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4QDtn, the All Souls Deuteronomy, is the best-preserved of all the Deuteronomy manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumran.¹ A photograph and partial translation of the manuscript were published by Frank Moore Cross in 1969 in the catalogue “Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea.”² The manuscript consists of four complete columns and two partially damaged columns. Columns 2–6 are one continuous sheet of leather, with a sewn edge on col. 2. Column 1 has two sewn edges and was originally attached to the beginning of col. 2 (the columns were separated in the process of restoration). The manuscript was well prepared; the scribe used both horizontal and vertical dry lines, marking the horizontal dry lines with points jalons.³ The manuscript is dated, on paleographical grounds, to the early Herodian period (30–1 BCE). The orthography of the manuscript is much fuller than that of either the MT or the Samaritan Pentateuch.⁴

The contents of col. 1 are Deut 8:5–10. Columns 2–6 contain Deut 5:1–6:1. It is with the portion of the manuscript containing the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, that this paper will be concerned. The Decalogue, as is well known, exists in two versions: the version found in Exodus (or the Priestly version) and the version found in Deuteronomy (the Deuteronomic version). Although the versions are substantially the same, there are certain differences between the two, particularly in the fourth commandment, and these differences raise the questions of which is the more ancient version, and of the possibility of recovering the original text of the Decalogue from

¹ The purchase of this scroll was made possible by All Souls Church (Unitarian), New York City, hence its name.
³ A dry line is a line ruled onto the uninscribed leather by a sharp instrument as a guide to the scribe for the placement of his text. Points jalons are dots in ink at the beginning of each line, made by the scribe to aid in the placement of the dry lines.
⁴ For a complete discussion of the paleography and orthography of this manuscript, see my “A Critical Edition of Seven Deuteronomy Manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumran: 4QDta, 4QDtc, 4QDtd, 4QDtf, 4QDtg, 4QDti and 4QDtn” (diss., Harvard University, 1988).
either or both of the two versions. This paper will attempt to locate the All Souls Deuteronomy version of the Decalogue within the history of the transmission of the text and to illuminate some of the text-critical questions concerning the Decalogue. The witness to the Decalogue found in the All Souls Deuteronomy is firmly in the tradition of Deuteronomy 5:6–21, but has been infected by the Priestly tradition (Exod 20:1–17) at one crucial point (see below). In addition, it preserves unique readings at several points.

A transcription of each commandment of the Decalogue as found in the All Souls Deuteronomy follows (line numbers refer to the transcription for ease of location; please refer to the photograph for the actual column and line numbers of the manuscript. Deut 5:1 commences at the beginning of col. 2). The word vacat indicates an empty space in the manuscript. Following the transcription, I will give textual notes dealing with the Decalogue, collating the important witnesses to Deuteronomy and Exodus against the All Souls witness. I will also collate the evidence of the Nash Papyrus. The sigla are as follows:

M The MT of Deuteronomy according to BHS
G The critical reconstruction of the Old Greek text where no significant variants exist
GA A F M (y) (z) [the symbol ( - ) indicates that not all of the manuscripts in a group agree on the reading]
GB Vaticanus
GC The catena texts
GL d (n) p t7
GO The Hexaplaric text
S The Samaritan Pentateuch
Syr. The Syriac Peshitta
Tg. The text of Targum Onqelos
Vg. The Vulgate

5 These empty spaces do not coincide with sētūmōt or pētūhōt as found in the MT. In fact, they are not meant deliberately to indicate a space in the text, rather, they seem to be the result of avoidance of bad patches on the leather.

6 The Nash Papyrus is a papyrus manuscript, found in Egypt, which W. F. Albright dated to the second half of the second century BCE. It contains the entire Decalogue (mainly following Exodus) and the Shema’ on a single leaf. It appears to have been a type of lectionary. For further information and bibliography, see W. F. Albright, “A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus,” JBL 56 (1937) 145–76. For my text of the Nash papyrus (hereafter PapNash), I am using the anonymous transcription published in RB 1 (1904) 142–50.

7 These minuscules are designated by J. Ziegler as the Lucianic text (Joseph Ziegler, “Zur Septuaginta-Vorlage im Deuteronomium,” ZAW 72 (1960) 237–62). J. W. Wevers does not believe a Lucianic text can be isolated in Deuteronomy (Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978] 20–30). However, these manuscripts consistently fall together and often contain independent readings. I therefore agree with Ziegler that these minuscules form a major group and feel that, although an Antioch provenance is by no means assured, it may serve as a convenient label.
This paper is set up in the following manner: the commandment as it appears in the All Souls Deuteronomy is given, along with the chapter and verse of Deuteronomy. The text-critical notes follow; the All-Souls reading is given, then the witnesses which agree with it are collated, followed by a large bracket. Following this bracket the readings which differ from All Souls are given. (The siglum Ꝋ indicates that the witness does not contain the 4Q reading.) Finally, I will discuss the preferable reading. In the case of minor variants, a discussion will be omitted.

The First Commandment

Deut 5:7

לא ירח

לך אלוהים אבותיך乐园 פניך

Line 1, 5:7 היה M, S, PapNash, Syr., Vg., MEx, SEx] cf. G, GEx, which have the plural אלוהים, a result of the plural noun and adjective אלוהים עשרת.

The Second Commandment

Deut 5:8–10

לא תעשה לך סמל כל

תקونة אשר ב месяцев מעיל ואשר כאזר<tag> תחתן ואשר</tag> קומת תחתת לה עלא והעבים

יכי אנכי יזרו אלהים אלカラー פחדוןlekشركة על קומך עלanken אתך עלא

בוכך על שלשה וע נרבוד למען ישנה והשח חזור אלפים

לאחר הושמדן מוץורי

Line 1, 5:8 בְּכִל G, S, Syr., Vg., MEx, GEx, SEx] בְּכִל M, Tg.

Line 4, 5:8 בְּכִל M, G, S, Tg., Vg., MEx, SEx] בְּכִל GEx: 'נ' 'נ' Syr.
The verb “to be” is not necessary in the Hebrew phrase; it was supplied by the Greek translators. It is a characteristic of the recension to distinguish between יהוה and יא by using the verb יתא with the former and not

* It will be noticed that I do not collate the evidence of the phylactery texts found at Qumran. The reason for this omission is that all the phylacteries present “mixed” texts, which are not useful for text-critical purposes. The interested reader is directed to J. T. Milik, “Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157),” DJD 6, 33–91.
with the latter, but I have not found a similar pattern in Deuteronomy. The Syr. has been infected by G\textsuperscript{Ex} at this point.

Line 5, 5:9 \( \text{עָלֹם שְׁלָשִׁים M} \):

cf. Tg.

Line 5, 5:9 \( \text{ם רְבָּעִים M, S, PapNash, M\textsuperscript{Ex}, S\textsuperscript{Ex}] + \text{גּוֹיָא G = Syr., Tg., Vg.} + \text{גּוֹיָא G\textsuperscript{Ex}} \)

Line 5, 5:10 \( \text{עָשֶׂה [תִּשׁוּר M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., M\textsuperscript{Ex}, G\textsuperscript{Ex}, S\textsuperscript{Ex}.} \)

Line 6, 5:10 \( \text{מְשָׁרָה M.} \)

\textit{Waw} and \textit{yod} are virtually indistinguishable in this script; therefore, the 4Q reading is materially uncertain. However, M's reading makes no sense in context and seems to be the result of confusion of \textit{waw} and \textit{yod} (note also the reading of M\textsuperscript{Ex}); therefore, it seems likely that 4Q has the preferable text with G et al.

\textit{The Third Commandment}

Deut 5:11

لاق تحاشي أنت شملت لسرت אלוהיך

לשהם כי לא נקח אתה ישור ישן אתה שמא לשהם

Line 1, 5:11 \( \text{יִדֹּו [תִּשׁוּר M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., M\textsuperscript{Ex}, S\textsuperscript{Ex}]} \)

\textit{xuph} \( \text{אֶשְׁתָּר G\textsuperscript{Ex}.} \text{The Greek of Exodus is exhibiting assimilation to a common formula, which appears earlier in the verse.} \)

\textit{The Fourth Commandment}

Deut 5:12–15

\( \text{כֹּל מִשְּׁמָרוּ} \) \( \text{אֲכַרֹת \textit{vacat} M\textsuperscript{A–B CL O–}, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., S\textsuperscript{Ex}] \)

Line 1, 5:12 \( \text{שָׁמַר M, GA–B CL O–, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., S\textsuperscript{Ex}] negatively G\textsuperscript{Ex}, GA–O–].} \)

GEy, PapNash. The different traditions of Deuteronomy and Exodus are clear here. The reading of the Samaritan Exodus is assimilated to the Samaritan text of Deuteronomy, while the reading of the few Greek manuscripts of Deuteronomy is assimilated to the Priestly tradition.

Lines 1 and 2, 5:12 נָאָשְׁר פֶּרֶנֶּר אַלְפֵּרִים, M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.] → MEx, GEx, SEx, PapNash. Again, this reading gives a clear distinction between the traditions of Deuteronomy and Exodus.

Line 2, 5:13 נָאָשְׁר הַר אָלֹם, M, S, PapNash, SEx.

Line 3, 5:14 נָאָשְׁר הַר כִּלֵּל, M, S, Syr., Vg., GEy, PapNash] → MEx, SEx: septicim dies Vg. It is difficult to determine the preferable text; however, it may be argued that the preposition in the tradition of G is an addition for clarification.

Line 3, 5:14 נָאָשְׁר הַר כִּלֵּל, M, S, Syr., Vg., GEy] → MEx, SEx. The second reading is perhaps the result of haplography (bet and kaph are extremely similar in the hand of this period).

Lines 4 and 5, 5:14 The text-critical problem raised here is the original version of this list.

Several observations can be made. First, there is great variation in the presence or absence of the wau: conjunctive. Second, the Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions show reciprocal influence. Third, this manuscript is unique for its paucity of the wau; conjunctive, while M shows the greatest use of the waw conjunctive.

It is possible to separate the Priestly and the Deuteronomic traditions. The Deuteronomic tradition consistently contains שָׁוֵי הָמוֹרִים, while Exodus does not in all cases. The presence of שָׁוֵי הָמוֹרִים in GEx and the Nash Papyrus can be explained as the result of the influence of Deuteronomy.10

Once separate lists have been isolated for the other witnesses to Exodus and Deuteronomy, the preferable versions of those lists must be reconstructed.

10 It is interesting that the influence of Deuteronomy is found in GEx and the Nash Papyrus together. F. M. Cross has stated that the Vorlage of the Septuagint is an Egyptian local text (The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies [rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961] 181), and, of course, the provenance of the Nash Papyrus is Egypt. GEx and the Nash Papyrus must stem from the same Hebrew Vorlage, at home in Egypt, which was, in this instance, influenced by the version of the Decalogue found in Deuteronomy.
In order to do this the presence or absence of the *waw* conjunctive in the various lists must be accounted for. First, each list contains several elements which can be grouped into sets of two: son-daughter, manservant-maidservant, and ox-ass (in the case of Deuteronomy). The clue to grouping these may be found in the phrase יבְּנֵי אָדָם (with the conjunction) is found in every single version. Making the phrase יבְּנֵי אָדָם a paradigm, I would phrase our groups of two as follows: בִּנְיָן וּבִנְיָן. Second, there are several elements in the list which stand alone: You, your beast, your sojourner. Since they stand alone, they should be considered in relation to the groups of two. רֹאשׁ must stand alone as the primary addressee, followed by the group specifying the family. The word יבַּנְיָן raises two questions: should it be preceded by *waw* and should it be preceded by יָל? It may be argued that in Deuteronomy בַּנְיָן serves as the climax of the “animal” group, and therefore should be joined to that group with יָל. However, in the Priestly version of the list, it immediately follows the “servant” group. 4QDtn and GB do not have יָל before בַּנְיָן. It was only after יָל was added in the Deuteronomic version in order to specify to which beasts the list was referring (lists have a tendency to expand), that יָל was added to בַּנְיָן to make it the climax of the “animal” group.11 Finally, נְדֵד stands alone as the final member of the household. I prefer to place a conjunction before it since it ends the list and the conjunction makes a smooth reading. However, its absence in 4QDtn may indicate that the conjunction is not original.

Thus, I have reconstructed the more primitive version of Exodus as:

And the more primitive version of Deuteronomy as:

Line 5, 5:14 מ, G, S, Syr., Tg., MEx] o παρασκεύων נְדֵד מֵאָדָם בַּנְיָן הֵמֶּשׁ הָיוֹרֵדֵה מֵאָדָם נְדֵד. The Greek reading appears to be a synonymous variant.13

11 This would fall under the rubric of *lectio brevis*. It might also be argued that the conjunction was added before יָל when the animal group was added to the Deuteronomic text, and that the original reading was בַּנְיָן. My personal preference would be for יָל without the conjunction, but there is no support in the Deuteronomic witnesses for this reading.

12 Frank Moore Cross has argued against the inclusion of the conjunction before יָל on the grounds that conjunctions are added rather than deleted. This is certainly true (Cross and D. N. Freedman observe that the conjunction is frequently introduced at the beginning of cola where it originally did not belong. See also their appendix, giving a table with the evidence for this practice in 2 Samuel 22 = Psalm 18 [Cross and Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (SBLDS 21; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975) 29]); however, in this case we can argue that the conjunction was omitted in 4QDtn by haplography. Given the grouping of pairs in this list, we feel that the conjunction is original.

13 After יָל יָתֵר מֵאָדָם אֲשֶׁר בְּשֻׁרְרֵךְ PapNash adds: יָל אֱשֶׁר מֵאָדָם אֲשֶׁר מֵאָדָם שֻׁרְרֵךְ. This agrees, for the most
Lines 5 and 6, 5:14
לַמֵּאזוּ יָוֵה עִבְרֵי אֲבותֵּךְךָ M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.]

MEx, GEx, SEx, PapNash. This phrase is unique to the Deuteronomic version of the fourth commandment.

Line 5, 5:14
יָוֵה עִבְרֵי אֲבותֵּךְךָ M, GA, C, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.]

GC(-329) adds בְּתֹא שָׁנָהLYO מֵעָלָיו נָשִׂים. This phrase is unique to the Deuteronomic version of the fourth commandment.

Lines 6–7, 5:15
הָרָה יִבְּרֵי בָּאָרֶם מְצָרוֹת יְתֵאצַי יְהוֹרָדָךְ מְשַׁמָּה בָּרִי הוּא הָוָה בּוֹרֵחַ נְפָרָה עַל כִּי צַעְיִוֹר אֲלוֹאָדְךָ לְשָׁמָּה אַתָּה יִשָּׁה בָּרֵה M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.]

MEx, GEx, SEx, PapNash. This is the reason given in Deuteronomy for the sabbath commandment.

Line 8, 5:15
וְתָשִׂין G, Syr., Tg., Vg.]

The Greek readings are exhibiting conflation from the list in 5:14 above.

Lines 9–11, 5:15
וְתָשִׂין G, Syr., Tg., Vg.]

There is no trigger for the loss of לַמֵּאזוּ in Deuteronomy. G and 44 have been influenced here by the end of the commandment in Exodus, which reads לַמֵּאזוּ (see also below).

4Q has included the reason for the sabbath observance from the Priestly version of the fourth commandment. The Priestly reason is surrounded on either side by לַמֵּאזוּ. The first לַמֵּאزو appears in Deuteronomy in G as well as in 4Q. The second לַמֵּאزو is echoed by Exodus at the end of the fourth commandment, which reads יָוֵה עִבְרֵי אֲבותֵּךְךָ בּוֹרֵה (אֲלָדְךָ אֲלָדְךָ יָוֵה עִבְרֵי אֲבותֵּךָ בּוֹרֵה). This is the reason given in the Exodus tradition for the sabbath commandment. The Nash Papyrus has the Exodus version of the Decalogue, which has been infected by Deuteronomy, just as 4QDtn is a Deuteronomy manuscript that has been infected by Exodus (pace Albright et al.).
replaced by a finite verb in Exodus); the first, however, according to the mechanics of haplography, should have remained. It is possible but not very likely that both should have disappeared, leaving only a few witnesses. We know, however, from the Samaritan Pentateuch and other witnesses, that at this period conflation was occurring in the text of the Pentateuch. It was not unusual for the texts of Deuteronomy or Exodus to be expanded with the parallel passages of the other.\textsuperscript{14} This phenomenon is known as harmonization.\textsuperscript{15} As Emanuel Tov states, harmonizations may be intentional or unintentional. Both types seem to be present here; the first, the presence of the first $\text{לְדָעָה}$, is unintentional harmonization (or reminiscence) of the text with the Decalogue in Exodus. The second, the addition of the Priestly reason for the sabbath commandment in $4QDtn$, appears to be intentional. The evidence of the Nash Papyrus, where the same harmonization occurs but yields a different text, would lead to the same conclusion. It is striking that this type of harmonization of the text of the Decalogue was not more widespread; the two different versions have reached us in largely pristine exemplars.

\textit{The Fifth Commandment}

\begin{verbatim}
Deut 5:16

כָּבָר אָבֶרֶךְ וָאָכְלֶךָ כָּאָשָׁר
cum. $\text{vacaat}$ לְמַעְתּ הָאָוֶרֶךְ וָיֵכָּבָר הָאָוֶרֶך
cum. $\text{vacaat}$

לֹּע הָאָוֶרֶךְ אָשָׁר הָוָה הָאָוֶרֶך
cum. $\text{vacaat}$

Lines 1 and 2 M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.] $\text{MEx}$, $\text{GEx}$, $\text{SEX}$, PapNash. The phrase is unique to the Deuteronomic version.

Lines 2 and 3, 5:16 לְמַעְתּ הָאָוֶרֶךְ וָיֵכָּבָר הָאָוֶרֶך הָאָוֶרֶך
cum. $\text{vacaat}$ $\text{MEx}$ (Mαξοροχρόνιος γενη G, $\text{GEx}$: μαξορο-

χρόνιοι γενη G$^B$), PapNash: $\text{MEx}$, $\text{SEX}$.

The text of the Decalogue has suffered from haplography owing to homioioarchton and sub-sequent misplacement. G and $\text{GEx}$ appear to preserve the preferable text. The text suffered haplography owing to homioioarchton from $\text{לְמַעְתּ}$ to $\text{לְמַעְתּ}$, with the result that the phrase $\text{יִכָּבָר}$ was lost. The shorter text was retained in the Priestly tradition of M and S. However, in the Deuteronomic tradition of M and S the loss of the phrase was recognized and replaced at
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Judith E. Sanderson (\textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: $4QpaleoExodm$ and the Samaritan Tradition} [HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986] 207), who points out “three major interpolations” in $4QpaleoExodm$ from Deuteronomy which that manuscript shares with the Samaritan Pentateuch. Mr. Nathan Jastram of Harvard University has also informed me that the same phenomenon occurs in $4QNum$.

the end of יָרַע. 4Q shares the error of this reading. 16
Line 3, 5:16 G Ex, S Ex, Tg., Vg., M Ex, M, G, S, Tg., Vg. [אֶבֶן אֲדֹאר הִבוּ בַּעַל מֶשֶׁךְ יָדָיו] G Ex: b’re ֹֹ tbt Syr. The reading of G Ex and the Syr. is an expansion.

The Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Commandments
Deut 5:17–19

לא תרצח לא תנאך לא תנכט

Lines 1 and 2, 5:17–19 These verses raise the question of the order of the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments, that is, prohibitions of murder, adultery, and stealing. There are at least three orders from the Decalogue itself:

1. לא אֶבֶן תנן,
2. לא תנן אֶבֶן,
3. לא תנן אֶבֶן.

In addition, there are the orders found in Hos 2:4 (לא תנצל לא תנכנת לא תנכנת לא תנצל) and Jer 7:9.

The first order may be termed the “Old Palestinian” order, since all the manuscripts which make up the “Old Palestinian” group are represented, that is, GA C O, S, S Ex, as well as M, M Ex, and its daughter versions, Syr., Syr. Ex, Tg. and Vg. 17 4QDtn exhibits the “Old Palestinian” order. In fact, all the phylacteries so far published from Qumran which contain the Deuteronomic Decalogue use the “Old Palestinian” order (i.e., 4QPhylb, 4QPhylg, and 4QPhyU). In addition, Josephus (Ant. 3.5.5); Matt 5:21, 27; 19:18; and Mark 10:19 all exhibit the “Old Palestinian” order.

The second order may be termed the Egyptian order, since Vaticanus and the Nash Papyrus (both Egyptian texts) preserve it. Also, GC L (Ex) (not Egyptian texts) have this order. In the NT, Luke 18:20; Rom 13:9; and Jas 2:11 exhibit the Egyptian order. In addition Philo preserves this order, as might

16 It is also possible that לא תנצל לא תנכנת לא תנצל was original to the Exodus tradition, and that most of the witnesses are conflate. However, we have no evidence for the shorter reading in Deuteronomy. Therefore, we have given the explanation above as the more likely cause of the corruption.

17 Cross discusses the “Old Palestinian” group in some detail: “By ‘Old Palestinian’ we mean the text type current in Palestine at the end of the fifth century B.C. [sic]” (Ancient Library, 189 n. 41). Emanuel Tov has disagreed with the use of the term “text type” (“A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls,” HUCA 53 [1982] 19). He is correct to advocate caution. However, it appears that we can at least talk about groups of texts; that is, texts that exhibit agreement in error and other peculiarities against other texts. In Deuteronomy, the complete witnesses to the text of Deuteronomy are MT, LXX, and S; therefore, these witnesses serve as a norm by which to arrange groups of texts, although they do not necessarily contain the best-preserved text within the group.
be expected from his Egyptian provenance. The third order is unique to the Old Greek of Exodus.

It seems clear that the “Old Palestinian” order was original to the text of Deuteronomy, since Vaticanus alone in Deuteronomy is not considered a reliable witness. It is also likely that the Egyptian order is original to Exodus, since there is strong Greek evidence for it outside of Egypt (as well as the Nash Papyrus). The order of M and S and the daughter versions in Exodus may be explained as the result of the influence of Deuteronomy. Therefore, I have two orders, one reflected in the original text of Exodus, the other in the original text of Deuteronomy. Beyond this, however, text criticism will not take us. The original order of the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments in the most ancient version of the Decalogue is not clear.

Lines 1 and 2, 5:17, 18, 19, MEx, G, GEx, S, SEx, Syr., PapNash (where extant) M, Tg., Vg. The waw conjunctive is not original to the negative commandments.

The Ninth Commandment

Deut 5:20

לא תענה ברעך נין שאה

Line 1, 5:20 MEx, G, GEx, S, SEx, Syr., PapNash] מנה M, Tg., Vg. The waw conjunctive is not original to the negative commandments.

Line 1, 5:20 M, S, Syr., Tg., PapNash] שקב MEx, SEx, G and GEx have שקב, which could translate either שקב or שקה. The tradition of Deuteronomy is united behind שקה. The Priestly tradition is divided, with M and S using שקה, and the Egyptian group (I am assuming that GEx and PapNash agree, as usual) using שקה. שקה appears to be original in Deuteronomy, while שקה may be original in Exodus. These appear to be ancient variants.

The Tenth Commandment

Deut 5:21

לא תמאו

Asa רַעְךָ לא תמאו בַּת רַעְךָ שֵׁרֵי עָבָד אֱלֹהִים

שחר חומר וּלְכָל בַּת רַעְךָ

Lines 1 and 2, 5:21 Again, the question is of the original version of the list:

18 Wevers, Text History, 48.
Several variants present themselves. Two can be easily resolved: the presence of the direct object marker in the Nash Papyrus and the addition of conjunctions before נון in the various traditions. These are prose particles which crept into the text and can be eliminated. The first major variant among the traditions is the second verb. The MT of Deuteronomy (and its targums) has יָבָבְנַה, while all the other witnesses have יָבָבְנַה. I would restore the more difficult verb יָבָבְנַה as the preferable reading, viewing the second יָבָבְנַה as leveling through from the first verb.

The second major variant involves the word order. The Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions are thoroughly confused at this point. Text criticism is not helpful, except to show that there is a tendency to level through the order “wife ... house” (all our later witnesses preserve this order). G. E. Wright (among others) has suggested that the order of Exodus is earlier, and that נון in this context means “household,” with the list that follows specifying that which belongs to the household. Later, when the wife gained an improved status, the list in Deuteronomy reflected this improved position. William Moran, however, uses the Ugaritic legal contracts with their lists of possessions to prove that the list in Deuteronomy can be every bit as ancient as that of Exodus and implies no special status for women. Ugaritic lists are usually headed by the word for house (בֵית), which can mean “house,” “house and land,” or “land.” It often appears in the formulaic expression בֵית וַאֶרֶץ, “house and field.” When it appears in this expression the word order is fixed. The other formulaic expression that appears in these Ugaritic lists is the phrase “everything belonging to him,” which concludes the list in every case. Thus, the typical scheme of the Ugaritic legal documents is “house and field” + specifications + generic closing formula. The order of the parts is rigid. This is precisely the order of the list in Deuteronomy after the second verb (see below). Typologically, then, the list of Deuteronomy is very old. As Moran states, “If this is a typical list of common possessions subject to sale,

---

19 Cross and Freedman note that the direct object marker appears very infrequently in ancient texts (Ancient Yahwistic Poetry, 28).

20 As William Moran points out, the verbs are practically synonymous, so it cannot be supposed that one represents any “refinement of moral standards” over the other (“The Conclusion of the Decalogue,” CBQ 29 [1967] 543, 545).

21 G. Ernest Wright, Deuteronomy (IB 2; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953) 368.
exchange, or inheritance, then the wife has no place in it.”\(^{22}\) The wife is placed before the list, in a completely separate position. This does not imply a movement beyond Exodus, where the wife is considered a part of the household. Rather, it is simply a matter of using a different, though equally ancient, formula. Therefore, there are two ancient variants, and one cannot be assigned priority over the other\(^{23}\)

Lines 2 and 3, 5:21 The problems here are very similar to those in 5:14.

There are almost as many lists as witnesses. In two of the lists, a certain amount of expansion has taken place. The list of G and G\(^{Ex}\) has expanded because of the influence of the list in 5:14 (the addition of \(\text{ילוים וטומרים שלום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום}
\)) and appear together many times in the Hebrew Bible, including Exod 22:4; 1 Sam 22:7; Jer 32:15; and Neh 5:3, 4, 5. This explains the Syriac expansion. Neither of these expansions is to be taken as pointing to the original text. The reconstruction of the original list may be approached as was the list in 5:14, by placing together the groups of two \(\text{ילוים וטומרים שלום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום}
\) and \(\text{ילוים וטומרים שלום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום}
\). It may be argued that the groups without the conjunction, witnessed by 44, are preferable. However, it may also be argued that these \(\text{waw}\)s dropped out of 4Q by reason of haplography (since the preceding words end in \(\text{waw}\)). At the end of the list, all the other witnesses agree on 4Q, which serves as the climax to the list. This leaves the problem of \(\text{waw}\). If it is original, it should stand alone, and should not have the \(\text{waw}\) conjunction (as in 4Q, M, S, \(\text{SEx}, \text{Tg}\)). However, M\(^{Ex}\) does not contain \(\text{waw}\). This raises the question of its originality. The list in 5:14 above does not contain \(\text{waw}\), and the tradition of M\(^{Ex}\) may have deleted it under that influence.\(^{24}\) Therefore, I reconstruct this list as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{שלמה ואשות ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלום חכמה שלום ושלום שום ושלוםชום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שום ושלום שומ
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{22}\) Moran, “The Conclusion of the Decalogue,” 548–52. Moran gives as an example the list of RS 16:148 + , which is a royal grant to a certain Takhulenu. The list reads “his houses, his fields, his menservants, his maidservants, his oxen, his asses, everything else belonging to him.”

\(^{23}\) Moran, in fact, does suggest that in the original list of commandments, Deut 5:21a and 5:21b were two separate commandments (“The Conclusion of the Decalogue,” 554). If this is so, then Deuteronomy would be earlier than Exodus, Exodus stemming from a period when the two separate commandments were put together, with “household” at the head of the list.

\(^{24}\) Also, see the arguments of Moran cited above concerning the Ugaritic formulaic pair \(\text{bitu ú eqū} \).
It is clear from the above discussion that the witness to the Decalogue found in the All Souls Deuteronomy does stand clearly in the tradition of Deuteronomy. At 5:12, All Souls contains חַגְּרָה, the verb of the Deuteronomic tradition. All Souls uses, at 5:12 and 5:16, the phrase אַלְּדָּהָרִים, which appears only in the Decalogue of Deuteronomy. The phrase יָוִּיתָ (5:14), in the household list, appears chiefly in the Deuteronomic tradition, infecting the Old Greek of Exodus and the Nash Papyrus. At 5:20, Deuteronomy contains יָשִּׁר instead of יָשֵׁר, a reading which 4QDtn shares. Finally, at 5:21, the All Souls shares with the other witnesses to Deuteronomy the word order יָשִּׁר, הב. So much, then, is clear. Can it be placed within a group of witnesses in the Deuteronomic tradition? There are only two cases of shared error in the All Souls’ witness, at 5:16 (commandment 5) and 5:21 (commandment 10). At 5:16, 4Q agrees in error with M, S, and the daughter versions of M; at 5:21, with G and GEx. There is not enough evidence here to draw a sound conclusion. When discussing the order of the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments, I noted that the All Souls was a witness to the “Old Palestinian” order (as opposed to the Egyptian order), as were all the published texts from Qumran. This, again, does not allow us to draw any conclusion, except to say that there was a tendency at Qumran to level through the “Old Palestinian” order.

The most striking thing about this manuscript is the conflation evident in the fourth commandment. Clearly, in this period the distinction between the Decalouges in Exodus and Deuteronomy had become somewhat blurred (witness also the earlier Nash Papyrus). However, this conflation certainly did not occur in all witnesses, at Qumran or elsewhere. So once again, there is not enough evidence on which to base a judgment. What finally must be said is that the All Souls Deuteronomy bears witness to a text of the Deuteronomic Decalogue, which is, with one important exception, almost free from error and very close to what may be presumed to be the original text of the Deuteronomic Decalogue.

25 E.g., 4QPhy1a, 4QPhy1b.