June 1990

THE ALL SOULS DEUTERONOMY AND THE DECALOGUE

Sidnie White Crawford
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, scrawford1@unl.edu

THE ALL SOULS DEUTERONOMY
AND THE DECALOGUE

SIDNIE ANN WHITE

Albright College, Reading, PA 19612

4QDt[n], 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.

[2] Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969). The complete scroll, with photographs, will be published in DJD 10, forthcoming from Oxford University Press.

[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 trans-
mission of the text and to illuminate some of the text-critical questions con-
cerning 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.[5] 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.[6] 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
G^A	A F M (y) (z) [the symbol (-) indicates that not all of the manuscripts in a group agree on the reading]
G^B	Vaticanus
G^C	The catena texts
G^L	d (n) p t[7]
G^O	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 *sĕtûmôt* or *pĕtûhôt* 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 Maccabaean
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 Antiochan provenance is by no means
assured, it may serve as a convenient label.

4QDt^n (Portion containing the Decalogue)

MEx   The MT of Exodus
GEx   The Old Greek of Exodus
SEx   The Samaritan text of Exodus

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.[8] Following this bracket the readings which differ from All Souls are given. (The siglum › 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

לוא יהיה

לך אלוהים אחרים על פני

Line 1, 5:7 יהיה M, S, PapNash, Syr., Tg., Vg., MEx, SEx] cf. G, GEx, which have the plural εσονται, a result of the plural noun and adjective אלהים אחרים.

The Second Commandment

Deut 5:8–10

לא תעשה לך פסל וכול

תמונה אשר בשמים ממעל ואשר בארץ מתחת ואשר

במים מתחת לארץ לוא תשתחוה להם ולוא תעובדם

כי אנוכי יהוה אלוהיך אל קנא פוקד עוון אבות על

בנים על שלשים ועל רבעים לשנאי עושה חסד אלפים

לאוהבי ולשומרי מצוותי

Line 1, 5:8 וכול G, S, Syr., Vg., MEx, GEx, SEx] כל M, Tg.
Line 4, 5:8 אנוכי M, G, S, Tg., Vg., MEx, SEx] εγω ειμι GEx: 'n' 'n' 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 καιγε recension to distinguish between אנכי and אני by using the verb ειμι with the former and not

---

[8] 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.[9] The Syr. has been infected by G^Ex at this point.

Line 5, 5:9 ועל שלשים M: ‎[S^Ex ,M^Ex ,.Vg ,.Syr ,PapNash ,S ,G ‎על שלשים cf. Tg.

Line 5, 5:9 רבעים M, S, PapNash, M^Ex, S^Ex] + γενεαν G = Syr., Tg., Vg.: + γενεας G^Ex.

Line 5, 5:10 ועשה]עושה[M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., M^Ex, G^Ex, S^Ex.

Line 6, 5:10 מצוותי G, S, PapNash, Syr., Tg., Vg., M^Ex, S^Ex] מצותו M. *Waw* and *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 *waw* and *yod* (note also the reading of M^Ex); therefore, it seems likely that 4Q has the preferable text with G et al.

The Third Commandment

Deut 5:11

לוא תשא את שם יהוה אלוהיך
לשוא כי לוא ינקה יהוה את אשר ישא את שמו לשוא

Line 1, 5:11 יהוה (second occurrence) M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., M^Ex, S^Ex] κυριος ο θεος σου G^Ex. The Greek of Exodus is exhibiting assimilation to a common formula, which appears earlier in the verse.

The Fourth Commandment

Deut 5:12–15

¹²שמור *vacat* את יום השבת לקדשו כאשר צוך יהוה
אלוהיך ¹³ששת ימים תעבוד ועשית את כול מלאכתך
¹⁴ויביום השביעי שבת ליהוה אלוהיך לוא תעשה בו כל מלאכה
אתה בנך בתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמורך
ובהמתך גריך אשר בשעריך למען ינוח עבדך ואמתך
כמוך ¹⁵וזכרתה כי עבד היית *vacat* בארץ מצרים ויציאך
יהוה אלוהיך משם ביד *vacat* חזקה ובזרוע נטויה
על כן צוך יהוה אלוהיך *vacat* לשמור את יום השבת
לקדשו כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ
את הים וכול אשר בם וינוח ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה
את יום השבת לקדשו

Line 1, 5:12 שמור M, G^A- B C L O-, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., S^Ex] זכור M^Ex, G^A- O-,

---

⁹ S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912) lix.

G^Ex, 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 זכור of the few Greek manuscripts of Deuteronomy is assimilated to the Priestly tradition.

Lines 1 and 2, 5:12 כאשר צוך יהוה אלוהיך M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.] › M^Ex, G^Ex, S^Ex, PapNash. Again, this reading gives a clear distinction between the traditions of Deuteronomy and Exodus.

Line 2, 5:13 ועשית את כול M^Ex] ועשית כל M, S, PapNash, S^Ex.

Line 3, 5:14 וביום השביעי G, G^Ex, PapNash] ויום השביעי M, S, Syr., Tg., M^Ex, S^Ex: *septimus 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 תעשה בו כל G, S, PapNash, Syr., Vg., G^Ex] תעשה כל M, Tg., M^Ex, S^Ex. 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.

4Q, G^B]	אתה בנך בתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמורך					ובהמתך גריך
M, Syr., Tg.:	אתה ובנך ובתך ועבדך ואמתך שורך וחמרך				וכל בהמתך ונרך
G^A C L O, S:	אתה ובנך ובתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמרך				וכל בהמתך ונרך
Vg.:	אתה ובנך ובתך עבדך ואמתך ושורך וחמרך				וכל בהמתך ונרך
M^Ex:	אתה ובנך ובתך עבדך ואמתך				בהמתך ונרך
G^Ex, PapNash:	אתה ובנך ובתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמרך				וכל בהמתך ונרך
S^Ex.	אתה ובנך ובתך עבדך ואמתך				בהמתך ונרך

Several observations can be made. First, there is great variation in the presence or absence of the *waw* conjunctive. Second, the Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions show reciprocal influence. Third, this manuscript is unique for its paucity of the *waw* 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 שורך וחמורך, while Exodus does not in all cases. The presence of שורך וחמורך in G^Ex 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 G^Ex 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. G^Ex 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 ועבדך ואמתך. עבדך ואמתך (with the conjunction) is found in every single version. Making the phrase עבדך ואמתך a paradigm, I would phrase our groups of two as follows: בנך ובתך, עבדך ואמתך, שורך וחמורך. 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. אתה must stand alone as the primary addressee, followed by the group specifying the family. The word בהמתך raises two questions: should it be preceded by *waw* and should it be preceded by כל? It may be argued that in Deuteronomy בהמתך serves as the climax of the "animal" group, and therefore should be joined to that group with וכל. However, in the Priestly version of the list, it immediately follows the "servant" group. 4QDt[n] and G[B] do not have כל before בהמתך. It was only after שורך וחמורך were added in the Deuteronomic version in order to specify to which beasts the list was referring (lists have a tendency to expand), that כל was added to ובהמתך to make it the climax of the "animal" group."[11] Finally, גרך 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 4QDt[n] may indicate that the conjunction is not original.

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

אתה בנך ובתך[12] עבדך ואמתך בהמתך וגרך

And the more primitive version of Deuteronomy as:

אתה בנך ובתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמורך ובהמתך וגרך

Line 5, 5:14 גריך אשר בשעריך M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg., M[Ex] ο παροιχων εν σοι G[E], G[Ex]. The Greek reading appears to be a synonymous variant.[13]

---

[11] This would fall under the rubric of *lectio brevior*. It might also be argued that the conjunction was added before בהמתך when the animal group was added to the Deuteronomic text, and that the original reading was בהמתך. My personal preference would be for בהמתך 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 כתך 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 4QDt[n] by haplography. Given the grouping of pairs in this list, we feel that the conjunction is original.

[13] After בשעריך PapNash adds: כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ את הים ואת כל אשר בם וינח ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה את יום השביעי ויקדשיו. This agrees, for the most

Lines 5 and 6, 5:14 למען ינוח עבדך ואמתך כמוך 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 ואמתך M, GA C, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.] GC(-329) 127 adds ο βους σου
χαι το υποζυγιον σου: GB L O adds το υποζυγιον σου. The Greek readings are
exhibiting conflation from the list in 5:14 above.

Lines 6–7, 5:15

וזכרתה כי עבד היית בארץ מצרים ויציאך יהוה אלוהיך משם ביד חזקה ובזרוע

נטויה על כן צוך יהוה אלוהיך לשמור את יום השבת 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 לשמור G, Syr., Tg., Vg.] לעשות M, S. The text of 4Q, G et
al. is the result of reminiscence of the first word of 5:12, the beginning of the
sabbath commandment. The text of M and S is preferable.

Line 9, 5:15 לקדשו] χαι αγιαζειν αυτην G: › M, S, Syr., Tg., Vg. There is
no trigger for the loss of לקדשו in Deuteronomy. G and 4Q have been
influenced here by the end of the commandment in Exodus, which reads
ויקדשהו (see also below).

Lines 9–11, 5:15 After לקדשו, 4Q adds, against all the Deuteronomic
witnesses:

לקדשו כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ את הים וכול אשר בם

וינוח ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה את יום השבת לקדשו

The text of MEx and SEx reads:

כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ את הים ואת כל אשר בם וינח

ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה את יום השבת ויקדשהו (χαι την θαλασσαν GEx).

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 לקדשו. The first לקדשו appears in Deuteronomy in G as well
as in 4Q. The second לקדשו is echoed by Exodus at the end of the fourth
commandment, which reads ויקדשהו. It should be noted, however, that the
verb in Exodus is a finite verb, not an infinitive construct. Therefore, there
are two infinitive constructs in 4QDtⁿ not found elsewhere in the tradition.
These infinitive constructs were used as seams (by the scribe of 4QDtⁿ or his
Vorlage) to surround the addition of the Exodus text. It might be suggested
that לקדשו . . . לקדשו were triggers for haplography in the early stages of the
writing down of the fourth commandment, but if they were, both infinitive
constructs have disappeared in most witnesses (the second possibly being

part, with MEx: כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ ואת הים ואת כל אשר בם וינח
ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה את יום השבת ויקדשהו (χαι την θαλασσαν GEx). 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.[14] This phenomenon is known as harmonization.[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 לקדשו, 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 4QDt[n], 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.

The Fifth Commandment

Deut 5:16

כבד את אביך ואת אמך כאשר
צוך יהוה אלוהיך vacat למען יאריכון ימיך ולמען ייטב
לך על האדמה אשר יהוה אלוהיך נותן לך

Lines 1 and 2 כאשר צוך יהוה אלוהיך M, G, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.] › M[Ex], G[Ex], S[Ex], PapNash. The phrase is unique to the Deuteronomic version.

Lines 2 and 3, 5:16 למען יאריכון ימיך ולמען ייטב לך M, S, Syr., Tg., Vg.] למען ייטב לך למען יאריכון ימיך G, G[Ex] (Μακροχρονιος γενη G, G[Ex]: μακρο-χρονιοι ητε G[B]), PapNash: למען יאריכון ימיך M[Ex], S[Ex]. The text of the Decalogue has suffered from haplography owing to homoioarchton and subsequent misplacement. G and G[Ex] appear to preserve the preferable text. The text suffered haplography owing to homoioarchton from למען to למען, with the result that the phrase ייטב לך ולמען 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

---

[14] Cf. Judith E. Sanderson (*An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExodm and the Samaritan Tradition* [HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986] 207), who points out "three major interpolations" in 4QpaleoEx[m] 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[b].

[15] For a good discussion of harmonization, see Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonization in Biblical Manuscripts," *JSOT* 3 (1985) 3–29.

the end of יָמִיךָ. 4Q shares the error of this reading.[16]

Line 3, 5:16 עַל הָאֲדָמָה M, G, S, Tg., Vg., M^Ex, S^Ex] επι της γης της αγαθης G^Ex: *b'r'' tbt'* Syr. The reading of G^Ex and the Syr. is an expansion.

The Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Commandments

Deut 5:17–19

לוא תרצח לוא

תנאף לוא תגנוב

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.	2.	3.
לא תרצח	לא תנאף	לא תנאף
לא תנאף	לא תרצח	לא תגנב
לא תגנב	לא תגנב	לא תרצח

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

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, G^A C O, S, S^Ex, as well as M, M^Ex, and its daughter versions, Syr., Syr.^Ex, Tg. and Vg.[17] 4QDt^n 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., 4QPhyl^b, 4QPhyl^g, and 4QPhyl^l). 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, G^C 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 למען יאריכון ימיך was original to the Exodus tradition, למען ייטב לך to Deuteronomy, 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.[18] 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 לוא MEx, G, GEx, S, SEx, Syr., PapNash (where extant)] ולא M, Tg., Vg. The *waw* conjunctive is not original to the negative commandments.

The Ninth Commandment

Deut 5:20

לוא תענה ברעיך עד שוא

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

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

The Tenth Commandment

Deut 5:21

לוא תחמוד
אשת רעיך לוא תחמוד בית רעיך שדהו עבדו אמתו
שורו חמורו וכול אשר לרעיך

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

[18] Wevers, *Text History,* 48.

4Q, G, GEx] לוא תחמוד   אשת רעיך לוא תחמוד   בית רעיך

M, Tg.: ולא תחמד   אשת רעך ולא תתאוה   בית רעך

S, SEx: לא תחמד   בית רעך ולא תחמד   אשת רעך

Syr.: לא תחמד   אשת רעך ולא תחמד   בית רעך

MEx: לא תחמד   בית רעך לא תחמד   אשת רעך

PapNash. לוא תחמד את אשת רעך לוא תחמוד את בית רעך

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 לא in the various traditions. These are prose particles which crept into the text and can be eliminated.[19] The first major variant among the traditions is the second verb. The MT of Deuteronomy (and its targums) has תתאוה, while all the other witnesses have תחמד. I would restore the more difficult verb תתאה as the preferable reading, viewing the second תחמד as leveling through from the first verb.[20]

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 בית 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.[21] 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 ($b\bar{\imath}t\bar{u}$), which can mean "house," "house and land," or "land." It often appears in the formulaic expression $b\bar{\imath}t\bar{u}$ $\bar{u}$ $eql\bar{u}$, "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.

4Q]	שדהו	עבדו אמתו שורו חמורו	וכול אשר לרעיך
M, Tg.:	שדהו	ועבדו ואמתו שורו וחמרו	וכל אשר לרעך
G, G^{Ex}:	ושדהו	ועבדו ואמתו ושורו וחמרו וכל בהמתו וכל	אשר לרעך וכל
S, S^{Ex}:	שדהו	עבדו ואמתו ושורו וחמרו	וכל אשר לרעך
Syr.:	ושדהו וכרם עבדו	אמתו ושורו וחמרו	וכל אשר לרעך
Vg.:	ושדהו	ועבדו ואמתו ושורו וחמרו	וכל אשר לרעך
M^{Ex}.		ועבדו ואמתו ושורו וחמרו	וכל אשר לרעך

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 שדה (וכל בהמתו). and כרם 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 עבדו ואמתו and שורו וחמרו. It may be argued that the groups without the conjunction, witnessed by 4Q, are preferable. However, it may also be argued that these *waws* dropped out of 4Q by reason of haplography (since the preceding words end in *waw*). At the end of the list, all the other witnesses agree on וכל אשר לרעך, which serves as the climax to the list. This leaves the problem of שדהו. If it is original, it should stand alone, and should not have the *waw* conjunction (as in 4Q, M, S, S[Ex], Tg.). However, M[Ex] does not contain שדהו. This raises the question of its originality. The list in 5:14 above does not contain שדהו, and the tradition of M[Ex] may have deleted it under that influence.[24] Therefore, I reconstruct this list as:

שדהו עבדו ואמתו שורו וחמרו וכל אשר לרעך

---

[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 *bītu ū eqlu*.

* * * *

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 שמור, the verb of the Deuteronomic tradition. All Souls uses, at 5:12 and 5:16, the phrase כאשר צוך יהוה אלהיך, which appears only in the Decalogue of Deuteronomy. The phrase שורך וחמורך (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 שוא instead of שקר, a reading which 4QDt^n shares. Finally, at 5:21, the All Souls shares with the other witnesses to Deuteronomy the word order בית, אשת. 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 G^{Ex}. 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 Decalogues 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.[25] 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., 4QPhyl^a, 4QPhyl^b.