remove conflicting verses in the original text. But the point of the interpolation was so important for him that he was willing to live with the inconsistency, which he presumably rationalized in some way. For us it is another example of how interpolations can

---

64. There is no need to go into this ancient debate here (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13.3, 4, secs. 74–79). The Jewish claim that the text originally read "Mount Ebal" has wide support (e.g., Kahle, "Untersuchungen," p. 7; Kaufmann, *Joshua*, 2d ed., p. 130), but it is not unanimously accepted (see, e.g., Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, pp. 101–2; Eissfeldt, *OTI*, p. 216 n. 9, but contrast p. 695; Tov, *RB*, 78:374, 376; Purvis, *EM* 8:175).

65. Cf. Greenberg, "Decalogue," col. 1438.

66. See Weiss, *Studies*, pp. 201–2.

cause inconsistencies. Furthermore, since the interpolation was the latest element added to the text, its inconsistency within its context further illustrates the point that the grossest disturbances in a composite text are those added in the latest redactional stage, when the traditional materials have lost plasticity.[67]

We are thus able to document three stages in the evolution of the Jethro and theophany pericopes: (1) a first stage, represented by the Masoretic Torah, in which the Exodus and Deuteronomy versions were separate; (2) a second stage, represented by the proto-Samaritan Qumran manuscripts, which combined the two versions; and (3) a third stage, represented by the Samaritan Torah, in which the conflate narrative has been tendentiously interpolated and revised. The second stage in particular answers the query which prompted this study. Obviously there are differences between the proto-Samaritan redactor's interests, the state of his source material and his freedom of operation and what is presumed in the case of the Pentateuch. The proto-Samaritan redactor encountered variant accounts scattered about the Torah in already fixed places, and these included variant speeches which all purported to have been uttered on the same occasions. He could combine a variant from one locus with its counterpart elsewhere in the Torah, but could not then drop it from the former locus to avoid redundancy. As a result, material added to Exodus from Deuteronomy was simultaneously preserved in Deuteronomy. Even though his sources were continuous documents, the proto-Samaritan redactor appears as an interpolator who supplemented one basic text from another rather than giving equal play to both sources or creating a totally new account. The compiler of the Pentateuch is credited with somewhat greater freedom in this regard. It is not in these respects that the redaction of the proto-Samaritan Torah and the composition of the Pentateuch are analogous, but in the very fact of combining and in the techniques and goals of combining.

In the cases of the Samaritan Pentateuch, including the proto-Samaritan manuscripts, and the manuscripts of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy, we have both sources of the conflate passages in their independent forms. In the case of the Septuagint of Esther, we have one source in its original form (Est. 2:21–23 in the MT), and the other only in the form in which it appears in the conflate text, from which we must infer what the original form was.[68] In all these cases we find that the non-Masoretic versions

67. See above, Chapter 1, pp. 44–46. Another contextual inconsistency in the interpolation is the very notion that the promised land will be entered by crossing the Jordan (v. 17d) and the location of Mount Gerizim as across the Jordan (v. 17h). At Mount Sinai, where the Samaritan Pentateuch has this commandment given, the Israelites had no idea that they would be entering the land from the east.

68. The same is true of version 2 of the MT narrative in 1 Samuel 17–18; see below, Chapter 3.

represent a stage in the process of composition beyond the point at which the Masoretic Text was frozen.[69] Elsewhere the reverse is true and the Septuagint reflects an earlier stage in the development of the text, with the Masoretic Text representing a further development.[70] In either case, the examples illustrate the process of composition by conflation. They show that inconsistencies, vocabulary variation, and similar phenomena considered to be source-critical clues do sometimes result from conflation. They demonstrate that the documentary hypothesis presumes a method of composition which was demonstrably employed in ancient Israel and by Jewish editors at a time close to that in which most of the biblical books attained their present form. The examples reviewed here are cases of conflation unfolding before our very eyes.

Conflation in Postbiblical Literature

Hebrew and other author-editors continued to create texts by conflation from late antiquity down to modern times. One of the techniques by which the Qumran *Temple Scroll* was created is the conflation of passages from different contexts in the Torah dealing with the same or related topics (mostly legal), although on the whole the *Temple Scroll* is much more independent of its sources than the Torah is presumed to be.[71] Rabbinic

---

69. See Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 293–94. Another case is the account of the rise of Jeroboam in the LXX, which contains both a version of the MT's account in 1 Kings 11:26–12:24 and a second account not found in the MT, though resembling it in many details (12:24a–z in Rahlfs's edition, 1:661–64; a translation is printed in *The Septuagint Version*, pp. 465–67). The result is a version of 1 Kings in which Jeroboam is introduced twice (11:26–28 and 12:24b); his conflict with Solomon and flight to Egypt are reported twice (11:27, 40, and 12:24b end, 25); two prophecies are addressed to him, and in each a garment is torn into twelve pieces, symbolizing the twelve tribes of Israel (11:29–39 and 12:24o); Solomon's death, Rehoboam's succession, and Jeroboam's return from Egypt are reported twice (11:4–44 and 12:24a, 24d–f); there are two accounts of the abortive negotiations at Shechem and the revolt of the north (12:1–20 and 24p–t) and of Shemaiah's prophecy forbidding the south to oppose the secession (12:22–24 and 24y–z), etc. Opinions differ regarding the origins of these two versions, their relationship to the MT, and their historical value. These questions do not concern us directly. For our purposes, what is important is that two different versions of the story reached the LXX and both were incorporated in it, with no apparent attempt to integrate them. Because of difficulties of interpretation and a complicated textual tradition, however, the work of redaction that went into the LXX here is difficult to reconstruct. See the bibliography given by Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 303–4.

70. See below, Chapters 3–4.

71. The similarity of some of the editorial techniques used by the author of the scroll to those presumed to have been used in the redaction of the Pentateuch can be inferred from Yadin's analysis of the scroll's sources (Yadin, *Temple Scroll* 1:38–60 [col. 3 of chart], 60–65) and has been noted by several scholars (Levine, "Temple Scroll," p. 20; Brin, "Bible," p. 224;

literature, too, often presents texts from separate sources fused together in a single passage.[72]

In addition to legal texts, a number of liturgical texts were produced by conflation. The *Passover Haggadah* contains two different introductions to a homiletic commentary on Deut. 26:5–8. The Mishna requires that the

---

Licht, "Torah," cols. 485–86; Kaufman, "Temple Scroll"). The most extensive comparison of the methods of the author of the scroll to those presumed in biblical criticism is that of S. Kaufman, who concludes that the scroll "demonstrat[es] the feasibility of the documentary hypothesis" and its general conception of how the Torah was composed, but that it also shows that for the critic to analyze "verses and paragraphs composed of two, three, or more texts" accurately without knowing their sources in advance would be nearly impossible. In the latter conclusion, Kaufman comes down on the negative side of a question that has been considered several times in this and the preceding chapter, and supports the doubts expressed even by advocates of the documentary hypothesis that one could successfully unravel texts as composite as the more extreme source critics have posited (cf. Y. Kaufmann, *Tôlĕdôt* 1:19, *Religion*, p. 136). But the fact that some of the analogues we have studied in this chapter seem as if they could have been analyzed without the critic knowing their sources in advance, while the *Temple Scroll* does not, suggests that different analogues are applicable to different parts of the Torah. In Chapter 1 we expressed doubt that the sources of the *Gilgamesh Epic* could have been accurately reconstructed from the texts of its Akkadian versions (p. 51). This doubt was based on the fact that the epic was extensively revised from version to version. Extensive rewriting by the author of the *Temple Scroll* is what would make its analysis, too, so difficult if we did not have its sources. Kaufman shows that the scroll is sometimes extremely conflate and that its author has taken great liberties in rephrasing and modifying his sources, and has added much material of his own (see also Tov, "Temple Scroll"). Further, rather than preserve contradictions between the sources, the scroll at least sometimes simply omits contradictory matter (see Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, pp. 79 and 81 with n. 11). In the Samaritan Pentateuch, on the other hand, the redactor preserved the wording of his sources essentially as he found it, modifying only slightly; this is what would have made critical analysis of the Samaritan Pentateuch much easier. (Only the Samaritan tenth commandment—a tendentious, sectarian passage like the *Temple Scroll*—reflects a freer use of the sources, but even that passage does not approach the degree of freedom reflected in the *Temple Scroll*.) To the extent that the *Temple Scroll* is analogous to Pentateuchal narratives (see S. Kaufman, "Temple Scroll," p. 32), I would argue that the analogy applies basically to those pericopes in the Torah which critics have found difficult to analyze thoroughly, and it would support the assumption that the difficulty is sometimes due to extensive rewriting by the redactor (cf. Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 283; others attribute the difficulty to original similarities between the sources [cf. ibid., pp. 13, 19, 117, 126] a view which could also find support in the *Temple Scroll*; cf. the passage discussed by Kaufman, "Temple Scroll," p. 36 n. 22). That the analogy would not apply to pericopes which display considerable inconsistencies of style and content is clear from the fact that the *Temple Scroll* is relatively free of such inconsistencies, and this would support the assumption that inconsistencies in the Torah are due to original differences between the sources and the redactor's refraining from rewriting, as in the case of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The upshot is that different analogues apply to different passages in the Torah and that different passages have to be explained by different critical theories, for which reason we need to consider numerous analogues (cf. the observations of Rofé, below, Chapter 4, pp. 143–44).

72. See Epstein, *Māvô*ʾ, 2:797–803, 1214; idem, *Prolegomena*, pp. 234–40; Lieberman, *Hellenism*, p. 99.

commentary be preceded by a narrative which "begins with the degradation and ends with the glory" (*m. Pes.* 10:4). In the view of the sage Samuel (Babylonia, third century C.E.) the account of the degradation is to begin with "We were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt (Deut. 6:21)," whereas the sage Rav (also third-century Babylonia) held that the account was to begin with "At first our ancestors were idol-worshippers" (*b. Pes.* 116a). The early post-Talmudic authorities ruled that "we practice in accordance with both (views)" and "we recite them both," and since that time the *Passover Haggadah* has included both introductions.[73] The principle "we recite them both"—which could well serve as a redactor's motto—was invoked to resolve several other disagreements over the wording of liturgical texts. The Talmud records several discussions in which different rabbis propose different formulations for blessings to be recited on certain occasions, and the final ruling is "therefore we shall recite both/all (the formulations)"; accordingly, it is the conflate forms which are found in the traditional Jewish prayerbook.[74]

What makes these conflate texts frustrating for the historical-critical scholar (though not necessarily for their intended users) is the fact that the variants are not explicitly identified as such in the texts. When G. F. Moore first adduced the analogy of the *Diatessaron*, he mentioned in passing Ibn Hisham's *Life of Mohammed* as a similarly composite work.[75] Moore's interlocutor, C. M. Mead, sought to turn this example against the analogy by pointing out that Ibn Hisham does precisely what the redactor of the Torah does not do: he names the authorities from whom each tradition or variant has come.[76] In fact, manuscripts of the *Diatessaron*—at least some of the Arabic ones—also identify the sources of each excerpt with sigla standing for the four Gospels.[77] Mead insisted that if the Pentateuch were really conflate, the redactor could have done something similar or, if he did not know the authors of his sources, "he could have indicated that his sources, though anonymous, were various, and he could have kept them separate and distinguishable if he had wished to do so." In fact, however, it

---

73. See Glatzer, *Haggadah*, pp. 22–23, 28–29; Kasher, *Haggadah Shelemah*, pp. 17–30; E. D. Goldschmidt, *Haggadah*, pp. 13–19.

74. See Goldschmidt, *Maḥᵃzôr*, 1:15–16; Heinemann, *Studies*, p. 56, citing, e.g., *b. Ber.* 11b, 12b, 59a; *Meg.* 21b; *Soṭa* 40a. Goldschmidt describes a "general tendency . . . not to choose one version from among those transmitted, but to join two parallel texts to each other and to recite one after the other"; Heinemann speaks similarly. Goldschmidt notes that in addition to the conflation of variants into a single text, parallel versions were sometimes kept separate and used on different occasions; see also Ehrman, *Talmud*, p. 238.

75. Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron," pp. 205, 212 (below, pp. 247, 252–53).

76. Mead, "Tatian's Diatessaron," p. 51; cf. Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron," p. 212; Widengren, "Oral Tradition," pp. 236–41.

77. Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron," p. 211.

appears that the redactor probably could not or would not have done so.[78] It was not until the Roman period that Jewish scribes developed or adopted a technique for explicitly designating variants as such.[79] In biblical manuscripts this did not happen until the Middle Ages, when the *kĕṯîḇ-qĕrê* system was adopted for this purpose.[80] The very fact that earlier biblical manuscripts could only record alternate readings side by side, sometimes sacrificing intelligibility in so doing,[81] indicates the absence of a system in the period of the redactor.[82] The failure of the redactor to indicate that he was drawing on different sources is therefore a reflection of the state of ancient Hebrew scribal practice. It is not an essential difference between the redactor of the Torah and later editors of conflate texts who name their sources and indicate their variety.[83]

78. See ibid., pp. 211–12, for reasons (including the normal anonymity of Israelite historiography; cf. below, n. 83) why the redactor had no need to do so; Mead's objections ("Tatian's Diatessaron," pp. 51–52) are not persuasive.

79. In Qumran biblical commentaries, second and third interpretations are introduced with *wĕ⁽al*, "and (its interpretation is also) about" and *wĕkēn*, "and likewise (1QpHab I, 3, 5). In rabbinic literature, variant traditions are introduced by such phrases as *ʾîkâ dĕʾāmrê*, "there are those who say" (*b. Ḥul.* 3b), while alternative interpretations are introduced by *dābār ʾaḥēr* (*Lev. R.* 1:2, pp. 6, 9), or by the names of their proponents (*Gen. R.* 3:1, pp. 18–19), or both. Medieval manuscripts of the targums introduce variant readings with abbreviations for *lišānāʾ ʾaḥᵃrînâ*, "another wording," *nûshāʾ ʾaḥᵃrînâ*, "another reading," and the like (see Weiss, *Aramaic Targum*, p. 288), while some manuscripts of the Mishna place variant readings between colons (Epstein, *Māvôʾ*, p. 1212; on the Talmud, see idem, *Prolegomena*, pp. 137–44). Akkadian scribes had developed methods for indicating variants already in the second millennium B.C.E.: they could either be introduced with *šanîš*, "secondly, alternatively," and the like (see *AHw*, p. 1164, s.v. *šanîš* II; Lambert, "Birdcall," p. 110; idem, "Theology," pp. 55–56) or marked off by a siglum which scholars call a "Glossenkeil" (Krecher, "Glossen").

80. Gordis, *Biblical Text*, pp. xxiii–xxiv, 41–43.

81. See above, n. 5, on conflate readings.

82. Unsatisfactory as this situation was, it should occasion no surprise, since even in late antiquity the technology of writing still lacked many aids for readers that we take for granted, such as punctuation, sentence dividers, parentheses, special layout for poetry, etc. A similar situation obtained in classical literature; see Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes*, pp. 4–15. Somewhat reminiscent of the introduction of undesignated variants in a way that interrupts the flow of the text is the introduction of parenthetic and background material with similar disregard for its intrusive effect; see Paul, *Studies*, p. 110 n. 1 (where the second reference to Weiss, *Sources and Traditions*, should read p. 524 n. 1), and Sarna, "Anticipatory."

83. Biblical writers and editors did cite the sources of some lyric poems (Josh. 10:13; 2 Sam. 1:18) and the authors of some psalms and proverbs (2 Sam. 23:1; Ps. 90:1; Prov. 1:1; 25:1; 30:1; 31:1; etc.), but for whatever reason, not the sources of narrative texts. (The various royal chronicles and prophetic writings cited in Kings and Chronicles may have served as sources of information for those books, but the text does not identify them as such, but as places where further information is found. The "Book of Adam's Line" [Gen. 5:1] is cited as a title of what follows, not an external source, although that's what it may be). The incorporation of one text in another with minimal change and without attribution is typical. Note the chapters shared by Kings and Isaiah, Kings and Jeremiah, Ezra and Nehemiah (see Bendavid, *Parallels*, pp. 144–51, 158–67), and the wholesale incorporation of parts of Samuel and Kings in Chronicles (see ibid., passim).

A Modern Example: *Sēfer hā-ʾAggādâ*

The Jewish liturgical texts and Arabic historical texts such as *The Life of Mohammed*[84] show the continued use of conflation in the Middle Ages. The practice has in fact been followed in modern times as well.[85] In the years 1908–11, H. N. Bialik and Y. H. Rawnitzki published their classic anthology of rabbinic aggadic lore, *Sēfer hā-ʾAggādâ*. In presenting tales about biblical and postbiblical characters, the editors often "joined different excerpts from different sources (and sometimes from parallels of the same aggadah) into a single unit."[86] Where it met their criteria the editors would give preference to the version of an aggadah found in the Babylonian Talmud, replacing or supplementing it with extracts from other sources as they saw fit. At times they interrupted one source in midsentence with an extract from elsewhere, and sometimes they virtually created a new aggadah without adding a single passage or word that was not found in one or another of their sources. In analyzing the work of Bialik and Rawnitzki, J. Heinemann concluded:

The editors were really confident that they had not presented to their readers anything but what they had found in their sources. . . . [They] were of the opinion that they had not created an aggadah of their own, but that they had succeeded in "restoring the crown to its former glory" and in rediscovering an original and authentic aggadah which had been cut up, its fragments preserved in different sources.[87]

Like the examples we have been studying, the methods of Bialik and Rawnitzki can be inferred from a comparison of their work with their sources. But the critic of *Sēfer hā-ʾAggādâ* has an additional source of information at his disposal: Bialik and Rawnitzki's own introduction to their work and other essays of theirs. According to an essay quoted by Heinemann, Bialik believed that the aggadah once really included "large units, extensive in scope, of epic tales" which are now lost.[88] In their introduction, Bialik and Rawnitzki indicate that one of the factors which made their anthology necessary is the fact that "nowadays . . . not everybody is able to join scraps and patches into a complete cloak, or fragments of

---

84. For others see Widengren, "Oral Tradition," pp. 231–43.

85. For modern non-Hebrew writers, see Introduction, p. 18.

86. Heinemann, "On Bialik's Method," p. 89; see also Halevy, "Composition."

87. Heinemann, "On Bialik's Method," p. 91; cf. Greenberg's description of the Pentateuchal redactor, above, p. 54.

88. Heinemann, "On Bialik's Method," p. 84.

broken stones into an edifice."[89] The main task the editors assigned them-
selves was to gather the material in "an arrangement which is construc-
tive . . . [i.e.,] whatever involves the joining of links into chapters, and
chapters into a single body with a complete form, whatever includes inner
harmony and unity among the parts, whatever makes it possible to under-
stand the whole from its parts"[90] and presents everything in its proper
place.[91]

Aggadah is sometimes impoverished in one place and rich in another; likewise,
many aggadot are related in a number of places in different versions, some incom-
plete, some excessive, and the like. In such cases the editors tried to choose the
most complete and lovely of the versions, and also, where necessary and where it
would provide a remedy, to combine a number of versions with each other and
blend them together, or to join scattered fragments of a single aggadah into some-
thing complete. The editors believe that in a popular book this does no violence to
the essence of the aggadah. On the contrary, if this is done properly and with the
appropriate caution, sometimes this "restores the crown to its former glory" since,
as is known, the aggadot have been considerably confused and mixed up by scribes
and copyists. . . .[92]

Convinced that the original style and language of the aggadot was an
expression of the spirit of the Jewish people, the editors strove to preserve
these wherever possible, so that the reader would have direct contact with
the material, not an adaptation of it. This aim did not forbid the editors
from correcting readings on the basis of the sources and "restrained conjec-
ture" when necessary, or from rephrasing indelicate expressions in view of
the book's popular audience, but on the whole they were convinced that
they had not added "a pennysworth of cosmetics of their own" or changed
anything of the original form of the aggadah.[93]

There is much in the form of aggadic literature and the approach of
Bialik and Rawnitzki which differs from what is observable in the analogues

89. Bialik and Rawnitzki, *Sēfer*, p. ii (in the 1960 edition the front matter is unpaginated; I
have numbered the pages of the introduction starting with i). The aim of piecing the legends
together to aid the many who cannot rummage through the sources and reconstruct the
sequence of the narratives on their own bespeaks the popular character of *Sēfer hā-ʾAggādā*.
The *Diatessaron*, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX have also
been described as popular for similar reasons; see Stenning, "Diatessaron," p. 456a; Gaster,
Samaritans, pp. 124–29.
90. Bialik and Rawnitzki, *Sēfer*, p. v.
91. Ibid., p. iv.
92. Ibid., p. iii.
93. Ibid., pp. iii, v, and passim.

we have reviewed in this chapter and from what is presumed about biblical literature and its redactors. Furthermore, as a modern work, *Sēfer hā-ʾAggādâ* cannot be accorded much weight in confirming the methods of ancient redactors. But composition by conflation was not an exclusively ancient procedure, and the writings of Bialik and Rawnitzki are a piquant testimony to redactors' own understanding of their aims and methods. They add color to what critics have inferred from the Bible and to what we have inferred from its ancient analogues. The latter, to repeat what we have said above, constitute cases of composition by conflation unfolding before our very eyes, and they confirm that the method was demonstrably employed at a time close to that in which most of the biblical books were still being formed. They show that the kinds of inconsistencies and vocabulary variations observable in the Torah do sometimes result from the conflation of sources.

Appendix A.

Samaritan Exodus 18:21–27 and Sources

Different typefaces are used for material from the Masoretic Exodus and from the Masoretic Deuteronomy; underlining indicates redactional material. The Masoretic Text is from BHS; the Samaritan text is from the edition of A. and R. Sadaqa, with verses numbered as explained above, p. 63.

Masoretic Deuteronomy 1

ואמר אלכם בעת ההוא לאמר לא⁹
אוכל לבדי שאת אתכם¹⁰ ה' אלהיכם
הרבה אתכם והנכם היום¹³ הבו לכם
אנשים חכמים ונבנים וידעים
לשבטיכם ואשימם בראשיכם¹¹·¹²
נאם אתכם ...

Samaritan Exodus 18

Samaritan Exodus 18

ואתה תחזה מכל העם²¹
אנשי חיל יראי אלהים אנשי אמת
שנאי בצע ושמת עלהם שרי
אלפים שרי מאות שרי חמשים ושרי עשרת²⁴ᵈ
ושפטו את העם בכל עת²² והיה כל
הדבר הגדל יביאו אליך וכל
הדבר הקטן ישפטו הם והקל מעליך
ונשאו אתך²³ אם את הדבר הזה תעשה
וצוך אלהים ויכלת עמד וגם כל
העם הזה על מקמו יבא בשלום²⁴ᵇ
וי.¹·²⁴ᶜ
כן אוכל גם אנכי לבד שאת אתכם¹⁴·²⁴ᵈ
הבו לכם אנשים חכמים וידעים לשבטיכם²⁴ᵃ
אמר.

Masoretic Exodus 18

Masoretic Exodus 18

ואתה תחזה מכל העם²¹
אנשי חיל יראי אלהים אנשי אמת
שנאי בצע ושמת עלהם שרי
אלפים שרי מאות שרי חמשים ושרי עשרת.
ושפטו את העם בכל עת²² והיה כל
הדבר הגדל יביאו אליך וכל
הדבר הקטן ישפטו הם והקל מעליך
ונשאו אתך²³ אם את הדבר הזה תעשה
וצוך אלהים ויכלת עמד וגם כל
העם הזה על מקמו יבא בשלום²⁴
אמר.

נאָר הערשער.
דער וועלט איז די הידוש
נאָך דאָרגעזונט. [18]ואָרוּם אַזוֹיאָ
וּוּתוֹ נאָר קליין קלאַר וואָ לאַרקונן
נאָך די הידושע קנעלטוּ הינ
כרעלע וועגאָרוּן לוֹן הרלוּ מאַר.
[17]ליין הרעלע גלעל בּהרגעסם ברליין
בעל נאָ קלעל נאַק נעל בּעל.
אַרם בּעל נעשעס לאַגאַלעם קלאַ
[19]וּאָרלוּ נאַ מאַגעשעם כראַע הערלן קנעל
לאַרע מאַלעל נאַלוּ לאַל, הרלאַס.
נאָרעם לעלער קאַעל לאַל, הרעשעם.
לעלע נעל לאַמשעם נערעם בּל,
אַרקעשעם נערעם הערגעם וּערלעם.
קליאַל. [19]לאָרלע נאַר לאָרע
הערקעלל נעל הרלעל נאָר לראָל
לאַרעקעם כלאַראַרעם. [14]הראַשעל נאָרע

___

הערוּ לעל לעל נאַ אַרעל.
לעלגעל לוּ [27]לעל הרלעם
בּאָרלע עדע נעל אַן נעל בּלעל נעל
לעקעל הערער לעל לעל הרעל בּעל נעל
נאָר לעל. [26]הרלעשעם

___

[24][26]הרעל נאָ קל הרעלע
נאָרעם לאַרקונן, [26]הרעל נעל [24]נאָרע [26]הראַם
וּוּתוֹ נאָר קליין קלאַר וואָ לאַרקונן
נאָך די הידושע קנעלטוּ הינ
כרעלע וועגאָרוּן לוֹן הרלוּ מאַר.
[24]ליין הרעלע גלעל בּהרגעסם ברליין
בעל נאָ קלעל נאַק נעל בּעל.
אַרם בּעל נעשעס לאַגאַלעם קלאַ
[44b]לעשער נאַ מאַגעשעם ... כראַע
לאַרע מאַלעל נאַ מאַגעשעם כראַעקעם.
נאָרעם לעלער קאַעל אַל, הרעשעם.
[24g]לעלע נעל לאַמשעם נערעם בּל,
אַרקעשעם נערעם הערגעם וּערלעם.
קליאַל. [24g]לאָרלע נאַר לאָרע
הערקעלל נעל הרלעל נאָר לראָל
לאַרעקעם כלאַראַרעם. [24f]הראַשעל נאָרע ...

___

הערוּ לעל לעל נאַ אַרעל.
לעלגעל לוּ [27]לעל הרלעם
בּאָרלע עדע נעל אַן נעל בּלעל נעל
לעקעל הערער לעל לעל הרעל בּעל נעל
נאָר לעל. [26]הרלעשעם

___

לאַל, הרעל.
אַרקעם אַל, אַרעל אַל, הרעשעם
לאַל נאַם לראַעם אַנ לעל אַל,
אַרקעם לעל ברעל, וּעלאַק
[25]לעקעלל ברעל

Appendix B.
Samaritan Exodus 20:18–26 and Sources

Different typefaces are used for material from the Masoretic Exodus, the Masoretic Deuteronomy 5 and from the Masoretic Deuteronomy 18; underlining indicates redactional material.

Masoretic Exodus 20	Samaritan Exodus 20	Masoretic Deuteronomy

ישעיה ה 5:30 ...

18:18

19

21

22

29

22h

22i

22a

22b

22c

22e

22g

21

20

אל תהמה מקרה אחד

יקרה את כל מעשיך על עבודת ה' יתברך ואל
תאמר כי הזמן קצר ואיך אוכל להשלים...
ובטחונך לא יחסר לך בעבודתך. וזהו
אשר תראה כי גדול הבורא[28]

ואם[25] תשמרנו, יקברנך.
וכל מדה טובה את נפשך אצל עלמין
רק לא יחסר את חקך את מקום לבך
כלם, הכינם לקח מראש ובינה לבינה
יחד. וכל דבר ידוע, אשר כבודך תמיד[24]
וכל חכמה אשר חכמה האדם תמצא[23]
נעשה שלום עד בואך אל בית מלכך כי
כל ייצר טובך בדרכי מעלה להטיב כי

חליפות.
ואתה בני אמר אבי, בני חכם
אבכה עד עת מות, ה' יודע[22]

אל תהמה מקרה אחד
יקרה את כל מעשיך על עבודת ה' יתברך ואל
תאמר כי הזמן קצר ואיך אוכל להשלים...
ובטחונך לא יחסר לך בעבודתך. וזהו
אשר תראה כי גדול הבורא[26]
אכול אשר תשיג ידך יקברנך.
ואם[25] תשמרנו יקברנך.
ומדה טובה את נפשך אל עלם בא ותברכך
רק לא יחסר את חקך את מקום לבך
כלם, הכינם לקח מראש ובינה לבינה
יחד. וכל דבר ידוע, אשר כבודך תמיד[24]
וכל חכמה אשר חכמה האדם תמצא[23]
נעשה שלום עד בואך אל בית מלכך כי
כל ייצר טובך בדרכי מעלה להטיב כי

חליפות.
ואתה בני אמר אבי, בני חכם

Appendix C.
Samaritan Ninth and Tenth Commandments (Exodus 20:17ff.) and Sources

Different typefaces are used for material from the Masoretic Exodus, the Masoretic Deuteronomy 11, and from the Masoretic Deuteronomy 27; underlining indicates redactional material.

Masoretic Deuteronomy 27

Samaritan Exodus 20

Masoretic Deuteronomy 11

Masoretic Deuteronomy 27