**4QpaleoExodm and the ‘Samaritan’ Tenth Commandment**

The ‘Samaritan’ tenth commandment deals with one of the central concepts of Samaritan theology, namely, the centralization of worship on Mount Gerizim.[[1]](#footnote-1) A composite text, it incorporates material from Exodus 13:11a and Deuteronomy 11:29, 27:2b–3a, 4a, 5–7, and 11:30, and includes the command to build an altar on Mount Gerizim. This passage is repeated in both versions of the Samaritan Pentateuch’s Decalogue and establishes the veneration of Mount Gerizim as an integral part of the laws revealed on Mount Sinai.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The tenth commandment has been characterized primarily as a sectarian change interpolated into a Jewish textual tradition that had circulated in the late Second Temple Period.[[3]](#footnote-3) This so-called pre-Samaritan tradition is documented in a small group of Pentateuchal scrolls from Qumran that contain significant editorial interventions, most later known from the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP). The tenth commandment was not preserved in these scrolls. The absence of the tenth commandment from the pre-Samaritan scrolls as well as the fact that the sanctity of Mount Gerizim as the chosen place of worship is the most important difference between Judaism and Samaritanism, have led scholars to conclude that the tenth commandment belongs to a layer of sectarian changes that pertained to the centralization of the cult site. The Samaritan layer was interpolated into the pre-Samaritan tradition when the latter was adopted by the Samaritans as the base text of their authoritative Pentateuch.[[4]](#footnote-4)

An additional prominent change, alongside the tenth commandment, was associated with the Samaritan layer: the use of the perfect form בחר rather than the imperfect יבחר in the cult centralization formula of MT-Deut: הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר יְהוָה, “the place where the Lord will choose.”

However, in recent years, scholars have increasingly undermined the widely accepted model of the SP's textual development, proposing that variants associated with the Samaritan layer already existed in the pre-Samaritan tradition. Thus, Edmond Gallagher and Stefan Schorch, for instance, suggest that the tenth commandment was developed in the pre-Samaritan tradition because it shares hermeneutical methods with other pre-Samaritan expansions.[[5]](#footnote-5) Moreover, Adrian Schenker and Schorch do not consider the interchange of the forms בחר–יבחר in the Deuteronomic formula as a sectarian variant, but as the original reading. Schenker points out that the בחר reading is also attested in some Greek Septuagint manuscripts, as well as in Coptic and Latin secondary translations of the old Greek text of the Pentateuch.[[6]](#footnote-6) It is also documented in MT-Neh 1:9, which states, וַהֲבִואֹתִים אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתִּי לְשַׁכֵּן אֶת־שְׁמִי שָׁם, “I will bring them unto the place that I *have chosen* to set my name there.” Therefore, the perfect form בחר has nothing to do with the Samaritan ideology of the chosen place. Rather, according to Schorch, this form was altered to the imperfect form יבחר to bring the book of Deuteronomy into agreement with the books of Samuel and Kings.[[7]](#footnote-7)

This paper focuses on the tenth commandment. The question as to whether this passage is a sectarian reading or not has thus far been discussed mainly in literary historical terms, but I would now like to suggest new material data that can shed additional light on it. Evidence arises for a reconsideration of whether the commandment was originally included in 4QpaleoExodm, also known as 4Q22, the longest preserved pre-Samaritan scroll. 4QpaleoExodm shares several expansions and duplications with SP and thus represents the expansionist text-type of the book of Exodus, of which SP is a later exemplar. However, as the text of the Decalogue was not preserved in 4QpaleoExodm, the question of whether the scroll agrees with the SP’s version of the Decalogue remains unanswered.

Based on the material reconstruction of 4QpaleExodm, Patrick Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith Sanderson, the original editors of 4QpaleoExodm, contended that the tenth commandment was not included in the scroll.[[8]](#footnote-8) Their opinion continues to prevail among scholars, who simply refer to them and accept their claim without much discussion.

This paper sheds new light on the appearance of the tenth commandment in 4QpaleoExodm, using material and textual reconstruction of the relevant columns of the scroll. The reconstruction indicates that the tenth commandment to build an altar on Mount Gerizim *was probably included* in 4QpaleoExodm and therefore belongs to the early, pre-Samaritan layer. Put differently, the tenth commandment is *not* a sectarian reading but rather existed in the pre-Samaritan tradition adopted by the Samaritans. These findings have implications both on the textual development of SP and the origin of the pre-Samaritan tradition.

**I. Material and Textual Evidence of 4QpaleoExodm**

4QpaleoExodm is a carefully inscribed manuscript that attests to portions of Exod 6:25–36:24. It is written in a neat and formal paleo-Hebrew script and is dated on paleographical grounds to the second or first century BCE.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The material reconstruction of the scroll proposed in the official edition indicates that the preserved text occupied fifty-five consecutive columns in the original scroll, two of which have been lost in full (XIV; XLIII).[[10]](#footnote-10)

4QpaleoExodm tests to most of the major features that characterize SP-Exod. In what follows, I shall detail the major features of SP-Exod and the elements it has in common with 4QpaleoExodm.

When compared with MT and LXX, SP-Exod includes seventeen major expansions.[[11]](#footnote-11) Of these, ten appear in the plagues narrative (Exod 6:9b; 7:18b; 7:29b; 8:1b; 8:19b; 9:5b; 9:19b; 10:2b; 11:3b i; 11:3b ii). These expansions add detail to both the divine command to speak to Pharaoh and the fulfillment of this order.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Additional major expansions in the book of Exodus deal with the organization of the judiciary (Exod 18:24b, 25b); the theophany on Mount Sinai (Exod 20:13b, 15, 17b); the instructions for the priestly vestments (Exod 27:19b); and the episode of the golden calf (Exod 32:10). In most of these cases, a certain amount of the text in Exodus was copied from parallel accounts in Deuteronomy.[[13]](#footnote-13)

In addition to the major expansions documented in SP-Exod, it presents also two cases of rearrangements or transpositions: in the instructions for both the incense altar and the installation of the high priest. MT and LXX, on the one hand, and SP, on the other, insert these passages in different places. While MT and LXX place the instructions for the incense altar in Exod 30:1–10, SP places them after Exod 26:35. Furthermore, the instructions for the installation of the high priest appear in MT and LXX in Exod 29:21, but in SP they are placed after Exod 29:28.

4QpaleoExodm and SP-Exod apparently reflect agreement concerning the two transpositions.[[14]](#footnote-14) 4QpaleoExodm shares with SP the arrangement of the instructions for the incense altar in Exod 26. In addition, similar to SP, it does not include the instructions for the installation of the high priest in Exod 29:21. Yet, since verses 28–29 have not been preserved in 4QpaleoExodm, we cannot ascertain whether these instructions originally followed verse 28, as in SP. According to Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, the material reconstruction makes it likely that the installation of the high priest indeed appeared at this point of the scroll.[[15]](#footnote-15)

With respect to the major expansions, 4QpaleoExodm preserves eleven major expansions documented in SP-Exod (Exod 7:18b; 7:29b; 8:19b; 9:5b; 9:19b; 10:2b; 18:24b; 18:25b; 20:15; 27:19b; 32:10). As Sanderson states in her detailed textual analysis of 4QpaleoExodm, there is good reason to believe that four additional expansions, no longer preserved, were included in the scroll.[[16]](#footnote-16) These appeared in the plagues narrative (Exod 6:9b; 8:1b; 11:3b i; 11: 3b ii). Since the expansions within the plagues narrative exhibit a consistent and systematic character, it is highly unlikely that a scroll that includes expansions on several plagues would exclude them elsewhere in the narrative. In the remaining two cases, both in Exod 20 (Exod 20:13b; 20:17b), the text is not preserved in 4QpaleoExodm. Nonetheless, Sanderson proposed that all the major expansions in SP-Exod were originally included in the scroll save for the tenth commandment to build an altar on Mount Gerizim in Exod 20.[[17]](#footnote-17)

In the official edition, the editors elaborate on Sanderson’s suggestion by drawing on material and textual evidence in 4QpaleoExodm.[[18]](#footnote-18) SP-Exod 20 contains three major expansions: (1) The tenth commandment to build an altar on Mount Gerizim (Exod 20:13b); (2) The people’s request that Moses act as mediator at Sinai, drawn from Deut 5:24–27 (Exod 20:15); (3) God’s response to the people’s request, drawn from Deut 5:28–31; 18:18–22 (Exod 20:17b).

The preserved fragments of 4QpaleoExodm (col. XX) attest to the second expansion, that is, the people’s request, while the tenth commandment and God’s response to the people’s request were not preserved. Based on the material reconstruction of the scroll, Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson concluded that the scroll agrees neither with MT-like nor SP-like texts. They write as follows:[[19]](#footnote-19)

Fragments from cols. XX and XXII which are securely placed leave too much room between them for the text of Exod 20:1–21:6 as in MT, but too little room for the text as in SP, which includes three major expansions.

According to the editors, since the scroll describes the request of the people, it would be quite natural for the scroll to include God’s response, so as to bring the story to completion. Such an assumption does not leave room for the tenth commandment in 4QpaleoExodm. The editors thus believe that it was not originally included in the scroll, a conclusion that is reevaluated in this study.

**II Is the Tenth Commandment a Sectarian text?**

As Stated, the assumption that the tenth commandment is not included in 4QpaleoExodm heavily influenced the designation of the tenth commandment as a purely ideological Samaritan change. However, this has recently been questioned.

Molly Zahn, although she did not argue that the tenth commandment belongs to the pre-Samaritan tradition, nevertheless emphasized that this section shows very close connections to the hermeneutical principles reflected in other pre-Samaritan expansions.[[20]](#footnote-20) Following Gary Knoppers, Zahn convincingly demonstrated that the text of the tenth commandment shares content and linguistic elements with the last verses of Exod 20 that deal with an altar law.[[21]](#footnote-21) Nonetheless, the altar law does not provide a specific location for the altar and probably refers to altars in general. The insertion of the tenth commandment preceding it clarifies that the commandment refers to one specific altar that, according to SP-Deut 27:4, should be built on Mount Gerizim.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Schorch, in turn, demonstrated in detail the similarity of the scribal techniques used in the tenth commandment and the third expansion in Chapter 20, which deals with God’s response and the role of the prophet.[[23]](#footnote-23) Both incorporate materials from different chapters in Deuteronomy into a composite text to create an explicit text in the book of Exodus. Schorch concluded that the tenth commandment and God’s response were penned by the same scribal circles.[[24]](#footnote-24)

**III Material and Textual Reconstruction** **of 4QpaleoExodm columns XVIII – XXII**

The attribution of the tenth commandment to the pre-Samaritan stage raises the question of its presumed absence from 4QpaleoExodm. Since the scroll shares with SP-Exod most of its major features; if the tenth commandment indeed belongs to the pre-Samaritan layer, we would expect it to be included in the scroll as well.

Schorch does, in fact, deal with this issue. In his reassessment, he estimated that the lacuna between the extant fragments in the relevant portion in the scroll and demonstrated that there is room for the tenth commandment in 4QpaleoExodm.[[25]](#footnote-25) Schorch’s conclusion directly opposes that of the editors mentioned above. In order to check the contradicting claims, I conducted a material and textual reconstruction of the relevant columns in 4QpaleoExodm using digital tools that simulate the condition of these columns before the scroll’s deterioration. The simulation clearly and transparently displays the data and enables a decisive conclusion.

In what follows, I shall describe the principles underlying the material and textual reconstruction.

1. Each column in the scroll consists of 32 to 33 lines and is an estimated 25–27 cm in height. The column widths are inconsistent. They vary from around 35 to 60 letters per line, yielding approximate column widths of 12–15 cm.[[26]](#footnote-26)
2. The proposed reconstruction extends from column XVIII to column XXII, which corresponds to Exod 17:16-21:6.[[27]](#footnote-27) As can be seen from table 1, Chapter 20, which includes the Decalogue, is expected to appear only in columns XX-XXII. However, the discussion begins with the closest fragments to those that preserve the text of Chapter 20, which are securely located. As seen in figure 1, Columns XVIII and XXII include fragments that show traces of bottom margins, and their location is thus certain. As such, they serve as anchors for the reconstruction of the poorly preserved text between them.

Figure I. 4QpaleoExodm columns XVIII–XXII (Exod 17:16–21:6)

Table 1. The content of 4QpaleoExodm columns XVIII–XXII

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Column | XVIII | XIX | XX | XXI–XXII |
| Verses | Exod 17:16–18:21 | Exod 18:21–19:7 | Exod 19:7–20:2 | Exod 20:2–21:6 |

1. The official edition includes 447 unidentified fragments.[[28]](#footnote-28) The hereby proposed reconstruction includes several fragments that were successfully identified by Nathan Jastram and Drew Longacre after the completion of the official edition.[[29]](#footnote-29) I did not accept all the new identifications they suggested, but only those that were compelling and that seemed certain.[[30]](#footnote-30)
2. Column XVIII can be confidently reconstructed as it consists of fragments that preserve both top and intercolumnar margins, in addition to bottom margins. Once I have located the fragments at the top of the column, I reconstructed the text using a font based on typical letters in the scribe’s hand.[[31]](#footnote-31) The column includes enough extant fragments to inspire confidence in its contents and arrangement. The complete column attests to 33 lines, which is in line with other columns in the scroll.

Figure II. Textual and Material reconstruction of 4QpaleoExodm column XVIII (Exod 17:16–18:21)

1. Columns XIX and XX preserve fragments that also inspire some confidence in their textual reconstruction. Fragments associated with column XIX preserve the top and intercolumnar margin and are thus securely located. These columns show traces of successive lines, which allows for the secure measurement of their width. In terms of text, some of the extant fragments of col. XIX attest to the expanded text of Exod 18:24–27. Conversely, the missing text between the fragments in col. XX is relatively stable. No major expansions, omissions or transpositions are documented across the textual traditions.

Figure III. Textual and Material reconstruction of 4QpaleoExodm columns XIX (Exod 18:21–19:7); XX (Exod 19:7–20:2)

1. The text of Exod 20 in the scroll is spread over columns XXI and XXII, which are poorly preserved. Column XXI preserves only three fragments. All of them attest to the pre-Samaritan expansion of Deut 5, which details the people’s request from Moses. Column XXII includes one small fragment at its top (frg. 114), identified by Jastram, and two fragments at its bottom, both attesting to Exod 21:5–6 (see fig. 5). These fragments were places according to the textual reconstruction. Due to the poor preservation of these columns, their reconstruction is less certain. All the same, the reconstruction of the previous column as well as the placement of the two fragments at the bottom of column XXII do frame the expected place where Exod 20 once appeared in these columns.

Figure IV. The expected place of Exod 20 in 4QpaleoExodm

The reconstruction of the missing text between the extant fragments thus reveals that there is room for all three major expansions of SP-Exod 20 in the original scroll. In figure 5, the three major expansions are colored in red. It can be clearly seen that the lacuna between the preserved fragments fits perfectly with the amount of the text of SP-Exod 20, including all three expansions. The fact that the tenth commandment involves a significant quantity of text grants a high degree of certainty to the conclusion that there is room for it in the original scroll.

The findings presented here deviate from those of Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson for one principal reason: the accuracy of the reconstruction. The digital font and canvas allow us to come up with a more precise reconstruction of the discussed columns. Thus, for instance, col. XXI in this case begins with Exod 20:2, while in the editor’s reconstruction, this column begins with Exod 20:4.[[32]](#footnote-32). Furthermore, the editors proposed that the text of SP-Exod 20:4–21:6 would require 79 lines in the layout of 4QpaleoExodm and thus concluded that the scroll could not have had all three of the expansions in Exod 20.[[33]](#footnote-33) However, this turned out to be inaccurate, since, as I have shown above, SP-Exod 22:2–21:6 was spread out over only 66 lines (cols. XXI–XXII).

Figure V. Textual and Material reconstruction of 4QpaleoExodm columns XX (Exod 19:7–20:2); XXI (Exod 20:2–20:15b); XXII (Exod 20:15b–21:6)

To be clear, this study does not intend to claim that the proposed textual reconstruction fully reflects the original layout of the scroll. Slight changes are inevitable due to different techniques of paragraph division and orthography. A further consideration that may affect the reconstruction’s accuracy is the arrangement of the Decalogue, which is unknown because no fragment of 4QpaleoExodm preserves it. I therefore inserted intervals between the commandments sporadically, as did the scribe of 4QDeutn (4Q41), a copy of the book of Deuteronomy that preserves the Decalogue. However, even if the layout of the original text was quite different, the amount of text included in the reconstructed column far exceeds the potential margin of error.

Figure VI. Textual and Material reconstruction of 4QpaleoExodm columns XVIII–XX

Moreover, the reconstruction of a text in lacuna is made difficult by the fluidity of the textual traditions attested in the Qumran manuscripts.[[34]](#footnote-34) The text of SP has been used as the base text for the textual reconstruction. Nonetheless, the statistics of the readings of 4QpaleoExodm indicate no clear alignment of the scroll with SP, neither with MT and LXX.[[35]](#footnote-35) Therefore, minor variants in the reconstructed text are inevitable. These variants may slightly affect the reconstruction but would probably not change the conclusion regarding the tenth commandment since they usually involve a limited amount of text.

**IV 4QRPa**

Despite its long history of analysis and classification, 4QRPa (4Q158) has been widely accepted as a scriptural text.[[36]](#footnote-36) 4QRPa preserves a version of the theophany on Sinai that is based on the pre-Samaritan tradition, but reflects additional changes that are not found in SP.[[37]](#footnote-37) Fragments 6–8 display an expanded text of the theophany, from both a stylistic and logical point of view. Thus, for instance, 4QRPa is unique in adding the words את קול דברי אמור להמה before God’s declaration about the prophet (frg. 6 6) and the account of how the divine command to send the people to their tents was fulfilled: וישובו העם איש לאהליו (frg. 7 5). These additions seem to create smoother transitions within the text and to respond to interpretive difficulties.[[38]](#footnote-38) Moreover, the Decalogue in 4QRPa is located after the people’s request from Moses.[[39]](#footnote-39)

4QRPa is a heavily edited text, one that freely composites and interpolates new texts, and includes many other smaller editorial changes. It takes a step beyond the 4QpaleoExodm and SP, in which expansions are made solely through duplication of Pentateuchal materials.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Fragments 7–8 shows that the tenth commandment does not appear in 4QRPa. Put differently, 4QRPa is the only pre-Samaritan scroll that provide evidence for the absence of the tenth commandment in this textual tradition. Gallagher, however, rightly argued that the absence of the tenth commandment in the Qumran scrolls does not necessarily indicate that it was added to the text later.[[41]](#footnote-41) Not all pre-Samaritan scrolls share the same expansions; some scrolls attest to certain ones, but not others.[[42]](#footnote-42) Textual deviations “indicate that these texts are not copies of one another but are part of a tradition in which an individual scribe (or group of scribes) had freedom to manipulate a received text within a broader body of tradition.”[[43]](#footnote-43) Therefore, the fact that the tenth commandment was not included 4QRPa does not necessarily indicate that it was not included in other manuscripts that belonged to the pre-Samaritan tradition but are no longer preserved. Nonetheless, the possibility that the tenth commandment was deliberately rejected by the scribes responsible for the text of 4QRPa cannot be excluded.

**V Implications**

The material and textual reconstruction of the five columns of 4QpaleoExodm demonstrates that the scroll probably included a text of the Decalogue that contained a commandment to build an altar on Mount Gerizim. This conclusion is in line with recent studies proposing that the tenth commandment shows affinity to the pre-Samaritan tradition.

These findings carry importance that far exceeds the discussion of 4QpaleoExodm as they shed new light on both the textual development of SP and the socio-historical background of the pre-Samaritan tradition.

With regard to SP, the development of the SP’s text is here claimed to be the opposite of what has been widely accepted thus far: the insertion of the tenth commandment in Exod 20 preceded the adoption of the pre-Samaritan tradition by Samaritans. Thus, this paper follows the approach questioning the existence of a Samaritan layer in SP. As the tenth commandment—the most typical ideological change in SP—seems to originate in the pre-Samaritan tradition, we may conclude that the Samaritan layer, if exists at all, is thinner than commonly thought.

Still, one may point to one sectarian variant in SP: the insertion of the tenth commandment in the version of the Decalogue in SP-Deut 5:17b. In most pre-Samaritan expansions, the Pentateuchal materials are duplicated in one direction—from Deuteronomy to Exodus and Numbers. Although there are two exceptions to this rule, in which Pentateuchal material is interpolated into Deuteronomy (SP-Deut 2:7b; 10:6b), Segal convincingly suggests that both cases are overshadowed by the prevalence of duplication in reverse.[[44]](#footnote-44) Thus, the unusual interpolation of material in the Decalogue in Deuteronomy may have been the work of Samaritan scribes, who intended to establish the sanctity of Mount Gerizim as an integral part of the Decalogue. Yet, as there are no certified pre-Samaritan scrolls of Deuteronomy, no decisive conclusion can be drawn.

This study also supports the claim that the pre-Samaritan tradition was developed by scribes associated with the temple on Mount Gerizim.[[45]](#footnote-45) Archaeological findings attest to the presence of a temple on Mount Gerizim as early as the mid-fifth century BCE.[[46]](#footnote-46) The temple was dedicated to the same god as the Temple of Jerusalem was—YAHWE—and the two presumably shared rituals.[[47]](#footnote-47) The common features of the worship in the temples in Gerizim and Jerusalem were part of a general system of reciprocal influence between the two groups settled in the regions of Jerusalem and Samaria.[[48]](#footnote-48) If, indeed, there once had been a version of the Decalogue that included the command to build an altar on Mount Gerizim, then it would most likely have been generated in Samaria among the scribes of the temple on Mount Gerizim.

One may therefore conclude that the Samaritans, who originated with the Northern Yahwists, did not simply adopted a Jewish textual tradition of the Pentateuch as their authoritative text. Instead, they accepted a textual tradition with which they were already familiar, and in whose development they probably had a hand.[[49]](#footnote-49)
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