**Reassessing the Transmission Process of the Samaritan Pentateuch Tradition**

Abstract:  
This article explores the transmission process of the Samaritan Pentateuch and examines the degree of proficiency and precision of the ancient Samaritan scribes. It focuses on textual variants that can be ascribed to graphic similarity between the versions attested in the Masoretic Text and in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The article demonstrates that with respect to variants that originate solely in graphic similarity between letters, the Samaritan Pentateuch contains superior versions in an equal number of instances as the Masoretic text. This fact can teach us about the meticulous work of the copyists who transmitted the versions in the Samaritan branch/community. (ענף). This sort of work is not entirely free of errors, but the fact that their number is roughly similar to that of the Masoretic text—which was also transmitted with great meticulousness—shows that the free attitude of the Samaritan scribes was not accompanied by careless transmission.

The Masoretic Text (MT) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) are the two comprehensive witnesses to the Hebrew text of the Torah and they represent two textual traditions that were found in the land of Israel in the Second Temple era. The current article examines the transmission process of SP, an exemplar of an editorial-harmonistic textual tradition.[[1]](#footnote-1) The scribes who transmitted SP allowed themselves the liberty of improving the text in content, language, orthography and further small details.[[2]](#footnote-2) This study examines whether the widely-recognized connection between the conservative scribal approach of MT scribes and their meticulous textual transmission, has a mirror parallel in the Samaritan Pentateuch, i.e., whether scribes’ free attitude to the text is accompanied by sloppy and inaccurate transmission. The level of the accuracy of the transmission process will be quantifiable by the relative incidence of secondary readings due to graphic similarity between letters in SP as compared to MT.[[3]](#footnote-3) Interchanges of similar letters are committed unintentionally and are an inevitable part of copying and transmitting a text. However, their frequency will be lower as the level of scribal scrupulousness increases.

Our discussion focuses on the processes that occurred during the transmission of the MT and SP. The most comprehensive and oldest manuscripts of both of these two versions belong to a late stage in the transmission of the Torah: the three most important manuscripts of the MT date from the beginning of the tenth century BCE (the Aleppo Codex, in which most of the Pentateuch is no longer extant, from about 925 CE; MS Leningrad, from 1009; and MS Cairo, which contains internal evidence pointing to a date of 895, but is probably later). The earliest extant manuscripts of SP date from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries C.E.[[4]](#footnote-4) Nevertheless, even though these manuscripts belong to a late stage in the transmission of the Torah, the study of the biblical scrolls from Qumran has shown that the medieval copies are reliable evidence of ancient textual traditions with a long history of formation and transmission. Still, there is a centuries-long gap between the partial documentation from Qumran and the complete manuscripts from the beginning of the second millennium C.E. Thus, accepted text-critical methodology involves relying on the combined textual evidence stemming from the collective product of generations of transmission, rather than being able to point to specific periods in the transmission process or to identify the activity of individual scribes.

1. The Inferior Status of SP as a Textual Source

Before the discovery of pre-Samaritan texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran, the Samaritan Pentateuch was primarily compared to the Masoretic Text, which led to a negative bias against SP. A significant landmark in this context is Gesenius’s work at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He sorted the variants between SP and MT into eight different categories and opined that most of the Samaritan readings were secondary. Out of approximately six thousand differences between the versions, there are only six cases in which he regarded the Samaritan as preserving the original reading, while in all other cases he deemed the MT as preferred.[[5]](#footnote-5) Gesenius’s claim about the inferior nature of the Samaritan Pentateuch influenced the scholars who came after him, and they underestimated its importance and the value of its contribution to textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.[[6]](#footnote-6)

This attitude continued even after the discovery of the pre-Samaritan scrolls, and even to current scholarship, and was influenced by the characterization of the Samaritan tradition as an expansive and harmonizing tradition. Thus, for example, Tal-Florentin, marked many differences in their edition of SP as “deliberate variants,” thus rejecting the possibility that they represent ancient readings.[[7]](#footnote-7) Thus, despite the recognition of the importance of the Samaritan Pentateuch for the study of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and the renewed research interest in SP following the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, the assumption persists concerning its character, as a version that contains a considerable quantity of secondary readings.

A more balanced approach to the Samaritan versions is called for when we distinguish between deliberate exegetical changes aimed at eliminating difficulties and reconciling contradictions in Scripture, on the one hand, and inadvertent scribal errors, on the other. We should also take into account that errors are likely to occur independently in each one of the versions. The current study examines variants caused by graphic similarity between the Masoretic and Samaritan versions, as a subset of errors that occur during the transmission process. The systematic collection of all these differences, the textual assessment of each case on its own merits, and a summary of the data show that with respect to variants of similar letters, it is not possible to postulate a textual superiority of the MT over SP.

1. Variants Due to Graphic Similarity between MT and SP

Variants due to graphic similarity are a familiar phenomenon in textual criticism of the HB. These interchanges can occur under various circumstances. Sometimes the shape of the letters is so similar that they are virtually indistinguishable, which in some cases even requires the scribe to consider the context when deciding between letters. Other times, letters share one or more elements, so that any change or minor damage to the scroll can result in their interchange.

* 1. The orthographic systems for the transmission of the Pentateuch

The transmission process of the Pentateuch included transmission in two scripts: Paleo-Hebrew script and square script. Therefore, interchanges between letters may have occurred in Paleo-Hebrew script (e.g. *mem*-*nun*), in square script (e.g. *waw-yod*), or in both scripts (*dalet-resh*). SP was additionally transmitted in Samaritan script, which was branched from the Hebrew script.[[8]](#footnote-8) In general, there is no evidence of interchanges between SP and MT of graphically similar letters specific to the Samaritan script.[[9]](#footnote-9) This observation is limited by the scarcity of extant epigraphic artefacts written in Samaritan script from the early centuries C.E., and the lack of a comprehensive accepted typology of the development of the Samaritan script.[[10]](#footnote-10)

2.2. Established and Complex Variants

In the course of the discussion of variants arising from graphic similarity, it is necessary to distinguish between established and complex cases. Established cases are cases in which it may be assumed that there is a high probability that they were produced due to graphic similarity, since there is no other readily apparent reason standing behind the interchange. This applies in cases where the pair of letters are similar only graphically, and there is no other resemblance between them, such as phonological or morphological similarity.

Complex differences are those that could result from a combination of factors: graphic similarity between the letters and another factor, such as dialectical changes, morphological differences, weakening of gutturals, or exegetical emendations. This is applicable, for example, in cases where the Samaritan version aligns with the general characteristics of SP. In these variants, the Samaritan version is consistent with the tendency of SP to remove contradictions and anomalous forms in the text and to introduce small harmonizations. Therefore, they may reflect a deliberate emendation in the Samaritan. However, since these variants are limited to exchanges of graphically similar letters, there is also the possibility that they were created as a result of such an interchange.

Variants involving exchanges of the letters *waw*/*yod*, which reflect interchange of nominal patterns (*qatil*/*qatol*) or verbal forms (*we-qtal*/*yqtal*), will also be considered complex cases. The starting point for discussion of these exchanges is that they depend on linguistic factors and not on copyists’ errors. Nevertheless, it would not be right to evaluate them exclusively on the basis of a pure linguistic factor. This is because from the Hasmonean period, and especially in the Herodian period, *waw* and *yod* are practically indistinguishable. It must therefore be assumed that in this case both the graphic similarity and the linguistic innovations would have been combined. A copyist may not have been able to determine the form of the verb or the noun-pattern in front of him, and he would have relied on a paleographic-linguistic assessment in order to make his decision. Thus, the variation between the forms in MT and SP would have originated in the graphic factor, and the decision would have depended on the linguistic background known to the copyist.

Nevertheless, in the following instances, *waw*/*yod* interchanges will be classified as established cases despite the multidisciplinary similarities between them:

(1) When the exchanges produce a solidified or unique version.

(2) When the MT version does not conform to the traditional rules of biblical syntax.

(3) When the Samaritan version is contrary to the tendency to prefer noun patterns or verbal forms that are characteristic of the Samaritan dialect.

In all of these cases, the interchanges create an unusual or difficult version, and they are unlikely to be the result of a deliberate emendation on the part of the writer. Presumably, therefore, these are errors whose origins lie only in the considerable graphic similarity between the letters, and they are therefore classified as established cases. This principle will be illustrated by a number of representative differences.

2.2.1 *waw*/*yod* Interchanges Classified as Established Cases

2.2.1.1 Interchanges in Verb Forms and *qtl*/*yqtl* Forms that Deviate from the Mainstream of Interchanges of Forms

The interchange between forms of the verb and *qtl*/*yqtl* is related first and foremost to changes that occurred in syntax of the verb in the Hebrew of the Second Temple period. Imperative verbs of the form *w-qatal* in MT frequently appear in SP in the imperfect *yqtl* form. Another example is the use of *w-qatal* verbs in conditional sentences. Whereas conditional sentences in classical biblical syntax require an apodosis beginning with a verb with a prefixed *waw*, Samaritan Hebrew reflects a decline in precision in the use of forms with the consecutive *waw* in this syntactic situation.[[11]](#footnote-11) This decline joins the list of linguistic characteristics of the Second Temple period that can be identified in Samaritan Hebrew.[[12]](#footnote-12)

In light of these data, it is likely that interchanges of *waw* and *yod* in the forms *w-qatal*/*yqtl* were dependent on linguistic factors, and possibly on the graphical factor as well. In the examples before us, however, it seems that the exchanges took place solely because of the graphic similarity between the letters. This is because in these cases the text of MT and/or SP go against the grain of the usual interchanges of form (Example 1) or against the rules of biblical Hebrew syntax (Example 2).

Example 1 יִטְהָר – וטהר (wṭā̊r) (Num 19:12)[[13]](#footnote-13)

This verse deals with the purification process for one who is defiled by corpse impurity. The text of MT in the first colon of the verse indicates that the purification waters must be sprinkled upon the defiled person only once, on the third day, and the process ends on the seventh day. However, this contradicts what is said in the second colon, that the waters of purification must be sprinkled twice as a necessary condition for the purification of the dead—on the third day and on the seventh day. Therefore, most commentators rightly prefer the Samaritan version, which is also reflected in the Septuagint version (καὶ καθαρὸς ἔσται).[[14]](#footnote-14) The accepted interpretation of the verse in the words of the rabbinic Sages accords with the second colon of MT, and with the Samaritan version and LXX translation of the first colon, i.e., that the waters of purification must be sprinkled twice. This exegesis is also reflected in the cantillation marks for the first colon in MT, as the first division in the verse is found on the word “seventh” (marked by a *tipḥa*).

In the case at hand, the interchange of the forms *w-qtl*/*yqtl* is reversed from the conventional norm: the MT takes the *yqtl* form while the SP takes the *w-qtl* form. It can therefore be supposed that the scribal error occurred in the MT as a result of the graphic resemblance between *waw* and *yod*.

Example 2 וְטָמֵא – יטמא (yiṭmā̊):

Additional Occurrences of “shall be impure seven days” (ט.מ.א. שבעת ימים) in Num 19

The MT for Num 19:11 does not conform to biblical Hebrew syntax.[[15]](#footnote-15) This verse contains a conditional sentence with a participle, הַנֹּגֵעַ, in the protosis, and so we expect that the apodosis will open with a verb in the imperfect.[[16]](#footnote-16) The deviation in MT occurs only in vs. 11, as vss. 14 and 16 conform to the syntactic rules for the structure of a conditional sentence beginning with a participle. So too, the Samaritan version, which is reflected in the LXX as well, conforms to the accepted structure. Therefore, it seems that the MT is a result of a one-time scribal error that does not recur in the additional examples of the expression in the chapter, and is best explained as the result of the graphic similarity between *waw* and *yod*.

* + - 1. *waw*/*yod* Interchanges that generate a difficult or unique version

Example 1. שְׁאֵרִית – שארות (šā̊rot)

Gen 45:7: וַיִּשְׁלָחֵנִי אֱלֹהִים לִפְנֵיכֶם לָשׂוּם לָכֶם שְׁאֵרִית בָּאָרֶץ וּלְהַחֲיוֹת לָכֶם לִפְלֵיטָה גְּדֹלָה

“God sent me before you to preserve for you a remnant (MT: שְׁאֵרִית; SP: שארות) on earth, and to keep alive for you many survivors”

In this verse, Joseph identifies himself to his brothers and offers them comforting assurance that they need not be sad about having sold him into slavery, since it was God who sent him to Egypt as part of a divine rescue plan for the days of famine in Canaan. The word שארית means a remnant, descendants who survived a disaster, and לשום שארית denotes God’s provisions for making sure that somebody will have heirs.[[17]](#footnote-17) Thus, the meaning of Joseph’s words is that God sent him to Egypt before the brothers, in order to place him in a position to care for them during the famine so that they would thereby be saved. The word שארית in the MT is derived from שְׁאֵר. On the other hand, the word שארות in SP is derived, according to the reading tradition, from שַׁאֲרה.[[18]](#footnote-18) The word שארית is mentioned in the Pentateuch only in the present verse, but it is repeated in this form in other books of the Hebrew Bible.[[19]](#footnote-19) It is also documented twenty-two times in the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. In contrast, the Samaritan version is unique and is not documented in any other textual witness, apart from the appearance of the word שַׁאֲרָה in Lev 18:17. Furthermore, the feminine plural form in the Samaritan version does not fit the context well. Thus, it is likely that this anomalous version is secondary, and that it was created as a result of the substitution of the letter *waw* for the *yod* preserved in MT.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Example 2 יִיסָך – יוסך (yuwwā̊sak) (Exod 30:32)[[21]](#footnote-21)

The MT reading is difficult in this case as well, since the verb יִיסָךְ appears to be a conjugation of the verb י.ס.כ., which is not otherwise attested in HB.[[22]](#footnote-22) This stands in contrast to the reading יוסך in SP and LXX, which is a conjugation of the root ס.ו.ך. in the *qal* imperfect.[[23]](#footnote-23) In terms of its meaning, the root ס.ו.ך. fits well in the verse, serving to describe the non-ceremonial applications of oil. [[24]](#footnote-24) Indeed, many commentators and scholars have gone in this direction, viewing the MT version as secondary.[[25]](#footnote-25) It seems that here, too, the SP reading should be preferred.

* + - 1. Interim Summary

It can be difficult, and sometimes impossible, to determine the specific underlying cause of interchanges of letters in cases of double and even triple commonalities—graphic, phonological, and semantic. Nevertheless, there are times where textual variants involving interchange between the letters *waw* and *yod* are defined as established cases. This is based on evaluation of the versions produced by the interchanges: in cases in which they are semantically or linguistically anomalous versions, it can be concluded that they are the result of a scribal error and not of deliberate emendation.

1. Textual Evidence

Comparison of the MT and SP reveals that there are 122 differences that can be attributed to graphic similarity. These differences are presented in the table in the appendix, which includes differences that fall into the two categories defined above: established differences and complex differences. The complex differences are marked with an asterisk (\*) in the dedicated column in the table.

The question of the preferred reading was decided in cases where this is possible, i.e., in cases with sufficient linguistic, literary or exegetical data.[[26]](#footnote-26) The process evaluating of evaluating the variant readings sheds light on the manner in which the differences came about, so that one can point to the letter that appeared in the initial version and was replaced by the one similar to it in the secondary version. In such a study, in which there is a collection of all the relevant differences between the MT and SP, there is added value to the process of evaluating the versions. A summary of the number of preferred and secondary versions in each version can be used as a criterion by which we can test the textual value of MT and SP when it comes to variants due to graphic similarity.

The table shows that in 61 cases it is possible to determine with a reasonable level of certainty which of the versions is preferable, while acknowledging the built-in subjectivity of the decision. In order to examine the number of preferred readings in each version, we will exclude the cases in which there are differences in *qere* and *ketiv* in MT.[[27]](#footnote-27) In these cases the Samaritan version is attested in one of the traditions of the Masoretic text, and therefore they cannot be considered as differences in which SP has priority over MT or vice versa. After removing the cases of *qere* and *ketiv*, there remain 54 differences in which the preferred version can be determined. We will now look at the number of preferred readings in each of the two versions:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preferred Readings** | **Preferred Complex Readings** | **Preferred Established Readings** |  |
| 35 | 21 | 14 | MT |
| 19 | 4 | 15 | SP |
| 54 | 25 | 29 | Total |

Fig. 1: Number of preferred readings in each textual witness

It can be seen that the MT is superior to SP 35 times (app. 65% of all determinate variants), while the SP is better than MT 19 times (app. 35% of all determinate versions). That is, the total number of cases in which MT readings are preferred over SP readings is significantly greater than the opposite situation in which the SP readings are deemed superior to MT.

However, when examining only the established cases, whose origin is purely textual, no difference is found between the number of preferred readings in MT and SP. The exclusion of variants whose origins involve non-textual factors gives a more balanced picture of the data: out of the 29 determinate established cases, SP is preferred over MT 15 times, while in the remaining 14 cases MT is preferred to SP. Thus, with respect to the number of scribal errors resulting from the interchange of similar letters, there is no advantage to MT over SP. On the contrary: the SP has a bit of advantage over MT. This is despite the fact that it is characterized as inferior relative to the MT. In addition, although the MT is considered to be a carefully-preserved text that has been transmitted with diligence and precision, its readings are secondary in about half of the cases in which textual priority can be determined.

These data first and foremost confirm the trivial proposition that exchange of letters due to graphic similarity is an integral part of the work of any copyist, regardless of the school to which they belong. However, these errors may also have the ability to serve as a metric for evaluating the accuracy and rigor of the scribes who were entrusted with the transmission of SP. When we examine a small, established set of interchanges due to graphic similarity, which attest to the quality of the scribe’s copying skills, we see that the copying of Samaritan scribes was meticulous and careful, producing a version with a limited number of secondary readings due to interchange of graphically similar letters. Thus, the free scribal approach that is evident in SP, in introducing exegetical and linguistic emendations, does not stand in contradiction to its careful transmission.

1. The Transmission of Pre-Samaritan Scrolls

Emanuel Tov recently conducted a statistical analysis of the relationship between the degree of textual freedom and the prevalence of scribal errors in a text.[[28]](#footnote-28) He explored selected biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert corpus, affiliated with different textual traditions, as well as two groups of tefillin from Qumran: rabbinic tefillin and Qumran tefillin. Tov evaluated the carefulness of scribal transmission by the number of linear or supralinear corrections visible in deletions, erasures, and reshaping of letters in a manuscript. He found that there is often a correlation between the scribe’s approach and the degree of skill and accuracy of his work: a conservative scribe skillfully and meticulously reproduced the manuscript, while a scribe of free approach negligently and inaccurately transmitted his work. However, Tov’s conclusion does not apply to the pre-Samaritan scrolls, such as 4QpaleoExodm, 4QExod-Levf, 4QNumb, 4QRPb (4Q364) and 4QLevd. Tov found that these scrolls comprise harmonizing changes on the one hand, and they attest to a lack of scribal interventions on the other hand. Thus, using the criterion of scribal interventions, he concludes that the pre-Samaritan scrolls were transmitted with the same care as MT tradition, even though their prototype was of a harmonizing nature. It is possible that there is an association between Tov’s conclusions about the reliability of the transmission of the pre-Samaritan scrolls and the conclusions of the current study regarding the degree of precision of the transmission of SP, a late exemplar of the pre-Samaritan tradition. More research on this possible connection is a desideratum.

5 Summary

This article shows that with regard to textual variants that originate only in graphic resemblance between the letters, SP contains almost the same number of preferred readings as MT. The textual inferiority that has been attributed to SP is therefore not evident in this subgroup of textual variants. The fact that in established cases the SP preserves a significant proportion of the preferred readings, demonstrates the meticulous and accurate work of the copyists who transmitted the texts in the Samaritan tradition. These findings may be consistent with the evidence for the reliable transmission of the pre-Samaritan scrolls.
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