EDITORIAL TECHNIQUES
IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

RESOURCES FOR BIBLICAL STUDY

Editor
Hyun Chul Paul Kim, Old Testament/Hebrew Bible

Number 97

EDITORIAL TECHNIQUES
IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

Toward a Refined Literary Criticism

Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala

SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2022 by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala

Contents

Abbreviations

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor (Yale) Bible Commentary
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
Ant.	Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament deutsch
ATSAT	Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BSCS	Brill Septuagint Commentary Series
BZABR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBSC	Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CC	Continental Commentaries
col(s).	column(s)
ConJ	*Concordia Journal*
DCH	Clines, David J. A., ed. *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2016.
DDD	Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*

ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
EHAT	Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
ET	English Text
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
ETS	Erfurter theologische Studien
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
frag.	fragment
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GAT	Grundrisse zum Alten Testament
GBS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HS	*Hebrew Studies*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HThKAT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
impf.	imperfect
impv.	imperative
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
Joüon	Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. SubBi 14. 2 vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993.
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
KEH	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
KKAT	Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften, Alten Testament

LEH	Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. *Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
LXX	Septuagint
LXX^A	Codex Alexandrinus version of the Septuagint
LXX^B	Codex Vaticanus version of the Septuagint
LXX^L	Lucianic recension of the Septuagint
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NSKAT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar, Altes Testament
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OG	Old Greek
OL	Old Latin
ORA	Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
OTL	Old Testament Library
OtSt	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
per.	person
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
pl.	plural
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
SANER	Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records
SAT	Die Schriften des Alten Testaments
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SCS	Seputuagint and Cognate Studies
sg.	singular
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
StC	*Studia Catholica*
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum

TECC	Textos y estudios del Seminario Filológico "Cardenal Cisneros"
Text	*Textus*
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie.* Edited by Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller. 36 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–2004.
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau* New Series
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZABR	*Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZBKAT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Introduction

1.1. Rationale and Aims of This Book

This book seeks to investigate how ancient Hebrew Scriptures were edited before they became unchangeable as part of the canonized Hebrew Bible.[1] In order to understand how the texts developed and were changed in their transmission, the focus is on documented evidence for divergent readings preserved in the ancient textual traditions. Profound understanding of textual developments in the Hebrew Bible is significant for biblical studies at large, but it is crucial for historical criticism (or the historical-critical method), which builds on a diachronic analysis of the text.[2] One of its core

---

1. We generally use the terms "Hebrew Bible" and "biblical" to refer to the collection of books that *later* became a canonical collection in Judaism and received the title "Old Testament" in Christianity (in this book we will thus not refer to the New Testament when using the term biblical). We acknowledge that there was no Hebrew Bible as a collection during the formative period of these books when most of the significant scribal changes were made. Although referring to these texts as *biblical* can be regarded as anachronistic from a certain historical point of view, it is justifiable to use these terms for practical reasons and with respect to their traditional meaning. Historically it is probable that many of the books of the Hebrew Bible already received a normative and authoritative status during their transmission, beginning with the Pentateuch and followed by the prophetic writings. These books could be characterized as protocanonical in some sense; see discussion in final conclusions.

2. In this book we will primarily use the term historical criticism in reference to the study of the literary history of texts. Whereas biblical criticism is generally understood to include a larger array of methods (especially *Literarkritik* and *Redaktionskritik*), historical criticism more clearly refers to literary criticism (corresponding to German *Literarkritik*) and other methods that are built on literary criticism. The terms "higher" and "lower" criticism will not be used in this book. John Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 1–3, makes

methods, literary criticism (*Literarkritik*), seeks to identify texts written by different scribes in cases where documented text-critical evidence is lacking. This book compares documented scribal changes witnessed by textual variants with hypothetical discussions about how classic literary criticism would detect and reconstruct similar cases. An ultimate question is, can literary criticism reach significant and reliable results, or should it be altogether abandoned as a scientific approach. At stake is thus nothing less than a main area of historical criticism as a scientific method.[3]

We, the authors of this book, hold that documented evidence preserved in the ancient textual traditions indisputably shows multilayered texts throughout the Hebrew Bible that are the result of extensive and repeated scribal editing. We hope to have demonstrated this in our previous studies, but it will become further apparent in the analyses of this investigation.[4] The composite and multilayered character of the Hebrew Bible necessitates a methodologically deliberate position. What should be done with such texts when they are used as sources for historical questions? It would be a grave mistake for any historical investigation to bypass this issue and to apply other methods before one has a clear understanding of the documented textual transmission and a methodologically justifiable position to deal with composite and heavily edited texts. By going to the very core of historical criticism and its methodological cogency, this volume seeks to determine whether the conventional method of dealing with exceptionally

---

good arguments for using the term "biblical criticism" instead of "historical criticism." It is certainly the case that the latter may lead to the impression of a historical quest behind the method; it is not our intention to try to have the oldest text as some kind of primary goal of the method. The main contribution of historical criticism lies in its attempt to understand the literary history of texts without giving any preference to older texts over younger additions. The *historical development of the texts* is thus a central goal of historical criticism. On the other hand, the term biblical criticism is not as specific as historical criticism. Since our goal is to investigate the methodological basis of literary criticism, a core part of historical criticism, the use of this term is most appropriate here.

3. In this book we will refer to literary criticism when referring to the specific method of detecting inconsistencies, contradictions, and problems in the text in order to identify different authors. We use the term historical criticism in reference to the broader method of understanding the literary history of texts. Since the terms also overlap to some extent, they are partly used synonymously.

4. See, in particular, Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, RBS 75 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 219–27.

multilayered texts is useable and scientifically viable. At stake is thus not only historical criticism but also the Hebrew Bible as a historical source, for historical criticism has been and continues to be the only method to unwind those scribal changes that left no traces in textual variants.

The documented editorial changes witnessed by divergent textual traditions mainly illuminate how the texts were edited in the latter parts of the Second Temple period, to which the manuscript evidence goes back at the earliest.[5] However, it is reasonable to assume that the observable changes are organically linked with and comparable to earlier stages of the literary development, at least in the postmonarchic periods. In other words, there is little to suggest a fundamental difference between changes documented in text-critical evidence as variant readings and (mostly earlier) changes not witnessed as variants but that are postulated by literary criticism.[6] Any investigation and theory concerning how the Hebrew Bible was edited should thus begin by studying the documented scribal changes, and on that basis develop theories on the earlier transmission and its editorial techniques.[7]

––––––––––––

5. The oldest preserved biblical manuscripts go back to the third century BCE, and much more material, especially from the Dead Sea Scrolls, dates from the second century BCE to the first century CE. Although the largest portion of manuscript evidence comes from later periods—even from the medieval age and later—it is apparent that the textual variants often reflect earlier scribal changes, largely going back to the Second Temple period, as the changes after the destruction of the Second Temple were very limited.

6. In general, it is fair to assume that later additions are more prone to be preserved as variants in the textual witnesses because in the later transmission of many texts in the Hebrew Bible the text was already transmitted in various contexts and traditions. An addition or other editorial change that was made in one tradition would mostly be unknown in the other transmitting traditions of the same text or literary work. Because a very significant proportion of the notable variants are found between the MT and the LXX, the translation of the works in the Hebrew Bible into Greek is an essential watershed in this respect. After the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek in the last three centuries BCE, any change into one of the traditions automatically becomes a variant, whereas changes in the earlier transmission are much less frequently preserved in divergent textual traditions. Clearly, the variants between the MT and the LXX may also go back to older editorial changes, because the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek was neither a text of the proto-MT transmission nor necessarily even close to the proto-MT.

7. It would be highly risky to assume a model of transmission that neglects the documented evidence, and if a different mode of transmission is assumed for

Divergent textual readings provide insights into two essentially different phenomena. Some of the variants were caused by accidental scribal errors when manuscripts were copied, while others were occasioned by scribes deliberately revising or editing the transmitted text. Accidental changes, which sometimes had a notable impact on the transmitted text, are usually easy to identify, since they tend to confuse the syntax and logic of the base text. Their nature and occurrence are largely uncontested among biblical scholars. This book focuses on deliberate changes, which potentially altered the text in a more fundamental way, but which are more difficult to detect and are therefore more controversial as a phenomenon. Views on their frequency and impact differ considerably in scholarship—a situation that this book seeks to remedy by systematically investigating the evidence that is documented by divergent ancient textual traditions.

1.2. Assumption of Masoretic Text Priority Untenable

The Masoretic Text has largely been the starting point for most research of the Hebrew Bible, and with some exceptions, such as text-critical studies and Qumran studies, it continues to be. This was partly understandable at the beginning of critical research, as the MT was the only available Hebrew text. Familiarity with the Samaritan Pentateuch had no substantial impact on the position of the MT, as the Samaritan textual tradition was widely regarded as sectarian and its text a secondary version that usually would not preserve original readings against the MT. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls slowly started to change the scholarly discussion, including the perception of the SP, but it is only in recent decades that the scrolls and the SP have begun to receive the attention they deserve.[8] Nevertheless, their study still has rather limited implications for biblical studies at large.

Poor familiarity with and partial neglect of the Septuagint is perhaps more surprising, because its importance for textual history had

---

undocumented changes than the documented changes, this theory would have to be very well argued. Unfortunately, the documented variants are widely bypassed in historical-critical studies, and far-reaching and complicated models of literary development are often postulated that pay little or no attention to the peculiarities of the textual transmission.

8. For a helpful review of text criticism in biblical studies, see James A. Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text: Canon as Paradigm* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 127–51.

been acknowledged already in the nineteenth century.[9] While the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls is sometimes very fragmentary and many manuscripts witness a textual tradition close to the MT, the original Greek translation, the Old Greek, preserves many early readings predating those of the MT. Research in several books has shown that the proto-MT texts were often more extensively edited than the LXX manuscripts after the traditions diverged. This is clearly the case throughout Jeremiah and Samuel, and it is probable in some other books, such as Joshua, Kings, and Ezekiel, as well. Undoubtedly, each reading has to be discussed and argued separately, but a methodological approach that assumes that the MT preserves the most original text unless proven otherwise—apparent in countless studies and commentaries—is methodologically unjustifiable and in the worst case distorts our perception of the evidence.[10]

The reasons for this unfortunate situation are partly understandable. We do not possess any manuscripts of the OG, and its readings have to be established on the basis of existing variants in various manuscripts of much later origin. The main problem lies in the many recensions toward a proto-MT type Hebrew text that have influenced all Greek manuscripts that are preserved. Recensions replaced readings of the original translation and thus make it more difficult to establish what the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG translation was. In some cases, also discussed in this volume,

---

9. To some extent the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship was more familiar with the Septuagint evidence. For instance, commentaries and other studies of this time regularly considered LXX readings in different traditions, and the Old Greek was regularly assumed to preserve more original readings than the MT; e.g., Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871); Heinrich Holzinger, *Das Buch Josua*, KHC 6 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901); Charles Fox Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings: With Introduction and Appendix* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903); Samuel R. Driver, *Notes of the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913); Samuel Holmes, *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).

10. Countless examples, even from very recent publications could be mentioned. Commentaries of Kings are illustrative, as nearly all fall short of adequately considering readings other than the MT. Very typical is Konrad Schmid, "Outbidding the Fall of Jerusalem: Redactional Supplementation in 2 Kings 24," in *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Saul M. Olyan and Jacob L. Wright, BJS 361 (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018), 87–103, who discusses 2 Kgs 24–25 without mentioning any of the important Greek variants (e.g., 24:10), many of which are bound to be older than the MT.

the original Greek translation may only be recovered from an Old Latin (OL) translation of the Greek, while all Greek manuscripts may have been secondarily revised toward a proto-Masoretic text. A case in point is 2 Sam 5:4–5, a passage found in all other witnesses except in the OL witness Codex Vindobonensis and 4Q51 (4QSam[a]). Despite the poor manuscript attestation, it is highly likely that these two witnesses preserve the original text here and that all others are the result of a secondary expansion. Since Codex Vindobonensis and 4Q51 cannot be connected other than through the original reading, it logically follows that Codex Vindobonensis is the only witness that preserves the OG and its *Vorlage* here, albeit in a Latin translation. It is unlikely that this is the only case where the probably most original text is preserved in manuscripts often regarded as marginal.[11]

In addition to broader recensions and translation techniques that differed from book to book, the smaller cross-influences of various manuscripts and manuscript families are a field that only specialists can master, and each book may have had a different history. It is thus also a matter of comfort to begin with the MT rather than be faced with a very complicated situation in the LXX manuscripts, which often requires specialist knowledge. However, this frequently leads to a situation where a theory is established even before significant variants are considered, and thus variants in the LXX or its daughter translations may only receive irregular consideration or may be explained in light of an already existing broader conception of the text in question. Although one can understand why many scholars not specialized in textual criticism shy away from this evidence, it is scientifically an untenable position. In this book we seek to consider the variants without predisposition toward a witness and weigh text-internal considerations when evaluating which variant is most original.[12] The reader will notice that the LXX (or the OG that lies behind the LXX manuscripts) often emerges as the earliest attainable text. This is especially the case in the historical books from Joshua to 2 Kings, while in the Pentateuch the MT seems more often, albeit not always, to preserve a more original version. Because of the rather commonly met doubts about

---

11. This example highlights the importance of always considering internal criteria as well; the main witnesses may all contain a secondary reading. The history of the manuscripts and readings in many books is not yet well known, and the harmonizations toward the MT or recensions may have secondarily corrupted most main witnesses.

12. This principle is accepted in most introductions and reviews of textual criticism; see, e.g., Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text*, 134.

the value of the LXX, it is necessary to argue in detail when the LXX probably preserves the more original reading.

The present volume also reacts to the hypothetical assumption that some versions of biblical texts were generally shortened in their transmission, which is especially the case in disregarding the LXX as a significant witness for the textual development of entire books.[13] To be sure, some

––––––––––––

13. An extreme position is represented by the Jeremiah commentary of Georg Fischer, *Jeremia 1–25*, HThKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005), 39–46. He regards the MT as a reliable basis for studying Jeremiah, while he claims not to have found a single passage where a LXX reading should be preferred (p. 46: "in ganz Jer [gibt es] keine einzige Stelle, an der eine LXX-Lesart gegenüber MT wahrscheinlicher oder zu bevorzugen wäre"). This position boldly contradicts the conclusion by a number of text critics, who have demonstrated with substantial arguments that the Greek version overwhelmingly more often than not preserves the more original text. In fact, Fischer's commentary shows a clear bias against using the LXX as a witness, which is accompanied by a disregard of the textual evidence. An extreme tendency of marginalizing the LXX of Jeremiah, albeit from a somewhat different angle, is also visible in the approach of Jack R. Lundbom, "Haplography in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah," *HS* 46 (2005): 301–20, who explains most of the minuses in Jer LXX as resulting from accidental omissions due to haplography. William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 157, seems to imply a similar position, since he assumes "that the book of Jeremiah (as we know it through most English translations from the Masoretic Text) received its final form in the exile and under the general auspices of the exiled royal court of Jehoiachin," but his position is not unambiguous, since he also seems to imply that sometimes the LXX preserves more original readings (see pp. 156–57). Apart from such one-sided positions, there are several scholars who share the assumption that the shorter LXX of Jeremiah is, at least in part, the result of secondary abbreviations of an earlier textual tradition, while the MT would preserve the more original text; see, e.g., Christoph Levin, *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt,* FRLANT 137 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 69–72; Arie van der Kooij, "Jeremiah 27:5–15: How Do MT and LXX Relate to Each Other?," *JNSL* 20 (1994): 59–78; Shimon Gesundheit, "The Question of LXX Jeremiah as a Tool for Literary-Critical Analysis," *VT* 62 (2012): 29–57. For a review of text-critical approaches to the text, see Rüdiger Liwak, "Vierzig Jahre Forschung zum Jeremiabuch: I. Grundlagen," *TRu* 76 (2011): 131–79; Richard D. Weis, "Jeremiah. 7.1 Textual History of Jeremiah," in *Textual History of the Bible*, ed. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 1:495–513, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0007010000; and esp. Hermann-Josef Stipp, "A Semi-empirical Example for the Final Touches to a Biblical Book: The Masoretic *Sondergut* of the Book of Jeremiah," in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us*

LXX translations may include deliberate abridgments, but this is also not as clear as often assumed.[14] In largely literal translations it is unlikely that the translator would have omitted meaningful sections of the text. As for the Hebrew tradition, there are some cases that can be explained as intentional shortenings.[15] The SP sometimes simplifies earlier readings by omitting single textual elements, as shown in the chapter on omissions (ch. 8). However, documented evidence for abridgments remains infrequent and it seems that texts were only shortened for substantial reasons. In the textual material reviewed for this volume there is very little, if any, evidence for general abridgment among the books of the Hebrew canon. The assumption that a text is shortened should not be applied generally to a specific witness; instead, such a theory should always be argued and a clear motive or reason for the abridgment should be shown.

A different phenomenon is the creation of entirely new compositions by using another text as a source; a clear example for this is Chronicles in relation to its sources. Such rewriting of a given tradition needs to be distinguished from the textually continuous transmission of the same literary work.[16] The same partly applies to changes made in the translation

---

14. The LXX of Esther is a classic example that is assumed to have shortened its Hebrew *Vorlage*. However, even in LXX Esther one should always look closely for what exactly may have been shortened. The Hebrew of Esther is particularly confusing and possibly even corrupted, and quite a number of the probable omissions and shortenings took place where the Hebrew seems problematic or even incomprehensible. E.g., in Esth 6:8 the LXX leaves out the peculiar idea that the royal crown is placed on the head of a horse (וסוס אשר רכב עליו המלך ואשר נתן כתר מלכות בראשו), which is very unlikely to be original. On the other hand, there are also intentional abridgments. Many of the omissions in Esth 8–9 were motivated by the attempt to censor the most brutal details where the Jews are allowed to massacre their enemies. This was probably done in order to make the translation more acceptable to an international audience in Greek Alexandria.

15. There is, indeed, evidence from Qumran and later literature that some older compositions could be paraphrased or rewritten to form entirely new compositions, and in this process parts of the text could have been abridged. The formation of such new compositions should, however, be distinguished from the transmission of essentially the same text.

16. In our previous study, Müller, Pakkala, Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 205–17, we also considered the evidence from Chronicles in parallel with text-critical evidence from the same book. The present study has indicated that the pro-

process, especially if the translation was generally very free such as LXX Esther. A translation should not be equated with the scribal transmission of the protobiblical manuscripts. Nonetheless, most of the translations of biblical texts were rather faithful, and in such cases it is often possible to reconstruct the *Vorlage* with considerable accuracy. This is to say, any general assumption on the character of a variant version, be it translation or a composition in the same language, should be carefully argued and its nature shown.

1.3. Unevenly Distributed and Unsystematic Changes

The documented textual evidence studied for this book suggests that the emerging biblical Scriptures contain an unevenly and unsystematically distributed mosaic of multiple editorial alterations. The textual divergences imply haphazard unintentional changes, but also deliberate modifications that can be conceptualized as ancient editing. A textual divergence much more often goes back to a deliberate change than to an accidental scribal mistake. While sometimes it is difficult to determine whether the change was done intentionally or unintentionally, in a majority of cases there are strong reasons to assume a deliberate editorial intervention. This is particularly so if the version that appears to be secondary is nevertheless understandable, since an accidental scribal mistake frequently garbled the syntax or grammar, as well as the meaning and narrative logic. Undoubtedly, each case has to be determined separately, as an intentional change may also disturb the syntax or confuse the narrative logic, but intentional changes rarely created meaningless or incomprehensible texts.

Evidence for intentional changes can be found in abundance throughout the Hebrew Bible. Although only a fraction of the evidence can be discussed and analyzed in this book, our selection of case studies seeks to

---

cess of creating a new composition is different from the transmission of the same composition (or what is regarded as the same composition). Although the author of Chronicles was to some degree faithful to the sources in Samuel and Kings, even large parts of them could still be omitted in the new composition of Chronicles. This kind of freedom cannot be found in the text-critical evidence of the same composition at all. Consequential omissions are rare and done only for compelling reasons, as will be demonstrated in this volume; see also Juha Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*, FRLANT 251 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 351–60.

be as representative as possible. To some extent the cases are an arbitrary selection, and the prose texts of the historical books in particular would easily yield a large number of additional cases. On the other hand, poetic parts of the Hebrew Bible are somewhat underrepresented because the cases are often very complex and would require a more detailed discussion. Moreover, in some biblical books the preserved text-critical witnesses diverge less than in others. For example, there is clearly less evidence for variants in the Pentateuch than in the historical books from Joshua to Kings. Although the documented evidence is thus altogether unevenly distributed—which is probably due to different stages in the protocanonizing processes of the emerging Hebrew scriptures and also to some extent due to later harmonizations of the Greek translation—scribal modifications can be found in all biblical books.[17]

Despite the uneven distribution of the evidence, the documented scribal changes provide a similar picture on the transmission of texts in different parts of the Hebrew Bible. Ancient scribes made repeated and very similar changes to the texts they were transmitting. There appears to be no fundamental difference in the type of changes, and there seems to be a very similar underlying attitude toward the transmitted text. In other words, although the Pentateuch contains much less documented evidence for scribal changes than Jeremiah, for example, the types of changes we observe are essentially similar in all parts of the Hebrew Bible. Regardless of the book and genre in question, the techniques and motives of scribal change seem to have been more or less the same. This has strengthened our assumption that the text-critical evidence from the late Second Temple period is representative for the nondocumented phase of transmission in the earlier stages of transmission as well.

The scribes mostly added new material by inserting single words and phrases, clauses and sentences, larger passages, sometimes even entire new blocks of text. Under certain circumstances, they could also omit parts

---

17. With the exception of the final chapters of Exodus, the textual transmission of the Pentateuch appears to be notably stable and does not show large variation in the preserved witnesses, while in Joshua, e.g., the main textual traditions of the MT and the LXX substantially diverge from each other in many places. Clearly, the Samaritan Pentateuch in relation to the MT contains repeated text-critical variants throughout the Pentateuch. It stands to reason that the apparent stability of the Pentateuch is primarily due to the fact that the text-critical witnesses mainly reflect a later stage in their transmission than the evidence from the historical books.

of the transmitted text or replace them with new material. Sometimes they also transposed words, phrases, or passages and thereby created new sequences of the transmitted material. As for their reasons or motives, the vast majority of deliberate changes fulfilled interpretive purposes, sometimes only indirectly and implicitly, but often explicitly. The texts were stylistically amended, crucial parts were updated, theologically difficult passages were revised, and entirely new material was added. Although the scribes seem to have been rather conservative in their dealings with the texts—they usually transmitted the older material as faithfully as possible—the changes betray substantial scribal creativity in shaping the text in a certain direction. Scholarship has only begun to understand how this scribal conservatism relates to scribal creativity and freedom, which is simultaneously attested.[18]

The documented scribal changes seem to have happened in a largely unsystematic way. Although changes are documented throughout the Hebrew Bible, they rarely form patterns that would justify attributing them to comprehensive redactions of entire books or larger textual sequences.[19] When a passage was amended, the scribal change often reacted to or was in dialogue with certain aspects of the immediate context, corresponding passages, and/or central theological concepts. Because of the similarity with which editors related to the older text, a number of scribal changes seem related in content, conceptions, and style. For example, nomistic additions are often similar in emphasizing the obedience to the law in any action or aspect that may be discussed in a given text. Many editors also seem to have updated the language or harmonized a section or paragraph with a related passage elsewhere. Despite these similarities, it is mostly difficult to pinpoint two or more related editorial changes that would go

---

18. See esp. Sidnie White Crawford, "Interpreting the Pentateuch through Scribal Processes: The Evidence from the Qumran Manuscripts," in Müller and Pakkala, *Insights into Editing*, 59–80.

19. There are some exceptions to this, although they also do not correspond to classic redactions. E.g., the MT of Jeremiah contains a series of additions that refer to Babylon, Babylonians, Babylonian chronology, or the Babylonian king, but there seems to be no clear connecting ideology between the additions. Although many of these additions could potentially derive from a single editor, it is difficult to determine what the intention was. This is distinctly different from the classic redactions where an intention is central when additions are connected with each other to form a redaction. It is evident that more investigation of the documented evidence is needed in this respect.

back to one and the same scribal hand. Although this may partly be due to the contingent nature of the documented evidence—as it is provided by manuscripts from antiquity to the medieval age that were accidentally preserved—the documented evidence gives a picture of uncoordinated and even somewhat spontaneous editing. In other words, the texts were demonstrably changed all over the place, but documented evidence for comprehensive and systematic redactions remains scarce.[20] Prominent and theologically crucial passages (such as the giving of the law at Mount Sinai/Horeb), key events (e.g., the destruction of Samaria in 2 Kgs 17), and theological topics (such as Solomon's sin in 1 Kgs 11 or Josiah's reform in 2 Kgs 23) have clearly attracted scribal changes more often than other passages, and thus such texts are more clogged with repeated scribal changes.

1.4. Challenges to Historical Criticism

Since the beginnings of critical research, scholars have generally acknowledged that the Hebrew Bible has been revised to some extent, and additions are widely acknowledged.[21] Literary critics have conventionally assumed that editorial changes, and especially additions, were so numerous and weighty that it is imperative to identify them and thereby reconstruct the underlying textual development. According to this scholarly tradition, the Hebrew Bible cannot be used as a reliable document or source for the history, religion, and society of ancient Israel and early Judaism unless there is a serious attempt to distinguish texts from entirely different historical, socio-political, and religious contexts. This approach is based on the conviction that it is possible to identify literary historical seams in the biblical texts and reconstruct editorial changes and thus stages in the textual development. Scholars of this tradition have been rather optimistic that much of the textual development can be reconstructed.

---

20. To be sure, there are exceptions to this rule; see, e.g., Kristin De Troyer, "The History of the Biblical Text: The Case of the Book of Joshua," in Müller and Pakkala, *Insights into Editing*, 223–46, who argues for a kind of very late redaction that took place in the transmission of the proto-MT tradition of Joshua. Nevertheless, the type of changes that she finds in the text-critical evidence of Joshua are much subtler, mostly limited to individual words, than the much more substantial redactions conventionally assumed in redaction criticism.

21. For a discussion of a number of such cases in different parts of the Hebrew Bible, see Saul M. Olyan and Jacob L. Wright, eds., *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, BJS 361 (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018).

In recent scholarship classical historical criticism has become increasingly sidelined. Scholars who implicitly or explicitly reject historical criticism and use texts in the Hebrew Bible in their "final" forms (mainly the Masoretic Text) for historical issues in effect question the importance and extent of scribal changes, and thus regard their impact on the preserved final texts as limited. Without denying some editorial interventions, they imply that changes would be small and/or would mainly interpret the received text. Therefore, it would not be necessary to invest into such a labor-intensive, hypothetical, and controversial enterprise. Although this position is rarely argued in a methodologically consistent way, it can be found as the implicit starting point of many studies that effectively bypass questions of textual history and the nature of the texts as historical sources. A large number of histories of Israel, commentaries, and individual studies on specific topics could be mentioned here. Already the a priori preference of the MT is a step in this direction. The weakness of this position is apparent. A lack of methodological deliberation and inadequate understanding of a key source is shaky ground for any scientific approach.[22] Moreover, the assumption that late editing was limited and insignificant in content does not withstand critical scrutiny and clearly contradicts documented scribal changes, as many of the examples discussed in this book show.

1.5. The Question of Reconstructability

Another main challenge to historical criticism is the allegedly poor reconstructability of the literary history. Acknowledging that the Hebrew Bible was extensively revised, some scholars contend that we do not have the tools to identify later additions and other editorial changes with enough

---

22. Clearly, an approach that merely investigates texts in the Hebrew Bible as literature in their final forms without any attempt to investigate the historical background or development of texts, the so-called synchronic reading, can be perfectly scientific. Nevertheless, in such cases one should clearly acknowledge the methodological starting point that one does not pursue any historical results other than related to the somewhat arbitrary form of a certain textual version that one has selected for investigation, be it the MT, LXX, SP, or something else, including modern Bible translations. One should expect that the reasons for selecting one of these so-called final texts would be clearly stated in synchronic studies, but this does not seem to be done very often.

certainty, let alone reconstruct their long histories of transmission.[23] The biblical texts would not contain enough unequivocal traces of the editorial processes and therefore these processes would remain beyond the reach of modern investigation. In their recent edited volume, Ray Person and Robert Rezetko challenge conventionally used criteria, such as *Wiederaufnahme*, as too uncertain. Jason Silverman is similarly skeptical about the validity and applicability of the criteria used by literary critics to detect additions. Although he acknowledges additions and the possibility of gaining some results, his own studies largely neglect the textual complexity behind the Masoretic Text, which is used as the primary source.[24] Ehud Ben Zvi, who admits that biblical texts were extensively edited, writes: "scholarly reconstructed texts cannot but be hypothetical and unverifiable, and rarely command any consensus."[25] This contention effectively leads him to abandon historical-critical approaches in favor of more synchronic readings. Many others imply a similar position, and it is implied that theories should not be built on this method since its results cannot be confirmed and therefore will inevitably remain controversial.

The consequent conclusion of assuming significant editing that cannot be reconstructed would be to abandon the Hebrew Bible as a historical

---

23. See, Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 29–43; Ehud Ben Zvi, *Hosea*, FOTL 21A (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 6; Ben Zvi, "The Concept of Prophetic Books and Its Historical Setting," in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, Bible World (London: Equinox, 2009), 73–95; Raymond F. Person and Robert Rezetko, eds., *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, AIL 25 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 1–35 (esp. the introduction); some of the contributors of *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism* also imply a skeptical positon toward the possibilities of historical criticism (see, e.g., contributions by Person and Alan Lenzi), but the discussed evidence is hardly representative of the Hebrew Bible. Many of the contributions discuss texts outside the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Maxine L. Grossman, Joseph A. Weaks, Alan Lenzi, and Sara J. Milstein), while those that discuss texts in the Hebrew Bible hardly touch the question of reconstructability (see, e.g., Stefan Schorch or Julio Trebolle). In fact, in his contribution "Division Markers as Empirical Evidence for the Editorial Growth of Biblical Books," 165–216, Trebolle even discusses markers that could reveal editorial interventions.

24. See Jason Silverman's contributions in "Historical Criticism: Essential or Expendable?," by Cynthia Edenburg, Francis Borchardt, Jason M. Silverman, and Juha Pakkala, in *Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions: Methodological Encounters and Debates*, ed. Jutta Jokiranta and Martti Nissinen, SBL Press, forthcoming.

25. Ben Zvi, *Hosea*, 6.

source, at least for a number of historical questions or even completely. However, such a position is rarely represented in biblical studies.[26] Much more common is the continued use of the Hebrew Bible as a witness to ancient Israel and early Judaism without clearly distinguishing between textual elements that derive from different contexts and times. Some scholars who express skepticism toward reconstructing how the texts developed take the biblical texts confidently as sources for remarkably early periods.[27] If one deals with the Hebrew Bible in this way, the view of all historical issues is necessarily so wide and unspecific that the picture is in effect distorted, for the Hebrew Bible is apparently the product of a very long transmission.

Many biblical passages contain vestiges of subsequent hands from different times and socio-political contexts from monarchic times in Israel and Judah to late Hellenistic and even Roman period in the diaspora. For example, in Samuel and Kings as well as in many prophetic books the oldest text may derive from a monarchic context, while the youngest additions are from the late Second Temple period. The book of Samuel was still developing in the Roman period, as implied by its repeatedly differing editions in the MT and LXX. Even in the later books, such as Chronicles or Ezra–Nehemiah, where the transmission history is somewhat shorter, heavy editing is apparent, and contradictory concepts can be found side by side.[28] It thus seems problematic to use such texts as historical sources without distinguishing the different conceptions and historical elements contained in them. Any advocate of an overall methodological skepticism of histori-

---

26. Perhaps some scholars who primarily focus on the reception and later use of the Hebrew Bible have concluded so, but this is speculative.

27. See, e.g., the somewhat skeptical position of David Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 4, toward the possibilities of historical criticism, but his simultaneous confidence in our ability to use the Hebrew Bible as a historical source for the monarchic period (apparent throughout chs. 10–17 on pages 304–490). For criticism of his position and a review of the book, see Juha Pakkala, "Literary Criticism and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible," *Marginalia: Los Angeles Review of Books*, February 10, 2014; https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101d.

28. For Chronicles, see Georg Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlußphänomen: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*, BBB 93 (Beltz: Athenaum, 1995); for the development of Ezra 7–10 and Neh 8, see, e.g., Juha Pakkala, *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7–10 and Nehemia 8*, BZAW 347 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).

cal criticism who takes a biblical book as a source for a single historical period—like Ben Zvi, who deduces the concept of the prophetic book from the early Persian period—necessarily has failed to address the obvious historical complexity of these sources.[29] It would be hazardous to use the MT of Samuel or Kings, for example, as a Persian period witness.[30] To which period does the final Samuel bear witness, and which version is regarded as the source or the final text in the first place? Already the comparison of the MT and LXX undermines such a position, since the texts differ so greatly. One could also opt for the latest stages when the texts underwent significant revision, the Roman period, but this is problematic as well, for most of the textual substance is older and the text hardly reflects particular conceptions of the Roman period. In other words, one does not avoid the inevitable source problem by focusing on a later period when the texts had already become more or less stable.[31] It is difficult to see how the final compositions could be reliable witnesses for any late period except as a text that was used and read during this period, but this belongs already to reception history. It stands to reason that without addressing the issue of composite and edited texts the usability of texts in the Hebrew Bible in their final forms would remain limited and highly uncertain. In fact, the resulting uncertainty could thus be even bigger than the uncertainty one seeks to avoid in disregarding historical criticism and addressing only a certain final form. This position

---

29. See Ben Zvi, "Concept of Prophetic Books," 73–95. Ben Zvi comes to this historical setting of the early Persian period by postulating that the "concept of prophetic book (in its present form) cannot be placed before the end of the monarchic period and its immediate aftermath" and must predate "the composition of both Chronicles and Jonah," which are "both likely from the late Persian period," since Chronicles and Jonah presuppose this concept (79). Apart from the debatable dating of Chronicles and Jonah, this argument seems historically very general and imprecise to understand the factual texts of these books, and it particularly ignores the multiple traits of continuous literary development far beyond the Persian period.

30. E.g., Ehud Ben Zvi, "Memories of Kings of Israel and Judah within the Mnemonic Landscape of the Literati of the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Period: Exploratory Considerations," *SJOT* 33 (2019): 1–15, uses the book of Kings as evidence for "the Mnemonic Landscape" in the late Persian/early Hellenistic period, but it is not self-evident that the book can be used as any type of evidence for this period. Ben Zvi's approach implies that essential parts of Kings were written or revised exactly during this period, but that has not been shown. It is probable that most of the content in the book was written earlier and that it continued to be revised even later. The late Persian/early Hellenistic background of Kings may be only limited.

31. This is the position of Ben Zvi, "Memories of Kings of Israel and Judah."

also mainly uses the MT as the source text and largely bypasses the differences between the witnesses, which would display evident problems, such as with the two widely differing versions of Samuel. It is difficult to build a solid methodological basis for the study of the biblical texts if variant editions are neglected and one merely uses one text in its final form without any attempt to distinguish its textual and literary history.[32]

Furthermore, an overall skepticism toward reconstructing editorial histories of texts appears one-sided and exaggerated. There are certainly many passages whose development remains difficult to reconstruct, and many samples in this book indeed show that editorial changes often did not leave unequivocal traces to be detected by modern critics. However, this is only one side of the coin. There are many cases indicating the opposite, which should also be taken into consideration in any model. A great number of editorial changes documented by divergent textual traditions would be detectable even without the variant that preserves the older reading. These changes disturbed the syntax, structure, content, and/or narrative logic to such an extent that a careful critic would be able to reconstruct what happened. The documented textual transmission suggests that there is an entire range between nonreconstructability of editorial changes and partial and full reconstructability. To be sure, reconstructions that cover every detail of the literary development without any tentativeness seem exaggerated and untenable. But it is also scientifically unsustainable to only address the unreconstructable cases and use them to justify the complete rejection of historical criticism. At the end of this book, we try to develop criteria for how reconstructable changes can be distinguished from those cases of editing that remain undetectable or largely unreconstructable. Future scholarship should seek to understand what kind of editorial changes left detectable traces in the resulting texts, study such cases among the documented textual transmission, and learn from them how to detect similar changes where no documented evidence is extant.

1.6. Model of Transmission and Textual Fluidity

Benjamin Ziemer fundamentally challenges historical criticism by arguing that its assumed model of textual development is flawed. According

---

32. We have addressed some of the challenges and concerns raised by Niels Peter Lemche and Ben Zvi in Müller, Pakkala, Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 12–14. These points need not be repeated here.

to him, the assumption that texts primarily developed through additions is contradicted by documented evidence in textual variants. Discussing a large number of different texts that were preserved in variant editions, he argues that omissions, rewritings, and transpositions were much more prevalent than what is conventionally assumed. These faulty assumptions would undermine the method's approach and lead to distorted reconstructions.[33]

Two significant problems in Ziemer's approach are its heavy reliance on texts from the entire ancient Near East and the assumption that the same scribal or editorial processes were in place in various contexts, cultures, and languages. He largely fails to discuss how scribes perceived the texts they transmitted, and thus much of the evidence may not be directly relevant to the question of how the Hebrew Bible was transmitted. The texts of the Hebrew Bible came to be perceived as holy and authoritative, which influenced their transmission in a crucial way. This is seen in omissions, for instance, which were common in many texts of the ancient Near East, whereas documented evidence from the Hebrew Bible shows that its editors sought to preserve the older text as much as possible even when they changed the text's intention or meaning by additions. Omissions were made in exceptional cases when the text contained something offensive that could not be bypassed by additions.[34] The avoidance of omissions and replacements often resulted in repetitive and inconsistent texts, such as 1 Kgs 8 and 11 or 2 Kgs 23, which have no parallels outside the Hebrew Bible. In most other literature of the ancient Near East, scribes could much more freely smooth texts by replacing and omitting textual segments.

Ziemer's approach contains a number of other problems as well. He relies heavily on free Greek translations, such as Esther, Daniel, and First Esdras, where it is particularly challenging to reach the Hebrew *Vorlage*.[35] Of all the Greek translations that he uses as evidence for Hebrew scribal processes, Jeremiah is perhaps the most relevant, since the translation is rather faithful and thus allows a reliable comparison of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the Old Greek.[36] Ziemer justly comes to the con-

---

33. Benjamin Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz*, VTSup 182 (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 697–716.

34. Juha Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 183–252.

35. Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*, 384–460 (chs. 11–13).

36. Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*, 273–383.

clusion that omissions and rewritings are rare in Jeremiah. However, he paradoxically assumes that Jeremiah is an exception in ancient literature,[37] while it may in fact be one of the best examples of typical transmission processes in the Second Temple period. A similar picture in many other books, such as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, corroborates the scribal processes in Jeremiah. The scribal freedom Ziemer argues for is essentially based on other ancient Near Eastern literature and rather free Greek translations, while core texts in the Hebrew Bible that show scribal processes in the Second Temple period are neglected.

Another problem of Ziemer's approach is the blurred difference between new literary works and later scribal editing or *Fortschreibung* of the same literary work,[38] which allows him to use new compositions, such as Chronicles, Jubilees, and the Genesis Apocryphon, as evidence for scribal processes. It is widely acknowledged that new literary works in the Hebrew Bible commonly used sources selectively. However, one should recognize how a new literary composition relates to the older texts that were used as sources. At least Jubilees and Genesis Apocryphon were probably written to supplement their sources in the Pentateuch and not to replace them, and therefore it is apparent that the authors were not concerned about skipping entire sections in their sources. Rewritings and omissions in them should not be likened to omissions in the later transmission of the same composition, such as Exodus, Joshua, or Kings. The use of various types of evidence from the ancient Near East without making a clear distinction between different contexts and perceptions of the transmitted text fundamentally undermines Ziemer's criticism of historical criticism.[39]

For other scholars, the general fluidity and pluriformity of the Hebrew Bible during the Second Temple period is an implicit reason to doubt the feasibility or reliability of historical-critical methods. Variant editions were in circulation in various contexts where they were independently edited, which occasioned constantly increasing plurality, complexity of transmission, and an endless web of interconnections between texts. Therefore, it would be difficult or even impossible to establish the genetic lineage and

---

37. Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*, 380–81.

38. Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*, 13–15.

39. For further discussion of Ziemer's model, see Juha Pakkala, review of *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz*, by Benjamin Ziemer, *Bib* 102 (2021): 463–68.

relative ages between variants made in different literary transmissions. According to this line of thought, the idea of a more original text would be elusive or even misleading. Here one should clearly distinguish between *the* original text of literary works—an ideal entity that may remain beyond reach, if such ever even existed—and the comparison of two readings to determine which one is relatively more original than the other. Many critics of historical criticism seem to assume that the former is still a central goal of the method.[40] Undeniably, there are scholars who pursue the original text (or the *Urtext*) in some compositions, but for most of the Hebrew Bible it is hardly possible to reach any original texts.[41] For example, in the study of prophets, the uncertainties become so immense that it would be hazardous to build on any reconstruction that claims to have identified the original text of Hosea, or the very words written by the prophet Jeremiah, for example.[42] In addition to the uncertainty of complicated literary development, the whole concept of the original text may be illusory. More important as a historical task is the later development that provides significant information about the transmitting contexts.[43] On the other hand, the pursuit of the original sources may in some cases be a meaningful historical goal even if one were unable to reach a high degree of certainty about each reconstructed text. The book of Kings is an example, as there

---

40. This seems to be assumed in the introduction in Liv Lied and Hugo Lundhaug, eds., *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*, TUGAL 175 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 1–6; thus also Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text*, 127–40.

41. The search for the pentateuchal sources is a notable example of the search for the original text, although current scholarship increasingly sees very fragmentary sources and uncertain development.

42. Hermann-Josef Stipp, "Sprachliche Kennzeichen jeremianischer Autorschaft," in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah,* ed. Hans M. Barstad and Reinhard G. Kratz, BZAW 388 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 148–86, has developed a remarkable linguistic method for discovering supposedly authentic words of Jeremiah in the book, but there remain doubts about whether such an approach underestimates the complexities of the literary historical developments and is able to produce valid results.

43. For a discussion and review of New Testament discussion concerning the secondary expansions that have become more and more important, see Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 352–62. According to him, in New Testament scholarship the shift from original texts to the work of scribes in the whole transmission "is arguably the most significant development over the past two decades, especially in the English speaking world."

is a rough consensus as to which texts may derive from the royal annals of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Without a literary-critical approach, the highly important information contained therein remains hidden and is in effect useless for historical research.

Although various consequences could be drawn from the undeniable fluidity and pluriformity of transmission, a number of scholars assume that these points essentially undermine the rationale and methods of historical criticism.[44] The fluidity would be further complicated or even confused by the partial orality of transmission. A few examples will suffice.

By using example texts in 1 Kgs 11–14, Frank Ueberschaer has argued that the many variants between the MT, LXX[B], LXX[L], Peshitta, Vulgate, and Old Latin imply a broad fluctuation of the textual transmission ("eine grosse Bandbreite der Textüberlieferung"), and in some cases none of the witnesses may preserve the original text. This would at least in part be the result of an oral-written transmission where several *texts* were transmitted in parallel but where none could be regarded as more original than the others. Although this would not apply to every textual segment, the possibility should be taken into consideration in every analysis. Ueberschaer thus does not categorically reject the quest to determine the relative age of variant readings, but he assumes that there are cases where this is not possible, and two or more readings may simultaneously be original. The reason for this would be the partial orality of transmission: Some pieces of

---

44. For a review of some challenges to historical criticism, see Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 63–72, and Müller, Pakkala, Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 9–15. A number of names could be mentioned here, such as Person, but it is very difficult to find a systematic analysis of historical criticism from this perspective. In their recent book, Lied and Lundhaug, *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions*, 2–6, have also voiced criticism of the conventional approach, but other than proposing a fundamental shift in focus to the manuscripts, there is little discussion on the methodological basis of historical criticism. They rightly question the attempt to find the earliest form of biblical texts, and here one can only agree that such a goal would be unrealistic in many cases. However, this does not mean that one should abandon the attempt to understand the textual development that may still contain very significant information. It is also difficult to see how manuscript studies—which the so-called new philology effectively is part of—would exclude historical criticism. In other words, there is no need to see historical criticism and new philology as somehow alternatives that exclude each other. It should also be noted that most of the contributions in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions* do not address the methodological questions discussed here. For new philology, see also Liv Lied in https://www.academia.edu/12026818/_New_Philology_-_in_a_Nutshell_.

tradition were orally transmitted alongside the written texts so that their form and position were not clearly fixed. Later, when the oral traditions were written down, different transmitting traditions could place them in different forms in different places. In favor of this theory, Ueberschaer discusses some examples in detail, such as 1 Kgs 11:1–3; 11:43–12:2, where two textual witnesses place a section in different locations and in slightly different form (see analyses of these verses in ch. 10, "Transpositions").[45] Ueberschaer is certainly right that there are cases where one may not be able to determine which one of the many variants is most original. Nevertheless, there are two aspects here, and both need to be clearly distinguished: orality and textual fluidity.

It is evident that the transmission of the Hebrew Bible was in a constant flux in its formative period before freezing as a canonical text. Repeated scribal changes, and especially additions, will also be underscored in the present study, and it is evident that secondary changes were made in different textual traditions in parallel. For example, the proto-MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX were evidently both edited after they diverged as separate textual strands, and there may have been various textual strands in both of them. Other textual traditions were edited in other contexts, such as the text-type represented by the Samaritan Pentateuch, and some biblical Qumran manuscripts imply nonalignment with the main known traditions. The development was undeniably very complicated. In addition to various changes in parallel literary traditions, some texts were secondarily harmonized toward a text that was regarded as more authoritative and/or more reliable, mostly toward the proto-Masoretic Text. A more original reading may thus have been secondarily altered and harmonized toward a less original reading. Many of the examples in this volume discuss such cases, and often the nonharmonized and more original text has to be found among the textual variants in translations, especially in Greek and Latin. Such recensions thus further complicate the already complex development. Indeed, this investigation underscores the complexities involved with textual or literary histories of the Hebrew Bible. This brings us back to the question of whether historical criticism can reconstruct any of this development reliably enough that it can justify using

---

45. Frank Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie: Eine text- und literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1Kön 11–14*, BZAW 481 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 28–36.

the method, which is the main reason for this volume. A general model on how complicated the development was is surely significant and various models should be discussed, but complexity of transmission as a whole does not as such say much about our ability to detect individual scribal changes, which is the focus of historical criticism. The biological evolution of species was also extremely complicated and may never be reconstructed in full, but this does not say anything as such about scientists' ability to investigate individual microlevel evolutionary changes. The reliability of historical criticism needs to be evaluated on the basis of actual documented cases of scribal changes where it is possible to test whether individual scribal changes could be detected or not. This is one of the main goals of the book.

Orality of transmission is a different issue, and its relationship with a complicated literary history should be understood before jumping to far-reaching conclusions. That a critic cannot determine which variant is more original does not inevitably lead to orality as an explanation. It would have to be shown that orality played a role and not merely assumed when a textual explanation fails to convince or remains uncertain. Clearly, scholarship on the role of orality in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible has advanced in recent times. Earlier scholarship assumed that the early transmission of biblical books was oral and that at some stage the traditions were written down as texts, after which the transmission was textual. Such a clear-cut division certainly cannot be maintained.[46] An originally oral transmission also cannot be taken as given, but should always be shown if such is assumed. On the other hand, it is now widely acknowledged that oral dynamics did influence later textual transmission, and can thus explain some phenomena and variants in the texts.[47] However, the impact of orality should not be exaggerated. This is implied by the manuscript evidence (e.g., Qumran) as well as the type of changes that can be observed in the documented evidence. For example, clear tensions and syntactic errors are best explained as the results of textual alteration and would hardly be preserved to such an extent as we have in the Hebrew Bible if the transmission had been essentially oral (see also discussion below).

---

46. Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Israel* (London: SPCK, 1996), 134.

47. Niditch, *Oral World Written World*, passim; David M. *Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 287–91.

1.7. Oral Performances or Written Transmission?

In view of the considerable textual plurality in the Second Temple period, Raymond Person has suggested that oral dynamics not only influenced, but played an essential role in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. Accordingly, he argues that the transmission history cannot be reconstructed with enough certainty to be usable for historical purposes. Each manuscript would only be "an imperfect instantiation of the broader tradition" by scribes who "were performers of their tradition in ways analogous to oral bards."[48] Since hearers were assumed to know the transmitted tradition in full, it was not necessary to write down everything in each written copy of the tradition. Parts could be left out if they were not relevant for the performance in question or for other occasions for which the written copy was made. Familiar with the full tradition, the audience would supplement skipped sections in their mind. Sections could be added, and thus the textual copy used for a performance could include such a new section. On the other hand, Person argues that "different manuscripts containing different readings can … be understood as representing the same literary text" and they all are also "faithful representations of the same broader tradition."[49] As an example he mentions the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Chronicles, which would both be "faithful representations of the same broader tradition." Consequently, the oral aspect or dynamics of transmission would mean that the texts or traditions were even more fluid than conventional textual models assume. Person concludes that the Hebrew Bible can only be used as a rather general source because it cannot provide as detailed information as historical criticism assumes. If Person is right, it would indeed be futile to determine the relative age of variant readings, which would undermine all classic textual and historical studies of the Hebrew Bible, including text criticism.

---

48. Raymond F. Person, "Text Criticism as a Lens for Understanding the Transmission of Ancient Texts in Their Oral Environments," in *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, ed. Brian B. Schmidt, AIL 22 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 197; he writes: "as texts in a primarily oral society like ancient Israel, each manuscript represents the broader tradition as an imperfect instantiation of the broader tradition that existed."

49. Person, "Text Criticism as a Lens," 207, 197.

The model Person suggests is important as an example that is not essentially based on observations in documented textual evidence in the Hebrew Bible. It relies on the assumption that the Hebrew Bible is largely analogous with traditions that were (or are assumed to be) orally transmitted by bards. Person mentions as possible analogies the homeric Iliad, medieval English tales, and A Thousand and One Nights, where one can similarly see variation between the preserved textual witnesses. By using these traditions, Person assumes that the Hebrew Bible was also transmitted orally, which then leads him to assume that the full tradition was a mental text in the collective memory of the people, and therefore the preserved texts would not represent the whole tradition.

However, the documented evidence suggests that the transmission of the Hebrew Bible was much more textual than the supposed analogies. Without denying some influence of orality, parts of the Hebrew Bible refer to the importance of putting down the tradition in writing (e.g., Exod 24:4 and Deut 31:9). Some texts, such as Deut 4:2 and 13:1, emphasize that one may not take out or add anything from the tradition, which fits poorly with Person's model. One should also not underestimate the perception of the Torah as a divine revelation, attested already in the late Second Temple period, which essentially distinguishes it from folk tales used as entertainment. The Torah refers to itself as a written document (e.g., Deut 28:58; 29:20–21; 30:10). That it was understood as a written revelation is mirrored in various other parts of the Hebrew Bible (e.g., 2 Kgs 22:13; 23:3).[50] Some of the same problems can also be seen in Ziemer's criticism of the historical-critical method, as discussed §1.6, and the following discussion undermines his assumed model of transmission as well.

Most important is documented evidence from the Hebrew Bible itself. Some documented cases indeed imply changed word orders, words replaced with synonyms, and other similarly modified textual elements, and some of these variants could be explained by an oral dimension, as shown by Susan Niditch, David Carr, and Person (e.g., as memory variants).[51] This certainly undermines assumptions that every single word

---

50. The textual background of many other parts can also be shown. E.g., the royal annals, which were used as the main source for Kings, were in all likelihood written texts. Joshua, Samuel, and Kings also contain references to "books" that were used as sources (Josh 10:13; 2 Sam 1:18; 1 Kings 11:41; 14:19).

51. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 41–42; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 33; Niditch, *Oral World and Written World*; Raymond F. Person, "Formulas and

was always faithfully preserved. However, there is very little evidence that *meaningful* sections of the tradition could easily be added, replaced, or omitted. The present volume discusses several cases where the older text was very carefully preserved although an addition was partly contradictory or in tension with the older text. For example, in 1 Kgs 15:5 a shorter version refers to David as the ideal king, but an expansion found in another version that mentioned David's sin with Bathsheba created an evident contradiction. This would have been easily avoided by omitting or replacing one or two words. The faithful preservation of the various textual elements including contradictory and inconsistent textual sequences suggests that the text was transmitted as an essentially written tradition. Oral transmission would most likely remove contradictions and especially syntactic errors (see Josh 1:7), while the careful preservation of written material better explains their preservation through the centuries. Another related case is the Chronicler's attempt at disguising David's adultery with Bathsheba in 2 Samuel. A sentence of the older narrative ("David remained at Jerusalem" in 2 Sam 11:1) was kept in the new version (1 Chr 20:1), although there it makes little sense (see 1 Chr 20:2).[52] There are also many examples where Chronicles interprets a given *textual* tradition by adducing passages from the Torah, and this is often done in such intricate ways that it is very difficult to imagine this as being due to an oral performance.[53] Phenomena like these cannot be explained as resulting from oral composition of the same tradition.

Ancient Israel was certainly an essentially oral society, as Person stresses, but this does not mean that its normative and authoritative literature, which emerged in historically poorly known circumstances, followed the same rules as other literature of different genres in quite different cultures and times. It would be necessary to demonstrate that traditions

---

Scribal Memory: A Case Study of Text-Critical Variants as Examples of Category-Triggering," in *Weathered Words: Formulaic Language and Verbal Art*, ed. Frog and William Lamb (Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2021), 147–72. An oral dimension of textual transmission is implied in many general studies and introductions; e.g., Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 195–97.

52. Thus already Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Edinburgh: Black, 1885), 178; see also the discussion by Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 361–64.

53. See Lars Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik: Studien zur Rezeption des Pentateuchs in den Chronikbüchern*, FRLANT 274 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019).

performed by bards are indeed close analogies to the Hebrew Bible.[54] One should also distinguish oral performance and oral transmission, which are not inevitably connected.[55] At least since early medieval times the MT has been transmitted as a written text at the same time that it was orally performed in synagogues. Oral performance in synagogues tells little about the early transmission of these texts.

Furthermore, in contrast with Homer's epics, much of the Hebrew Bible is written as prose, which is not as well suited for oral transmission, and thus a close analogy between epics drafted exclusively in hexameters and the biblical prose narratives that contain a variety of forms and literary styles should be demonstrated before assuming it a priori. Person's criticism of historical criticism does not make a clear distinction between the literary forms. Instead of assuming uncertain analogies, documented evidence from the Hebrew Bible should remain the core of any investigation that evaluates or criticizes historical criticism.

1.8. The Prospects and Limits of Historical Criticism

Although the methodological alternatives may not stand on solid ground, the reasons for neglecting and rejecting historical criticism can be understood. Despite using the same methods, there are different and even contradictory models on the history of the same texts. Models range from repeated editing and countless textual layers to those that only identify isolated additions and otherwise assume rather coherent texts. After the critical study of more than a century, there is no consensus on the literary histories of many biblical texts, sometimes even along general lines of entire books (e.g., Joshua, Samuel, Kings). Although there are exceptions

---

54. This cannot be assumed as given, especially since there is very little evidence or information about oral performance, let alone about the oral transmission of the Hebrew Bible.

55. See Erhard Blum, "Die Stimme des Autors in den Geschichtsüberlieferungen des Alten Testaments," in *Historiographie in der Antike,* ed. Klaus-Peter Adam, BZAW 373 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 107–29, who opts for a model according to which the ancient Hebrew prose narratives of the historical books were drafted and transmitted in writing to be read aloud to audiences (esp. p. 115). Blum also argues that the author's voice in this kind of anonymous "traditional literature" (*Traditionsliteratur*), which can be heard only very indirectly in some parenthetic remarks, is of a completely different nature than in ancient Greek prose historiography and in the epic poetry of Homer and Hesiod (pp. 126–27).

where most scholars who value historical criticism would agree that a passage was added (e.g., Deut 4 or 13), this rarely extends to broader models or the literary histories of larger compositions.[56]

The reasons for lack of consensus in many texts are complicated, but to some extent these problems arise from the basis of historical criticism, which has not been firmly anchored in documented evidence.[57] Its basic assumptions, methodological possibilities, and limits have not been methodologically tested and compared with cases where one can observe how the texts were edited. The actual reconstructability of scribal changes in particular has only been assumed, but how reliable the reconstructions are has not been evaluated with regard to the documented evidence. This is clearly an area where historical criticism has not adequately responded to its critics. The nature of the editorial changes that can be seen in the documented evidence only partly correspond to the changes that are commonly assumed in literary criticism or historical criticism in general. As we will see in the analyses, there is more variety in the actual editorial techniques than is commonly assumed. For example, omissions and replacements took place, although they are often rejected or neglected by literary critics, and this needs to be taken into consideration in implementing the method. The limits and possibilities of historical criticism should therefore be systematically explored and clearly acknowledged. In this book we seek to remedy some of these problems by focusing on the documented evidence, which we believe is *the* springboard for testing and improving the method.

It should finally be stressed that a large majority of biblical scholars take no part in the methodological discussion about historical criticism. Apart from those who practice the method, a growing number of scholars imply that it is not relevant, and to some extent the method becomes

---

56. Nevertheless, Eckart Otto "Treueid und Gesetz: Die Ursprünge des Deuteronomiums im Horizont des neuassyrischen Vertragsrechts," *ZABR* 2 (1996): 40, assumes that Deut 13 is a core of the book, but he peculiarly also regards the chapter as alien in its context.

57. There are many texts that cannot derive from the same author, but the literary development is complicated beyond reconstruction, e.g., Josiah's reform in 2 Kgs 23; it is clear that attempts to reconstruct such a text remain very hypothetical, and thus it is also difficult to reach consensus. Moreover, there are different conceptions on the extent of later scribal activity, which influences the way a scholar views the analyzed text. Different scholarly traditions also relate differently to the textual witnesses, and there is clearly a lack of familiarity with the LXX and other textual traditions.

more and more silenced by disregard. Although this may not be a conscious process, at the background is the assumption that other approaches and methods are more relevant or provide the expected information about ancient Israel and early Judaism. It is clear that historical criticism requires painstaking and sometimes frustrating textual investigations that may not lead to conclusive results, and therefore this method needs to prove that it can provide important results that justify the historical work put into it.

1.9. Presentation of the Evidence and Technical Issues

The different types of documented editorial changes presented in this book are divided into four main categories: additions, omissions, replacements, and transpositions. Additions will be further subdivided into additions of different sizes, while other main categories need not be subdivided, since they are much less frequently attested and the number of examples is much smaller. Moreover, most of the changes of the other categories are rather short. For example, nearly all meaningful omissions are of one word or one sentence.

The four main categories derive from an essential difference between these editorial techniques. As historical criticism conventionally only assumes additions, it is necessary to discuss the other types of changes separately. Particular attention will be on these changes as a technique and on the attitude of scribes toward them. Additions often explain, clarify, or interpret the older text, while meaningful omissions and replacements can be seen to challenge the older text more than additions. We will thus ask whether the scribes related to the different techniques differently and how the different scribal approaches can be described.

With some exceptions, the analyses are divided into standard sections. After the introduction and presentation of the variants in question, we will propose a theory of what happened to the text and arguments in its favor. This is followed by a discussion of alternative theories and possible counterarguments. The evidence may also be ambiguous, in which case a definite conclusion will be left out. The chapters also include a section on the nature of the observed editorial change. Here we seek to discuss how the editorial change may have been technically made. For example, was it made between the lines or in the margins of an already existing manuscript, or was it made when the entire manuscript was copied? In this section we will also ask if there are any signs of a redaction that the edito-

rial change could be part of, or whether it is more likely to be an isolated addition. Without going into detail, the dating and purpose of the editorial change will also receive some attention here.

As one of the goals of this book is to investigate the methodological basis of literary criticism, an important section of each analysis is a hypothetical discussion on whether the documented editorial change could have been detected without the older or more original version being preserved. It is clear that some subjectivity is inherent in discussing such hypothetical cases, yet we will lay the arguments on the table for any criticism, and in any case we will pursue a critical evaluation. The analyses will be concluded by a brief summary of the results.

Due to the focus and scope of the book, only a selection of secondary literature on individual analyses can be considered here. There is much more scholarly discussion that could have been included for some of the cases analyzed, but this would have inflated the book beyond reasonable limits. We have not pursued the final say for any of the analyzed example texts as such and have considered other literature only as far as is necessary for the goals of this study. In many cases we defend a theory that has already been proposed in biblical studies, in some cases already in the nineteenth century, while in other cases we offer a new theory that has not been proposed before. We also do not seek to solve all text-critical problems in the discussed passage but merely focus on the main scribal change in question and variants directly related to it. In many cases, especially when a Hebrew text is compared with a translation, there are a number of additional small variants that could be discussed.

As for technical markings in the charts and diagrams, the expansions and pluses in the textual witnesses are underlined. Rewritten and otherwise differing parallel texts are displayed in dashed underline. Relocated or transposed sections of text are written in gray. Omitted sections are marked with ~~strikethrough~~. Note that underlined pluses in one witness may be omitted in another witness. Plus is a neutral characterization of a reading that is missing in another witness, while an expansion (or addition) as well as omission is a characterization based on a critical evaluation of the two readings. Parallel or similar sections in two different texts being compared are highlighted with gray background. Because of the scope of the volume, as discussed above, not all variants between witnesses in different languages have been marked. A translation often contains a number of smaller variants, some of which may be related to the translation technique, which do not concern us here.

Most of the English translations of the Hebrew follow the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), while the English translations of the LXX and Old Greek follow the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), but both have occasionally been modified. The masoretic vowels and other signs have also been left out of the MT, because they largely reflect later interpretations of the Hebrew text than the textual stages that are compared in this book.

In books where the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint has not yet appeared, we have used the Cambridge sigla in reference to manuscripts and manuscript groups. For the main codices and traditions we have also used superscript as follows: LXX[A] for Codex Alexandrinus, and so on, and LXX[L] for the Lucianic or Antiochene group of texts.

List of Passages Investigated in Detail

Additions
   Single words and short phrases: Gen 14:22; 31:53; Exod 3:1; Deut 26:17; Josh 1:7; 1 Kgs 17:14; 18:18; 19:10, 14; Jeremiah (epithets, titles, etc.); Ezra 10:3; 1 Esd 8:90; 2 Esd 10:3
   Single sentences and expressions: Gen 43:28; Exod 22:19; Deut 1:25, 35, 39; 17:3; Josh 2:12; 4:10; 10:13; 11:19; 19:15, 22, 30, 38; 22:25; 1 Sam 31:6; 2 Sam 22:3; 1 Kgs 11:33–34, 38–39; 15:5, 23; 16:10; 22:28; 2 Kgs 8:27; 16:11–12; Jer 25:1–2; 26:20–23; 28:3, 14; 29:1; 32:30; Psalms headings; Pss 13:6; 18:2; 135:6; 149:9; Neh 9:6
   Small sections, clusters of connected sentences: Exod 32:9–10; Deut 34:1–3; Josh 8:7–8; 23:16b; 1 Sam 18:10–11, 17–19; 2 Sam 5:4–5; 1 Kgs 16:34; Jer 27:18–22; Neh 11:20–21
   Larger passages: Jer 29:16–20; 33:14–26; 1 Chr 1:11–26

Omissions
   Exod 21:18, 21; Deut 1:8, 35; 11:9; Josh 5:14; 1 Sam 4:7; 2 Sam 15:8

Replacements
   Gen 2:2; Exod 21:28–29; 24:4; Num 1:47; 2:33; Deut 32:8–9; Josh 24:1, 25; Judg 20:2; 1 Sam 1:23; 2:21; 22:6; 2 Sam 5:21; 6:6–7; 1 Kgs 11:11; 2 Kgs 12:10; Ps 72:1, 5, 7

Transpositions

    Gen 31:45–52; 47:5–6; Exod 1:5; Lev 8:10–12; Num 1; 26 (focus on Gad); 1 Kgs 11:1–10; 11:43–12:3; Jer 28:5

Additions: General Introduction

Textual evidence indicates that additions were the most common type of editorial intervention in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. It has been generally acknowledged since early critical research that biblical texts were gradually expanded, which is substantiated by text-critical evidence and variant versions.[1] Documented additions can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible as well as in related contemporary early Jewish literature. Additions are particularly evident when we look at variant editions of an entire biblical book that notably differ in length, the Greek and Hebrew versions of Jeremiah being a classic example.[2] There are many examples where an entire passage is missing in one of the witnesses, for example, Judg 6:7–10 in 4Q49 (4QJudgᵃ), 1 Kgs 6:10–15 in the LXX, or Jer 33:14–26 in the LXX, which in these cases probably preserve an earlier phase in the text's development.[3] It is not uncommon that the longer text is found in the Masoretic Text.[4]

---

1. See, e.g., Werner Carl Ludewig Ziegler, "Kritik über den Artikel von der Schöpfung nach unserer gewöhnlichen Dogmatik," in *Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte* 2 (1794): 39–44; Karl David Ilgen, *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt* (Halle: Hemmerde & Schwerschke, 1798), 1:434; regarding the postulated secondary character of the seven-day scheme in Gen 1, see Christoph Levin, "Tatbericht und Wortbericht in der priesterschriftlichen Schöpfungserzählung," in *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, BZAW 316 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 23–39; and Levin, *The Old Testament: A Brief Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 25–28. See also Olyan and Wright, *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, which discusses a number of additions in different parts of the Hebrew Bible.

2. See Stipp, "Semi-empirical Example," 295–318.

3. See Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 59–68, 101–8.

4. Although there are some examples of different phrasing between the main textual variants, this phenomenon seems to be rather rare. Such examples are only

There are good reasons to assume that the shorter witness is mostly more original than the longer one. Needless to say, this cannot be a preset rule and each case has to be discussed and argued separately.[5] It is always necessary to compare potential alternative explanations and present a clear case for why a proposed theory should be preferred. If a certain element found in a textual tradition is lacking in another, an accidental omission or a deliberate abridgment of the text is also a possible reason for the divergence. Nevertheless, a review of the text-critical evidence in the example-texts discussed in this chapter shows that additions commonly turn out to be the most probable explanation for the variants. Theories assuming a systematic abridgment are not uncommon, for example, as an explanation for the shorter LXX of Jeremiah, but they usually encounter substantial difficulties in explaining why the abridgment was made.[6] Any theory that assumes a deliberate abridgment requires precise argumentation for why a particular section was omitted. While there are certainly cases in which elements of the older version were intentionally omitted, as the examples in the chapter on omissions in this book demonstrate, this kind of editorial intervention seems to have taken place rather rarely and only for weighty reasons and/or in special circumstances. There is very little documented evidence for assuming that shortened versions of entire compositions or passages were commonly made.

---

infrequently found in most books of the Hebrew Bible. E.g., when we compare the MT and LXX versions of Jeremiah, it is difficult to find examples where both textual traditions preserve the same content but express it in very different terms or phrases. The vast majority of the differences are pluses that find no equivalent in one of the versions. The exceptions to this are the Greek versions of some of the younger compositions such as Esther, Daniel, and 1 Esdras. In part, at the background may be a free translation technique, but there are also examples where theological or ideological concerns motivated altered phrasing (this is particularly evident in Esther).

5. A well-known and notoriously difficult case is the Goliath story in 1 Sam 17–18; see, e.g., Dominique Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism*, OBO 73 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

6. Some scholars, such as Fischer, *Jeremia 1–25*, 43, 46, assume that the shorter Greek version of Jeremiah is largely the result of abridgments throughout the text. The Greek version would nearly always be secondary when it presents the shorter text. This seems to be a preconception that has not been substantiated by detailed discussion of the texts in question, and it runs counter to many text-critical investigations of the book.

Accidental omissions are also possible, but caution is necessary. They should only be postulated as a preferred explanation if the longer text contains features, such as doublets and similar clusters of characters and words (homoioteleuton or homoioarchton), that could have easily triggered a scribal parablepsis. Haphazard omissions of textual elements can never be entirely excluded, but theories assuming such omissions should not be preferred over theories that provide a good explanation for why the text was expanded. A strong counterargument against an accidental omission is usually provided if the shorter version contains a clear and seamless textual sequence. It would be a coincidence that an unintentional skipping of a section results in a completely logical and even clearer version than the older text. Postulating such a process is rarely a viable alternative to assuming an addition that introduces a new textual element. In other words, a purely accidental omission usually confuses the textual sequence since it did not happen with regard to the content of the passage, while an addition is often a logical unit of its own and to a certain extent is also separated from its immediate context. Consequently, there are usually enough criteria for deciding whether an accidental omission is more probable than an intentional addition, or vice versa.

The documented textual evidence provides evidence for additions in the final stages of the transmission, and it is reasonable to assume that the process of expanding the transmitted texts continued for at least several centuries. There may not be any other texts in the world literature that were expanded so extensively as books that eventually became part of the collection called the Hebrew Bible. The textual history attests to multiple minor as well as some major pluses inserted by editors. Compared with other editorial techniques discussed in other chapters, additions were, by far, the most common type of editorial intervention, at least in those stages of the literary development that are documented by the extant textual traditions.[7] As discussed in the chapters on replacements and omissions, later scribes seem to have been much more reluctant to remove elements of the text than to add new elements. The main exceptions to this are entirely

---

7. It has to be noted that the very early transmission of biblical texts may have differed from the late transmission to some extent. A possible reason for this is that in the late transmission the texts were already regarded as considerably authoritative and they were also transmitted in many contexts. These factors would have inhibited the most radical editorial changes. This issue will be discussed in more detail in the final conclusions.

new compositions that used another text as a source and rewritten texts. Sometimes shortenings could also have taken place in the translation process, but this mostly relates to means of expression and is thus a somewhat different phenomenon (see discussion at §8.1, below).

2.1. Additions Interpret, Correct, and Renew Texts

The added material usually served interpretive purposes that sought to guide the reader to a certain understanding of the text by providing a new aspect, piece of information, or detail. They consist of secondarily inserted words, phrases, or larger passages that may highlight a certain motif of the given text, explain its context, or comment on it. They may also introduce completely new motifs, theological ideas, and (sub)scenes that are, in some way, related to the older text. Editing a transmitted text by inserting additional elements always entails a certain hermeneutical process where the older text is explained or reacted to but simultaneously expanded. The transmitted text is thus preserved and revised at the same time. A common intention that underlay the editorial technique of adding something to a transmitted text was to enhance the understanding of the text by its recipients. Added elements seek to render the text more understandable to the contemporary reader, or to make its alleged true meaning more explicit or precise. In this regard, additions often had a conservative stand toward the transmitted texts.

Because of the new motifs and ideas, most additions in effect also corrected, expanded, or otherwise altered the transmitted text. By introducing new theological concepts, the additions served the changed religious needs of the community. New theological ideas arise out of the context of transmission and the challenges of the repeatedly changing circumstances. In this regard additions update the texts to remain relevant for each generation. Without repeated updating, the texts were in danger of becoming outdated and thus losing importance as authoritative and normative documents for the community. It is thus understandable that biblical texts had to be constantly expanded until they became unchangeable in the early centuries of the Common Era. After the Hebrew Bible was frozen for text-internal additions, the same processes continued in the interpretive and other literature. The need to explain and update the texts for new generations remained.

A notable number of additions were duplicated or otherwise deduced from other parts of the respective composition or from other parts of

the Hebrew Bible. Many additions may be characterized as mere harmonizations as they may not provide anything new as far as the whole composition or the Hebrew Bible is concerned, but they may still change their new context. Nonetheless, most harmonizations are between passages already closely related and therefore we are often dealing with minor additions of detail. The Samaritan Pentateuch contains particularly many harmonizations where related passages in the Pentateuch influenced each other, and most of them thus add no new information as far as the whole Pentateuch is concerned. Within the same composition, harmonizations are often attempts to coordinate between related passages or to insert central phrases and motifs from other parts of the composition. This also highlights the conservative nature of many additions.

2.2. Typical Preconceptions

Although the extent and number of additions is disputed, there is no disagreement among critical scholars that the Hebrew Bible contains additions.[8] Some scholars assume that additions were virtually the only type of editorial intervention, and this is especially the case with some literary critics, who have notable confidence in our ability to reconstruct the entire editorial history of the texts through the centuries.[9] The textual evidence, however, cannot validate the basis of such a methodological preconception, but this issue will be taken up in more detail in chapter 8, "Omissions."

Another and perhaps more heated issue is the discussion about the ability of historical criticism or literary criticism to detect additions and reconstruct the editorial history of the text. While some biblical scholars are overly confident about our ability to determine sequences of multiple layers, other biblical scholars deny that additions can be detected with

---

8. For the general discussion on editing in the Hebrew Bible, see the discussion in the general introduction (ch. 1).

9. Many scholars have assumed that the transmission only developed through additions, although many do this only implicitly. The following scholars have explicitly denied changes other than additions: Uwe Becker, *Exegese des Alten Testaments*, 3rd ed. UTB 2664 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 86; Levin, *Old Testament*, 22–23; Reinhard Kratz, "Redaktionsgeschichte/Redaktionskritik I Altes Testament," *TRE* 28 (1997): 370, on the method of subtracting subsequent layers. In this volume we seek to demonstrate that other editorial interventions took place as well, albeit to a much lesser extent.

enough certainly to be scientifically viable, and that therefore redaction histories should not be reconstructed.[10] Beyond these extreme positions, the discussion has been too much on an abstract and theoretical level without considering actual documented cases from the perspective of their detectability. The skeptics of literary criticism have especially failed to demonstrate with a systematic approach that literary criticism cannot reach plausible results. Clearly, it is possible to gather a number of extremely challenging texts that could never be unraveled by literary criticism.[11] There is no doubt that such exist and some of the examples discussed in this volume underscore this. However, it is questionable whether the most challenging cases are representative of the whole. Only a more systematic study and evaluation of documented cases can provide a solid basis for the methodological discussion and thereby a way forward. This is one of the main purposes of this volume.

We will therefore ask in each analysis what can be learned from the case about the critic's possibilities of detecting the addition if the documented evidence for variant versions had not been available. Did the expansion leave any grammatical, formal, content-related, or other traces in the resulting text that would disclose the addition and allow the critic to reconstruct what happened to the text? The discussion will be conducted with the classic criteria of literary and redaction criticism in mind. We will ask, are they valid in principle at all, and if yes, should they, on the basis of documented evidence, be refined or improved in some ways.

2.3. Categories of Additions

Editorial expansions range from the addition of single words to the addition of entire passages. The various forms and types of additions differ in grammatical structure, origins, editorial technique, and detectability, and

---

10. This overconfidence is seen in many redaction critical reconstructions; e.g., by Uwe Becker, Christoph Berner, Christoph Levin, and Timo Veijola (see esp. Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium; Kapitel 1,1–16,17*, ATD 8.1 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004]). In recent discussions the position that we should not attempt reconstructions is especially voiced by Person and Rezetko, *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, 1–36, but many others imply a similar skepticism toward literary and redaction critical methods.

11. E.g., Kaufman, "Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," 29–43; to some extent Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, passim; and Person and Rezetko, *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, 1–36.

therefore they will be analyzed according to the following subcategories: (1) single words or short phrases (such as construct chains or prepositional phrases consisting of two or three words) that do not form complete clauses;[12] (2) syntactically complete clauses and sentences; (3) clusters of connected sentences containing short (sub)scenes, sections, or thematic digressions from the main line of thought; and (4) comprehensive passages that are relatively independent of their contexts (such as separate scenes, speeches, prayers, narratives, and quoted documents). To be sure, this categorization based on size is only an abstraction, and it is clear that ancient scribes did not work or think in these categories, and in some cases it also remains a matter of definition as to which category a case should be assigned. Nevertheless, these four categories, each with slightly different characteristics, background, and nature, provide a fruitful basis for investigating the documented evidence. The technique of adding is partly dependent on the length and syntactical character of the added element. Adding an entire new passage that forms a relatively independent subunit in a text differed technically from inserting a single word in a sentence. The textual evidence also shows that there are different grades of detectability. In a certain set of cases, additions were integrated seamlessly into their context, and it would be next to impossible to detect them without documented evidence. On the other hand, there are multiple cases where an addition clearly disturbed the grammar, style, structure, or logic of the context, which thus betray the addition. We will discuss the most apparent correlations that emerge from the analyses in the conclusions of this chapter.

2.4. Uneven Distribution of Documented Additions

Some books in the Hebrew Bible provide numerous documented examples of additions, whereas in other books textual variants are much more infrequent. Many illustrative examples of additions can be found in the historical books from Joshua to 2 Kings, as well as in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. As a great number of significant textual variants are between the MT and the LXX, the translation technique in a given book has a considerable impact

---

12. Theoretically, one could also mention the addition of single letters in this context. However, if a letter was added to a word so that it resulted in an entirely new meaning, such a process is better characterized as a replacement, for the older meaning was effectively replaced by a new one.

on our ability to reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and thus use this evidence to its full potential. A free or poor translation creates uncertainties about the exact Hebrew *Vorlage*, which thus diminishes our ability to use these data to compare readings. Therefore, evidence from particularly free translations will be limited in our examples. Fortunately, some Greek translations, such as that of Jeremiah, were rather faithful toward the Hebrew, which greatly enhances our ability to compare two variant editions written in different languages.[13] Many illustrative and clear examples of additions have thus been extracted from Jeremiah. In contrast, considerable uncertainties surround to the Greek translations of Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Job, although the MT and LXX versions of these books differ considerably and thus possibly contain important cases of editorial changes. In the historical books the translation techniques vary, but the Greek versions of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Kings are usually characterized as faithful translations that allow a fairly good understanding of the Hebrew *Vorlage*.[14] Accordingly, many examples from these books are analyzed as well. Clearly, the translation technique affects smaller additions more than larger additions. If an entire passage is missing in one of the witnesses, even a free translation would be usable for the present investigation. For example, the book of Esther, where the translation of both Greek versions is far from literal, still provides fruitful evidence of major additions, while smaller text-critical variants in Esther are often very complicated.

In the course of our review of the evidence it became clear that the documented evidence in the Pentateuch contains fewer additions than most other parts of the Hebrew Bible. This is particularly evident for the MT, but the SP and the LXX also appear to contain only a limited number of significant additions in the Pentateuch as far as the text-critical evidence is concerned. A notable exception to this is the harmonizations between passages, a large number of which can be found in both the LXX and the

---

13. For Jeremiah, see the examples in Georg Fischer, "7.3 Jeremiah," in Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, 7.3.5; http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0007030000, although he mostly explains the LXX variants as secondary abridgments.

14. On Joshua, see Seppo Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges Regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by waw and ki*, PFES 75 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999). On Kings, see Siegfried Kreuzer, "5.5 Septuagint (Kings)," in Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0005050000.

SP. Passages in Deuteronomy especially influenced parallel or related passages in Exodus and Numbers. Some harmonizing expansions can also be found in the MT, but they appear to be much less common than those in the SP and LXX.[15] Another notable exception to the low number of significant additions in the Pentateuch is the notoriously difficult ending of Exodus in chapters 25–40, which contains repeated differences between the MT and the LXX. The relationship between the MT and LXX remains controversial and cannot be solved in this investigation.[16] Despite the potentially significant number of additions and other editorial interventions in these chapters—especially if the much longer MT represents a generally later version as assumed by some scholars—they will not be discussed in this volume.[17]

---

15. For a summary of harmonizations in the Pentateuch, see Emanuel Tov, "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24," *TC* 22 (2017); https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101b, see esp. tables on pp. 15–16.

16. For a recent attempt to solve some of the problems in these chapters, see Brandon E. Bruning, "The Making of the Mishkan: The Old Greek Text of Exodus 35-40 and the Literary History of the Pentateuch" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2014).

17. A still useful comparison of the MT and LXX versions can be found in Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua)* (London: MacMillan, 1886), 76–80.

3
Additions: Single Words and Short Phrases

The additions in view here are single words or short phrases such as prepositional or genitival phrases that were inserted into a given text by a second hand. They may be added suffixes, conjunctions, appositions, genitives, prepositional phrases, subjects, objects, and so on. Because of their brevity, very small additions often can be well integrated into the existing syntactical structures. It is thus to be expected that they are generally difficult to detect without documented evidence for the older version.

Most minor additions in the Hebrew Bible seem to add little in terms of substance, and often the information they contain has been derived, directly or indirectly, from a related text by means of a harmonization, from another part of the same composition, or from the immediate context. Added patronyms, titles, and subjects stand out as a prominent group of such additions. For example, added patronyms rarely add new information, as the patronym is mostly mentioned elsewhere in the text and the addition merely repeats it, often unnecessarily. Genesis 36:39, which is part of a list of the kings of Edom in 36:31–39, is a typical example. The MT and LXX of this verse mention that the king who died was Baal-Hanan son of Achbor (וימת בעל חנן בן עכבור), whereas the SP (וימת בעל חנן), probably preserving the original text here, does not include the patronym (בן עכבור) and refers only to Baal-Hanan. The patronym is unnecessary in 36:39, since the preceding verse has already mentioned that Baal-Hanan was son of Achbor. Notably, in the same verse the LXX also adds the patronym of Hadad (Hadar), who was Baal-Hanan's successor, whereas the MT and SP lack this information.[1] This example from one verse highlights how fre-

---

1. The LXX reads ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ Αραδ υἱὸς Βαραδ, "Hadad son of Barad reigned in his stead," while the MT reads וימלך תחתיו הדר, "Hadar succeeded him as king." Note that the LXX of 36:39 refers to Hadad, whereas the MT/SP of this verse call this king Hadar. It is possible that the patronym Barad was mistakenly taken

quently patronyms and similar information could have been added (e.g., in the MT of Gen 36:18; cf. LXX). Examples of added patronyms can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible. In some cases, the logic behind added patronyms is difficult to grasp, but evidence shows that later scribes had a tendency to unnecessarily supplement this information. Many examples of this phenomenon can be found in the book of Jeremiah and will be discussed in more detail in the analyses.

Similar to added patronyms, one of the most common types of very small additions is the secondarily added titles, which are abundantly witnessed in the textual evidence of Jeremiah, but are also found throughout the Hebrew Bible. The title was often deduced from another part of the composition, but was added to places where it was unnecessary to repeat. In the death account of King Josiah in 2 Kgs 23:29, in the LXX, which probably preserves the more original text here, Josiah is merely called by his name. The MT adds his title and refers to him as King Josiah (המלך יאשיהו), although it is unequivocally clear from the context that Josiah is king. On the other hand, the same verse contains an addition in the LXX as well. According to the MT, "King Josiah went toward him, and he killed him in Megiddo when he saw him" (וילך המלך יאשיהו לקראתו וימיתהו במגדו כראתו אתו). Although it is evidently Josiah who goes to meet Pharaoh Neco and whom Neco kills, the sentence is slightly ambiguous with the succession of suffixes. A scribe behind the LXX tradition therefore added Neco's name: "Josias went out to meet him and Neco slew him in Megiddo when he saw him" (ἐπορεύθη Ἰωσίας εἰς ἀπαντὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτὸν Νεχαὼ ἐν Μαγεδδὼ ἐν τῷ ἰδεῖν αὐτόν). Comparable clarifying additions of subjects or objects have been added throughout the Hebrew Bible.

Not all very small additions are inconsequential. Sometimes they slightly altered the impression the text gives, without essentially changing the meaning. For example, the older text may have referred to Israel or the Israelites, while a later editor added the word עדה, "congregation," which gave the impression of an essentially religious community, an aspect that may have been missing in the original text. Such additions can be found, for example, in the MT versions of Num 1:53; 17:6 (16:41 ET); 27:20; and 1 Kgs 8:5; in these cases the LXX lacks the reference, probably preserving an earlier stage of the text. In Num 17:6 [16:41 ET], a further minor

---

from 36:35, although this is clearly a different king. Notably 1 Chr 1:50 also refers to Hadad son of Barad as the successor of Baal-Hanan thus following the LXX reading of Gen 36:39.

addition contributed to the changed impression. In the Greek text "the Israelites rebelled" (Καὶ ἐγόγγυσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ) against Moses, whereas in the MT the "whole congregation of the Israelites rebelled" (וילנו כל עדת בני ישראל) against him. The addition thus highlights the seriousness and totality of the rebellion.

First Kings 8:5 is a good example of several minor additions in a brief text. Apparently all additions have taken place in the proto-MT. The LXX is concise and tells that the king sacrificed with all of Israel; the MT secondarily adds the king's name, although it is unequivocally clear from the context that it was Solomon. As in Num 17:6, the MT also defines Israel as a congregation (עדת ישראל), while the LXX only refers to Israel. There is also a slightly larger addition, which further specifies that the congregation consisted of those who were assembled with Solomon, but since they are said to be sacrificing before the ark, this has probably been deduced from the text; the implicit was made explicit:[2]

1 Kgs 8:5 MT	1 Kgs 8:5 LXX
והמלך שלמה וכל עדת ישראל הנועדים עליו אתו	καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ
לפני הארון מזבחים צאן ובקר	ἔμπροσθεν τῆς κιβωτοῦ θύοντες πρόβατα καὶ βόας
אשר לא יספרו ולא ימנו מרב	ἀναρίθμητα.
King Solomon, and all the congregation of Israel, that were assembled unto him, were before the ark, sacrificing sheep and oxen that could not be counted nor numbered for multitude.	The king, and all Israel were before the ark, sacrificing sheep and oxen without number.

The MT of 1 Kgs 8:5 is clearly expansive, but the added substance is limited, because the information in the pluses can be found or deduced from the older text.[3] Although it is rare that so many small additions are docu-

---

2. Some Greek manuscripts (especially Codex Alexandrinus) also contain the pluses of the MT, but these are clearly later harmonizations toward the proto-MT text, and were unlikely to have been included in the Old Greek and its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

3. Thus many scholars, such as Bernhard Stade and Friedrich Schwally, *The Books of Kings: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text Printed in Colors Exhibiting the Composite Structure of the Books*, Sacred Books of the Old Testament 9 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), 100; Martin J. Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 385–86. According to Mulder, the MT "has a number of additions which are closely related to P."

mented in just one verse, the additions are comparable in technique and context to those in other parts of the Hebrew Bible.

In each analyzed case it is important to seek the motive of the addition, although in some cases it may not be apparent. A major challenge concerning very small additions is their detectability. We will ask: How well could they be detected without documented evidence? Did the addition leave any traces for an editorial intervention? This question will be brought up in connection with each example text. We will also ask what the most probable technique was with which the addition was made. Was it an isolated supralinear or marginal addition or was the addition part of an intentional redaction? Was it intended to be included in the text in the first place?

3.1. Genesis 14:22

Genesis 14:17–24 tells the story of Abram's encounter with the king of Sodom and king Melchizedek of Salem after Abram had defeated Chedorlaomer and his allies (14:17). Melchizedek, introduced as a priest of El Elyon ("God Most High"), blesses Abram by "El Elyon, maker of heaven and earth" (14:19). The scene is concluded by a brief dialogue between the king of Sodom and Abram concerning the goods and the people left from Chedorlaomer and his allies (14:21–24). In the dialogue, Abram swears by oath not to take any of the Sodomite goods into his possession, although the Sodomite king promised them to him (14:21–24). A small but significant textual variant occurs in Abram's opening words in 14:22. The MT identifies El Elyon, the god of Melchizedek, with Yahweh, while the LXX and Peshitta lack the reference to Yahweh. Instead of Yahweh, the SP refers to "(the) God" (האלהים). The targumim and the Vulgate follow the MT. The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Gen 14:22 MT	Gen 14:22 LXX	Gen 14:22 Peshitta
הרימתי ידי אל <u>יהוה</u> אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ	Ἐκτενῶ τὴν χεῖρά μου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον, ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν	ܐܪܝܡܬ ܐܝܕܝ, ܠܗܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܝܡܐ ܕܩܢܐ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܐܪܥܐ.
I have lifted my hand to <u>Yahweh</u>, God Most High, maker of heaven and earth	I will extend my hand to God Most High, who created the heaven and the earth	I have lifted my hand to God Most High, maker of heaven and earth

The shorter reading in the LXX and Peshitta is supported by a parallel to Gen 14:22 in the Genesis Apocryphon, an Aramaic paraphrase of the biblical narrative (1Q20 22:20–21):

<div dir="rtl">מרים אנה ידי יומא דן לאל עליון מרה שמיא וארעא</div>

I lift my hand and swear this day by God Most High, the Lord of heaven and earth.[4]

Although the Genesis Apocryphon does not follow the Hebrew text word for word, it seems likely that its source text also did not refer to Yahweh, for its intentional omission in Abram's proclamation would be difficult to explain. It is more likely that the source text shared the shorter reading with the LXX against the MT (and the SP). The three witnesses, the LXX, the Peshitta, and the Genesis Apocryphon, would thus go back to a textual tradition that did not identify Yahweh with El Elyon and that only referred to El Elyon in this verse. The Hebrew text behind this tradition probably read as follows:

<div dir="rtl">הרימתי ידי אל אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ</div>

I have lifted my hand to El Elyon/God Most High, maker of heaven and earth.

It is likely that the plus in the MT, the divine name Yahweh (יהוה), is the result of an intentional addition, the reason for which is apparent.[5] Yahweh had called Abram out of his homeland (Gen 12:1), had spoken to him more than once (Gen 12:1–4, 7; 13:14–17), and Abram had started to venerate Yahweh (Gen 12:7; 13:18). The patriarchal stories portray Yahweh as Abram's God. The shorter text in Gen 14:22 presents a theologically problematic picture where Abram swears to a deity who was not explicitly

---

4. Translation by Martin C. Abegg, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, by Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook, rev. ed. (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996).

5. Thus many since early research; e.g., August Dillmann, *Genesis, Critically and Exegetically Expounded* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897), 52; Samuel R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis: With Introduction and Notes* (London: Methuen, 1904), 166; John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), 271; Charles James Ball, *The Book of Genesis: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text Printed in Colors Exhibiting the Composite Structure of the Book*, Sacred Books of the Old Testament 1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896), 63.

identified as Yahweh. It gives the impression that Abram simply repeated from the mouth of Melchizedek the divine name and epithet אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ "God Most High, maker of heaven and earth" without confessing that he adhered to Yahweh. Since El Elyon can be understood as the name of a different deity—which it, in fact, originally was—it seems logical that a later scribe would try to remove any possibility that Abram pays homage and swears in the name of a god other than Yahweh.[6] Note that in Gen 14:19–20 Melchizedek addresses אל עליון, but in these verses Yahweh is not mentioned and there are no similar text-critical variants between the witnesses, which clearly indicates that the problem was in Abram paying homage to אל עליון. The secondary nature of the MT reading is further suggested by the fact that the SP reads האלהים, "(the) God" instead. This reading may be the result of a secondary replacement of the proto-MT's יהוה "Yahweh," by which this name was interpreted as referring to the one and single God of the earth. At the same time, the textual tradition attested by the SP avoids the impression that Abram had profaned the divine name in his conversation with the pagan king.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. One could alternatively assume that the shorter reading is the result of an unintentional or intentional omission. An accidental scribal error of one word can hardly ever be completely excluded, but it would be quite a coincidence that it took place in a word of such theological importance. There is a slight possibility that the omission of יהוה "Yahweh" would have been triggered by the graphically identical words אל "to" and אל "El/God." However, in this case, one would rather expect that either the preposition or the divine name אל would have been omitted in the process as well (homoioarchton). Moreover, it does not seem likely that a scribe would accidentally skip over the Tetragrammaton that reads like a theological climax to the passage.

An intentional omission is another theoretical possibility. One could argue that a later editor was offended by Abram's identification of Yahweh with El Elyon, a god who was perhaps known to be worshiped by non-Israelites, or that he wanted to avoid that Abram revealed the holy name of Yahweh to non-Israelites. This is not a completely impossible hypothesis, but it seems unlikely for several reasons. If a later editor was theologi-

---

6. For El Elyon as a different deity, see E. E. Elnes and P. D. Miller, "ELYON עליון," *DDD*, 293–99.

cally offended or concerned by the use of Yahweh in this context, a more substantial revision of the passage would have been a more logical consequence. The hypothesis that only the name of Yahweh was removed would assume that in an earlier version Abram confessed his adherence to Yahweh, which was later revised so that Abram by using a pagan creed concealed being a follower of Yahweh. This is a highly unlikely development. If a later scribe had resorted to omissions for theological reasons, it would be more probable that the reference to the pagan deity had been removed. One should further note that omissions are radical interventions in the text that are not done lightly, and in this case, it would also mean the omission of the divine name.[7] Consequently, it is likely that the shorter reading in the LXX, Peshitta, and Genesis Apocryphon should be given priority, while the longer MT and SP readings result from a later addition.[8]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The secondary addition of Yahweh in Gen 14:22 seems to be unconnected to other additions. It could have been added between the lines by a reflective reader with a pen, but it could also derive from a copyist, who—perhaps spontaneously— wanted to avoid the offence that Abram simply repeated a divine epithet from the pagans without confessing his adherence to Yahweh.[9] According to Charles James Ball, the change is more intentional and derives from a redactor.[10] In any case, the addition does not seem to be part of a wider theological redaction that sought to emphasize that El Elyon is identical with Yahweh, for Yahweh's name is otherwise missing in the entire chapter and there are no signs of other related theological corrections in the passage. The original narrative may have implied that El Elyon is no one else than Yahweh, since עליון "the Highest One" seems to be used as a title for Yahweh in many other passages in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Num 24:16; Pss 18:14; 21:8; 47:3; 97:8). This would have been made explicit by the addition of יהוה. Similar additions that make implicit explicit are rather typical in the Hebrew Bible. At any rate, from the perspective of religious history,

---

7. See Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 384–85.

8. Some scholars, such as Heinrich Holzinger, *Genesis*, KHC 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr Siebeck, 1898), 146, merely note the variant reading without evaluating its relationship with the MT/SP reading.

9. For the addition as an interlinear one, see, e.g., Driver, *Genesis*, 166, who suggests that the addition was probably made by "a later glossator."

10. Ball, *Genesis*, 63.

this small addition is significant because it explicitly identifies two origi-
nally different deities.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Would it be possible to suspect that
Yahweh in the MT of Gen 14:22 was added later, if the shorter reading
had not been preserved? The addition of the word did not create a gram-
matical inconsistency, although the sequence יהוה אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ
"Yahweh, God Most High, maker of heaven and earth" may appear some-
what congested. One would also note that this is the only verse that refers
to Yahweh in the entire chapter. However, these observations would prob-
ably not be enough to suspect an addition. In fact, Abram's confession to
Yahweh in 14:22 can be read as a theological climax of the chapter, after
the divine name El Elyon and the epithet "maker of heaven and earth"
have been referred to before more than once (14:18, 19, 20). A similar
climactic revelation of יהוה can be found in the "Elohistic" Gen 22:14–15.[11]
In addition, Yahweh and Elyon, "the Highest One" are often implicitly or
explicitly identified in the Hebrew Bible, and only rarely (such as in Deut
32:8 LXX; Isa 14:14) a critical reader may suspect that they were originally
regarded as separate deities. Thus, it would have been difficult to find clear
and cogent arguments that the name יהוה had been added later in Gen
14:22. The same cannot be said of the SP reading אלהים אל עליון, which is
peculiar and would more likely evoke the critic's suspicions.

Results. The shorter version of Gen 14:22 attested by the LXX, the Peshitta,
and 1Q20 indicates that the divine name יהוה "Yahweh" in the MT and the
term האלהים "(the) God" in the SP go back to a secondary expansion in
Gen 14:22, SP's reading probably resulting from a further replacement of
יהוה "Yahweh" with האלהים "(the) God." The additions demonstrate how
minor interventions can have a large theological impact on an entire pas-
sage. The connection between Yahweh and the epithet "El Elyon, maker of
heaven and earth," put in the mouth of a non-Yahwistic or pagan priestly
king, was theologically significant, and it was occasioned by merely adding
one word. This also created a nice theological climax to the passage. With-
out textual evidence, it would have been difficult to detect this one-word
interpolation.

---

11. It is worth noticing that here also a textual tradition seems to have existed that
had the word אלהים "God" instead of יהוה "Yahweh" in Gen 22:14, as indicated by the
fragmentary Qumran manuscript 4Q1 (4QGen-Exodᵃ).

3.2. Genesis 31:53

Genesis 31:44–55 deals with the covenant that Jacob and Laban made before they separated. After piling a heap of stones and setting up a pillar, Laban speaks to Jacob about the importance of the heap and the pillar and says that God will judge between them if either one will do or plan harm against the other (31:51–53). The MT, SP, and LXX contain an interesting text-critical variant, which discloses (a) later addition(s) with a theological aspect. The MT and the SP are expansive in relation to the LXX. The Vulgate and the targumim follow the MT, while the SP has a separate reading.

Gen 31:53 SP	Gen 31:53 MT	Gen 31:53–54a LXX
אלהי אברהם ואלהי נחור	אלהי אברהם ואלהי נחור	[53]ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ναχὼρ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν.
ישפט בינינו <u>אלהי אברהם</u> וישבע יעקב בפחד אביו יצחק	ישפטו בינינו <u>אלהי אביהם</u> וישבע יעקב בפחד אביו יצחק	[54]καὶ ὤμοσεν Ἰακὼβ κατὰ τοῦ φόβου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰσαάκ.
The god of Abraham and the god of Nahor will judge between us—<u>the god of Abraham</u>. Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac.	The god of Abraham and the god of Nahor will judge between us—<u>the god of their father</u>. Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac.	[53]The god of Abraham and the god of Nahor will judge between us. [54]Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac.

It is probable that the MT plus אלהי אביהם, "the god of their father" as well as the SP plus אלהי אברהם, "the god of Abraham" are later additions, while the shorter LXX preserves the more original text (although it is not completely original, as we will see).[12] This is suggested by the following considerations. The pluses are very poorly connected to the sentence or at least ill placed. One receives the impression that they were originally intended as marginal glosses or supralinear additions that were later inserted into a wrong place. The more natural location would be immedi-

---

12. Thus many since early research, e.g., Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1889), 43; Dillmann, *Genesis*, 268; Driver, *Genesis*, 289; Skinner, *Genesis*, 402; Holzinger, *Genesis*, 207; Ball, *Genesis*, 90.

ately after the word Nahor, although it would still be somewhat awkward. In any case, the plus provides a clarification for what exactly was meant by the two references to אלהים in the preceding text. This leads us to the motive: Why were the clarifications needed in the first place?

The sentence before the plus seems to imply that the god of Abraham and the god of Nahor were two different deities (אלהי אברהם ואלהי נחור), which would denote a polytheistic background. Otherwise one would expect the reading to be אלהי אברהם ונחור "god of Abraham and Nahor." The pluses in the SP and the MT avoid this problem by specifically defining who this god was. In the SP, he is said to be the god of Abraham, thus explicitly a single god. The MT plus is more subtle, as it refers to the father of Nahor and Abraham, who were brothers and had the same father. This would provide an explanation to the reader why the text first refers to two gods; the addition in the MT insinuates that the gods of Nahor and Abraham must have been the same god, because they had the same father. The addition in the SP makes this explicit.

A polytheistic background is further substantiated by the plural verb ישפטו "they will judge" in the MT. It is notable that the SP as well as the Greek solve the problem by rendering the verb in the singular ישפט and κρινεῖ "he will judge," thus identifying the two gods. The plural is probably original, for it is unlikely that the verb would have been secondarily changed to a plural. Apparently all MT, SP, and LXX readings have solved the implied polytheism of the original text in different ways. Some Greek manuscripts have yet another but separate secondary reading: Instead of ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ναχώρ, "the god of Abraham and the god of Nahor," manuscripts of the group 44–125 read ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ναχώρ, "the god of Abraham and Nahor." By omitting the second references to god, the text effectively identified the gods of Abraham and Nahor as the same god. These different and at least in part independent editorial interventions highlight that there was a theological problem with the original text. Since the LXX version was also edited by changing the verb into singular, none of the preserved readings contains the original text in full. The change of the plural to singular in the LXX may have taken place in the translation process, for a translator could have instinctively assumed that the text must refer to a single god. One should further note that the MT and SP pluses may be connected, for otherwise it is difficult to explain why both have solved the problem in a similar way by placing the expansion in a very awkward location in the sentence. It is very possible that the SP reading is dependent on the MT but contains a further development: By

the change of the letter י with the letter ר—intentionally or by accidentally misreading it—it became even clearer that only one god was meant. In any case, all these variant readings can be explained as attempts to avoid the theological problem in the original text.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The alternatives to the secondary nature of the MT and SP pluses are their unintentional or intentional omissions, but there are no technical reasons to support an unintentional omission by haplography. One would still have to explain why the verb number differs and why there were further attempts to change the text in some Greek manuscripts. The numerous variants in this verse preclude the possibility that the changes were accidental.

An intentional omission in the LXX could have been justified by the very awkward position of the plus. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that one would have merely omitted these words, because this would have changed the text to be more polytheistic. This explanation would also leave open the question of why the MT uses a plural verb if the original text only referred to one god. One would then have to assume an unrelated textual change. The most likely explanation to all the different variants is that there were several attempts to avoid the implied polytheism of the original text.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It is unclear whether the MT and SP additions were intended to be included in the main text, for there does not appear to have been a proper attempt to integrate the addition with the main sentence. It would have been much easier to accomplish the same result by altering the verb to the singular, as is done in Greek and/or by omitting the second reference to god, as is done in some Greek manuscripts. This would have necessitated the omission of one word and/or one letter only. Unless the letters would have been scraped off the manuscript surface, this would only have been possible in the course of reproducing the entire manuscript. Since a more awkward solution has been found, it is probable that we are dealing with a marginal gloss or a supralinear addition by a scribe who did not reproduce the whole text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the shorter reading in the LXX it would have been relatively easy to recognize the MT or SP pluses as later additions. They are so awkwardly connected to the sentence that one would probably suspect an original marginal gloss that was poorly placed.

One would also notice that in the MT the verb is in the plural, which contradicts the idea that the gods are one, as implied by the MT plus. The motive for the addition would also be apparent. Polytheistic vestiges have been detected in various parts of the Hebrew Bible, which contradicts the later monolatric or monotheistic contexts of later scribes. The literary critic would thus also be able to reconstruct the original text.

Results. The MT and the SP of Gen 31:53 contain awkward additions that may originally derive from a marginal gloss or a supralinear addition that was not necessarily even meant to be included in the main text. Because of obvious problems, it is very likely that even without the shorter text as preserved in the LXX a critic would have been able to detect the addition in the MT. The original motive for the addition was apparently an attempt to avoid polytheistic conceptions in the older text.

3.3. Exodus 3:1

Exodus 3 describes how Yahweh appeared to Moses at Horeb in the desert. According to the MT, the theophany took place at the mount of God (הר האלהים) at Horeb, whereas the LXX refers to Mount Horeb (τὸ ὄρος Χωρηβ). The grammatical function of the place Horeb differs in the two versions. Whereas in the MT Horeb is the place where Moses went to (חרבה) and thus the location of the mountain, in the LXX Horeb is the name of the mountain. Some Greek manuscripts (Cambridge: F^{b}Mbcdi*km-qs-xza2d2) and daughter translations (Armenian, Old Latin, etc.) follow the MT reading, but this is probably due to a later harmonization toward the proto-MT. The Old Greek seems to have lacked the reference.[13] The Samaritan Pentateuch, Peshitta (ܠܛܘܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܚܘܪܝܒ), and the Vulgate (*ad montem Dei Horeb*) follow the MT. The targumim are clearly dependent on the MT but contain further interpretations, which may reveal what is taking place in this passage. For example, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan reads ואתא לטוורא דאיתגלי עלוי יקרא דייי לחורב, "he came to the mountain, on which the glory of the Lord was revealed, to Horeb." The passage is not preserved among the Exodus manuscripts of Qumran.

---

13. See the Göttingen edition of LXX Exodus, which assumes that the shorter reading is original.

Exod 3:1 MT	Exod 3:1 LXX
ומשה היה רעה את צאן יתרו חתנו כהן מדין וינהג את הצאן אחר המדבר ויבא אל הר <u>האלהים</u> חרבה	Καὶ Μωυσῆς ἦν ποιμαίνων τὰ πρόβατα Ιοθορ τοῦ γαμβροῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερέως Μαδιαμ καὶ ἤγαγεν τὰ πρόβατα ὑπὸ τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος Χωρηβ.
Moses was keeping the sheep of his father-in-law Jethro, the priest of Midian; he led the sheep beyond the wilderness and came to the mount <u>of God</u>, to Horeb.	Moses was keeping the sheep of his father-in-law Jethro, the priest of Midian, and he led the sheep beyond the wilderness and came to the mount of Horeb.

It is probable that the MT reading is the result of a minor addition, while the LXX preserves the original reading.[14] This is suggested by the following considerations: The mountain is called the mountain of God in Exod 4:27; 18:5; 24:13 and this applies to both the MT and the LXX. The reason for the missing reference in Exod 3:1 is that Yahweh had not yet appeared to Moses. The other passages that mention the mountain are after the first theophany has already taken place. From the perspective of narrative consistency, it would have been anachronistic to call the place God's mountain before the theophany.[15] That the place is special comes as a surprise to Moses, who has come there merely to tend Jethro's flock. The original author is more inclined to recognize and keep the narrative consistency than a later editor, for whom Horeb is generally known as a holy place and the mountain of God. Reading a text where this information was missing, a later scribe would be more prone to make an anachronistic addition. Another possible trigger for the addition could have been the immediate context in Exod 3:5, where the place or the ground is called holy.

One should also note that the LXX reading corresponds to Exod 33:6, where also the MT refers to Mount Horeb (הר חורב). This verse thus shows

---

14. William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 183, considers this as one possibility (as do other scholars) but does not give a definite evaluation of the different possibilities.

15. E.g., James Murphy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866), 28, who does not consider the LXX reading at all, has difficulties explaining why the place was called a holy mountain before the theophany happened there.

that the LXX reading τὸ ὄρος Χωρηβ is a plausible alternative reading in Exod 3:1 that would probably go back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* הר חורב like in Exod 33:6 (or הר חרבה with the accusative of direction). A further argument in favor of the LXX is the fact that omissions are much less frequent than additions, particularly in the Pentateuch, and were usually undertaken only in cases where the text contained something highly problematic that could not have been left in the text or could not have been avoided by other editorial interventions. This is not the case with Exod 3:1.

Last but not least, an almost identical text-critical variant is found in 1 Kgs 19:8, which also refers to Mount Horeb in the LXX, while the MT has a plus with which the place is called mount of God, Horeb:

1 Kgs 19:8 MT	1 Kgs 19:8 LXX
ויקם ויאכל וישתה וילך בכח האכילה ההיא ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה עד הר <u>האלהים</u> חרב	καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν· καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι τῆς βρώσεως ἐκείνης τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας ἕως ὄρους Χωρηβ.
He got up, and ate, and drank; and he went in the strength of that food forty days and forty nights to the mount <u>of God</u>, Horeb.	He got up, ate, and drank, and he went in the strength of that food forty days and forty nights as far as Mount Horeb.

A similar motive is probably behind both the MT addition in Exod 3:1 and 1 Kgs 19:8: Horeb had become to be known as the Mount of God. In 1 Kgs 19 there would be no apparent reason to omit the reference, because the theophany had already taken place long before Elijah's time. Consequently, it is very likely that the LXX preserves the original reading in Exod 3:1 and 1 Kgs 19:8, while the MT readings contain later additions.[16]

---

16. E.g., Heinrich Holzinger, *Exodus*, KHC 2 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), 10, notes that "die Bezeichnung greift vor." Although some, such as Rudolf Kittel, *Die Bücher der Könige*, HKAT 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), 151, have noted the LXX reading, most commentators do not regard the LXX as preserving the more original text in 1 Kgs 19:8. A number of commentators make no mention of the LXX variant in Exod 3:1, e.g., Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967), 31; and Carol Meyers, *Exodus*, NCBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 52. The same appears to be the case for the LXX reading in 1 Kgs 19:8, e.g., Gwilym H. Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 330–31; Volkmar Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, CC (Minneapolis:

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Although an acciden-
tal omission behind the LXX reading in Exod 3:1 cannot be completely
excluded, a nearly identical variant in 1 Kgs 19:8 strongly suggests that this
is not the case. There are also no technical considerations, such as homoio-
teleuton or homoioarchton, that would have triggered the omission of the
word האלהים or τοῦ θεοῦ.[17]

One could argue that the LXX reading is the result of an intentional
omission, and the motive for this would have been the anachronistic
reference to God's mountain before he had appeared to Moses.[18] This
theory would imply that the original author anachronistically referred to
the mount of God, which was then later corrected by an editor. This is a
theoretical possibility, but it is more likely that the original author was
better familiar of the narrative logic than a later scribe or glossator, who
is already looking at a finished narrative and who has come to know the
place as God's mountain. One would then also have to explain why the
original author had made such an anachronistic reference. Moreover, this
argument cannot be used for 1 Kgs 19:8, since it clearly takes place much
after the theophany.

James Montgomery has suggested that the LXX reading is an inten-
tional omission, "for Sion was the Mount of God."[19] This suggestion is
problematic, since the LXX only lacks one reference to the mount of God
in Exodus, while elsewhere it shares the reading with the MT (Exod 4:27;
18:5; 24:13). In view of the Pentateuch where Mount Horeb has a very
central position, it seems very unlikely that the motive for omission could
have been the challenge it poses to Mount Sion. Nevertheless, Cornelis
Houtman apparently takes it for granted that the LXX is not original and

---

Fortress, 2003), 196–97; and Marvin A. Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, OTL (Louisville:
Westminster John Knox, 2007), 218–20, 231.

17. According to Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 183, "a parablepsis … between *hr* and *ḥrbh*"
could have occurred, but he also notes that the result would have been "an impossible
ʾl ḥrbh."

18. Thus, e.g., Bruno Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, HKAT 1.2 (Göttin-
gen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 19, who notes that the scribe was offended by
the reference to God's mountain before the theophany. Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 183, also
mentions this as a possibility. Baentsch does not seem to consider the possibility that
the LXX is original.

19. James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of
Kings*, ICC (New York: Scribner, 1951), 317.

writes: "The LXX left האלהים untranslated; why is not clear."[20] Daniel Gurtner similarly notes "Exod alters the MT's 'mountain of God, Horeb' to simply read 'the mountain of Chōrēb,' omitting, curiously, reference to God (האלהים)."[21] The possible originality of the LXX appears to be neglected.

Approaching the text from a literary-critical perspective, Christoph Levin has suggested that אל הר האלהים is a later addition and that the original text only read ויבא חרבה, "he came to the wilderness." He thus understands the word חרב as a reference to "wasteland" and not to a place-name Horeb.[22] This is an interesting theory, but it is undocumented and fails to provide any explanation to the LXX reading. If the LXX preserves the older text, Levin's redaction critical reconstruction is undermined.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Although the MT addition in Exod 3:1 consists of one word, it had considerable impact in its immediate context. The mountain became theologized before the narrative gave any reason why it is an important place. This change is part of the gradual development where Horeb and the events connected to the theophany became more and more central. Such a development is reflected in the targumic readings, which further add details highlighting that this is the place of the theophany (see above). In a separate development, many passages in the Hebrew Bible connect the name Horeb with Israel's covenant with God (thus, e.g., Deut 5:2; 29:1; 1 Kgs 8:9). The mountain and the place-name Horeb were gradually loaded with more and more theological implications. The addition in Exod 3:1 can be seen in view of this development.

There is no evidence that the addition was part of a wider redaction. Similar changes were not made systematically elsewhere in Exodus, which suggests that we may be dealing with an isolated, perhaps a spontaneous addition. It would have been technically possible to make the addition between the lines or in the margin, from where it was later adopted as part of the main text, but it could also have resulted as part of a copying process where a scribe was inclined to make small interpretive additions.

20. Cornelis Houtman, *Exodus: Chapters 7:14–19:25*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 335.

21. Daniel M. Gurtner, *Exodus: A Commentary on the Greek Text of Codex Vaticanus*, BSCS (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 198.

22. Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist*, FRLANT 157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 326–31.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the LXX reading it would have been difficult to detect the addition in the MT of Exod 3:1. One would certainly note that the passage refers to the mount of God before any theophany had happened. James Murphy's evaluation of the text is a case in point. Evidently neglecting or even being unaware of the LXX reading, he seeks to explain why it could be called mountain of God already before the theophany. He writes: "This range of hills earned this name, if not from some previous manifestation of God, yet from the signal displays of his presence and power which are about to be narrated."[23] Such explanations are unnecessary when the LXX reading is appreciated. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that without the LXX the critic would have been led to the assumption that the word "God" was added. The MT text is in line with other passages in Exodus where it is called the mount of God, and one would probably have assumed that the narrator regarded the place God's mountain regardless of the theophany. There is also no syntactic or grammatical problem in Exod 3:1 and therefore it seems unlikely that on the basis of the MT alone one would have been able to conjecture the original reading as preserved in the LXX.

Results. The MT plus in Exod 3:1 is probably the result of a minor addition that anachronistically theologized Horeb as "the mountain of God" before any theophany had happened. It may have been a spontaneous addition between the lines that neglected the narrative sequence. On the basis of the MT reading alone, it would have been very difficult to detect the addition and nearly impossible to reconstruct the original reading.

3.4. Deuteronomy 26:17

The Hebrew Bible contains a variety of very small additions that refer to the Torah, the commandments, the covenant, or related concepts. These additions are part of a gradual increase in the importance of the Torah in guiding the actions or events described in the text. Such additions are witnessed by the text-critical evidence in the Pentateuch (e.g., in Deut 28:15) as well as in other parts of the Hebrew Bible (e.g., 1 Kgs 18:18; 19:10; Ezra 10:3).[24] Some of the additions (such as Deut 26:17) build on the already-

---

23. Murphy, *Exodus*, 28.

24. In all these cases the MT contains the secondary expansion, whereas the LXX has preserved the more original reading (1 Esdras in Ezra 10:3).

existing nomism in the older text and develop it further, while others (such as Josh 1:7) introduce the Torah or its trappings as a new aspect. Examples of both cases will be analyzed in detail.

In Deut 26:17 Moses reminds the Israelites of the agreement between Yahweh and Israel: In exchange for Yahweh's promise to be their God, the Israelites have promised to follow his law and to obey him. In reference to the law, the MT uses three terms common in Deuteronomy, statutes, commandments, and ordinances, whereas the SP and LXX only use two of them. The targumim and the Peshitta follow the MT. The verse is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Deut 26:17 MT	Deut 26:17 SP	Deut 26:17 LXX
את יהוה האמרת היום להיות לך לאלהים וללכת בדרכיו	את יהוה האמרת היום להיות לך לאלהים וללכת בדרכיו	τὸν θεὸν εἵλου σήμερον εἶναί σου θεὸν καὶ πορεύεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ
ולשמר חקיו	ולשמר חקיו	καὶ φυλάσσεσθαι τὰ δικαιώματα
<u>ומצותיו</u> <u>ומשפטיו</u> ולשמע בקלו	<u>ומצותיו</u> ולשמע בקולו	<u>καὶ τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ ὑπακούειν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ
Today you have obtained Yahweh's agreement:[25] to be your God; and for you to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, <u>and his commandments, and his ordinances</u>, and to obey him.	Today you have obtained Yahweh's agreement: to be your God; and for you to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, <u>and his commandments,</u> and to obey him.	Today you have obtained Yahweh's agreement: to be your God; and for you to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, <u>and his ordi-nances,</u> and to obey him.

The SP version is lacking the ומשפטיו "and his ordinances" of the MT, whereas the LXX lacks an equivalent of ומצותיו "and his commandments." In Deuteronomy the Greek word δικαίωμα is usually a rendering of the Hebrew חק (thus in Deut 4:1, 5, 8; 5:1, 31; 6:2, 20; 8:11; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16;

---

25. This harmonistic translation by the NRSV is certainly questionable, but for the sake of convenience it is retained since we do not investigate the אמר *hiphil* phrase in this context.

27:10; 28:45),[26] whereas the word κρίμα usually renders the Hebrew משפט (thus in Deut 4:1, 8; 5:1, 31; 6:1, 20; 7:11; 8:11; 21:22; 26:16; 32:41). Most commonly the Hebrew word מצוה is translated with the Greek word ἐντολή (in Deut 4:40; 5:29; 6:2; 7:9; 8:2, 11; 11:13; 13:5, 19; 26:13, 18; 27:10), but there are some exceptions, such as πρόσταγμα (Deut 5:10) and κρίσις (Deut 11:1). Although the Hebrew for these three central words may have been translated using different Greek words, the translator does not seem to have confused the words between each other. Consequently, it is probable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek was missing the Hebrew ומצותיו.[27]

This leads us to several alternative explanations for the variants between the MT, LXX, and SP, and it is not obvious what was the original reading. The first suspicion would be that the list containing all three is secondary, because there would be a natural tendency to supplement the list with elements found in other passages. Often used synonymously in Deuteronomy, they are most commonly met in pairs, but also alone and in a list of all three (Deut 8:11; 11:1; 26:17; 30:16).[28]

It is possible that the word מצוה was originally used in the singular to refer to the whole law, that is, to the statutes and ordinances listed in the law. It is used in this way in Deut 5:31; 6:1; 7:11. According to Timo Veijola, these three passages belong to an earlier stage in the development of the book.[29] For example, Deut 6:1 reads וזאת המצוה החקים והמשפטים אשר צוה יהוה אלהיכם "This is the commandment—the statutes and the ordinances—that Yahweh your God commanded.…" In the later transmission of Deuteronomy, the three concepts would have developed into parallel and equal terms.[30] This background would be a possible explanation why the מצות were added later to Deut 26:17 in the LXX version. The conception that the three form a triad that are somehow synonymous developed later, and parts of the book were edited accordingly, Deut 26:17 being one

---

26. There are some exceptions such as Deut 11:1 where the Greek translation for חק appears to be φύλαγμα.

27. I.e., unless it was later omitted; for this alternative theory, see below.

28. Deuteronomy 5:31; 6:1; 7:11 also refer to all three in a list, but in these cases the word מצוה is, in contrast with the other two, used in the singular to refer to the whole law. The three are not parallel and equivalent terms in these cases.

29. Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 138–39.

30. See Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 138–39. The passages where מצות, "commandments" are mainly found are in what he calls DtrB or in younger editorial layers, see Deut 4:40 (p. 118); 5:29 (pp. 144–45); 6:2 (pp. 145–46); 7:9 (pp. 207–8); 8:2 (pp. 218–19), 11 (p. 214); 11:13 (p. 250); etc. See also Deut 13:5, 19; 26:13, 18; 27:10.

example. In this case, the LXX version of the verse would represent an older editorial stage.

The missing משפטים in the SP is another question, for which there are two possible explanations. Either it was accidentally omitted or it was missing from the original text. In the latter alternative one would have to assume that the original text only referred to the statutes (חקים) and that the LXX and SP/MT traditions separately added different words to the verse, ומשפטי and ומצותיו respectively. After the separation of the proto-SP and proto-MT the latter would have further added ומצותיו. This theory implies three separate intentional insertions. The theory that the SP minus is an accidental omission may be less complicated. Although certainty can hardly be reached here, the latter theory should perhaps be preferred. In any case, it is unlikely that the MT would be the oldest text, because it would imply independent unintentional omissions in two traditions. Clearly, one could refer to the similar endings of all three words (ומשפטיו, ומצותיו, חקיו) that may have occasioned a scribal lapse (homoioteleuton). This theoretical possibility is represented by some scholars such as Richard Nelson, but accidental omissions as an explanation for text-critical problems should only be used with caution.[31] Nevertheless, most commentators neglect the shorter readings in the LXX and the SP and thus imply that the MT is more original.[32]

Without the variant versions in the SP and LXX, it would have been impossible to detect the additions. All three words are met together elsewhere in Deuteronomy (8:11; 11:1; 26:17; 30:16) and there is no syntactic inconsistency that would draw the critic's attention. We are dealing with a typical development of nomistic texts that were gradually expanded by adding more nomistic terminology. That different variants are found in three witnesses shows that nomism emerged in different literary strands and is not

31. Richard Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 305.

32. E.g., Carl Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua: Und allgemeine Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, HKAT 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900). Samuel Oettli, *Deuteronomium, Josua und Richter* (Munich: Beck, 1893), 89; Alfred Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, KHAT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1899), 82; Samuel R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, 3rd ed. ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), 292–93; Andrew D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 337–39.

merely the result of an isolated nomistic school. We should rather speak of a nomistic milieu that encompassed several contexts of transmission.

Results. Deuteronomy 26:17 provides examples for gradual nomistic expansions. The MT probably preserves the youngest textual stage, while both the SP and the LXX represent middle stages of the development. The oldest text may only have referred to חקיו "his stipulations." The addition of the terms משפטיו "his ordinances" and מצותיו "his commandments" is very typical, as the three words gradually came to be used synonymously to refer to the individual laws in the Pentateuch.

3.5. Joshua 1:7

Joshua 1:7 is part of Yahweh's speech to Joshua after Moses's death (1:1–9). Yahweh instructs Joshua to lead the people to the promised land and to conquer it from its inhabitants. According to the shared reading of the MT and LXX, Joshua should do as Moses had commanded him, but the MT contains a plus that slightly alters the meaning of Yahweh's instructions: Joshua should act in accordance with all the law (ככל התורה) that Moses had commanded Joshua. Many Greek manuscripts (Cambridge: Facdghknptxa2) and daughter translations follow the MT plus, but this is probably due to a later harmonization toward the proto-MT.[33] Vetus Latina (*sicut praecipit tibi Moyses*) accords with the shorter Greek reading and thus further corroborates that the Old Greek translation lacked the reference to the law. Targum Jonathan (ככל אוריתא), Peshitta (ܠ ܢܬܘܡܣܐ), the Samaritan Joshua, and the Vulgate (*omnem legem*) have a parallel to the MT plus. The verse is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

---

33. This is evident in the hexaplaric manuscripts, which mark a section corresponding to the MT plus (κατα παντα τον νομον) with an asterisk.

Josh 1:7 MT	Josh 1:7 LXX
רק חזק ואמץ מאד לשמר לעשות	ἴσχυε οὖν καὶ ἀνδρίζου φυλάσσεσθαι <u>καὶ</u> ποιεῖν
<u>ככל התורה</u> אשר צוך משה עבדי	καθότι ἐνετείλατό σοι Μωυσῆς ὁ παῖς μου,
אל תסור ממנו	<u>καὶ</u> οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖς ἀπ' <u>αὐτῶν</u>
ימין ושמאול	εἰς δεξιὰ οὐδὲ εἰς ἀριστερά,
למען תשכיל בכל אשר תלך	ἵνα συνῇς ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ἐὰν πράσσῃς.
But be strong and very courageous, to observe (and) to do <u>in accordance with all the law</u> that my servant Moses commanded you; do not turn from <u>it</u> to the right or to the left, so that you may be successful wherever you go.	Thus be strong and manly, to observe <u>and</u> to do as Moses my servant commanded you; <u>and</u> do not turn from <u>them</u> to the right or to the left, so that you may be perceptive in everything you do.

It is quite likely that the MT reading is the result of a later expansion.[34] This is suggested by the following considerations. In the ensuing instruction not to turn away from it, the MT uses a masculine singular suffix in ממנו, although the word תורה "law" is feminine. If the law is original in this context, the suffix should be a feminine singular.[35] The original author would hardly make such a mistake in grammatical gender.[36] The masculine gender apparently refers to what Moses commanded (אשר צוך), which could have been referred to with the masculine. With αὐτῶν "them" the LXX has rendered the suffix in plural neuter, which is probably due to the translation: What Moses had commanded Joshua to do could be understood in the singular or plural. In any case, the plural neuter of the LXX or the singular masculine of the MT are hardly compatible with the feminine word תורה.[37]

---

34. Thus many, e.g., Carl Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, HKAT 3.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899), 154; Richard Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 27–28; Holmes, *Joshua*, 17, regards it "almost certain" that the LXX is original here.

35. John Lloyd, *The Book of Joshua: A Critical and Expository Commentary of the Hebrew Text* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1886), 19, completely neglects the LXX reading and presents the ספר התורה as a possible reference for the masculine singular.

36. It is possible that 1:8 is a later addition in this context. It essentially increases the standing of the law in guiding Joshua's actions. This addition would have later impacted also 1:7, which originally did not refer to the law.

37. Thus also Nelson, *Joshua*, 28.

Second, the MT reading implies the idea that Moses had commanded Joshua to follow the Torah. Although the general context of Deuteronomy, where Moses commands all Israelites to follow the law, could imply this, such an event is not mentioned in the preceding narrative and it also fits poorly in this context. This inconsistency is probably the result of an addition where it was more important to add a reference to the law than to consider its exact reference and suitability in the context. At the background of the original text is most likely Deut 31:7–8 and/or 31:23. Instead of referring to the law, in these passages Moses instructs Joshua to be strong and courageous (חזק ואמץ) in order to bring the Israelites to the land, conquer it, and take it into possession. Notably, these verses use exactly the same phrase as Josh 1:7.[38] There is no reference to the law that Moses had told Joshua to observe in order for him to be able to conquer the land.[39] The text that follows Yahweh's speech to Joshua in Josh 1 also refers to details about the conquest of the land, but does not mention the law. In Josh 1:13–16 Joshua discusses Moses instructions but this only relates to the conquest. The only exception is 1:8, which unexpectedly introduces the book of the law that should be constantly in Joshua's mind. It is possible that the addition of 1:8 later occasioned a further addition in 1:7, which is preserved in the MT.[40]

Third, it makes little sense that Joshua needs to be courageous and strong to follow the law. One would expect something dangerous and difficult as the reference of such an encouragement. Moses's instructions to Joshua to bring the people to the land and conquer it from its inhabitants is clearly something for which courage and strength would be needed. The LXX text is logical in this respect, while the MT introduces a narrative peculiarity, the reason of which is the theological importance of

---

38. Note that there seems to be a confusion as to who is the subject of Deut 31:23. According to the context in 31:22 and 24, Moses is the subject, as no one else is mentioned, but the content of the text in 31:23 implies that it is Yahweh.

39. In both Deut 31:7–8 and 31:23 the text continues with references to the law, but Joshua does not play a role in this. E.g., in Deut 31:9–10 Moses gives the law to the Levites, who are instructed to follow some commandments, but this is unrelated to Joshua's task or the conquest of the land.

40. Joshua 1:8 is clearly a digression from the general theme and narrative in the chapter. According to Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 154–55, all of 1:7–8 belong to a very late addition, but his theory fails to appreciate the older LXX reading in 1:7, which implies that 1:7 may otherwise be older than 1:8.

following the law. The addition was partly made irrespective of how it influences the immediate context.

Fourth, the speaker of the scene is Yahweh, which does not fit well with the MT reading. Why would Yahweh refer to the commandments that Moses had ordered Joshua to observe? If the reference to the law was the original reading, it would be more logical that Yahweh refers to his own law or to the law that he instructs Joshua to observe.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is unlikely that the LXX reading is the result of an accidental omission. There are no technical considerations (e.g., homoioteleuton) that would speak in its favor, and it would be quite a coincidence that exactly the law was accidentally omitted, as its omission makes the text much more logical and removes the contradiction with the grammatical gender. Clearly, one can never completely exclude an accidental omission, but they should not be assumed if no obvious triggers in the texts can be found and/or an alternative theory can easily explain the variants, as is the case here.

An intentional omission to clarify the text is a theoretical possibility. As noted above, there are many reasons why the text would be much better without the law. One could thus argue that a later editor in the LXX tradition or its *Vorlage* improved the text. In this case, however, one would expect a very different editorial intervention than a sheer omission of the law. It is difficult to find a motive for omitting the whole idea of Joshua being instructed to act according to the law. If a scribe in the LXX tradition had been disturbed by the evident problems, it is more probable that the scribe would have sought to reformulate the text rather than merely make a significant theological omission. Clearly, 1:8 refers to the law and its observance, so one could argue that there is no reason to repeat it in a confusing way in 1:7. However, the whole passage is very repetitive (e.g., Yahweh tells Joshua to be strong and courageous four times in 1:6–9!), but there is no evidence in the Greek version that there had been attempts to remove other repetitions or otherwise improve the text. This reduces the probability that such a motive could explain the shorter reading in the LXX of 1:7. It is more probable that it preserves the more original text than the MT. It should also be noted that omissions were done for very weighty reasons only, but such cannot be found in this context.[41]

---

41. Some commentators since early research make no reference to the shorter

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The context refers to the law in both versions of 1:8, and it is possible that the MT addition in 1:7 was influenced by 1:8 in an attempt to make it explicitly clear that Joshua had to follow the whole law in order to be successful. Although Josh 1:8 already mentions this, the repetition is typical of editorial tendencies and techniques: Another passage or verse has attracted a small and closely related expansion in an adjacent passage. A later editor was thematically reminded about the law in 1:8, which motivated him—by way of association—to make a thematically related addition in 1:7 as well. In Deuteronomy, but also in other passages in the Hebrew Bible that relate to the observance of the law, additions often bring very little new in terms of substance, but the idea is expressed differently and the repetition functions to highlight how important the issue is. This is especially the case with the law, the importance of which was repeated over and over again in many late additions.

The poor technique of the MT addition (e.g., the incorrect gender) in 1:7 implies that it is an isolated, perhaps a spontaneous and poorly planned addition. Although there are other similar additions that introduce the law and its stipulations to various parts of the Hebrew Bible, there is no reason to assume a connection or any broader redactional scheme. Since the documented cases of added emphasis on the law are spread out to different parts of the Hebrew Bible, there is not enough evidence to assume that the addition in 1:7 would have been part of a wider redaction. For example, 1:8 may derive from an earlier editor, although there is no text-critical evidence in support of this. There appears to be a general and gradual "Torahization" of several parts of the Hebrew Bible, which is seen in isolated additions that do not necessarily derive from the same author.

Because the addition in 1:7 is quite short, it may have been made between the lines or in the margin. This could explain the incorrect use of grammatical gender, which a careful editor would probably have corrected. On the other hand, because the addition changes the meaning substantially, it is not a clarification or explanation of the text but rather an attempt to introduce an entirely new aspect. It thus stands to reason that the addition was intended to be included with the text; it could also have been made when the entire manuscript was reproduced for copying

---

LXX reading, e.g, Oettli, *Deuteronomium, Josua und Richter*, 130; Lloyd, *Book of Joshua*, 19, and others merely mention it without any discussion about its relationship to the MT reading, e.g., Holzinger, *Josua*, 1–2.

or editing. The example highlights that broken grammatical rules, such as incorrect gender, have often been caused by editorial interventions, and therefore they are useful markers for literary critics.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. A literary critic would easily note the problems in the MT. The reference to the law does not make sense in this verse and causes incongruences with its immediate context. It is also inconsistent with other passages, especially with Deut 31:7–8; 31:23; and Josh 1:13–16. Because the problems are multiple, it is probable that even without the LXX reading a literary critic would have come to the conclusion that the reference to the law is a secondary addition in the MT. It would thus be possible to reconstruct an earlier stage of the text without the documented evidence. This is an important example, and perhaps an exception, where a very small addition could very probably be detected without textual evidence.

Results. The reference to the law in the MT of Josh 1:7 is in all likelihood a secondary addition, the shorter Old Greek preserving the more original reading. The addition was rather poorly made, as it confuses its immediate context and creates a grammatical error. A literary critic would notice the problems of the MT reading and be able to reconstruct the original text even without the LXX manuscripts that attest the older reading.

3.6. 1 Kings 17:14

First Kings 17:7–16 is a story about Elijah and the widow of Zarephath. Because of drought, the widow and her son were faced with famine. After Elijah had asked the widow to give him her last food, he delivered a divine proclamation that her jars will not be empty before it will rain again. The MT calls the divinity יהוה אלהי ישראל "Yahweh the God of Israel," while most Greek manuscripts lack the epithet "God of Israel." It is probable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek translation did not contain the epithet. Those Greek manuscripts that include it (for example, Codex Alexandrinus) were secondarily harmonized toward a text close to the MT.

1 Kgs 17:14 MT	1 Kgs 17:14 LXX
כי כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל כד הקמח לא תכלה וצפחת השמן לא תחסר עד יום תתן יהוה גשם על פני האדמה	ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἡ ὑδρία τοῦ ἀλεύρου οὐκ ἐκλείψει καὶ ὁ καψάκης τοῦ ἐλαίου οὐκ ἐλαττονήσει ἕως ἡμέρας τοῦ δοῦναι κύριον τὸν ὑετὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
For thus says Yahweh <u>the God of Israel</u>: The jar of meal will not be emptied, and the jug of oil will not be in need, until the day that Yahweh gives rain on the earth.	For thus says the Lord: The jar of meal will not be emptied, and the jug of oil will not be in need, until the day that the Lord gives rain on the earth.

It is highly likely that the plus in the MT is the result of a later expansion.[42] This is suggested by the fact that Yahweh is otherwise never called the God of Israel in this passage (see 17:8, 12, 16). Outside 1 Kgs 17:14, Yahweh is called the God of Israel only once in all of the Elijah-Elisha stories, in 1 Kgs 17:1, where אלהי ישראל could also be a secondary addition.[43] It would also be difficult to explain why the epithet had been omitted in the Greek tradition. A further argument that the epithet is secondary is that there are many other passages in the Hebrew Bible where a later scribe also added the same epithet to a text that originally only referred to Yahweh. The book of Jeremiah in particular contains wide textual evidence for this; it is probable that the pluses in its Hebrew version are the result of secondary expansions.[44] This is probably the case in 1 Kgs 17:14 as well.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Although an accidental omission can never be completely excluded, the text does not contain

---

42. Thus also some scholars since early research, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 150; Simon J. DeVries, *1 Kings*, WBC 12 (Waco, TX: Word, 1985), 213.

43. According to Ernst Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Könige 1–16*, ATD 11.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1977), 220–21, 1 Kgs 17:1 is a late (post-Deuteronomistic) addition that seeks to transform the drought from an accident, as portrayed in the older stories, into a punishment of Ahab. Several Greek manuscripts (including the Lucianic group boe$_2$ as well as nc$_2$) do not attest the reference to the God of Israel in 1 Kgs 17:1.

44. E.g., in Jer 34:2 (LXX 41:2), the Greek text only refers to Yahweh, while the MT also contains the epithet "God of Israel."

any technical reasons—such as homoioteleuton or homoioarchton—that could trigger an omission. It would be hazardous to assume the arbitrary omission of two words. Another alternative is to assume an intentional omission. According to Montgomery, "the omission of the nationalistic phrase was due to Hellenistic universalism."[45] This is theoretically possible, but there is no evidence that such a motive had influenced the LXX version of Kings. The epithet is found twenty-eight times in Kings, and in most cases the Greek version also includes it. If there had been a tendency to denationalize Kings in the Greek version, one would expect more systematic tendency in this respect. A single omission of an apparently nationalistic epithet would make little difference. In any case, Kings (and much of the rest of the Hebrew Bible) is in many respects overtly 'nationalistic' and it repeatedly refers to the God of Israel. It would have been a great enterprise to shape the text toward Hellenistic universalism. Consequently, it is far more likely that the variant reading in 1 Kgs 17:14 goes back to a secondary expansion in the MT.[46]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition of the epithet in 1 Kgs 17:14 could be a marginal gloss or an addition between the lines, but it may also have been added in the copying process, intentionally or accidentally out of memory: Kings refers to "Yahweh the God of Israel," יהוה אלהי ישראל in many other places (e.g., 1 Kgs 14:7, 13; 15:30; 16:26, 33; 17:1; 22:53). However, the epithet was not systematically added to the Elijah-Elisha stories, which suggests that there was no wider redaction to this effect. In comparison, Yahweh's epithets were much more systematically and widely added to the MT Jeremiah, the LXX mostly preserving the more original text in these cases.[47]

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without textual support it would be very difficult to identify an added epithet such as the one in 1 Kgs 17:14.

---

45. Montgomery, *Kings*, 297.

46. Apparently Vojtěch Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige: Übersetzt und erklärt*, 2 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1911–1912), 421, implies that the MT plus is original because it highlights the title, but the logic is not fully clear. A number of commentators do not mention the LXX variant, e.g., Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 181, 183; Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 207–8.

47. See §3.10, "Added Epithets, Titles, Professions, and Patronyms in the Book of Jeremiah," below, for details and discussion.

In some cases, where the longer text otherwise never calls a person or divinity with a particular epithet, its appearance in the middle of the story would raise the suspicion that it may not be original. This could be the case in 1 Kgs 17:14, but a careful literary critic would still be hesitant to come to this conclusion with any certainty and build a broader theory on it. Added epithets are a challenging area for the literary critical method.

Results. Epithets and titles have been secondarily added in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. This is a typical development for persons, but it can also be observed for the Israelite deity (e.g., Jer 25:29; 26:13, 18; 28:2, 14).[48] For the literary critic, this means that although one should be careful before making a definite conclusion that an epithet was added, if the text shows signs that the epithet may not be original, it probably is not.

3.7. 1 Kings 18:18

The passage 1 Kgs 18:19–40 describes the battle between Elijah and Baal's prophets. As a prelude to the scene, King Ahab accuses Elijah of being responsible for the drought and famine that Israel has faced (18:1–2, 17). In his response to the king, Elijah reverses the accusation and claims that the king caused the misfortunes. According to the MT of Elijah's response, the king and his family forsook Yahweh's commandments, whereas according to the LXX they forsook Yahweh. Targum Jonathan (פקודיא דיוי), the Peshitta (ܘܦܘܩܕܢܘܗܝ, ܕܡܪܝܐ), and the Vulgate (*mandata Domini*) follow the MT. The verse is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is notable that Greek manuscripts consistently omit the plus. In many other cases where the MT and Old Greek differ, several Greek manuscripts have been secondarily harmonized toward the MT, but this does not appear to be the case in 1 Kgs 18:18. It is thus highly probable that the shorter Greek reading goes back to Old Greek.

---

48. E.g., Ezra 10:10: Ezra's title "the priest" is missing in the parallel in 1 Esdras; Jer 26:1, 19; 28:5–6, 10; 29:29; 36:21, 26.

1 Kgs 18:18 MT	1 Kgs 18:18 LXX
ויאמר לא עכרתי את ישראל כי אם אתה ובית אביך בעזבכם את <u>מצות</u> יהוה ותלך אחרי הבעלים	καὶ εἶπεν <u>Ηλιου</u> Οὐ διαστρέφω τὸν Ισραηλ, ὅτι ἀλλ᾽ ἢ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ πατρός σου ἐν τῷ καταλιμπάνειν ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον <u>θεὸν ὑμῶν</u> καὶ ἐπορεύθης ὀπίσω τῶν Βααλιμ
He said, "I have not ruined Israel, but you have and your father's house in forsaking (pl.) <u>the commandments of the Lord</u> and you (sg.) have followed the Baalim.	<u>Elijah</u> said, "I am not ruining Israel, but you and your father's house in forsaking (pl.) the Lord, <u>your God</u>, and you (sg.) have followed the Baalim.

The verse also contains other differences between the MT and LXX. It is probable that in all cases the pluses (the MT plus מצות, commandments as well as the LXX pluses Elijah [Ηλιου] and your God [θεὸν ὑμῶν]) are later additions. Although all three pluses may bear witness to similar editorial processes where the text was gradually expanded by small additions, we will focus here on the MT plus מצות "the commandments," which, unlike the other additions, essentially changes the meaning of the text.

The following considerations suggest that the word מצות "the commandments" is a secondary addition.[49] Besides the MT of 18:18, no other text related to Ahab in 1 Kgs refers to the commandments or other trappings of the law. This verse would be the only place where he is accused of violating Yahweh's law, whereas his conduct is otherwise described in more general terms as displeasing to Yahweh (1 Kgs 16:30, 33; 21:20, 22, 25). Considering the theological importance of the idea, it would be surprising if the original author referred to the breaking of the commandments only

---

49. Thus many, e.g., Montgomery, *Kings*, 310; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 430. Some commentators fail to discuss the variant, e.g., Charles F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903), 222; Immanuel Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige*, KHC 9 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1899), 109; Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 187, 190; Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 216, 220, 226–27; others merely note it without discussing what happened here, thus DeVries, *1 Kings*, 214. According to Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 153, the reference to the commandments in the MT is a late addition, but the LXX also contains an addition, namely, "your God," θεὸν ὑμῶν, which is probably correct.

once and that he would be inconsistent about the theological problem that the text is essentially about. Second, there is a clear juxtaposition between Yahweh and Baal in the ensuing narrative, which is partly watered down by the reference to the law. The original idea was probably to convey that Ahab has abandoned Yahweh and embraced Baal instead, and this would fit very well with Elijah's battle with the prophets of Baal where the focus is to find out which one is God in the first place. The Israelites have to make a choice between Yahweh and Baal (1 Kgs 18:21). The reference to the commandments disturbs this juxtaposition and is thus not in line with the wider context.[50] Third, the idea of forsaking (עזב) Yahweh's commandments or his law is rare, and in the rest of Kings is met only in 2 Kgs 17:16. It appears only three times in the rest of the Hebrew Bible.[51] In contrast, the idea of forsaking Yahweh is rather common in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic History (e.g., Deut 28:20; 31:16; Josh 24:16, 20; Judg 2:12, 13; 10:6, 10,13; 1 Sam 8:8; 12:10; 1 Kgs 9:9; 11:33; 2 Kgs 21:22; 22:17), and in notably many of these passages there is a similar juxtaposition between forsaking Yahweh and following other gods as in the LXX of 1 Kgs 18:18.[52] It is thus probable that the same concept is behind 1 Kgs 18:18, while the MT plus disturbs this.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is theoretically possible that the plus was accidentally omitted in the LXX. However, the text contains no technical factors, such as a homoioteleuton, that would have facilitated an accidental omission. Although an accidental omission of one word could theoretically always take place, an alternative possibility that can easily be explained should be preferred to a haphazard accidental omission.

An intentional omission in the LXX is a further alternative, but it is difficult to find any motive for it. One could argue that without the reference to the commandments the text is more consistent with its context (as seen in the discussion above), but this would merely transpose the problem. One would still have to explain why the text had originally been written

---

50. Thus also Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 430, and others.

51. Besides Kings, it is otherwise met in Jer 9:12; Ezra 9:10; and 2 Chr 7:19.

52. The idea of forsaking Yahweh is also found in other parts of the Hebrew Bible, in Jeremiah in particular (see, e.g., Jer 1:16; 2:17, 19; 5:7). For the juxtaposition between forsaking Yahweh and following other gods, see, e.g., Deut 31:16; Josh 24:16; Judg 2:13; 10:6, 10; 1 Sam 12:10; 1 Kgs 9:9; 11:33.

so that a later editor had to make it more consistent. Moreover, as we have seen, one usually needs a good reason for an omission, but since this is not the case in 1 Kgs 18:18, the assumption of a later addition in the MT should be preferred.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT plus in 1 Kgs 18:18 is one of the many additions that increase the role of the laws and commandments. A sin or violation is increasingly seen as a violation of the Torah and its commandments. Although similar additions can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible (see, e.g., the MT in 1 Kgs 11:33–34), there is no evidence for a systematic redaction to this effect. It is more probable that we are dealing with the gradually increasing impact of the Pentateuch and especially Deuteronomistic concepts in the rest of the Hebrew Bible. The additions were made by individual scribes who spontaneously or instinctively added such conceptions to different passages. We are probably dealing with an isolated addition in 1 Kgs 18:18, since the broader context and the narrative otherwise shows little evidence of additions that increased the importance of the Torah and its commandments.

Although the addition could have been made between the lines or in the margin, it was probably intended to be included in the text. The addition does not interpret the older text but adds an aspect that slightly changes the meaning. This implies an intentional addition made when the text was reproduced. Significantly, the LXX manuscripts consistently lack the MT plus. In a typical case many of the manuscripts have been secondarily harmonized toward the MT. Since this appears not to be the case in 1 Kgs 18:18, it is possible that the MT addition is relatively late and therefore had less influence on the Greek manuscripts than in a typical case.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. There are no technical considerations that would easily disclose the addition. Although the addition introduces a new genitive construct, it does not disturb the sentence in any way. Nevertheless, the reference to the commandments would certainly be noted, since similar references are only found occasionally in Kings, and many literary critics have assumed that such additions were commonly made. That the reference remains rather isolated in its context would increase the suspicions. Nevertheless, the literary critic would not necessarily assume that only one word was added. Without any arguments rising out of the sentence and the immediate context, any theory assuming that the word was added would remain a hypothetical conjecture. The literary critic

could be led to assume a larger expansion than merely one word. The present example thus shows challenges facing literary criticism when trying to reconstruct additions of one word only, but it is also an example where signs of editing were left in the resulting text.

Results. The MT plus מצות "the commandments" in 1 Kgs 18:18 is probably a later addition, which corresponds to the typical tendency in many parts of the Hebrew Bible to secondarily regard disobedience of Yahweh as disobedience of his commandments. Without the older text preserved in the LXX version a literary critic could conjecture that the reference to the commandments may not be original, but it would be difficult to build on this theory and determine the exact extent of the addition.

3.8. 1 Kings 19:10 and 19:14

As part of a nightly vision at Mount Horeb, Yahweh asks Elijah what is he doing there. According to the MT version of Elijah's reply, he has come because the Israelites have forsaken Yahweh's covenant, whereas in the LXX version of the reply the Israelites are said to have forsaken Yahweh himself. Targum Jonathan (קימד), Peshitta (ܩܝܡܗ), and the Vulgate (*pactum Domini*) follow the MT plus. The Qumran manuscripts do not preserve the verse.

1 Kgs 19:10 MT	1 Kgs 19:10 LXX
ויאמר קנא קנאתי ליהוה אלהי צבאות כי עזבו <u>בריתך</u> בני ישראל את מזבחתיך הרסו ואת נביאיך הרגו בחרב ואותר אני לבדי ויבקשו את נפשי לקחתה	καὶ εἶπεν <u>Ηλιου</u> Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι, ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχήν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν.
He said, "I have been very zealous for the Lord, the God of hosts; for the Israelites have forsaken your <u>covenant</u>, they threw down your altars and killed your prophets with a sword. I alone am left, and they are seeking my life, to take it."	<u>Elijah</u> said, "I have been very zealous for the Lord Almighty, for the sons of Israel forsook you; they threw down your altars and killed your prophets with a sword. I alone am left, and they are seeking my life, to take it."

Notably, the same variant is found in 1 Kgs 19:14, which preserves an almost identical text:[53]

1 Kgs 19:14 MT	1 Kgs 19:14 LXX
ויאמר קנא קנאתי ליהוה אלהי צבאות	καὶ εἶπεν <u>Ηλιου</u> Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι,
כי עזבו <u>בריתך</u> בני ישראל	ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπον σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ
את מזבחתיך הרסו	τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου καθεῖλαν
ואת נביאיך הרגו בחרב	καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ,
ואותר אני לבדי	καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος,
ויבקשו את נפשי לקחתה	καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχήν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν.
He said, "I have been very zealous for Yahweh, the God of hosts; but the Israelites have forsaken your <u>covenant</u>, thrown down your altars, and killed your prophets with the sword. I alone am left, and they are seeking my life, to take it away."	<u>Elijah</u> said, "I have been very zealous for Yahweh, the God of hosts; but the Israelites have forsaken you; thrown down your altars, and killed your prophets with the sword. I alone am left, and they are seeking my life, to take it away."

Unlike in 1 Kgs 19:10, in 19:14 some Greek manuscripts follow the MT. It is nevertheless probable that the Old Greek and its *Vorlage* did not contain the word. The shorter reading is preserved in the Lucianic manuscripts (bc₂e₂) as well as in Codex Alexandrinus. The congested reading in Codex Vaticanus strongly suggests a harmonization toward the proto-MT: ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπον σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ τὴν διαθήκην σου, "but the Israelites have forsaken you, your covenant." Note the peculiar word order in Greek, which places the subject in the middle of two objects. It is probable that the additional τὴν διαθήκην σου was added after the proto-MT reading, but peculiarly the older reading was also left in place, which created a confusion. It is probable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek read כי עזבוך בני ישראל.

It is hardly a coincidence that an identical variant is found in two verses in the same passage, which already excludes the possibility of an accidental omission. It is probable that the plus is a later addition, because the idea that one would forsake Yahweh's covenant is otherwise very rare and is only met in three other passages in the Hebrew Bible (Deut 29:24;

---

53. There are only some differences in the Greek variants; see below.

Jer 22:9; and Dan 11:30).[54] The idea of forsaking Yahweh is much more common (see analysis of 1 Kgs 18:18 above).[55] Besides the phrase "the ark of the covenant," the whole concept of covenant is otherwise not met in the Elijah or Ahab stories, and it is not particularly common in 1 Kings.[56] A further argument for the secondary nature of the additions is the lack of feasible alternatives. It is very unlikely that an important theological concept would have been intentionally omitted in the Greek tradition or its *Vorlage*. It is much easier to understand its addition, as related additions (e.g., in 1 Kgs 18:18) can be found in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. It is also possible that the editor wanted to lessen the sin of the Israelites by referring to the abandonment of the covenant and not Yahweh himself. This would leave more hope for reconciliation and return. The introduction of the covenant may also imply a slightly more developed form of understanding the relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Since an accidental omission of two identical cases in neighboring verses can be excluded, the only alternative theory left is intentional omissions in the Greek tradition or its *Vorlage*. However, it is difficult to find a motive for the omission of the covenant. This would imply a very bold attitude to revise the text, as it necessitated the omission of an important theological concept. One could argue that an editor wanted to increase the direct defiance of the Israelites toward Yahweh but in this case one would still expect that the editor had preserved the word covenant in some way (e.g., by changing the text to "the Israelites have forsaken you and your covenant"). Since this is not the case, it is more probable that the LXX preserves the more original text.[57]

---

54. Thus also a number of scholars since early research, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 157; Burney, *Notes*, 231; Benzinger, *Könige*, 113; Montgomery, *Kings*, 317. Nevertheless, according to Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 449, the reference to the covenant fits here very well. This may be from a later theological perspective, but it is not a strong argument for originality.

55. E.g., Deut 28:20; 31:16; Josh 24:16; Judg 2:12, 13; 10:6, 10; 1 Sam 12:10; 1 Kgs 9:9; 11:33; 2 Kgs 21:22.

56. Other than in reference to the ark of the covenant, the concept is only met in 1 Kgs 8:21, 23; 11:11. Notably, in the last passage, a reference to the covenant is only found in the MT, whereas the LXX only refers to the commandments. It is probable that the MT is secondary here, which would suggest the direction of the development; the covenant was secondarily added to various passages.

57. A number of scholars merely note the variants without any discussion on

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. There seems to have been a tendency to develop the more original idea of forsaking Yahweh to forsaking his commandments (1 Kgs 18:18) or his covenant (1 Kgs 19:10, 14). Although this may not be any systematic redaction, we are dealing with a general tendency toward a similar end, to refine the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. That the pluses are found in the MT speaks for some connection between them, although it would be very hypothetical to assume the same editor. By introducing a new theological concept, the addition had clear impact on the resulting text. It is thus clear that the additions are not merely interpretations of the older text. They are intentional attempts to develop the text in a certain direction.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It would be difficult to detect the additions in 1 Kgs 19:10 and 14, for the resulting text is grammatically correct and its content is consistent. The rare reference to forsaking the covenant of Yahweh in this passage would not go unnoticed and perhaps one would suspect that the concept is not original to the passage. However, it is unlikely that the critic would be able to conclude on its basis that we are dealing with two additions of single words. A theory that only these words were added would largely remain hypothetical and receive little support. The critic could be misled to assume a larger addition. In other words, although the critic could suspect an editorial intervention in both cases, it would be difficult to reconstruct very exactly what happened to the text.

Results. The MT pluses in 1 Kgs 19:10 and 14 are in all likelihood later additions. The introduction of Yahweh's covenant was a theological intervention that slightly refined how the relationship between Israel and Yahweh was perceived. It is possible that some critics would suspect additions without the older versions of the text being preserved in the LXX, but it would be very difficult to reconstruct the older text precisely.

––––––––––

whether the pluses are later additions in the MT or omissions in the Old Greek; thus, e.g., DeVries, *1 Kings*, 233. A number of recent commentators make no mention of the variants, e.g., Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 195–98; Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, 326–33; Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 218–20. We have seen a number of cases where older commentators note and discuss important variants in the LXX, while the more recent ones ignore the variants completely. This is very problematic in cases where the variants may be more original and the difference is significant.

3.9. Ezra 10:3, 1 Esdras 8:90, and 2 Esdras 10:3

With its parallel in 1 Esd 8:90, Ezra 10:3 is a prime example of minor additions that emerged in all three main witnesses, the MT, the LXX (also called 2 Esdras), and 1 Esdras. The use of 1 Esdras for understanding editorial processes is hampered by its somewhat free translation technique. The text of 1 Esdras differs considerably from the other two witnesses in this verse and in many others, and it can generally be regarded as a later development.[58] However, there are several cases where it preserves a more original reading, and the current verse may contain at least one. There are several minor and rather typical variants in this verse, and 1 Esdras differs considerably, but we will only discuss the most notable ones that illustrate additions.[59]

Ezra 10:3 LXX	Ezra 10:3 MT	1 Esdras 8:90
καὶ νῦν διαθώμεθα διαθήκην τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἐκβαλεῖν πάσας τὰς γυναῖκας	ועתה נכרת ברית לאלהינו להוציא כל נשים	ἐν τούτῳ γενέσθω ἡμῖν ὁρκωμοσία πρὸς τὸν κύριον, ἐκβαλεῖν πάσας τὰς γυναῖκας <u>ἡμῶν</u> <u>τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀλλογενῶν</u>
καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ὡς ἂν βούλῃ. <u>ἀνάστηθι καὶ φοβέρισον</u> <u>αὐτοὺς</u>	והנולד מהם בעצת אדני והחרדים	σὺν τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν, ὡς ἐκρίθη σοι, καὶ ὅσοι πειθαρχοῦσιν
ἐν ἐντολαῖς θεοῦ ἡμῶν, <u>καὶ ὡς ὁ νόμος γενηθήτω.</u>	במצות אלהינו <u>וכתורה יעשה</u>	τοῦ νόμου τοῦ κυρίου.
Let us make a covenant with our God to cast out all women and who were born of them, however	Let us make a covenant with our God to send away all women and who were born of them	Let us take an oath to the Lord <u>on this</u> to cast out all <u>our</u> women, <u>who (are) of</u> <u>gentiles</u>, with their

---

58. See contributions in *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras*, ed. Lisbeth S. Fried, AIL 7 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).

59. First Esdras often renders the word אלהים found in the MT with κύριος, and this takes place twice in 1 Esd 8:90. Variants of the divine name are very common throughout the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, and it is not always clear which one is more original. There appears to have been a tendency to avoid the divine name Yahweh in some traditions, which occasioned a change to a more general word "God." In this case, the present verse would contain a replacement in the MT tradition.

| you want. <u>Arise</u>, and scare them with the commandments of our God, <u>and let it be done according to the law.</u> | according to my lord's counsel and of those who tremble at the commandment of our God; <u>and let it be done according to the law.</u> | children, according to your judgment and as (to those?) who obey to the law of the Lord. |

Some of the differences between the versions are interpretive. For example, והנולד מהם, "and those who are born of them" of the MT is paralleled in 1 Esdras by the word "children," τέκνοις. Although children are evidently meant in the MT version as well, 1 Esdras is clear on this. Some of the changes are more substantial. The "covenant," ברית, found in the MT, has been rendered as ὁρκωμοσία, which primarily refers to an oath, and this change may be theological. The translator may have regarded the word for covenant διαθήκη, as too strong for the current context where the text is about canceling mixed marriages. It is probable that in these cases 1 Esdras preserves a secondary reading, which highlights the freedoms taken in its textual transmission or in the translation.

Our main interest in this verse is found at the very end, where 1 Esdras may contain an original reading in relation to the MT (and LXX). The MT plus וכתורה יעשה, "and let it be done according to the law" appears to find no parallel in 1 Esdras. The theory that 1 Esdras is more original here implies that the Greek word νόμος is a rendering of מצוה, and other passages, such as 1 Esd 8:84 (τὸν νόμον σου; cf. Ezra 9:14: מצותיך), suggest that the translator has indeed rendered מצוה as νόμος.[60] Although some uncertainties remain because of the freedoms taken in the textual transmission of 1 Esdras, it seems probable that καὶ ὅσοι πειθαρχοῦσιν τοῦ νόμου τοῦ κυρίου of 1 Esd 8:90 goes back to והחרדים במצות אלהינו. From this it would follow that 1 Esdras does not have a parallel to וכתורה יעשה. This theory is strengthened by the fact that the word יעשה, "let it be done" finds no parallel in 1 Esdras. If καὶ ὅσοι πειθαρχοῦσιν τοῦ νόμου τοῦ κυρίου were a shortened rendering of במצות אלהינו וכתורה יעשה, one would have to assume that an important theological idea—that a case is solved according to the law—would have been intentionally left out in 1 Esdras. This seems

---

60. See discussion in Dieter Böhler, *Die Heilige Stadt in Esdras α und Esra-Nehemia: Zwei Konzeptionen zur Wiederherstellung Israels*, OBO 158 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 176, 197.

highly unlikely, so it is more probable that 1 Esdras was unfamiliar with an equivalent of וכתורה יעשה.

Moreover, the two expressions במצות אלהינו and כתורה יעשה probably had different authors. If the same author had written both, it would be more logical to refer to those who "tremble" (החרדים) at the law of God (בתורת אלהינו) and that the case is solved according to a specific commandment (כמצוה יעשה), but now the words are used in an exactly opposite way. It should also be noted that the idea of the plus goes beyond the rest of the text and makes the preceding text party redundant. In the preceding text, the case should be solved according to the counsel (עצה) of Ezra and the tremblers, but this is unnecessary if it is made according to the law. Further on, the nature of the action, the expulsion of women, is not as is described in the law. It is a practical matter that is eventually described in Ezra 10:5–14, and this narrative must be the original reference of 10:3 as well. A later editor, who found it central to stress the law in any case, wanted to go beyond this and made a further link to the entire law. The reference to "the commandment of our God" functioned as a midrashic hook that may have triggered the addition, which effectively shifts the perspective to the law.

The plus τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀλλογενῶν, "who (are) of gentiles," in 1 Esdras is a typical explanative addition. The context unquestionably implies that foreign wives are meant, but since this is not explicitly stated, an editor would be tempted to add this information. The Masoretic Text is fully understandable in the originally intended meaning without this clarification, and thus there is no reason to assume that 1 Esdras is more original. One should also note the supplementary and somewhat artificial nature of the sentence "who (are) of gentiles," which gives the impression that it may have been written only after the scribe had copied the preceding word and realized that the text does not specify the expulsed wives as foreigners. Rather than the awkward γυναῖκας τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀλλογενῶν, more natural references to foreign wives can be found in 1 Esd 8:89; 9:7, 12, 17, 36 (γυναῖκας ἀλλογενεῖς); 9:9 (γυναικῶν τῶν ἀλλογενῶν); 9:18 (ἀλλογενεῖς γυναῖκας). The peculiar expression in 8:90 sticks out even in the Greek text of 1 Esdras.

The LXX also contains a small plus, ἀνάστηθι, "rise," which may be a consequence of and connected to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. For the MT החרדים the LXX reads φοβέρισον αὐτούς. Instead of the plural adjective/participle, "tremblers" that the MT vocalization implies, the Greek reading appears to correspond to a third-person singular imper-

ative of *hiphil* חרד followed by a third-person plural suffix: "terrify them." Since the text was unvocalized and possibly also written defective (החרדם), the mistake could easily emerge. After the misunderstanding, a further verb, ἀνάστηθι, "rise" was added; it is frequently used in Ezra 10 as a verb that commences action (10:4, 5, 6). Since it is essentially a Hebraism, it seems probable that the mistake is dependent on the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The main alternative for assuming that the plus וכתורה יעשה, "and let it be done according to the law" is secondary is to assume that the shorter reading in 1 Esdras is a free rendering. במצות אלהינו וכתורה יעשה would thus have been intentionally shortened with a general reference to those who tremble at the law of the Lord. Although this is not an impossible theory, it would imply that the meaning was also intentionally changed in this process. In the MT, the ensuing conduct is based on the law, whereas in 1 Esdras the conduct is based on the judgment of Ezra and those who follow the law. If 1 Esdras was intentionally changed, it would mean that Ezra's judgment was underlined and the law was put to the background. It would be very difficult to find a motive for such a change, whereas the opposite direction of development is understandable. A personal judgment was secondarily replaced by a conduct based on the law.

As for the plus "who (are) of gentiles" in 1 Esdras, one could suggest that it was intentionally shortened in the MT because it is in any case clear that foreign women are meant. This is only a theoretical possibility, since a tendency to remove detail is not known from other parts of the MT version. In fact, many passages are repetitive and congested (e.g., Ezra 7:1–10) and if a scribe in the proto-MT tradition had shortened the text, one would expect it to take place much more in those passages. There are also no technical phenomena that could have easily triggered an accidental omission.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It seems probable that all three main pluses were probably intended to be included in the text. This is implied by the way they are formally integrated as part of Shecaniah's speech. A clarifying explanation not intended for the actual text would not necessarily follow a person's form of speech, although it is not impossible either. On the basis of their length, any or all of them could have been made as additions in the margins or between the lines.

The plus in 1 Esdras is a clarifying addition that adds no information to the text. It is a rather typical addition, as it draws all its information from other parts of the older text. Much of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible seems to have included these kinds of additions. The plus ἀνάστηθι "rise" in the LXX is probably a consequence of a misunderstanding. The plus adds no new information but changes the meaning of the sentence. The most significant addition is the shared MT/LXX plus, which adds the idea that the law should be the guiding principle in deciding over the foreign women. Although the entire scene is implicitly connected with the law, it is not otherwise explicitly mentioned in Ezra 9–10, which deals with mixed wives (but note Ezra 7 and Neh 8). A later editor apparently wanted to make the link explicit. This is also a very typical addition, as the law, its commandments, and trappings are increasingly stressed in later additions.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is possible that one could detect the MT/LXX addition at the end of the verse without the shorter reading in 1 Esdras. The inclusion of the law partly competes with the preceding text and it also adds an entirely new (passive) sentence at the end of the verse. The sentence hangs at the end to the extent that a literary critic would at least have suspected an editorial intervention.

It is probable that critics would also have noticed the somewhat awkward expression τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀλλογενῶν, "who (are) of gentiles." It clearly differs from the other references to foreign wives found in the immediate context, and, for example, in the preceding verse. It is also apparent that the expression is not necessary to the sentence. It is thus likely that one would have theorized, at least, that the expression is not original to its context.

Without documented evidence it would have been difficult to notice that the verb ἀνάστηθι "arise" was added to the LXX. Although it emerged out of a misunderstanding, the addition is well integrated in the text and does not stick out from its context. It is noteworthy that the plus reflects a typical expression to begin an action found in other parts of the chapter (10:4, 5, 6), which would have made it even more difficult to detect.

Results. Ezra 10:3 and its parallel verse in 1 Esd 8:90 preserve several small additions. That additions are found in all three witnesses highlights the frequency of such additions and their emergence in different literary traditions. With the exception of the LXX plus, it would have been possible to detect the main additions in the MT and in 1 Esdras without textual

evidence. The pluses are of different types: The MT/LXX plus adds the law as focal in deciding about the matter. The LXX plus is a consequence of a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. The plus in 1 Esdras is a clarifying addition that makes explicit what is implicit in the older text.

3.10. Epithets, Titles, Professions, and Patronyms in Jeremiah

The divergent Hebrew and Greek versions in the book of Jeremiah provide significant information about editorial processes in the Hebrew Bible. Although the shorter Greek may generally preserve the more original text, each textual difference between the MT and LXX should be determined separately and without any prejudgment in favor of a witness.[61] Lacking in the Septuagint, the Hebrew version often contains an additional epithet, title, profession, or patronym after a personal name. In most cases there are reasons to assume that the plus in the MT is a secondary addition, the shorter Greek preserving the older text.[62] This phenomenon is widespread in the book of Jeremiah and as similar additions were repeatedly made, only some examples suffice to illustrate the phenomenon.

Although the following examples are only from the book of Jeremiah, similarly added titles, professions, patronyms, and epithets are found in other parts of the Hebrew Bible. Jeremiah is not an exception, and similar editorial tendencies seem to have been common in the textual transmission of the Second Temple period. For example, the MT of 2 Kings often inserts that Elisha was a man of God (איש האלהים), whereas the LXX, probably preserving the more original text, lacks the title. The MT of 2 Kgs 5:8aα reads ויהי כשמע אלישע איש האלהים כי קרע מלך ישראל את בגדיו "When Elisha the man of God heard that the king of Israel had torn his clothes," whereas the LXX reads καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν Ελισαιε ὅτι διέρρηξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ισραηλ τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτοῦ "When Elisha heard that the king of Israel had torn his clothes."[63] Added titles can also be found

---

61. Clearly, various views concerning the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew versions have been defended in scholarship, most text critics, such as Tov, Stipp, and Aejmelaeus, assume the general priority of the LXX. The general priority of the MT is defended by some, such as Fischer, but this position stands on weak ground.

62. There are some cases where the additional element is found in the LXX, but they are clearly less common than pluses in the MT.

63. See, e.g., 2 Kgs 4:16 [original text preserved in LXX[L]], 25 [second reference], 27 [second reference]; 5:8, 14 [the word "Elisha" was replaced with "man of God"], 20;

often throughout the Hebrew Bible. For example, the MT of 2 Kgs 8:25 adds Jehoram's title, מלך יהודה "king of Judah," while the LXX refers only to Jehoram. Similarly, the title of Hazael as the king of Aram (מלך ארם) is mentioned in the MT of 2 Kgs 13:22, while the Greek version refers only to Hazael. The MT of Josh 1:1 introduces Moses as the servant of Yahweh (עבד יהוה); the LXX is probably original in lacking the title.

Epithets of Yahweh in Jeremiah

The Hebrew version of Jeremiah occasionally includes an additional epithet after the divine name Yahweh. Two typical examples are found in Jer 25:27–28 (LXX 32:27–28), which is part of a prophecy to the nations.

Jer 25:27–28 MT	Jer 32:27–28 LXX
²⁷ואמרת אליהם כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל שתו ושכרו וקיו ונפלו ולא תקומו מפני החרב אשר אנכי שלח ביניכם ²⁸והיה כי ימאנו לקחת הכוס מידך לשתות ואמרת אליהם כה אמר יהוה צבאות שתו תשתו	²⁷καὶ ἐρεῖς αὐτοῖς Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος παντοκράτωρ Πίετε καὶ μεθύσθητε καὶ ἐξεμέσατε καὶ πεσεῖσθε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀναστῆτε ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς μαχαίρας, ἧς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν. ²⁸καὶ ἔσται ὅταν μὴ βούλωνται δέξασθαι τὸ ποτήριον ἐκ τῆς χειρός σου ὥστε πιεῖν, καὶ ἐρεῖς Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος Πιόντες πίεσθε·
²⁷Say to them: Thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: "Drink, get drunk, and vomit, fall and rise no more, because of the sword that I send among you. ²⁸If they refuse to take the cup from your hand to drink, then you shall say to them: Thus says Yahweh of hosts: You must drink!"	²⁷Say to them: Thus says the Lord Almighty; "Drink, get drunk; and vomit, fall, and rise no more, because of the sword that I send among you." ²⁸If they refuse to take the cup from your hand to drink it, then you shall say: Thus says the Lord: You must drink."

In the MT version Yahweh is additionally called the God of Israel (אלהי ישראל) in 25:27 and of hosts (צבאות) in 25:28, while the LXX does not

---

6:9 [the word "Elisha" was replaced with "man of God"], 10 [the word "Elisha" was replaced with "man of God"].

attest both epithets. The additions may have been inspired by other passages in Jeremiah that contain these epithets, so that an editor sought to add them to places where they were missing. A copyist could also have out of memory included these epithets, because the preceding text—in both versions—often included them (e.g., Jer 23:2, 36; 24:5; 25:8, 15). It should be noted that the MT version of Jeremiah uses the epithet "God of Israel," אלהי ישראל, forty-nine times, while the equivalent expression ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ is only met eighteen times. It would be difficult to find any motive for the intentional omission of divine epithets in more than half of the cases.[64]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Since the tendency to add the epithet אלהי ישראל "God of Israel" to the divine name Yahweh is rather common in the MT, an accidental omission in the Greek version can be ruled out as a general explanation. To be sure, an accidental omission can certainly have taken place in some of the occurrences in the Greek version. It would also be difficult to explain an intentional omission of Yahweh's epithets, and if it were the case, one would expect a systematic omission of all the epithets. For example, in Jer 25:27–28 it would be difficult to explain why the title צבאות would have been omitted in 25:28 but not in 25:27. Similarly, both the Greek and Hebrew texts refer to Yahweh as the God of Israel in Jer 25:15 (LXX 32:15). If one assumes that the epithet was intentionally omitted in 25:27, it would be necessary to explain why it was left in 25:15. Random intentional omissions of the epithets seems highly unlikely and it would also be difficult to find any motive for intentionally omitting the epithets. It is far more likely that Yahweh's typical epithets were secondarily added to the divine name in places where they were originally missing.

Some scholars assume that the LXX version has the tendency to abridge and simplify, which could be seen as the reason for the intentional omissions.[65] Although it is not possible to discuss the translation technique of Jeremiah in detail here, several scholars have shown that the

---

64. Many commentators, also those who commonly work with the LXX, neglect the shorter reading, e.g., Robert P. Carroll, *Jeremiah. A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 500, possibly because of the supposed insignificance for the passage.

65. Thus especially Fischer, *Jeremia 1–25*, 43. In part also Wilhelm Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 3rd ed., HAT 1.12 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968), xxi; and others.

LXX is quite literal.[66] In parallel sections the LXX is mostly close to the MT, often using Hebrew expressions and syntax in Greek. In some cases, the translation is so literal that the Greek is difficult to understand.[67] In view of this, it would be difficult to explain that in other places the translator resorted to "reductions, simplifications, and explanations," as argued by Georg Fischer, for example.[68] This would imply an inconsistent translation technique. It is far more probable that the differences go back to the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage*, and therefore the priority of the versions should be determined by assuming that in the background are two variant editions, both in Hebrew. This makes it more difficult to explain the minuses in the LXX version, for then one would expect that a scribe in the Hebrew transmission intentionally abridged the text throughout the composition. Although this possibility should never be excluded when discussing a single variant, this cannot be taken as a general starting point. An abridgment needs to be argued and its reasons need to be understood. In some cases, there could indeed be abridgments.[69] In any case, it would be difficult to regard the translation as the main reason for shorter LXX readings. Each case should be determined separately on account of its internal criteria, whereas arguments on the basis of its presence in the translation should be rejected.

Similar Cases

Yahweh's epithets were not added in a particularly systematic way in Jeremiah. This is suggested by the fact that the LXX also contains added epithets that are missing in the MT (e.g., in 32:28). This fact also speaks against the assumption of an abridged LXX. The tendency to add epithets secondarily thus seems to have been rather common and could have taken

---

66. E.g., Joseph Ziegler, *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta*, MSU 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), 32. Some scholars in earlier research assumed that the translation contains many free elements—thus, e.g., Rudolph, *Jeremia*, xix–xx—but this is hardly the case for most parts of the translation. In cases where the translator may not have understood the Hebrew, the translation may differ considerably from the assumed Hebrew *Vorlage*, but in general it seems probable that the translation was fairly literal.

67. See examples in Fischer, "Jeremiah," 7.3.5.

68. Fischer, "Jeremiah," 7.3.5.2.

69. See William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, 2 vols., ICC (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1986, 1996), xvii.

place in different strands of transmission. One should further note that the added divine epithets are found in various forms, which corroborates the suspicion that several independent scribes who were not editing in any systematic way, are behind them. Added epithets are found, for example, in the following passages:

Added Epithet	MT Verse Numbers
אלהים	26:13; 37:3; 42:5, 13, 20, 21; 43:1, 2
אלהי ישראל	32:15; 34:2; 37:7; 42:9; 44:7; 45:2
אלהי צבאות אלהי ישראל	35:17; 38:17
צבאות	25:8, 28; 26:18; 29:4; 32:18; 39:16; 42:15; 44:2, 25
צבאות אלהי ישראל	28:2, 14; 29:8; 32:15; 35:15; 42:18; 43:10; 44:11
ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ	32:28 (LXX 39:28)

Titles and Professions

Like the divine epithets, the MT of Jeremiah refers to a person's profession or title more often than the Greek version. It is probable that most of the pluses are secondary additions in the MT and not omissions in the LXX. It suffices to discuss in detail one passage that contains three added professions after personal names.

Confrontation between Jeremiah and Hananiah

The confrontation between the prophets Jeremiah and Hananiah is described in Jer 28 (LXX Jer 35). The MT uses the titles after the name several times in cases where the LXX merely includes the name. In the LXX version the word "prophet" is used once in the entire chapter, in reference to Hananiah at the beginning of the scene in verse 1. Although the Greek version uses the word ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης "false prophet," it is very likely that this goes back to a Hebrew הנביא, "prophet" and not to a different word in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.[70] The translator probably interpreted the word on the

---

70. This is suggested by the fact that when the word ψευδοπροφήτης is used, the Hebrew parallel in the MT always contains the word הנביא (see Jer 6:13; 33:7, 8, 11, 16;

basis of its context. Jeremiah 28:5–6 (35:5–6 LXX), which are illustrative of the differences found also elsewhere in the passage, are the beginning of Jeremiah's response to Hananiah, after the latter has pronounced, in the name of Yahweh, that Babylon will be defeated and that the temple vessels as well as King Jehoiachin will return to Jerusalem (vv. 2–4). When verses 5–6 refer to the two prophets, the MT includes the professions, while the LXX only uses the personal names.[71]

Jer 28:5–6 MT	Jer 35:5–6 LXX
⁵ויאמר ירמיה הנביא אל חניה הנביא	⁵καὶ εἶπεν Ιερεμιας πρὸς Ανανιαν κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν ἱερέων τῶν ἑστηκότων ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου
לעיני הכהנים ולעיני כל העם העמדים בבית יהוה	⁶καὶ εἶπεν Ιερεμιας Ἀληθῶς· οὕτω ποιήσαι κύριος·
⁶ויאמר ירמיה הנביא	στήσαι τὸν λόγον σου, ὃν σὺ προφητεύεις, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι τὰ σκεύη οἴκου κυρίου
אמן כן יעשה יהוה	καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποικίαν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον.
יקם יהוה את דבריך אשר נבאת	
להשיב כלי בית יהוה	
וכל הגולה מבבל	
אל המקום הזה	

⁵Then the prophet Jeremiah spoke to the prophet Hananiah in the presence of the priests and all the people who stood in the house of Yahweh; ⁶The prophet Jeremiah said, "Amen! May Yahweh do so; may Yahweh fulfill the words that you have prophesied, and bring back to this place from Babylon the vessels of the house of Yahweh, and all the exiles."	⁵Then Jeremias spoke to Ananias in the sight of all the people and the priests who stood in the house of the Lord, ⁶and Jeremias said, "May the Lord indeed do thus; may he confirm your word which you prophesy, to return the vessels of the house of the Lord, and all the captivity, out of Babylon to this place."

The following considerations suggest that the pluses in the MT are secondary additions and that the LXX preserves the more original readings:[72] A title, profession, or genealogical information is important at the begin-

---

34:9; 35:1; 36:1, 8 [LXX verse numbers]). It is highly unlikely that the Hebrew *Vorlage* would have contained a different word than the MT in these passages.

71. Note that these verses also contain a transposition that will be discussed in ch. 10, "Transpositions."

72. A similar conclusion is assumed by several scholars, e.g., McKane, *Jeremiah*, 709–13.

ning of a scene when a person is introduced for the first time. There is
no reason to repeat it every time the person is mentioned (the principle
of economy). Although one should not be very dogmatic about this and
variation does occur, in general one would expect that the first author
does not repeat these elements unnecessarily. Added elements already
clear to the reader would only disturb the narrative flow of a story. The
repetition of the prophet's profession would be more understandable
from a later editor who is already looking at the more finished book of
a prophet and who may be more focused on a single reference to Jere-
miah. It is also apparent that there is an increasing tendency to emphasize
the role of Jeremiah as a prophet and as the prophetic authority behind
the book, which would explain the inclination to add the title to places
where it was originally missing. In other words, an increased interest in
the theological aspect would explain the added titles that are unnecessary
for the narrative. Moreover, with the recurrent interpolation of the titles,
the conflict between the real prophet and the false prophet in Jer 28 (35
LXX) is additionally highlighted. The Greek translation ψευδοπροφήτης
"pseudoprophet" (for the neutral נביא in Hebrew) undermines Hana-
niah's authority from the outset, and it may be a further (but a separate)
step in the same direction.[73]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. As alternative explana-
tions, accidental omissions can be excluded, as the pluses in the MT are
also found in 28:9, 10 (twice), 11, 12 (twice), and 15 (twice).[74] Repeated
scribal lapses of the same word go against all probabilities. An intentional
omission of the pluses would mean that a later editor in the Hebrew *Vor-
lage* of the LXX systematically omitted the titles, except in verse 1, but
then one would need to explain why this was done. One possibility would
be the improvement of the style—either by an editor of the Hebrew *Vor-*

---

73. Concerning the nature of the addition, 28:9 (35:9 LXX) contains the same plus
in the MT, but here one can find an additional detail that further suggests that the MT
is secondary. For the MT בבא דבר הנביא יודע הנביא, "when the word of that prophet
comes true, then it will be known...," the Greek reads ἐλθόντος τοῦ λόγου γνώσονται
τὸν προφήτην, "when the word comes true, they shall know the prophet...." Missing in
the LXX, the MT adds הנביא. However, forming a construct, the plus is connected to
the preceding word דבר. This indicates that the addition of הנביא has also necessitated
the omission of the article in הדבר. This suggests that we are probably dealing with a
deeper intervention in the text than merely added titles between the lines.

74. See also Jer 29:1, 29; 32:2; 34:6; 36:8.

lage of the LXX or by the translator. On this basis, most scholars who assume that the LXX is secondary have argued that this took place in the translation process. For example, Fischer assumes a general tendency to reduce unnecessary repetitions.[75] However, this goes against other parts of the translation, where the Greek follows the Hebrew very closely. In the end Fischer's theory would imply an inconsistent view of the translator.[76] Moreover, this theory would assume that the original writer's style left something to be improved, and that the translator had a better understanding of good style, but this is improbable. It is more likely that the deficiencies in style were introduced by later editors in the proto-MT tradition. The LXX text largely corresponds to the literary style that one would expect from an original author in this respect, while the MT contains unnecessary repetitions.

Another possibility would be to explain that the omissions had a theological motive, particularly in the context of the Greek translation where Hananiah is dubbed "pseudoprophet" in the exposition (35:1 LXX). He would not deserve to be called a prophet in the first place. This would be an understandable explanation, but it would still not explain why Jeremiah's titles are also omitted in 35:5, 10, 11, 12, and 15 (LXX numbering). After the Greek translator decided to call Hananiah "pseudoprophet" in verse 1, he could easily have highlighted the contrast between Hananiah and Jeremiah much more effectively by translating verse 5 and the ensuing verses with "Jeremiah the prophet … Hananiah the pseudoprophet," that is, if the title הנביא was in fact contained in his *Vorlage* in all places where the MT preserves it. Because of these considerations, it is probable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX did not contain the title in verses 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15. It is also probable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* preserves more original readings than the MT.

---

75. E.g., Fischer, *Jeremia* 1–25, 43.

76. In discussing the translation technique of Jeremiah, Fischer, "Jeremia," 7.3.5.1–3, has separate sections for "Closeness to the Original" and "Reductions, Simplifications, and Explanations." It is not surprising that these sections have been supplemented with an additional section that seeks to explain the inconsistency of the translation technique.

Other Added Titles and Professions in MT Jeremiah

Similar differences between the MT and LXX concerning titles and pro-
fessions can be found throughout Jeremiah. The LXX text mostly, but not
always, corresponds better than the MT to the conventional literary style
that one would expect from the original author. The frequent unnecessary
repetitions are more understandable as later additions. An exemplary list
of added titles and professions suffices to illustrate the development, and it
also helps to identify similar additions in other parts of the Hebrew Bible
where textual evidence for the shorter reading is missing and where one
may suspect, for example, on the basis of an unmotivated repetition, that
it is secondary.[77] The list that follows records added titles (underlined) in
MT that are missing in LXX:

> 26:1; 36:9
> יהויקים בן יאשיהו מלך יהודה, Jehoiakim son of Josiah king of Judah
> 26:19; 32:4
> חזקיהו מלך יהודה, Hezekiah king of Judah
> 29:29
> צפניה הכהן, the priest Zephaniah
> 29:29
> ירמיהו הנביא, Jeremiah the prophet
> 35:11; 37:1
> נבוכדראצר מלך בבל, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon
> 36:21
> אלישמע הספר, Elishama the scribe/secretary
> 36:26
> ברוך הספר, Baruch the scribe/secretary
> 36:28, 32
> יהויקים מלך יהודה, Jehoiakim king of Judah

Patronyms

The Hebrew version is also more expansive than the Greek in giving addi-
tional patronymic information after personal names. As with the titles and

---

77. It needs to be emphasized that each case has to be analyzed separately, and
some of the cases are controversial. It is quite possible that in some cases the Greek
text may be the result of an omission, but in general this is the exception.

professions, it is expected that the father's name or other patronymic infor-
mation is mainly given when a person is introduced or at the beginning of
a new passage, after which it is unnecessary to repeat. The LXX often (but
not always) accords with this convention, and thus we are mostly dealing
with secondary additions in the MT rather than omissions in the LXX.[78]
The following contains an exemplary list of added patronyms in the MT of
Jeremiah (verses marked with * are also omitted in 4Q72a = 4QJer^d).

28:4; 37:1
  יכניה בן יהויקים, Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim
29:21
  צדקיהו בן מעשיה, Zedekiah son of Maaseiah
35:1
  יהויקים בן יאשיהו, Jehoiakim son of Josiah
35:8
  יהונדב בן רכב, Jonadab son of Rechab
36:8
  ברוך בן נריה, Baruch son of Neriah
36:14
  ברוך בן נריהו, Baruch son of Neriah(u)
28:4
  יכניה בן יהויקים, Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim
40:6, 7, 14, 16; 41:1, 6, 18
  גדליה בן אחיקם, Gedaliah son of Ahikam
40:9; 41:2
  גדליה בן אחיקם בן שפן, Gedaliah son of Ahikam son of Shaphan
40:11; 43:6*
  גדליה בן אחיקם בן שפן, Gedaliah son of Ahikam son of Shaphan
40:14; 41:2, 6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18
  ישמעאל בן נתניה, Ishmael son of Nethaniah
40:15, 16; 41:13, 14, 16; 42:1, 8; 43:4*, 5*
  ויוחנן בן קרח, Johanan son of Kareah

---

78. It is clear that in some passages the LXX also contains added patronyms. This
is suggested by 4Q72a, which does not attest the name of Baruch's father Neriah in
43:3, while both the MT and the LXX include it. Moreover, one cannot expect absolute
consistency in this. It is only if a repetition is disturbing and a variant edition such as
LXX Jeremiah lacks the repetitions that we may be confident that the patronyms have
been added.

41:9

ישמעאל בן נתניהו‎ ,י, Ishmael <u>son of Nethaniah(u)</u>

Baruch Son of Neriah in Jeremiah 36

The LXX of Jeremiah includes the patronym when a person is introduced for the first time or at the beginning of a scene. The MT, however, often repeats it, more or less irregularly, throughout the passage. Jeremiah 36 (Jer 43 LXX) is a case in point. Baruch is introduced for the first time in 36:4, and, as would be expected, both versions include the patronym, Neriah. It is reasonable to assume that the patronym is original in this verse because the introduction of a person usually includes at least the father's name. In the MT, however, the patronym is found in the middle of the passage as well (36:8, 14, 32). In 36:14 its presence is particularly peculiar, since the beginning of the same verse refers to Baruch without the patronym:

Jer 36:14 MT	Jer 43:14 LXX
וישלחו כל השרים אל ברוך	καὶ ἀπέστειλαν πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες πρὸς Βαρουχ
את יהודי בן נתניהו	υἱὸν Νηρίου τὸν Ιουδιν υἱὸν Ναθανίου
בן שלמיהו בן כושי לאמר	υἱοῦ Σελεμίου υἱοῦ Χουσι λέγοντες
המגלה אשר קראת בה	Τὸ χαρτίον, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἀναγινώσκεις ἐν αὐτῷ
באזני העם קחנה בידך	ἐν ὠσὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, λάβε αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν χεῖρά σου
ולך ויקח ברוך <u>בן נריהו</u> את המגלה <u>בידו</u>	καὶ ἧκε· καὶ ἔλαβε Βαρουχ τὸ χαρτίον
ויבא אליהם	καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτούς.
Then all the officials sent Jehudi son of Nethaniah son of Shelemiah son of Cushi to say to Baruch, "Bring the scroll that you read in the hearing of the people, and come." Baruch <u>son of Neriah</u> took the scroll <u>in his hand</u> and came to them.	Then all the officials sent Ioudin son of Nathanias son of Selemias son of Chousi to say to Barouch "Bring the scroll that you read in the hearing of the people, and come." So Baruch took the scroll and came to them.

It is highly unlikely that the original author would have suddenly included the patronym just a few lines after referring to the person without it.[79]

---

79. The priority of the LXX in this variant is implied by a number of scholars, e.g., McKane, *Jeremiah*, 899.

One should also note that the patronym is found in two different Hebrew forms in this chapter, נריה (36:4 and 8) and נריהו (36:14 and 32), which is rather unlikely from one author. This corroborates the suspicion that the patronyms are secondary. It also seems probable that patronyms (as well as titles and epithets) were added by different scribes in different stages and contexts. It stands to reason that the Greek is mostly original in not including the patronym for Baruch when the MT includes it.

Johanan Son of Kareah and Gedaliah Son of Ahikam in Jeremiah 40

Jeremiah 40 (LXX Jer 47) is another example of how the MT pluses are illogically distributed. In this passage Gedaliah son of Ahikam is introduced for the first time in 40:5, where he is said to be son of Ahikam son of Shaphan.[80] Both the Greek and Hebrew versions mention the father and grandfather, which is to be expected when these persons are introduced.[81] However, in the MT the father's name Shaphan is repeated in 40:6, 7, 9, 14, and 16, while the LXX lacks the patronym in all of these verses. In 40:9 the MT also includes his grandfather's name. It would be exceptional that the original author suddenly, in the middle of the passage, included his grandfather's name, when the text has already referred to him without the patronyms in 40:8. It is more probable that the pluses in the MT are later additions.[82] In not repeating the information, the LXX probably preserves the original readings.

Johanan son of Kareah is a further example that corroborates the pattern. The LXX is more consistent in including the patronym only at the beginning of a scene, while the MT is more irregular and generally expansive in this respect. In the scene, which describes the murder of Gedaliah, a military leader called Johanan is introduced for the first time in Jer 40:13 (LXX 47:13).[83] This verse mentions his father's name Kareah. The passage also refers to him in 40:15 and 16, but in these verses the MT again includes the father's name, while the LXX does not. It is probable that

---

80. He is also introduced in another passage in 39:14.

81. The grandfather's name is often omitted.

82. It should be added that in 40:11 the MT again includes both the father and grandfather, while in this verse the LXX only mentions the father's name. In 40:12 both versions omit the patronymic information altogether.

83. He is also introduced in 40:8, but this is a different scene and is a list of several names.

the LXX is original in not repeating the father's name (these verses also contain other differences, but they will not be discussed here and are not marked in the text below):[84]

Jer 40:13–16 MT	Jer 47:13–16 LXX
[13]Now Johanan son of Kareah and all the leaders of the forces in the open country came to Gedaliah at Mizpah [14]and said to him, "Do you know that Baalis, king of the Ammonites, has sent Ishmael <u>son of Nethaniah</u> to take your life?" But Gedaliah <u>son of Ahikam</u> did not believe them.	[13]And Johanan son of Kareah and all the leaders of the force, those in the open fields, came to Gedaliah at Mizpah [14]and said to him, "Do you know that Baalis, king of the Ammonites, has sent Ishmael to strike your soul?" But Godolias did not believe them.
[15]Then Johanan <u>son of Kareah</u> said secretly to Gedaliah at Mizpah, "Please let me go and kill Ishmael <u>son of Nethaniah</u>, and no one else will know. Why should he take your life, and all Judeans who are gathered to you be scattered, and the remnant of Judah would perish?"	[15]Then Johanan said secretly to Gedaliah at Mizpah, "I will indeed go and strike Ishmael, and let no one else know, lest he slay your soul, and all Judah, those gathered to you, be scattered, and those remaining of Judah shall perish."
[16]But Gedaliah <u>son of Ahikam</u> said to Johanan <u>son of Kareah</u>, "Do not do such a thing, for you are telling a lie about Ishmael."	[16]And Gedaliah said to Johanan, "Do not do this thing, because you are telling lies about Ishmael."

Patronyms Added to Both Versions

It should be emphasized that the LXX does not always represent the original version as far as the patronyms are concerned. Some patronyms were secondarily added already before the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and MT diverged as textual traditions. Each case should be investigated separately with the possibility that both the MT and LXX or either one may contain an added patronym.

Jeremiah 43:3 (LXX Jer 50:3) is an example where both MT and LXX contain a later added patronym. While the MT and LXX include the name

————

84. McKane, *Jeremiah*, 993, 1003–4, and many others assume that the LXX is generally more original in the patronyms in this passage (and elsewhere).

of Baruch's father, Neriah, 4Q72a—although fragmentary here—appears to lack the patronym. Baruch is introduced for the first time in this scene, but he has been introduced with the patronym several times in other passages in the preceding chapters. It would not be necessary to include his father's name, and therefore it is very possible that the shorter reading in 4Q72a is original. It would be difficult to explain why it had been omitted in this witness. Clearly one cannot exclude an accidental omission, but since patronyms are widely added, it is more probable that we are dealing with a similar case here. Because both the MT and LXX contain added patronymic information in Jer 43:3, it seems probable that they were not systematically added at once to one version. There was a general tendency to add them, and it was done by various scribes in different contexts, the MT preserving the most expanded version.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without documented evidence, the addition of titles, professions, epithets, and patronyms is difficult to detect on syntactic or stylistic grounds. Such additions are often well integrated into the syntax, as they are usually found immediately after the name as an apposition. Nevertheless, the evidence from Jeremiah strongly suggests that an addition is to be suspected when an element after a personal name is unnecessarily repeated in a passage. For example, the recurrent repetition of הנביא "the prophet" in Jer 28 is stylistically awkward and could raise the question of whether all these occurrences derive from the original author. The uneven or illogical distribution of titles or patronyms would also raise the suspicion that something may have been edited. This is the case when a title, profession, or patronym is mentioned, although the person in question has already appeared earlier in the text many times. It is fair to assume that in many such cases the titles, professions, and patronyms are mainly met at the beginning of a text or passage, when a person is mentioned or introduced for the first time. This should be regarded as the starting point, while a practice that differs from this begs for an explanation.[85] Clearly, a deviation from this convention does not unequivocally prove that an element was added, but it can be used as an argument that something may have been edited. An epithet of a divinity, in particular, may be a different case. The use of the epithet may have had other functions than to intro-

---

85. One should expect that the original author generally creates a consistent story that does not contain too many unnecessary repetitions, although one should not be too dogmatic about this.

duce a divinity, such as the manifestation of the divinity's authority, or another theological function. At any rate, each case should be investigated separately.

Results. Textual evidence shows that titles, professions, epithets, and patronyms were frequently supplemented, while original authors mostly—but not always—provided additional information about the person when he/ she was introduced for the first time. Although it is challenging to recognize all of them as secondary additions without textual evidence, sometimes the passage provides signs that it may not be original. We have seen cases where a literary critic would be able to suspect a later addition without textual evidence. Since the book of Jeremiah shows frequently added titles, professions, epithets, and patronyms and this evidence is merely accidental, it is probable that similar additions were made in other parts of the Hebrew Bible as well.

4
Additions: Single Sentences and Expressions

The Hebrew Bible contains many examples of added single sentences and expressions. They often add a further feature, perspective, or idea that seeks to develop the text in some way. Some of these additions are clarifications that nevertheless introduce a new aspect in relation to the older text. In this respect a full sentence provides more possibilities than isolated words or characters. In a typical case, added single sentences are syntactically or logically somehow dependent on the older text, which distinguishes them from larger additions that contain several added sentences that may add up to a separate and a somewhat independent scene.

Added single sentences range from those that had only minor impact on the older text to those that essentially changed its meaning. An example of the former is Lev 22:31, which is Yahweh's command to the Israelites to keep the commandments. At the end of the command the MT adds the nominal sentence אני יהוה, "I am Yahweh," which is missing in the SP, 4Q24 (4QLev[b]), and the LXX.[1] The MT reading is probably the result of a later addition, the cause of which are 22:30 and 32–33, where the same nominal sentence is found at the end of the verses that similarly provide Yahweh's instructions to the Israelites. Leviticus 22:31 was thus probably harmonized with its context, but the addition did not have a major impact on the text or add information.[2] There are also many added sentences that

---

1. The textual affiliation of 4Q24 is debated, but there may be an inclination toward the LXX; see Armin Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*, vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 70.

2. A possible reason for the original difference between 22:31 on the one hand and 22:30, 32–33 on the other is that 22:31 may have a different origin. Whereas the context refers to individual instructions, 22:31 unexpectedly contains an exhortation to follow the commandments in general; 22:31 may be a later addition that was, after

4
Additions: Single Sentences and Expressions

The Hebrew Bible contains many examples of added single sentences and expressions. They often add a further feature, perspective, or idea that seeks to develop the text in some way. Some of these additions are clarifications that nevertheless introduce a new aspect in relation to the older text. In this respect a full sentence provides more possibilities than isolated words or characters. In a typical case, added single sentences are syntactically or logically somehow dependent on the older text, which distinguishes them from larger additions that contain several added sentences that may add up to a separate and a somewhat independent scene.

Added single sentences range from those that had only minor impact on the older text to those that essentially changed its meaning. An example of the former is Lev 22:31, which is Yahweh's command to the Israelites to keep the commandments. At the end of the command the MT adds the nominal sentence אני יהוה, "I am Yahweh," which is missing in the SP, 4Q24 (4QLev[b]), and the LXX.[1] The MT reading is probably the result of a later addition, the cause of which are 22:30 and 32–33, where the same nominal sentence is found at the end of the verses that similarly provide Yahweh's instructions to the Israelites. Leviticus 22:31 was thus probably harmonized with its context, but the addition did not have a major impact on the text or add information.[2] There are also many added sentences that

---

1. The textual affiliation of 4Q24 is debated, but there may be an inclination toward the LXX; see Armin Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*, vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 70.

2. A possible reason for the original difference between 22:31 on the one hand and 22:30, 32–33 on the other is that 22:31 may have a different origin. Whereas the context refers to individual instructions, 22:31 unexpectedly contains an exhortation to follow the commandments in general; 22:31 may be a later addition that was, after

merely supply information that is already implicitly present in the older text. For example, in 1 Kgs 18:26 the older text, as preserved in the Old Greek, reads καὶ ἔλαβον τὸν μόσχον/βουν καὶ ἐποίησαν καὶ ἐπεκαλοῦντο ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Βααλ, "They took the bull calf and prepared it and called on the name of Baal," whereas the MT secondarily defines the bull "that was given them" (אשר נתן להם). The preceding verse already refers to a bull that would be available for Baal's prophets to take, and thereby the MT addition merely fills the narrative with already implicit information.

Some added sentences only slightly add information but subtly change the impression the text gives. Such an example can be found in 2 Kgs 15:19, which deals with the tribute that King Menahem of Israel had to pay to the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III (also called Pul in the Hebrew Bible). At the end of the verse, the MT secondarily adds an interpretive expansion that seeks to explicate why the tribute was paid: "to strengthen the kingdom in his (Tiglath-pileser's) hand," להחזיק הממלכה בידו. Although the tribute is clearly paid because Israel was forced to do so—the Assyrian king came against Israel—the addition may give the impression that Menahem was somehow positively disposed toward the Assyrian king. Because the same Assyrian king is later—during the reign of Pekah—said to have conquered large parts of Israel and exiled their inhabitants to Assyria (see 2 Kgs 15:29), the expanded text thus subtly conveys that Menahem contributed to the destruction of Israel. The sentence is missing in the LXX, which probably preserves the more original text.

There are also cases where a minor addition contains entirely new information that cannot be deduced from the older text or that clearly goes beyond it. A good example can be found in 1 Kgs 22:28, which deals with Micaiah's prophecy to King Ahab about his fate in the battle between Israel and Aram in Ramoth-Gilead. According to both versions, the king will not return from the battle in peace, implying that he will die. However, the MT secondarily adds at the end of the verse that all nations should listen (ויאמר שמעו עמים כלם), perhaps implying that they should take heed of what will happen to King Ahab. The original text is about Micaiah's prophecy to Ahab, while the addition unexpectedly widens the perspective and audience to all nations. This example will be discussed in detail below.

---

its addition, later harmonized with its immediate context by adding the final sentence "I am Yahweh."

In some cases, the addition of a sentence significantly impacted the information of the Hebrew Bible as a historical source. The MT of 2 Kgs 25:10 describes the destruction of Jerusalem's city walls by the Babylonian army, but the whole information is missing in the Old Greek, as preserved in Codex Vaticanus.[3] Since the destruction of the walls is not mentioned outside 2 Kgs 25:10, and sources dependent on it, the variant is of considerable importance when determining the extent of destruction in 587 BCE and, for example, comparing textual evidence to archaeological data.

4.1. Genesis 43:28

Genesis 43 describes how the sons of Jacob go to Egypt for the second time to ask for food due to the famine in Palestine. Genesis 43:27–29 contains a brief dialogue of greetings between Joseph and his brothers, which contains a notable text-critical variant in 43:28. After the reply of the brothers to Joseph's enquiry about the health of their father, the SP and the LXX add a reaction of Joseph, which is missing in the MT. The targumim, Peshitta, and the Vulgate follow the shorter reading of the MT. The verse is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Gen 43:28 SP	Gen 43:28 MT	Gen 43:28 LXX
ויאמרו שלום לעבדך לאבינו עודנו חי <u>ויאמר ברוך האיש ההוא לאלהים</u> ויקדו וישתחוו	ויאמרו שלום לעבדך לאבינו עודנו חי ויקדו וישתחוו	οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ὑγιαίνει ὁ παῖς σου ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ἔτι ζῇ. <u>καὶ εἶπεν Εὐλογητὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ θεῷ.</u> καὶ κύψαντες προσεκύνησαν <u>αὐτῷ</u>.
They said, "Your servant our father is well; he is still alive." <u>And he said, "Blessed be that man to God."</u> Bending forward they did obeisance.	They said, "Your servant our father is well; he is still alive." Bending forward they did obeisance.	They said, "Your servant our father is well; he is still alive." <u>And he said, "Blessed be that man to God."</u> Bending forward they did obeisance <u>to him</u>.

---

3. For discussion of this passage, see Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 110–14.

It is more likely that the SP/LXX plus is a later addition than that the MT is the result of a shortening, intentional or unintentional.[4] Since the added sentence is a self-contained unit that contains no clearly divergent terminology, there are no strong arguments that rise out of the text. One can see a slight disruption of the action by the brothers in 43:28a and 28b, and one would perhaps expect the subject to be repeated in 43:28b if the SP/LXX is original. However, the text also anticipates some kind of a reaction from Joseph. In the MT Joseph's enquiry about his father's welfare does not lead to any reaction. One could also ask why Joseph refers to his father with a somewhat reserved term "that man," האיש ההוא, when in the preceding verse he referred to him as "your father, the old one," אביכם הזקן, which is more intimate. Nevertheless, it is improbable that these considerations alone clearly tip the case in favor of the MT.

The main argument for the MT is lack of clear arguments for the alternative. If the LXX/SP reading is more original, one would have to explain how the MT reading emerged. Beyond the beginning ו of the consecutive imperfect, the text does not contain anything that would have occasioned an accidental omission, and in any case an accidental omission of a self-contained unit should only be assumed with caution. Statistically accidental omissions confuse the text much more often than remove clearly dispensable sections. An intentional omission is a more potent possibility, but it would be difficult to find any good motive for it. Joseph's blessing of Jacob contains nothing problematic, theologically or otherwise, concerning the narrative logic. In fact, an intentional omission of a patriarch's blessing would be very difficult. Ball assumes that the plus belongs to the original text, but his view is dependent on partial emendations of the text without any textual support. He suggests that ויקדו וישתחוו should be וישתחו ויקד, "*he* did obeisance, and *he* bent forward," which would refer to Joseph.[5] This is highly conjectural and should therefore be rejected. Consequently, the main argument for assuming the priority of the MT reading is the higher improbability of the alternatives.[6]

---

4. Thus also Holzinger, *Genesis*, 243.

5. Ball, *Genesis*, 102.

6. Many commentators make no note of the LXX/SP variant, e.g., Dillmann, *Genesis*, 395; Hirsch, *Genesis*, 501; Driver, *Genesis*, 356–57.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition of Joseph's reaction is a typical added detail that fills a gap in the narrative.[7] The addition can also be seen as exegetical, for it adds a theological aspect to the dialogue and possibly draws its inspiration from 43:29b, where Joseph blesses Benjamin: אלהים יחנך בני, "God be gracious to you, my son!" A trigger for the expansion may have been the lack of Joseph's reaction when his brothers told him that their father is well.[8] Since the addition expands the dialogue, it was evidently meant to be included in the text. It is thus also unlikely to be a marginal note.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. The addition would be very difficult, if not impossible to detect. This is seen already in the difficulties in determining which version is more original and finding clear arguments in favor of one of the variants. The expanded text gives practically no signs of being the result of an expansion. Paradoxically, the more original MT leaves the reader to wait for Joseph's response, and perhaps it would thus disturb the reader more than the expanded version. This expected reply was also a reason for the expansion.

Results. The LXX and SP contain a later addition, while the shorter MT preserves the more original reading. We are dealing with an addition that filled a gap in the narrative, but it can also be seen as an exegetical expansion that adds detail. Without the shorter version preserved in the MT it would have been exceedingly difficult to detect the addition.

4.2. Exodus 22:19

Part of the Covenant Code, Exodus 22:17–19 [22:18–20 ET] contains three concise commandments all of which apparently punish the offenders with a death penalty. Our focus is on 22:19, which is conventionally assumed to refer to sacrifices to illegitimate gods. The verse contains several textual variants, which are small additions that sought to change or clarify the text. The MT and SP differ substantially, whereas the Greek manuscripts vary, most containing the MT plus. Some Greek manuscripts additionally

---

7. The addition in Gen 43:28 is reminiscent of the MT additions in Jer 26:21–23: King Jehoiakim's feelings, companions, and doings were secondarily inserted, while the LXX preserves a shorter and more original text.

8. Thus already Holzinger, *Genesis*, 243.

share the variant with the SP, and some also contain a further supplement. The targumim are familiar with both pluses, that of the MT as well as that of the SP. Two letters of the verse are preserved in 2Q3 (2QExod[b]) (frag. 5), but it is not evident which reading it supports. It is possible that there is not enough space to include the SP plus, but this cannot be determined with certainty. We will discuss the MT and SP readings first.

Exod 22:19 SP	Exod 22:19 MT
זבח לאלהים <u>אחרים</u> יחרם	זבח לאלהים יחרם <u>בלתי ליהוה לבדו</u>
Whoever sacrifices to the <u>other</u> gods shall be devoted (to destruction).	Whoever sacrifices to the gods shall be devoted (to destruction), <u>except to Yahweh alone</u>.

It is significant that the pluses in both the MT and SP influence the text in a similar way. After both pluses the text unequivocally refers to the other gods to whom the Israelites may not sacrifice, which is not apparent if we only look at the shared reading of the MT and SP. By adding the word אחרים "other" after the words "gods," the reader of the SP is immediately guided to understand the sentence as a condemnation of the illegitimate gods, which are prohibited, for example, in the Decalogue in Exod 20:3. The MT reaches the same effect by adding, at the end, a sentence that rules out sacrifices to Yahweh from the apparent prohibition: if one may only sacrifice to Yahweh, the others are clearly illegitimate.

What is important is that the shared reading of the MT and SP is ambiguous: זבח לאלהים יחרם, "who sacrifices to gods shall be יחרם." The meaning of the last word, and thereby the whole sentence, is unclear. The possible original reason for the verb יחרם will be discussed after the evaluation of the other witnesses, but the apparent unclarity may be the reason why the text was edited in different traditions, and all variants may be attempts to revise the sentence to be an explicit criticism of the other gods.

Most Greek manuscripts are familiar with the MT plus. Codex Alexandrinus (and many other manuscripts) also shares the plus with the SP, thus having both pluses: ὁ θυσιάζων θεοῖς <u>ἑτέροις</u> ἐξολεθρευθήσεται <u>πλὴν κυρίῳ μόνῳ</u>, "The one who sacrifices to the <u>other</u> gods, shall be destroyed; <u>except to the Lord alone</u>." Although it is possible that the Greek tradition was influenced by the same textual tradition as the SP, one should not exclude the possibility of an independent secondary addition. If the text

is read from the perspective of intolerant monolatry, it is logical that the gods would be read as a reference to the "other gods."

Instead of sharing the SP plus, Codex Vaticanus (and other manuscripts) has a different plus: ὁ θυσιάζων θεοῖς <u>θανάτῳ</u> ὀλεθρευθήσεται πλὴν κυρίῳ μόνῳ, "The one who sacrifices to the gods, shall be destroyed <u>to death</u>; except to the Lord alone." This plus seems to be a clarification perhaps influenced by 22:18 and its Hebrew expression מות יומת "shall be killed with a death."[9] Although the Greek verb ἐξολεθρεύω, "to destroy" already implies death, it is made explicit by the plus. This seems to be an inner-Greek development and does not go back to the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

It seems apparent that the Greek variants do not provide any older readings than what is preserved in the MT or SP. The Old Greek probably read ὁ θυσιάζων θεοῖς (ἐξ)ολεθρευθήσεται πλὴν κυρίῳ μόνῳ, "Whoever sacrifices to the gods, shall be destroyed; except to the Lord alone," which would go back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* identical with the MT.[10] Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Old Greek already contains a clear interpretation of the text as (ἐξ)ολεθρευθήσεται implies a negative stand toward the actor, while the Hebrew יחרם is more ambiguous and does not necessarily refer to destruction, as we will see.

It is not evident what is meant by the word אלהים: god or gods. Oswald Loretz has suggested that the word refers to the ancestral gods and their cult figures.[11] That the text is not fully clear in this respect is shown by the targumim, which, instead of using the word אלהין, regarded it necessary to use the word טעוון, which explicitly refers to idols. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is an illustrative example of how the ambiguities of the text were explained. It reads כל מאן דדבח לטעוות עממיא יתקטיל בסייפא "Who sacrifices to the idols of the gentiles will be slain with the sword."

---

9. Exod 22:18: Πᾶν κοιμώμενον μετὰ κτήνους, θανάτῳ ἀποκτενεῖτε αὐτούς, "Everything lying with an animal, you shall with death kill them." Cf. כל שכב עם בהמה מות יומת.

10. Thus in the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint of Exodus (John Williams Wevers, ed., *Exodus*, SVTG 2.1 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991]).

11. Oswald Loretz, "Das 'Ahnen und Götterstatuen-Verbot' im Dekalog und die Einzigkeit Jahwes: Zum Begriff des Göttlichen in altorientalischen und alttestamentlichen Quellen," in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus in der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, ed. Walter Dietrich and Martin Klopfenstein, OBO 139 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 498–507.

Although the search for the meaning of יחרם and אלהים goes beyond the focus of this volume, some possible alternatives should be discussed. The root חרם is met only in *hiphil* and *hophal* in the Hebrew Bible, with the main meaning "to be dedicated to god for destruction." The verb itself does not disclose the concrete action, but it primarily refers to the object being separated from the profane and given to god. The Hebrew Bible uses the verb mainly in military contexts, where it refers to the booty that will be dedicated to Yahweh as an offering and will thus be destroyed (e.g., Num 21:2; Deut 7:2; Jos 6:21; 8:26; Judg 1:17; 21:11). However, other Semitic languages use it to refer to any separation from a profane use after which it is sacred.[12] That the object in question is made holy is also found in the Hebrew Bible. For example, according to Lev 27:28, everything that has been devoted to destruction (יחרם) is most holy to Yahweh (קדש קדשים הוא ליהוה). Be it people, animals, or property, the object of the verb has been separated in order to belong to Yahweh (see also Mic 4:13; Deut 13:16). This connection makes the use of the verb in Exod 22:19 peculiar, and nowhere else is it mentioned as a punishment for breaking the law. If a punishment was indeed meant, one would expect the text to be more precise, and define in what way the person is dedicated to Yahweh. Although it is in principle possible that a punishment was meant in Exod 22:19, other alternatives should also be considered. Consequently, there are several possible interpretations of זבח לאלהים יחרם, some of which are based on a modification of the masoretic vocalization:

1. He who sacrifices to (the) gods/god shall be devoted (to be sacred, should be or is separated from the profane)
2. He who sacrifices to (the) gods/god shall devote (זבח לאלהים יחרם)
3. A sacrifice to (the) gods/god shall be devoted/declared sacred (זבח לאלהים יחרם)
4. A sacrifice to (the) gods shall be forbidden/banned (זבח לאלהים יחרם)
5. He who sacrifices to the (ancestral) gods shall be dedicated unto destruction
6. He who sacrifices to (the) gods/god shall be dedicated unto destruction[13]

---

12. See, e.g., *HALOT*, s.v. "חרם."
13. For a more detailed discussion of the different interpretations, see Juha Pak-

One should not completely exclude the possibility that something of the original text is missing—omitted intentionally or by accident—which could explain the ambiguities. In any case, the conventional assumption that the text was already in its earliest stage a prohibition against other gods, as suggested by many, is problematic.[14] Without the specification that it clearly refers to the "other" gods or a reference to Yahweh in 22:19b, it is very difficult to read the sentence as a clear attempt to curb sacrifices to other gods, for then it would also seem to prohibit sacrifices to any god, which was hardly meant. At any rate, it seems probable that the ambiguity in the meaning resulted in various attempts to read the text in a monolatric way.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An alternative explanation for the assumption that both the MT and SP contain secondary additions is to assume that the MT is original and the SP is the result of an accidental omission of 22:19b, בלתי ליהוה לבדו," except to the LORD alone." This would have later caused the addition of the word אחרים, "other" because the text became ambiguous. In addition to the fact that there are no technical reasons, such as homoioteleuton or homoioarchton, that would have facilitated the omission of the half verse, the problem with this explanation is that 22:19b is very poorly connected to the preceding sentence. Although 22:19b makes clear that the text is about the other gods, it seems very unlikely that one author would have formed the sentence in such an awkward and confusing way, and that exactly this loose sentence would have been accidentally omitted. This would assume a complicated development (Occam's razor). One should also note that Greek manuscripts, such as Codex Alexandrinus, include both pluses, which implies that the text was still not clear and had to be explained. The same is implied by the targum readings.

---

kala, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*, PFES 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999), 121–24.

14. For it being a prohibition at its earliest stage, see, e.g., Holzinger, *Exodus*, 91; Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen*, OBO 45 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 266; Rainer Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, GAT 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 97–98, 287; and Josef Schreiner, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, NEchtB Ergänzungsband zum AT (Würzburg: Echter, 1995), 234.

Older research in particular assumed that the SP reading is probably original and the word אחרים may have been accidentally omitted in the transmission of the MT and other traditions. The reason for this omission would have been the similar ending (homoioteleuton).[15] This is a possibility that cannot be completely ruled out. This would explain why the text had become unintelligible. Nevertheless, this reading is only preserved in the SP and it is not common that the SP alone preserves the oldest reading against all other witnesses. Moreover, the SP reading also remains ambiguous as to the meaning of the verb יחרם, as noted above. It is also unlikely that Exod 22:19 originally referred to a punishment that someone who has sacrificed to other gods will face. This also undermines the assumption that the SP is original.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition in 22:19b of the MT is a rather poorly made attempt to clarify the meaning of 22:19a. Because it is so awkwardly connected to the preceding sentence, it may originally be a marginal gloss or a supralinear addition. It is unlikely that a scribe with a conscious plan to revise the text would have corrected it in such a poor way, and thus we may be dealing with a spontaneous attempt to make sense out of the preceding sentence. One possibility is that after copying the verse, a scribe realized that the text was very ambiguous and added, as a supplement, a sentence that was not well connected. In any case, the addition left the text somewhat ambiguous as the meaning of יחרם remains unclear. The Greek translation of this verb (ἐξ)ολεθρευθήσεται, "he shall be destroyed" is already an interpretation that goes beyond the Hebrew word.

The addition in the SP was more successful, as it is well integrated to the sentence. Because it is only one word, it could technically be a supralinear addition, but it may also have been added when the whole text was reproduced. Although this addition did not remove the ambiguity of the verb יחרם, the preceding reference to the illicit "other gods" makes the reader anticipate a punishment and therefore he is disposed to understand the verb in this way, even if it may not have been its original meaning.

---

15. Thus August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880), 239; Holzinger, *Exodus*, 91; and Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 201.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Even without documented evidence for variant editions, a literary critic would most likely suspect an editorial intervention in 22:19b of the MT. The problems with this half-verse are apparent and it would probably be regarded as an addition without the documented evidence of the SP. This would allow the critic to reach the older textual stage, although the difficulty to understand it would remain. On the other hand, the secondary addition in the SP, אחרים, "other" would have been much more difficult to detect without the MT. The addition did not leave any traces in the final text of the SP and perhaps one would not even suspect an intervention. Nevertheless, one would still puzzle about the meaning of יחרם, but in view of the wider context in the Pentateuch, which is largely very critical of the other gods, one would probably read it as referring to a punishment by death.

Results. The textual evidence of Exod 22:19 contains several attempts to interpret an ambiguous text from the perspective of exclusive Yahwism. The MT and the SP both contain independent additions that work for the same effect. The Greek translations contain further attempts to make the text less unclear. Without documented evidence one would very probably suspect that 22:19b of the MT is a later addition. Without the MT and LXX readings, it would have been much more difficult to detect the SP addition.

4.3. Deuteronomy 1:25, 35, and 39

Although the main witnesses of Deuteronomy contain less text-critical variants than many other books of the Hebrew Bible, there are some illustrative examples. Here we discuss three short additions in Deut 1.

Deuteronomy 1:25

Deuteronomy 1:25 describes the return of the spies sent by Moses to scout the promised land. The MT contains an additional plus that refers to a report by the spies, while the sentence is missing in the LXX. The MT reading is supported by the SP, the Peshitta, and all extant Pentateuchal targumim, while the LXX reading is largely followed by the Vulgate.[16]

---

16. Deut 1:25 in the Vulgate: *Sumentes de fructibus eius ut ostenderent ubertatem*

Deut 1:25 MT	Deut 1:25 LXX
ויקחו בידם	καὶ ἐλάβοσαν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν
מפרי הארץ	ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τῆς γῆς
ויורדו אלינו	καὶ κατήνεγκαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς
<u>וישבו אתנו דבר</u>	
ויאמרו טובה הארץ	καὶ ἔλεγον Ἀγαθὴ ἡ γῆ,
אשר יהוה אלהינו נתן לנו	ἣν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν δίδωσιν ἡμῖν.

They took in their hands of the fruit of the land, which they brought down to us. <u>They brought back a report to us,</u> and said, "It is a good land that Yahweh our God is giving us."	They took in their hands some of the fruit of the land and brought it down to us and said, "It is a good land that the Lord our God is giving us."

In contrast with the main LXX tradition, some Greek Manuscripts of the *O* Group, supported by the Arabian and Armenian translations and the Syro-Hexapla, have in the place of MT's plus וישבו אתנו דבר "they brought back a report to us" καὶ ἐπέστρεψαν ἡμῖν ῥῆμα, which is a verbatim translation of the Hebrew phrase.[17] However, a corresponding phrase found in Deut 1:22 (וישבו אתנו דבר "they shall bring back a report to us") is translated differently in the LXX (καὶ ἀναγγειλάτωσαν ἡμῖν ἀπόκρισιν).[18] It is probable that the verbatim translation of MT's plus in Deut 1:25, as attested by the LXX *O* manuscripts, is due to a secondary revision of the Greek text toward the prevalent Hebrew tradition. Therefore, the shorter Greek version attested in the majority of the Greek witnesses most likely represents the OG.

The shorter Greek reading probably goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which represents a textual tradition more original than the MT reading.[19] According to this theory, the comparison between the LXX and the MT attests to a short addition inserted at a rather late stage, since it was not yet included in the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek.[20] The additional phrase וישבו

---

adtulerunt ad nos atque dixerunt bona est terra quam Dominus Deus noster daturus est nobis.

17. The main LXX tradition according to John William Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium*, SVTG 3.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 61.

18. Followed by τὴν ὁδόν, δι᾽ ἧς ἀναβησόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ, which corresponds to the Hebrew את הדרך אשר נעלה בה "regarding the route by which we should go up."

19. This textual tradition seems to be found also in the Vulgate.

20. Among others, Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 29 n. 115; Emanuel Tov, "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in*

דבר אתנו "they brought back a report to us" corresponds not only to the preceding passage 1:22 (וישבו אתנו דבר את הדרך אשר נעלה בה "they shall bring back a report to us regarding the route by which we should go up"), but it also has a verbatim equivalent in Num 13:26 (וישיבו אותם דבר "they brought back a report to them"), a passage that also deals with the return of the Israelite spies. In the recounting of the story in Deut 1, verse 25 is the very passage that corresponds to Num 13:26(–27), so a secondary harmonization of these passages is conceivable.

The plus smooths a content-related tension in the shorter version of Deut 1:25. According to the LXX version, the returned spies praise the land without reservations ("It is a good land that Yahweh our God is giving us"), after which it may thus come as a surprise that the people are unwilling to conquer the land (1:26) and complain about the discouraging report of the spies (1:27: "Our brothers have made our hearts melt by reporting, 'The people are stronger and taller than we; the cities are large and fortified up to heaven! We actually saw there the offspring of the Anakim!'"). The author(s) of Deut 1 have certainly created this contrast on purpose in order to stress the people's unfaithfulness to the divine promises.[21] Readers of the shorter version, however, may wonder, at which moment do the spies give the discouraging report to the people, for Deut 1:25 LXX mentions only their positive report. This problem is partly solved by the addition of וישבו אתנו דבר "They brought back a report to us," since it can be read in light of 1:27 as implying that the spies, when reporting about the land, did not only praise its quality but also reported about the discouraging strength of the land's inhabitants.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Alternatively, one would have to assume a secondary omission of the phrase וישבו אתנו דבר "they brought back a report to us." An accidental omission is theoretically possible, but, besides the typical beginning of the consecutive imperfect (וי), the text does not contain a clear feature that would trigger a scribe to skip the phrase.[22] Another alternative is an intentional omission, which could

Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed. Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt, and Michael James Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 20.

21. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 27–28.

22. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 22 n. b, proposes omission due to haplography ("*wy*[*šbw ʾtnw dbr wy*]*ʾmrw*") but admits to have "reservations" about this theory.

have happened either in the Greek translation or its Hebrew *Vorlage*. However, the omission of an entire phrase would need a clear reason, and this is not apparent, for the phrase does not create logical problems or contradictions, and does not contain any theological difficulties. By contrast, the text is, in part, more logical if וישבו אתנו דבר "they brought back a report to us" is part of 1:25, as shown above. Another theoretical possibility is a deliberate stylistic omission by the Greek translator.[23] But it is not clear why a Greek text without an equivalent to וישבו אתנו דבר "they brought back a report to us," i.e. καὶ κατήνεγκαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἔλεγον "and they brought it down to us and said," would be stylistically better than otherwise.[24] In sum, there are no strong counterarguments against the theory that the shorter Greek text attests to a late interpolation in the proto-MT.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. The plus in the MT is well embedded in the text. The phrase וישבו אתנו דבר "they brought back a report to us" is opened with a narrative form וישבו "they brought back" as part of a chain of narrative forms ויקחו … ויורדו … וישבו … ויאמרו "and they took … and brought down … and brought back … and said." This sequence does not give any indications for a literary break. The text is partly more logical with the plus, and thus the narrative logic would also not reveal the addition. Without the documented textual evidence of the LXX (and the Vulgate), it would be next to impossible to detect this addition.

Deuteronomy 1:35

Deuteronomy 1:35–36 describes Yahweh's punishment of the wandering Israelites for not having full trust in him: Except for Caleb, they will not see the promised land. Deuteronomy 1:35 contains three pluses: two in the

---

Such an omission would indeed be no typical haplography since, apart from the first two consonants, the forms וישבו and ויאמרו have not much in common.

23. Carmel McCarthy, ed., *Deuteronomy,* BHQ 5 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 51–52*: "M … may reflect an expansion taken from Num 13:26. However, while the shorter text of G is attractive, it could also be the result of stylistic editing on G's part." Also Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1–4,43*, HTKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2012), 372, refers to stylistic polishing as a characteristic trait of the Greek translation of Deuteronomy.

24. Lothar Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, BK 5.2 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 83. A most natural translation containing no obvious stylistic problems would be καὶ κατήνεγκαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν ἡμῖν ἀπόκρισιν λέγοντες.

MT and one in the LXX. The MT adds הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation" and לתת "to give," while the LXX adds ταύτην "this." Only the first variant reading that adds substance will be discussed here, while the others are mainly stylistic additions.

Deut 1:35 MT	Deut 1:35 LXX
אם יראה איש באנשים האלה <u>הדור הרע הזה</u> את הארץ הטובה אשר נשבעתי <u>לתת</u> לאבתיכם	Εἰ ὄψεταί τις τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν <u>ταύτην</u>, ἣν ὤμοσα τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν
Not one of these men—this evil generation—shall see the good land that I swore <u>to give</u> to your fathers.	Not one of these men shall see <u>this</u> good land, that I swore to your fathers.

The MT plus הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation," is also attested by the SP, the Vulgate, and the extant pentateuchal targumim. Although some Greek manuscripts follow the MT, these are probably later harmonizations toward a proto-MT, while the plus was probably missing in the Old Greek.[25]

The most likely explanation for the shorter LXX is that it goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* preserving an older textual stage than the MT, while the MT attests a supplement that was secondarily inserted into this verse.[26] This hypothesis is supported by the parallel version of the story in Num 13–14. Numbers 14 contains a similar phrase, העדה הרעה הזאת "this evil congregation" (14:27, 35), which refers to Yahweh not allowing the adult Israelites to enter the land. Although the phrases are not identical, the Numbers passage may still have influenced the plus in Deut 1:35 MT. The word עדה "congregation" is foreign to Deuteronom(ist)ic language and is not found in the entire book; therefore it could have been substituted in the proto-MT of Deut 1:35 by the word דור "generation," which is much more typical in Deuteronomy (2:14; 7:9; 23:3, 9; 29:21; 32:5, 7, 20).[27] The use of the word דור "generation" may also be influenced by Num 32:13,

---

25. Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 64. The Syro-Hexapla attests the plus *sub asterisco*.

26. Among others, Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 23; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 30 n. 118.

27. Norbert Lohfink, "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1.39," in *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis; Studies in Honour of Anthony F. Campbell for His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Mark A. O'Brien and Howard N. Wallace, JSOTSup 415 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 30–43.

where Moses refers to the death of the exodus generation with the words העשה הרע בעיני יהוה "which had done what was evil in Yahweh's eyes."[28]

Apart from harmonizing Deut 1 with Num 14, the MT plus interprets Deut 1:35 in a certain way. In the shorter reading, as attested by the LXX, the words "one of these men" (איש באנשים האלה), which are partly parallel to Num 14:22 (כל האנשים "all the men"), could be read to refer to the spies and not to the entire exodus generation.[29] The plus הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation," by contrast, makes clear that all adult Israelites of this time were not allowed to enter the land (cf. the reference to the death of כל הדור אנשי המלחמה "the entire generation, the men of the war" in Deut 2:14). In addition, the plus stresses that this was due to their evilness, which contrasts with the goodness of the land.[30] All in all, it seems probable that the shorter version of the LXX is original, while the MT plus is a late interpretive and clarifying insertion in the proto-MT.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The opposite direction of development—the secondary omission of the MT plus in the LXX—is more difficult to explain. An accidental omission can never be completely ruled out, but the text does not contain features, such as similar words or repeated phrases, that would have triggered a mechanical error in the process of copying. One should also be particularly critical of proposed accidental omissions of syntactic units that leave the text without any syntactic disturbance. In this case, exactly an appositional unit would have been accidentally left out.

Assuming that the plus was intentionally omitted, either in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX or in the Greek translation, the text would have become more difficult to understand. The preceding reference to האנשים האלה "these men" limits the punishment to the spies, and this does not fit to the larger context of this passage. In other words, it is unlikely that the original author could have meant the punishment to refer to the spies only, but the text was formulated so that an ambiguity was created. The clarification for an originally poor formulation is thus understandable, while it is improbable that a scribe had intentionally and secondarily created the ambiguity.

---

28. Tov, "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," 20.
29. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 53*.
30. Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 30 n. 118.

One possibility is to assume that the reference to הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation" was too offensive or otherwise problematic, which would have occasioned an interpretive omission. In particular, Eckart Otto has proposed that the phrase was omitted in the LXX in order to harmonize Deut 1:35 with Yahweh's reply to Moses's intercession in Num 14:22–23, for the term רע "evil" is not found in the Numbers parallel. In other words, Moses's paraphrase of Yahweh's reply to Moses in Deut 1:35 MT, which refers to הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation," would seem to be in conflict with Num 14:22–23, where this reference is missing. The longer MT would represent a more original *lectio difficilior*.[31]

Although the proposed development is certainly possible, it is unlikely that the Greek translator or a scribe in the *Vorlage* followed such an intricate logic in order to harmonize the two versions. It is certainly correct that "the men" are not explicitly qualified as "evil" in Num 14:22–23, but this qualification is found in Num 14:27, 35, which have no counterpart in Deut 1. Numbers 14:27, 35 refer to "this evil congregation" in a second speech of Yahweh, which repeats and explains Yahweh's oath in Num 14:22–23 promising that "all the men" who saw his wonders in the exodus and in the desert will not enter the land; the reference to Israel's evilness in Num 14:27, 35 helps to justify this punishment. Since Yahweh's second speech in Num 14:26–35 has no parallel in Deut 1, the plus in Deut 1:35 MT הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation" serves to adjust Deut 1 to Num 14:26–35 by merging the reference to האנשים האלה "these men," which accords with Num 14:22, with the reference to the people's evilness, which corresponds to Num 14:27, 35. The opposite development, an attempt to harmonize Deut 1 with Num 14 by omitting the reference to "this evil generation" in Deut 1:35 is improbable, since there is no substantial contradiction between Deut 1:35 MT and Num 14:22–23 + 14:27, 35, and the fact remains that the shorter text of Deut 1:35 LXX is more difficult to understand, as shown above. Moreover, harmonizations typically add some missing detail—which is often attested by the SP and the LXX

---

31. Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 373. Otto combines this with the hypothesis that Num 14:27, 35 depends on Deut 1:35 MT; in addition, he assumes that Num 32:13, which speaks about "all the generation that had done evil in the sight of Yahweh" (כל הדור העשה הרע בעיני יהוה), depends on Deut 2:14, which borrowed the term "generation" (דור) from Deut 1:35 MT. Thus Deut 1:35 MT, in Otto's theory, must represent the more original text.

in the Pentateuch, while omissions are a different and relatively rare phenomenon that were mainly made when the older text contained something offensive or there were other substantial reasons to leave out parts of the text.[32]

Detectability by Literary Criticism. The phrase הדור הרע הזה "this evil generation" is an apposition to the preceding האנשים האלה "these men," and it thus reads as a further explication before the ensuing object את הארץ הטובה "this good land." Thus, the words are not inseparable from the syntactical structure and they partly even "interrupt the flow of the sentence," as noted by Carmel McCarthy.[33] If we only possessed the MT, one could have suspected that the phrase is not original. It is possible to take out these words without any disturbance to the overall syntactical structure, and it is characteristic of many short additions that they contain further specifications of preceding words or sentences. Moreover, the MT is somewhat congested with its twofold reference to the subject. In sum, the textual evidence of the shorter LXX reading supports what could also be suspected by literary criticism based on the MT alone.

Deuteronomy 1:39

Part of the same passage as verse 35, Deut 1:39 discusses whether the Israelite children, who are already born, will enter the promised land. The verse contains notable variants between the MT, SP, and the LXX. The LXX lacks a sentence shared by the MT and SP, while the SP lacks a different sentence shared by the MT and LXX. The targumim and the Vulgate follow the MT in these variants. The fragmentary 4Q35 (4QDeut^h) follows the MT/LXX plus lacking in the SP: אׄ[..., ידע היום טוב "who] today does [no]t know good." Although the beginning of the verse is not preserved in the manuscript, there does not seem to be enough space for the MT/

---

32. On the harmonizing tendency of the LXX in the Pentateuch, see Tov, "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," 15–28; Tov, "Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs," in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Writings*, ed. Emanuel Tov, VTSup 167 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 3:166–88; Tov, "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24"; and Tov, "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11," in Tov, *Collected Writings*, 3:470–89.
33. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 53.

SP plus lacking in the LXX, and the singular verb also indicates a shared reading with the LXX (see below).[34]

Deut 1:39 SP	Deut 1:39 MT	Deut 1:39 LXX
וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם	וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע	καὶ πᾶν παιδίον νέον, ὅστις οὐκ οἶδεν σήμερον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν,
הם יבאו שמה ולהם אתננה והם יירשוה	המה יבאו שמה ולהם אתננה והם יירשוה	οὗτοι εἰσελεύσονται ἐκεῖ, καὶ τούτοις δώσω αὐτήν, καὶ αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν αὐτήν.
And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children, they shall enter there; and to them I will give it, and they shall inherit it.	And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children, who today do not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there; and to them I will give it, and they shall inherit it.	And every young child, who today does not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there, and to them I will give it, and they shall inherit it.

In other words, the MT preserves the fullest version containing a noun followed by a relative clause and a second noun followed by another relative clause:

וטפכם	And your little ones,
אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	who you thought would become booty,
ובניכם	and your children,
אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע	who today do not yet know right from wrong

---

34. Julie Ann Duncan "4QDeut^h (Pl. XVII–XVIII)," in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings*, ed. Eugene Ulrich et al., DJD XIV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 64–65. 4Q35 has several variants with the LXX against the MT, but it also contains variants with the MT against the LXX. According to Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress 2001), 116, 4Q35 cannot be clearly ascribed to any of the main textual traditions, and therefore it should be regarded as independent or nonaligned. According to Lange, *Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran*, 91, 4Q35 shows the "interference of different textual traditions in Hellenistic times" ("Interferenz der verschiedenen Texttraditionen in hellenistischer Zeit").

The OG has a much shorter text:[35]

καὶ πᾶν παιδίον νέον,	And every young child,
ὅστις οὐκ οἶδεν σήμερον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν	who today does not yet know right from wrong

While the relative clause ὅστις οὐκ οἶδεν σήμερον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν "who today does not yet know right from wrong" corresponds to the Masoretic אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע, the introductory sentence in Greek, καὶ πᾶν παιδίον νέον "and every young child," is only a somewhat general correspondence to וטפכם "and your little ones." An equivalent for the suffix כם-, "your" is lacking in the OG, and the OG contains a clarifying plus πᾶν "every"; both can be explained as interpretive modifications of the Hebrew *Vorlage* by the Greek translator, and also the Greek παιδίον νέον "young child" seems to be an interpretive translation of the word טף. While παιδίον is used in the LXX as a translation for both בן "child" and טף "little ones," the wording παιδίον νέον "young child" is nowhere else attested in the LXX.[36] It is probable that καὶ πᾶν παιδίον νέον "and every young child" is an interpretive translation of וטפכם "and your little ones," since טף "little ones" refers to the young age of the children and is a collective term that in the context of a translation can most naturally be explained by adding "all" or "every."[37] Thus, the OG probably goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* containing וטפכם אשר לא ידע[ו]^[38] היום טוב ורע "and your little ones who today do not yet know right from wrong."

In addition to lacking space for the MT plus against the LXX, 4Q35 shares the singular ידע with the LXX οἶδεν against the plural ידעו of the MT.[39] The singular only fits with טפכם as antecedent, whereas the בניכם would necessitate a plural. Therefore, the missing text at the beginning of 1:39 in 4Q35 can be reconstructed as ורע] וטפכם אשר ל[א ידע היום טוב "and your little ones who] today do [no]t yet know right [from wrong." This text

35. According to Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 65, a substantial number of manuscripts including LXX^B attest the plus in the MT, which is probably due to secondary harmonization of the Greek text with the proto-MT.

36. See the data given by Lohfink, "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1:39," 32. The LXX of Deuteronomy renders the Hebrew word טף variably: τέκνον (2:34; 3:19); παιδίον (3:6); ἀποσκευή (20:14); and ἔκγονος (29:10; 31:12).

37. Lohfink, "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1:39," 33–34.

38. On the minor divergence between the sg. and the pl. of this verb, see below.

39. For 4Q35 lacking space, see Duncan, "4QDeut^h," 64–65.

would be very similar or identical with the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the OG. This excludes the possibility that the shorter reading in Greek is the result of a stylistic shortening by the translator.

The SP, by contrast, attests to both nouns but only to the *first* relative clause:

וטפכם	And your little ones,
אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	who you thought would become booty,
ובניכם	and your children

The relationship between the three versions is complex, and it does not seem possible to reconstruct a linear development from one version to the others. The largest difference is found between the OG and the SP, which contain, in part, two separate variant readings. As argued above, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG probably read וטפכם אשר לא ידע היום טוב ורע "and your little ones who today do not yet know right from wrong," while the SP reads וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם "and your little ones who you thought would become booty and your children." The MT seems to be a combination of both of these pluses.

It is notable that the phrase וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה "and your little ones who you thought would become booty" is also found in Num 14:31, which is part of a parallel account of the same event in Num 13–14. Since the relative clause in the MT אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה "who you thought would become booty" and the ensuing ובניכם "and your children" are missing in the OG and 4Q35, the plus can be explained as a late addition and harmonization with Num 14:31. The sentence אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע "who today do not yet know right from wrong" is probably an unrelated addition, since it is lacking in the SP and found in the OG and MT. In this case, the oldest version would be found in the elements shared by the *Vorlage* of the OG and the SP:[40]

וטפכם	And your little ones—
המה יבאו שמה	they shall enter there

This phrase—grammatically a *casus pendens*—is syntactically correct and fully understandable.[41] Although this reading is not found in any witness, it would explain the emergence of both independent additions that were made in two textual traditions independent of each other. In a later stage,

---

40. Lohfink, "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1:39," 34–35.
41. See Joüon §156.

the proto-MT included both independent additions, perhaps as a means of harmonization.[42]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Despite its complications and uncertainties, any alternative theory needs to explain how the shorter versions of the OG and the SP originated. An alternative model necessitates that the OG, or its *Vorlage*, and the SP resulted from unintentional or deliberate shortenings. This assumption seems unlikely. It is certainly possible that the passage was shortened in one textual tradition, be it intentionally or unintentionally, but a shortening that took place in two separate textual traditions is clearly less likely than the theory of two expansions. While it can never be completely excluded that something was omitted by mistake, it would be an extraordinary coincidence if two such scribal mistakes happened independent of each other in the same verse and neither of them confused the text's syntax. The possibility of an intentional omission is also unlikely, because the text contains no apparent reason to have occasioned an editorial intervention that mainly took place for a clear reason (see discussion in ch. 3, "Omissions").

Having said this, the MT does contain textual features that could have triggered a scribal parablepsis. The repeated אשר "who" and the similar shape of וטפכם "and your little ones" and ובניכם "and your children" could have made a copyist skip the first אשר-clause with the ensuing noun ובניכם "and your children." In other words, the shorter reading of the OG *Vorlage* and of 4Q35 could be the result of an early haplography:

Deut 1:39 MT	Deut 1:39 OG *Vorlage*/4Q35
וטפכם וטפכם	
אשר לא ידע היום טוב ורע אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	
ובניכם המה יבאו שמה	
אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע	
המה יבאו שמה	
And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children, who today do not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there	And your little ones, who today do not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there

---

42. Lohfink, "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1.39," 34–35.

A minor phenomenon in this context is the fact that the reconstructed OG *Vorlage* and 4Q35 read the singular ידע instead of the plural ידעו attested by the MT. This detail is difficult to explain. The collective noun טף "little ones," if used as the syntactical subject, can be construed either with a verbal form in the singular (see יהיה in MT/SP) or with a plural form.[43] In this case, it seems slightly more probable that a more original singular ידע was secondarily changed into the plural ידעו since such a change can be explained as a harmonization toward the contextual plural forms ובניכם "and your children" and המה יבאו "they shall enter" in the proto-MT; such a development (i.e., from the singular ידע in the OG *Vorlage*/4Q35 to the plural ידעו in the MT/SP) would speak against the assumption that the reading of the OG *Vorlage* and 4Q35 results from a scribal parablepsis, since it would additionally indicate that the textual tradition represented by the MT is younger than the version of the OG and 4Q35. However, it also cannot be excluded that a more original plural ידעו was secondarily changed into the singular ידע in the tradition represented by the OG *Vorlage* and 4Q35; such a change may have been an indirect consequence of the unintentional omission of the preceding words because the singular form ידע may have been deemed stylistically more fitting with the antecedent טף. In sum, the phenomenon remains ambiguous.

The reading of the SP, by contrast, cannot be easily explained as resulting from a scribal mistake. The MT does not contain features that would easily cause a copyist to jump from ובניכם "and your children" to (ה)המ "they," thus unintentionally missing אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע.

Deut 1:39 MT	Deut 1:39 SP
וטפכם	וטפכם
אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה
ובניכם	ובניכם
<u>אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע</u>	
המה יבאו שמה	הם יבאו שמה
And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children, <u>who today do not yet know right from wrong</u>, they shall enter there	And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children—they shall enter there

---

43. For an ensuing singular form, see Exod 10:24; Num 32:16; for an ensuing plural form, see Num 14:3; 31:18.

Finally, an intentional omission of the respective plus is improbable in both cases. There are no discernible reasons that would explain why an editor of the Alexandrian textual tradition would have deliberately skipped the words אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם "who you thought would become booty, and your children," or why an editor of the pre-Samaritan textual tradition would have skipped the words אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע "who today do not yet know right from wrong."[44] The phrases are not problematic, neither grammatically nor in terms of content. The two parallel phrases may read a bit verbosely, but this does not justify the assumption that one or both of the shorter versions resulted from a stylistic polishing; both phrases contain weighty annotations illustrating that the following generation was innocent of Israel's unfaithfulness and was therefore not punished by being denied entrance into the promised land.

In sum, it is possible to explain the shorter reading attested by the OG and 4Q35 as resulting from a scribal mistake, but the minus that is attested by the SP can neither be explained with an unintentional nor with an intentional omission. The SP does in any case indicate that the phrase אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע "who today do not yet know right from wrong" goes back to a late addition in the proto-MT, while the minus attested by the OG and 4Q35 may also have resulted from an unintentional omission of the words אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם "who you thought would become booty and your children." Thus, as an alternative to the model of

---

44. *Pace* John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, SCS 39 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993*)*, 23, who explains the OG reading as a "free rendering" that "does rid the text of a troublesome doublet"; Otto *Deuteronomium*, 374, along the same lines, refers to the weight of the textual witnesses ("Gewicht der Textzeugen") and a tendency of the Deuteronomy LXX to smooth the text ("Glättung des Textes"); however, it is unclear why the OG and a corresponding manuscript from Qumran should have lesser weight than the MT and the SP, and a large-scale "smoothing" of the text by omitting such substantial elements is no clear tendency in the LXX of Deuteronomy. And *pace* Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 374, who argues that the other witnesses confirm the originality of the pre-Samaritan reading and explains the omission as an attempt of harmonizing Deut 1:39 with Deut 29:3–4. It is difficult to see on which basis MT and LXX should confirm the originality of this reading over against the SP; and, although Deut 1:39 MT/LXX certainly contains a logic different from Deut 29:3–4 MT, there is no such gross contradiction between Deut 1:39 MT/LXX (the Israelites' "children who today do not yet know right from wrong" will be the ones who are allowed to enter the land) and Deut 29:3 (the generation of the Moab covenant has not yet received from Yahweh "a heart to understand") that would justify a secondary omission of the theologically weighty plus in Deut 1:39 MT/LXX.

textual development proposed above, the following model must be taken into consideration:

Proto-SP type text	Proto-MT type text	OG *Vorlage*/4Q35
וטפכם	וטפכם	וטפכם
אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	~~אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה~~
ובניכם	ובניכם	~~ובניכם~~
	אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע	אשר לא ידע היום טוב ורע
הם יבאו שמה	המה יבאו שמה	המה יבאו שמה
And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children—they shall enter there	And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children, <u>who today do not yet know right from wrong,</u> they shall enter there	And your little ones, ~~who you thought would become booty, and your children~~, who today do not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. According to the first model proposed above, Deut 1:39 contains two typical additions often suspected in literary criticism. The additions add clarifying detail partly influenced by the parallel text in Num 14. Because the additions follow the form of the main text, they were apparently intended to be included in the text and are unlikely to be marginal notes. The additions could have been made between the lines, but it is also conceivable that they were written when the entire manuscript was produced.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. If we possessed only the MT, it would be difficult to unveil the full prehistory of Deut 1:39 MT, as it is attested by the SP and by the OG and 4Q35. However, the unnecessary use of two different words for children and the form of the verse in the MT with its two subsequent relative clauses may nevertheless arouse suspicion that text may have been edited.[45] In particular, one may discern a kind of resumptive repetition (*Wiederaufnahme*) in the term ובניכם "and your children," since this term seems more or less synonymous with the preceding וטפכם "and your little ones." If one takes ובניכם "and your children," as

---

45. See, e.g., Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 30, who distributes 1:39 on two literary layers, though without paying attention to the diversified textual transmission of the verse.

a resumptive repetition of וטפכם "and your little ones," this leads to the assumption that the words אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם "who you thought would become booty, and your children" were secondarily added to the verse. This corresponds precisely to the shorter reading attested by the OG and by 4Q35.

Deut 1:39 MT	Deut 1:39 OG *Vorlage*/4Q35
וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע המה יבאו שמה	וטפכם אשר לא ידע היום טוב ורע המה יבאו שמה
And your little ones, who you thought would become booty, and your children, who today do not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there	And your little ones, who today do not yet know right from wrong, they shall enter there

To be sure, the possibility that the OG and 4Q35 reading goes back to an accidental omission by haplography diminishes the weight of this evidence to a certain extent. However, it cannot be excluded and seems very possible that the shorter readings of both the OG and 4Q35 attest an older stage of the literary development, as shown above. That also the second relative clause was secondarily added, as attested by the *lectio brevior* of the SP, would be more difficult to detect. The form of Deut 1:39 MT does not indicate that the second אשר-clause goes back to an addition. Consequently, a literary critical approach would allow a partial reconstruction of Deut 1:39 but the entire development could probably not be reconstructed on the basis of the MT alone.

Results. The examples from Deut 1 show cases of typical additions of a sentence that clarifies the context and/or harmonizes the verse with parallel passages elsewhere in the Pentateuch. None of these additions adds substantially new information or fundamentally changes the meaning or the reader's understanding of the text. Some could have been detected (e.g., Deut 1:35) or suspected (e.g., Deut 1:39 partly) by a literary-critical approach, while others would have been difficult or nearly impossible to detect (e.g., Deut 1:25). Nevertheless, these documented examples correspond to typical additions assumed in literary and redaction criticism.

4.4. Deuteronomy 17:2–5

Deuteronomy 17:2–7 discusses in casuistic form a hypothetical legal case where an Israelite has worshiped other gods. This law has a close parallel in 11Q19 (Temple Scroll) LV, 15–21, but there are several variants with the biblical text, two of which are particularly illustrative of additions. In 11Q19 LV, 18, which is a parallel to Deut 17:3, 11Q19 lacks a relative sentence that is included in all biblical witnesses and the targumim. Deuteronomy 17:5 contains a further relative sentence in the MT that is missing in 11Q19 and in the Old Greek.[46] Some Greek manuscripts variably follow parts of the MT plus, but this is most likely a secondary harmonization toward the proto-MT. The Samaritan Pentateuch, the targumim, and the Peshitta follow the MT, but the Vulgate only partially (see below). Fragments of Deut 17:2–7 are preserved in 4Q30 (4QDeutᶜ). Although it provides no evidence for the variant reading in 17:3, it unequivocally follows the MT/SP in 17:5.[47]

Deut 17:2–5	11Q19 LV, 15–18
²כי ימצא בקרבך באחד שעריך	¹⁵אם ימצא בקרבכה באחד שעריכה
אשר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נתן לך איש או אשה	אשר ¹⁶אָנוֹכִי נותן לכה איש או אישה
אשר יעשה את הרע בעיני יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אשר יעשה את הרע בעיני
לעבר בריתו	¹⁷לעבר בריתי
³וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים וישתחו להם	והלך ועבד אלוהים אחרים וישתחו להמה
ולשמש או לירח או לכל צבא השמים	¹⁸או לשמש או לירח או לכול צבא השמים
אשר לא צויתי	
⁴והגד לך ושמעת	והגידו לכה עָלָיו ¹⁹ושמעתה את הדבר הזה
ודרשת היטב	ודרשתה וחקרתה היטב
והנה אמת נכון הדבר	והנה ²⁰אמת נכון הדבר
נעשתה התועבה הזאת בישראל	נעשתה התועבה הזואת בישראל
⁵והוצאת את האיש ההוא או את האשה ההוא	והוצאתה ²¹את האיש ההוא או את האשה ההיא
אשר עשו את הדבר הרע הזה אל שעריך	
את האיש או את האשה	
וסקלתם באבנים ומתו	וסקלתמה באבנים

---

46. According to some scholars, such as Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, JSOTSup 34 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 3, the biblical text behind 11Q19 was closer to the Old Greek than to that of the MT.

47. 4Q30 is characterized as an independent textual witness not evidently connected with any of the main textual traditions; see Lange, *Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran*, 88.

²If there is found among you, in one of your towns that <u>Yahweh your God</u> is giving you, a man or woman who does what is evil in the sight <u>of Yahweh your God</u>, and transgresses his covenant ³by serving other gods and worshiping them—whether the sun or the moon or any of the host of heaven—<u>which I have forbidden</u> ⁴and if (it) is reported to you or you hear of it, and you make a thorough inquiry, and the charge is proved true that such an abhorrent thing has occurred in Israel, ⁵then you shall bring out that man or that woman, <u>who has done this bad thing to your gates that man or that woman</u> and you shall stone them <u>to death</u>.

¹⁵If there is found among you, in one of your towns ¹⁶I am giving you, a man or woman who does what is evil in my sight, ¹⁷and transgresses his covenant by serving other gods and worshiping them—¹⁸whether the sun or the moon or any of the host of heaven—and if it is reported to you ¹⁹or you hear <u>about this matter</u>, and you make a thorough inquiry <u>and investigation</u>, and the charge ²⁰is proved true that such an abhorrent thing has occurred in Israel, then you shall bring out ²¹that man or that woman and you shall stone them.

Despite the support of all biblical manuscripts of Deut 17:3, it is probable that 11Q19 preserves the more original reading in lacking the relative sentence אשר לא צויתי.⁴⁸ The following considerations speak in favor of this theory. Since 11Q19 has a secondary tendency to highlight Yahweh's speech in the first-person (seen also in this passage), the intentional omission of such a sentence would go against its typical development.⁴⁹ Apart from the change of the third person to the first person, 11Q19 follows the biblical text rather faithfully in this law and in the related passage 11Q19 LIV, 8–18, which is a parallel to Deut 13:2–6, and no apparent tendency to shorten can be observed. Quite the opposite; there are minor additions that seek to clarify the text (see esp. 11Q19 LV, 19). Moreover, 11Q19 preserves some earlier readings against other biblical witnesses. This is especially apparent in 11Q19 LV, 21, where it shares a reading with the LXX of Deut 17:5 vis-à-vis the masoretic version.⁵⁰ It is thus evident that the author of 11Q19 had access to a rather early textual stage of Deuteronomy and its readings can thus not be disregarded as secondary developments.

---

48. The SP has אשר לא צויתיו, "which I did not command him." The added suffix may be an accidental dittography; thus Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 212.

49. In parallel sections where the Pentateuch refers to God in the third person 11Q19 often has the first person.

50. Regardless of whether the reading is original or not, the shared reading with the OG implies an early reading; see discussion below.

However, the most compelling reasons for assuming that the plus in Deut 17:3 is an addition are text-internal. The sudden reference to "what I have commanded" puzzles the reader as to who is speaking, Moses or Yahweh (note that in 11Q19 there would be no ambiguity, since the whole law has been changed to Yahweh's speech). There are also a few other cases where it is not entirely clear who is speaking (e.g., Deut 28:20). In this case, the sudden use of the first person is confusing. Although Moses speaks in the first person in some passages in the law section of Deut 5 (e.g., Deut 13:18; 15:5, 15–16), in Deut 17:3 the first person is met inside the law itself and not in the narrative frame of the law. Thereby one is led to assume that Yahweh is the *intended* speaker, which strongly suggests a later author, for in the same law, in the preceding verse, Yahweh is referred to in the third person.[51] The sentence in the plus is also unnecessary, because it is evident from the outset that the activity described here is regarded as a bad deed and a transgression against Yahweh (17:2). The plus additionally stresses the transgression against Yahweh's commandments. Moreover, it is unclear what exactly the sentence is referring to, the astral bodies of 17:3b or the worship of other gods in general of 17:3a. This implies the unplanned nature of the plus. All in all, it seems very probable that the biblical plus is a later addition and that 11Q19 alone preserves the original reading in this respect.[52]

The MT contains a lengthy plus in Deut 17:5 אשר עשו את הדבר הרע הזה אל שעריך את האיש או את האשה, "who has committed this bad thing in your gates, the man or the woman." In addition to 11Q19 LV, 19, this sentence is also missing in the Old Greek (καὶ ἐξάξεις τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκεῖνον ἢ τὴν γυναῖκα ἐκείνην καὶ λιθοβολήσετε αὐτοὺς ἐν λίθοις, καὶ τελευτήσουσιν), which probably preserves the most original text. Besides the textual support, text-internal considerations suggest that the plus cannot derive from the original author. The repetition of "the man or the woman" (את האיש או את האשה) causes a confusing syntactical structure. The double use of the object marker shows that both references to the sinners are objects of the same verb, which is already very peculiar. Further on, the second object is separated from its verb by another relative clause (אשר עשו את הדבר הרע

---

51. A similar case can be found in Deut 7:4, where the same verse refers to Yahweh in the first and third person. A literary-critical problem may be suspected there.

52. Many scholars have assumed that the relative clause is a later addition, but many argued so already before the discovery of 11Q19; thus, e.g., Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 63–64; Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 53.

הזה אל שעריך). This is a highly unusual construction that can hardly derive from one author. The main idea of the plus is to repeat how bad the crime is (את הדבר הרע הזה) and to add the location of the execution. The badness has already been mentioned in 17:2 using a very similar sentence (cf. אשר יעשה את הרע בעיני and עשו את הדבר הרע הזה). The only additional substance in the plus of 17:5 is the reference to the gates (שעריך), which is a very typical expression in Deuteronomy, and it stands to reason that its frequent use elsewhere has, in part, inspired the addition. That the relative sentence separates the gates from its intended verb (והוצאת … אל שעריך) further highlights the poor construction of the sentence, which is unlikely the product of a single author. Consequently, it seems probable that 11Q19 and the Old Greek reading preserve the most original text here.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There are no technical reasons, such as homoioteleuton, that would have easily triggered the accidental omission of the plus in Deut 17:3. Moreover, it would be quite a coincidence if a section that breaks the regular third-person reference to Yahweh had been accidentally omitted, thus making the text clearer. An intentional omission would be more understandable. The author of 11Q19 or a scribe of the biblical text used as the basis for 11Q19 could have omitted a disturbing sentence. However, this change would have been unnecessary in 11Q19, since the author changed most of the third-person references to the first-person. Moreover, one would still have to explain how the disturbing sentence emerged in the first place. This would lead to a more complicated theory than to assume the 11Q19 reading as more original. Consequently, the most probable explanation for the variant is that the plus in the biblical manuscripts is a later addition.

As for the variant in Deut 17:5/11Q19 LV, 21, one cannot entirely exclude the possibility of an accidental omission by homoioteleuton, caused by the dual use of את האיש או את האשה. However, the above-presented considerations suggest that a single author would hardly produce such a text in any case. It would thus be quite a coincidence that an accidental omission omitted a highly disturbing and repetitive section, and that the resulting text would be much clearer than the original. A more probable theory is an intentional shortening, and this is, in fact, argued by some scholars.[53] However, the plus also contains some additional information,

---

53. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 212. Peculiarly, he suggests (216) that "the relative

especially the reference to the gates and to how bad the crime was. Had a later scribe intentionally sought to smooth and improve a confusing text, one would expect that all information would still have been preserved. Considering that it is a technical term in the execution of legal cases, it is hardly probable that a reference to the gates had been completely omitted. The Vulgate and several Greek manuscripts apparently dependent on the addition are examples of attempts to remove some of the repetitions without omitting any of its information, whereas it seems likely that the Old Greek and 11Q19 preserve the original text.[54]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition in Deut 17:3 could be a somewhat unfitting marginal note, because it fails to follow the main form of the law that refers to Yahweh in the third person. On the other hand, the first-person reference to Yahweh also implies that it was intended to be included in the text and it is thus not merely an interpretive or clarifying comment. Somewhat unnecessarily, the addition seeks to highlight that the sin in question has already been forbidden in other parts of Deuteronomy (e.g., 4:15–20; 5:7, 9). According to many scholars, the addition was inspired by passages in Jeremiah similarly dealing with the worship of other gods.[55]

The addition in Deut 17:5 contains a rather classic case of the so-called *Wiederaufnahme* (resumptive repetition), where the expansion is concluded by repeating a section of the older text preceding the addition. This technique has been widely assumed in literary criticism, and the present text provides documented evidence for it. The use of this technique and the length of the addition suggest that the addition was made when the entire manuscript was reproduced. If the addition had been made between the lines or in the margins, the repetition would be less unlikely. Although

---

clause in v. 5a" is a later addition. He fails to discuss the possibility that the OG and 11Q19, which he neglects here, could preserve the original reading. His position implies that the relative clause was secondarily added and that the OG, dependent on the addition, secondarily omits the addition. It is far more probable that the OG preserves the original text.

54. Deut 17:5 in the Vulgate reads: *Educes virum ac mulierem qui rem sceleratissimam perpetrarunt ad portas civitatis tuae et lapidibus obruentur.*

55. Rosario Pius Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz: Eine literarkritische, gattungs- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Dt 12–26*, BBB 31 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1969), 173; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 266.

somewhat unnecessarily, the additions in 17:5 seek to clarify who was in question and that the stoning should result in death.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without documented evidence for the older text, it would have been relatively easy to detect the additions in Deut 17:3 and 17:5. The first one clearly sticks out from its context by interrupting the third-person reference to Yahweh, while the latter contains a disturbing repetition of the object and a grammatical anomaly that begs for an explanation. In addition to detecting the additions, in both cases the literary critic would probably be able to reconstruct the older textual stage without 11Q19 and (in 17:5) the evidence of the Old Greek. Accordingly, already before the discovery of 11Q19, many scholars assumed that the relative sentence in 17:3 is a later addition.[56]

Results. Deuteronomy 17:3 and 5 contain illustrative examples of added relative clauses that interrupt the text in such a way that a literary critic would certainly suspect editorial interventions. Without the older text preserved in 11Q19, the critic would have been able to reconstruct the older text in 17:3 and have a good chance in 17:5 as well. The latter is a classic case of an editorial technique (*Wiederaufnahme*) that is often assumed in literary criticism as a sign for a later expansion.

4.5. Joshua 2:12

Joshua 2 consists of an episode where Joshua sends two spies to inspect the land before the conquest. After arriving in Jericho, the men went into the house of Rahab, a local prostitute, to spend the night there in hiding (2:1). When the king of Jericho sought to find the spies (2:2), Rahab hid them on her roof thus saving them (2:4). As a reward she asked the spies that the Israelites save her and her family's lives when they conquer the land (2:12–13). Missing in the LXX, the MT of 2:12 adds Rahab's petition that the Israelites give a clear sign that they will save Rahab. The shorter LXX reading probably goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage*, and is not a change in Greek. Some Greek manuscripts (Cambridge: Ncdhkptz) as well as daughter translations of Greek follow the MT, but this is probably a later

---

56. Thus, e.g., Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 63–64; Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 53.

harmonization toward a proto-MT. Although the very beginning of 2:12 is preserved in 4Q48 (4QJosh[b]) (having a different first word than the MT and LXX), the variant in question here is not covered by the extant manuscript. The Vulgate and Targum Jonathan follow the MT.

Josh 2:12 MT	Josh 2:12 LXX
<div dir="rtl">¹²ועתה השבעו נא לי ביהוה</div> <div dir="rtl">כי עשיתי עמכם חסד</div> <div dir="rtl">ועשיתם גם אתם</div> <div dir="rtl">עם בית אבי חסד</div> <div dir="rtl"><u>ונתתם לי אות אמת</u></div> <div dir="rtl">¹³והחיתם את אבי</div> <div dir="rtl">ואת אמי ואת אחי ואת <u>אחותי</u></div> <div dir="rtl">ואת כל אשר להם</div> <div dir="rtl">והצלתם את נפשתינו ממות</div>	¹²καὶ νῦν ὀμόσατέ μοι κύριον <u>τὸν θεόν</u>, ὅτι ποιῶ ὑμῖν ἔλεος καὶ ποιήσετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔλεος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός μου. ¹³καὶ ζωγρήσετε <u>τὸν οἶκον</u> τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ τὴν μητέρα μου καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου <u>καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκόν μου</u> καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐξελεῖσθε τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου.
¹²And now swear to me by Yahweh, since I have dealt mercifully with you, deal mercifully with the house of my father. <u>Give me a sure sign</u> ¹³and spare my father, my mother, and my brothers <u>and sisters</u>, and all that they have, and rescue our lives from death.	¹²And now swear to me by the Lord <u>God</u>; since I have dealt mercifully with you, deal mercifully with the house of my father. ¹³and spare <u>the house</u> of my father, my mother, and my brothers, <u>and all my house</u>, and all that they have, and rescue my life from death.

It is probable that the MT plus in 2:12bβ is the result of a later addition, the LXX preserving the more original text.[57] Although the plus is not grammatically problematic—it is a self-contained sentence—inconsistencies within the story and the context speak in favor of an addition. The sign (אות) apparently refers to the red cord mentioned in 2:18 and 21 that Rahab should tie in her window so that the attacking Israelites will know where her family lives and thus can save her house from destruction.[58] From the perspective of narrative logic it is inconsistent that Rahab refers to the solution Israelites will offer before they have even offered to save her, let alone describe the means by which they will save her family. In other words, the MT plus in 2:12bβ, which is part of Rahab's speech, already

---

57. Thus many, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 158, Holmes, *Joshua*, 20–21, and Nelson, *Joshua*, 37–38. Note that in other variants in 2:12–13 the LXX may be secondary. This highlights the importance of discussing each case separately.

58. Thus also Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 158.

anticipates the red cord. It is unlikely that the original narrator would have made such a mistake in narrative logic. In addition, the plus clearly interrupts Rahab's request to save her, as the actual bid to let her and her family live is not told before 2:13. It is effectively in a poor location that can hardly derive from the original author.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Although it can never be completely excluded, there are no technical reasons (such as homoioteleuton) that could have triggered an unintentional omission. A more potent alternative is an intentional omission of verse 12bβ in the LXX tradition, and the reason for this could have been its awkward location. As suggested by Heinrich Holzinger, the plus would have been omitted for stylistic reasons.[59] In this case, however, one would expect that the editor would have relocated it, for example after 2:13, where it would not disturb Rahab's request for mercy. This is not the case, and one would thus have to assume a complete omission, but this would be an exceptional intervention in the text. Furthermore, this theory would assume that the original author wrote such an awkward text that it would cause a later editor to improve it. There are some other inconsistencies in the story, but they are commonly interpreted as signs of redaction and editing.[60] Even a poor writer would hardly jump ahead of the story in such an illogical way that it introduces an idea that is presented far later in the story. It is much more likely that the awkwardness was created by a later editor, who already knew the whole story and made a spontaneous associative link to a later part of the story. Consequently, it is probable that without the plus the Old Greek preserves the more original text.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. A later editor rather unskillfully placed a reference to the sign in anticipation of the solution that the spies will offer. It is likely that the addition was meant to be included in the main text, for it is part of Rahab's speech. If it were merely a marginal note not intended for the main text, one would not expect that the scribe had followed the form of the speech. The addition does not seem to be part of a wider redaction with an ideological aim. We are probably dealing with

---

59. Thus, e.g., Holzinger, *Josua*, 5.

60. See Nelson, *Joshua*, 40–41; Johannes Floss, *Kunden oder Kundschafter*? *Literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung zu Jos 2*, ATSAT 16 (Sankt Ottilien; EOS, 1982), 71–81.

an isolated and rather poorly and spontaneously made addition that was inspired or triggered by another part of the same story.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Grammatically it would have been very difficult to detect the plus as an addition without the LXX. However, its awkward placement and the inconsistency it creates for the narrative coherence would raise the suspicion that it is not original. A literary critic expects original authors to be fairly coherent in the narrative logic—unless there are particular reasons to assume otherwise—while later editors are much more prone to make mistakes in this respect. It is probable that literary critics would have detected the addition without the documented evidence from the LXX.

Results. The comparison between the MT and the LXX suggests that the MT plus in Josh 2:12bβ is an isolated late addition that connects Rahab's speech with the solution the spies offer in their speech in 2:18. Because of the apparent narrative inconsistency, the addition would probably have been detected without the shorter reading as preserved in the LXX.

4.6. Joshua 4:10

Joshua 4:1–10 portrays a scene that takes place after the Israelites have crossed the Jordan: Joshua instructs twelve men, one from each tribe, to take a stone from the middle of the Jordan river to be set up as a sign and memorial for all Israelites. After this has been done, the scene is concluded in 4:10 by noting that the people did everything as instructed by Joshua, who followed Yahweh's order. Joshua 4:10 contains several differences between the MT and the LXX, one of which is of notable interest. The MT contains a plus according to which Joshua also acted according to Moses's order. Besides the addition of the word τῆς διαθήκης "the covenant" in the LXX, which is a very typical minor addition, the other differences between the MT and LXX are probably due to the translation.[61] The Hebrew עד תם כל הדבר אשר צוה יהוה את יהושע לדבר אל העם is somewhat congested and confusing, which the translator apparently sought to improve in Greek. Our focus is on the major plus in the MT, which deals with Moses's command to Joshua:

---

61. The addition of the word "covenant" can also be found in 1 Sam 6:3 of 4Q51.

Josh 4:10 MT	Josh 4:10 LXX
והכהנים נשאי הארון עמדים ב<u>תוך</u> הירדן	εἱστήκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ αἴροντες τὴν κιβωτὸν <u>τῆς διαθήκης</u> ἐν τῷ Ιορδάνῃ,
<u>עד תם כל הדבר אשר צוה יהוה את יהושע</u> לדבר אל העם	<u>ἕως οὗ συνετέλεσεν</u> Ἰησοῦς πάντα, <u>ἃ ἐνετείλατο κύριος</u> ἀναγγεῖλαι τῷ λαῷ,
<u>ככל אשר צוה משה את יהושע</u>	
וימהרו העם ויעברו	καὶ ἔσπευσεν ὁ λαὸς καὶ διέβησαν.

The priests who bore the ark stood in <u>the middle of</u> the Jordan, <u>until everything was finished according to how the Lord commanded Joshua</u> to instruct the people, <u>according to all that Moses had commanded Joshua.</u> The people crossed over in haste.	The priests who bore the ark <u>of the covenant</u> stood in the Jordan <u>until</u> Joshua finished everything <u>according to how the Lord commanded him</u> to instruct the people. The people crossed over in haste.

In addition to the Vulgate, several Greek manuscripts (Cambridge: Fbcqx) and daughter translations of Greek follow the MT plus, but this is probably due to a later harmonization toward the proto-MT. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek most likely did not contain the plus. The passage is not preserved at Qumran.

It seems likely that the MT plus in 4:10aβ is a later addition, the LXX preserving the more original text in this respect.[62] According to Samuel Holmes, the MT plus is "almost certainly an addition," and there are good reasons for this evaluation.[63] The plus effectively competes with the older text and contradicts the context of the scene. According to the preceding text, Joshua has acted as Yahweh had ordered him in 4:2–3. However, the MT plus implies that Joshua also acted as Moses had ordered, and in fact, the plus in 4:10aβ partly duplicates a sentence from 4:10aα, except that it replaces Yahweh with Moses:

<u>כל</u> הדבר <u>אשר צוה</u> יהוה <u>את יהושע</u> …
כ<u>כל אשר צוה</u> משה <u>את</u> יהושע

The idea suggested in the MT plus is peculiar, since the text does not refer to anything that Moses had ordered Joshua to do. The passage is about the setting up of the twelve stones by the Jordan, but Moses, who has

---

62. Thus many, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 164, and Nelson, *Joshua*, 63–64.
63. Holmes, *Joshua*, 27.

already died before the scene takes place, never refers to the twelve stones at Jordan. Nelson suggests that the expansion is "perhaps based on Deut 27:4."[64] Despite a similar setting, the passages differ: In Deut 27:1–4 Moses instructs the people (not Joshua) to write the words of the law on plastered stones and set them up on Mount Ebal. The author of the plus in Josh 4:10 could also have had Moses's general instructions to Joshua in mind (e.g., Deut 3:28; 31:3, 7–8, 23), but this is unrelated to the scene in Josh 4:1–10. Regardless of the possible connection with passages in Deuteronomy, one receives the impression that the MT plus in Josh 4:10 has an entirely different perspective than the rest of the passage, which is focused on the ritual. Such a neglect of the actual context is possible from a later scribe, but it is hardly likely from the original author.

Besides having Moses's instructions to Joshua in Deuteronomy in mind, a possible motive for the addition may be an attempt to place Moses as an intermediary between Yahweh and Joshua. Moses gradually became the mediator par excellence between Yahweh and Israel and in this function he would also be between Yahweh and Joshua. The editor may have been disturbed by the too independent role of Joshua in this story as a receiver of divine messages. The addition clearly places Joshua below Moses in terms of importance, whereas the original text may give the impression that Joshua was a prophet on the same level with Moses.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There are no reasons that would have easily triggered the accidental omission of the MT plus in the LXX tradition or its Hebrew *Vorlage*. An intentional omission is theoretically possible, and the reason for it could have been the confusions and tensions mentioned above. The irrelevance of the MT plus for its immediate context could also be seen as a reason for omitting it.[65] However, it is very unlikely that a later scribe would have simply omitted a reference to Moses's command to Joshua, despite its ill placement. One could imagine that a scribe or editor, who was disturbed by the sentence, would have sought to reshape the text and include Moses in some other way, but this is not the case. Moreover, the theory of an intentional omission would still

---

64. Nelson, *Joshua*, 64.

65. According to August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua,* 2nd ed., Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886), 455, the sentence was "von den LXX nicht gelesen oder aber als unnöthig weggelassen."

have to explain the origin of such a disrupting sentence. If a later scribe had been so disturbed by it that he would have been inclined to omit it, one would have to ask how it came about in the first place. In other words, if the plus had been omitted in the LXX tradition, one would still have to consider the possibility that it was added at an earlier stage. The assumption of a later addition thus requires a less complicated history of intervention and can therefore be regarded as the more probable explanation (Occam's razor).

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition in the MT of Josh 4:10 was awkwardly made as it is in tension with its immediate context and with the rest of the scene in 4:1–10. The editor had a different and perhaps a broader perspective than the original author, and he may have been thinking about the instructions of Moses to Joshua in Deut 31 or other texts in Deuteronomy. It is typical of many later additions that the perspective and focus differ from that of the original text.

The content implies that the addition was intended to be included in the main text. The addition is somewhat indifferent to its immediate context and may thus be spontaneous. The awkwardness suggests that the editor did not seek to conceal the addition in any way. There appears to be no evident redactional intention behind it, unless one could find more similar additions where the position of Joshua has been downgraded in relation to Moses.

The addition utilizes a typical technique of later editors often assumed by literary critics. It repeats words from the older text in order to attach the addition to it (*Wiederaufnahme*). The MT addition in Josh 4:10 thus corroborates that the repetition of elements of the older text was a factually used technique.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is highly likely that the addition in the MT version of Josh 4:10 would have been detected by a literary critic without the LXX. The repetitions and tensions in this verse are so clear that they would hardly go undetected. It is very possible that a literary critic would have been able to reconstruct the older textual stage that lies behind the Old Greek translation without access to the Greek version.

Results. Joshua 4:10 contains an awkward addition in the MT version, while the LXX preserves the more original text. It adds an ill-placed reference to Moses's instructions to Joshua, although this is irrelevant in the

present scene. Because of the repetition and the tensions it creates with its context, the addition would probably have been detected without the more original reading of the LXX.

4.7. Joshua 10:13

Joshua 10:12–14 presents the singular event of the sun and the moon standing still during Joshua's battle against five Canaanite kings near Gibeon. The MT and the LXX differ in several details of this account, and one version contains a larger plus in 10:13.

Josh 10:13 MT	Josh 10:13 LXX
וידם השמש וירח עמד עד יקם גוי איביו <u>הלא היא כתובה על ספר הישר</u> ויעמד השמש בחצי השמים ולא אץ לבוא כיום תמים	καὶ ἔστη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐν στάσει, ἕως ἠμύνατο ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔστη ὁ ἥλιος κατὰ μέσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐ προεπορεύετο εἰς δυσμὰς εἰς τέλος ἡμέρας μιᾶς.
The sun stood still, and the moon stopped, until the nation took vengeance on their enemies. <u>Is this not written in the Book of the Upright?</u> The sun stopped in midheaven, and did not hurry to set for about a whole day.	The sun stood still, and the moon was in position until God avenged himself on their enemies; and the sun stood in midheaven; it did not go forward to set until the end of one day.

MT's reference to "the Book of the Upright" (הלא היא כתובה על ספר הישר) has no equivalent in the main LXX witnesses, and the minus probably goes back to the Old Greek.[66] It is probable that the reference is a late addition made in the proto-MT transmission after it diverged from the textual tradition behind the OG.[67] The addition implies that some of the preceding

---

66. Thus B, A, and other manuscripts; see Alan Brooke and Norman McLean, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, vol. 4.1 of *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1917), 712; cf. Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), 371. A substantial number of manuscripts, the hexaplaric version *sub asterisco*, and Theodotion attest MT's plus, which indicates that the text was secondarily aligned with the MT.

67. E.g., Bernardus Alfrink, "Het 'stil staan' van zone n maan in Jos 10:12–15,"

content is quoted from a certain written source called ספר הישר "Book of the Upright." Although the referent היא "it" leaves open what precisely is understood as the written material quoted from this book, it seems plausible that the reference to "the Book of the Upright" does not include all of the preceding narrative in Josh 10:1–13 but only certain parts of it. One receives the impression that the quotation comprises nothing more than Joshua's poetic address to the sun and the moon (10:12b), perhaps together with the preceding narrative introduction (10:12a: אז ידבר יהושע ליהוה, "Then Joshua spoke to Yahweh").[68] The Book of the Upright seems to be imagined as a collection of special pieces of older Israelite tradition. The second reference to the ספר הישר in the Hebrew Bible, found in 2 Sam 1:18, also points in this direction; this reference creates the impression that David's lamentation on the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam 1:19–27) was also contained in this book. A similar reference is found in 1 Kgs 8:53 (3 Kgdms 8:53 LXX): οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὕτη γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ᾠδῆς; "Is it not written in the book of the song?" This reference is lacking in the masoretic version of this passage in 1 Kgs 8:12–13, which indicates that it was added secondarily. Its style and its close similarity to Josh 10:13 MT and 2 Sam 2:18 suggest that the plus in 1 Kgs 8:53 (3 Kgdms 8:53 LXX) goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that read הלא היא כתובה על ספר השיר. In addition, it seems no coincidence that the consonants of הישר "the upright" are the same as of השיר "the song," and it may be speculated that one of them resulted from the other through metathesis of the consonants י and שׁ; in this case, the references to "the Book of the Upright" in Josh 10:13 and 2 Sam 1:18 and the reference to "the book of the song" in 1 Kgs 8:53 (3 Kgdms 8:53 LXX) would in some way be connected.[69] Be this as it may, the textual evidence suggests that both in Josh 10:13 and in 1 Kgs 8:53 (3 Kgdms 8:53 LXX) these references to allegedly older books from which certain material was quoted had only secondarily been inserted into the text.

StC 24 (1949): 256; Nelson, *Joshua*, 137; Kristin De Troyer "'Is This Not Written in the Book of Jashar?' (Josh 10:13c): References to Extra-Biblical Books in the Bible," in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*, ed. J. van Ruiten and Jacobus Cornelis de Vos, VTSup 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 45–50.

68. Martin Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 2nd ed., HAT 1.7 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), 64.

69. See Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 269, who proposed that השיר in the *Vorlage* of 1 Kgs 8:53 (3 Kgdms 8:53 LXX) resulted from an original הישר; the opposite development is proposed by Montgomery, *Kings*, 192.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The secondary omission of the MT plus is unlikely.[70] Nothing indicates that the phrase הלא היא כתובה על ספר הישר "Is it not written in the Book of the Upright?" was mistakenly skipped in the proto-Alexandrian textual tradition. The phrase and its immediate context do not contain textual features such as similar groups of letters or repeated words or short phrases that could have triggered a scribal parablepsis. As for the possibility of an intentional omission, either by an editor of the proto-Alexandrian Hebrew text or by the Greek translator, the phrase does not seem in any way problematic.[71] It is not stylistically awkward and does not contain ideas that could be regarded as difficult to accept from a theological point of view. Although 10:13aβ creates a slight interruption between 10:13aα and 10:13b (see below), this provides no sufficient reason for a stylistically motivated omission of the phrase. Regarding its content, one cannot see why the reference to "the Book of the Upright" should have been intentionally left out. Such a reference enhances the dignity of the preceding saying and gives additional authority to it. Theoretically one might argue that this book was, except from 2 Sam 1:18, otherwise unknown, because of which an editor omitted the reference. However, references to otherwise unknown books are also found elsewhere and do not seem to have posed problems in the textual transmission.[72] Joshua 10:13 MT corresponds to 1 Kgs 8:53 (3 Kgdms

---

70. Some commentators however bypass or marginalize the textual evidence and take the MT without further discussion as the sole fundament of their historical interpretation; Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 64; Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 112; Hartmut N. Rösel, *Joshua*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 169.

71. It would be very unlikely that the Greek translator had omitted sections without a very compelling reason. Although the translation of Joshua is not exceedingly literal, it has been shown that it is still rather faithful toward the content of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The freedoms that the translator took mainly related to the expression of ideas in Greek. For the translation technique of Joshua, see Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom*. With a slightly different emphasis on the translation technique, see Michaël van der Meer, "3.3 Septuagint. Joshua," 3.3.3. and 3.3.4., in Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0003030000.

72. See ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל "the book of the annals of the Kings of Israel" and ספר דברי הימים למלכי יהודה "the book of the annals of the Kings of Judah" in Kings (1 Kgs 14:19, 29, etc.) and ספר מלחמת יהוה "the book of the wars of Yahweh" (Num 21:14); while it seems plausible to assume that the annals of the kings of Israel and Judah did in fact exist when these references were written down, it may be doubted that this holds true for the "book of the wars of Yahweh," "the Book of the Upright," and the "book of the song."

8:53 LXX), both of which seem to attest a tendency of inserting additional references to such otherwise unknown books. In sum, there are no clear reasons that would justify the assumption that the masoretic plus in Josh 10:13 was secondarily omitted in the proto-Alexandrian textual tradition or by the Greek translator.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. By appealing to an ancient source, the addition seeks to increase the credibility and authority of the event in question. The reason for the need to substantiate the text is the unbelievable account that the sun and the moon would have stopped moving. The Book of the Upright, ספר הישר was either well-known and highly regarded or it was invented to give credibility to this passage.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. The reference to "the Book of the Upright," which is a complete nominal clause in the form of an interrogative sentence formulating a rhetorical question, creates a slight break within its near context. The ensuing description of the sun standing still in midheaven for the length of an entire day (10:13b) resumes and continues the preceding poetical descriptions of the sun and the moon (10:13aα), although 10:13b focuses only on the sun and provides details about the event that are not found in the preceding lines. The reference to "the Book of the Upright" interrupts both sets of descriptions and is no integral part of the narrative continuum; rather, Josh 10:13 MT can be read as an aside that qualifies the preceding saying.

וידם השמש וירח עמד
עד יקם גוי איביו
<u>הלא היא כתובה על ספר הישר</u>
ויעמד השמש בחצי השמים
ולא אץ לבוא כיום תמים

And the sun stood still, and the moon stopped,
until the nation took vengeance on their enemies.
<u>Is this not written in the Book of the Upright?</u>
The sun stopped in midheaven
and did not hurry to set for about a whole day.

Although the reference seems well embedded in its near context, its intrusive character is clear from the fact that it creates a slight break in the

description of the events. If only the MT version were extant, it could nevertheless be hypothesized that the reference had been secondarily added.

Results. Joshua 10:13aβ provides a clear case for a late addition that was made in the history of the proto-MT. It is next to impossible to argue for a secondary omission of the phrase. The content of the addition is remarkably weighty since it depicts Joshua's saying to the sun and the moon as part of an older collection of pieces of ancient Israelite tradition—a collection also referred to in 2 Sam 1:18. By creating the impression that the book of Joshua quotes from an ancient source, it enhances the notion of authenticity and authority not only for the passage itself but also for the entire book of Joshua. The intrusive character of the phrase, which syntactically forms a complete sentence, is rather obvious in its immediate context and could provide sufficient reasons to hypothesize that it was secondarily added, even if only the MT were extant.

4.8. Joshua 11:19

Joshua 11:16–23 contains a summary of Joshua's conquests in Canaan: it briefly describes the conquered area (11:16–17) and emphasizes that its population had waged war against Israel (11:18–20). According to Josh 11:19, the Israelites conquered all the cities (of the land) in war, but the MT and LXX differ. The MT mentions an exception, the Hivites, who are said to have made peace with Israel. Although many Greek manuscripts (as well as some of the daughter translations, such as Armenian, some Ethiopic manuscripts, etc.) contain a reading that parallels the MT, this is probably due to a later recension toward the MT. The shorter Greek reading probably goes back to the original translation and Hebrew *Vorlage*. The passage is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Josh 11:18–19 MT	Josh 11:18–19 LXX
¹⁸ימים רבים עשה יהושע	¹⁸καὶ πλείους ἡμέρας ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς
את כֹל המלכים האלה מלחמה	πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τούτους τὸν πόλεμον,
¹⁹לא היתה עיר	¹⁹καὶ οὐκ ἦν πόλις,
אשר השלימה אל בני ישראל	ἣν οὐκ ἔλαβεν Ισραηλ,
בלתי החוי ישבי גבעון	
את הכל לקחו במלחמה	πάντα ἐλάβοσαν ἐν πολέμῳ.

¹⁸Joshua made war a long time with <u>all</u> those kings. ¹⁹There was not a town that <u>made peace</u> <u>with the Israelites, except the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon</u>. They took all in war.	¹⁸Joshua made war a long time with those kings. ¹⁹There was not a town that Israel ~~did not take~~. They took all in war.

In addition to the plus in the MT, there is a further and apparently connected difference between the MT and LXX: the verb השלימה "made peace" used in the MT is paralleled by οὐκ ἔλαβεν "did not take" in the Greek, which probably goes back to לא לקח in the *Vorlage*.

It is probable that the longer reading in the MT is the result of a later addition, while the LXX probably preserves the more original text.[73] The addition was probably made in order to accommodate the passage with Josh 9, which describes how the Hivites in Gibeon deceived Israelites to save themselves from annihilation. The opposite direction of development would imply that the LXX intentionally sought to create a contradiction within the book of Joshua, which is very unlikely. It is more probable that 11:16–23 originally contradicted Josh 9–10—perhaps because they derive from different sources—and were later harmonized.

An additional argument for the secondary nature of the MT plus is that the last sentence in 11:19 ("They took all in war") is formulated unconditionally and does not leave much space for exceptions. The rest of the passage also makes no mention of exceptions, and instead refers to the conquest of everything (11:16: ואת כל; 11:17: ויקח יהושע את כל הארץ הזאת; 11:23: מלכיהם לכד; ויקח יהושע את כל הארץ).

Joshua 10 (especially 10:41) implies that the Israelites also conquered Gibeon, which would have contradicted Josh 11:19 if the text had only added a reference to the exception. In this case Josh 11:19 would have suggested that Gibeon was left unconquered. For this reason, it was necessary to change the verb לקח to השלימה. That Josh 9–10 influenced the MT of Josh 11:19 is apparent when we compare the verse with Josh 10:1, where Adoni-Zedek, the king of Jerusalem, refers to the agreement between the inhabitants of Gibeon and the Israelites. Not only was the verb השלימה in the MT of Josh 11:19 adopted from or influenced by Josh 10:1 but also the expansion seems to be influenced by this verse:

---

73. Thus many, e.g., Nelson, *Joshua*, 149–50.

לא היתה עיר אשר השלימה אל בני ישראל בלתי החוי ישבי גבעון 11:19:
וכי השלימו ישבי גבעון את ישראל ויהיו בקרבם 10:1:

Since this connection cannot be accidental, it is probable that the MT reading is the result of a secondary addition and an accompanying accommodation of the preceding sentence. The contradiction in the MT of Josh 11:19 corroborates that it is secondary here. According to the text, there was no city (עיר) that made peace with Israel, except the Hivites (החוי), but they are not a city; they are a nation. The editor who made the changes thus made a mistake in this respect and left in the text a contradiction that would be very unlikely from the original author. For these reasons, the LXX should be regarded as the more original text.[74]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The text does not contain any technical reason that would have facilitated an accidental omission (e.g., by homoioteleuton or homoioarchton). That there are two obviously connected differences between the MT and LXX in different locations of the verse excludes the possibility that we are dealing with a scribal mistake.

An intentional omission is a possibility, and a motive for this could be the tensions within the passage itself as well as the tension the reference creates with the ideal of total conquest of the land. However, this hypothesis is unlikely, because if one would have merely wanted to omit the reference to Hivites being an exception, it would have sufficed to omit the sentence "except the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon." Since also the preceding verbs and lacking negation in the MT differ, which would not have been necessary changes, it is more likely that the MT is secondary. In other words, the difference between the "made peace with" and "did not take" is necessary if the MT is secondary, but unnecessary if the LXX is secondary. For this reason, it is unlikely that the reading in the LXX is secondary in relation to the MT.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It is probable that the addition was an intended addition and not a marginal gloss that was accidentally placed in the main text. This is suggested by the fact that the addition was accompanied by other changes, including the replacement of

---

74. Other scholars have also assumed that the LXX is original here. Thus, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 197; Nelson, *Joshua*, 150; and Ernst Axel Knauf, *Josua*, ZBKAT 6 (Zurich: TVZ, 2008), 116–17.

a verb and its negation. What we are seeing in Josh 11:19 is an attempt to conciliate between tensions apparent in the book of Joshua between the total annihilation of the people of the land, emphasized in many passages, and the occasional passages that imply that some of the indigenous people remained. The addition was made in order to take the story in Josh 9–10 into account, and thus relativize the absolute statements in the passage, with which Josh 9 is in tension.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. A careful literary critic would have been able to detect the addition in the MT. The contradiction between the city, being the subject of the verb, and the Hivites, a nation being the exception, would have raised the suspicion that something is amiss here. The tensions within the verse and with the rest of the passage would have corroborated the suspicions that some editing may have taken place. Noticing the apparent literary connection between Josh 11:19 and 10:1 would have led to conjecture a harmonization between the passages. Further support for the suspicion could have been gained from other passages in Joshua where the total and partial conquest of the land are in tension. Nevertheless, it might have been very challenging to conclude that parts of the text had been replaced by a later editor. Because of the replacement, it would have been next to impossible to reconstruct the earlier editorial phase in total.

Results. The sentence "except the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon" found in the MT but missing in the Old Greek is very probably a secondary addition made in order to accommodate the absolute statements about the conquest in the passage with Josh 9–10. The addition was an intended editorial change that necessitated a further change of a verb. Without the LXX it would have been possible to suspect that we are dealing with an addition, but because of the additional replacement, it would have been impossible to reconstruct the older text in full.

4.9. Joshua 19:15, 22, 30, and 38

Joshua 19 lists cities allotted to Israelite tribes when Joshua divided up the conquered land. The lists of cities, which can also be found in Josh 15–18, contain many small variants between the Hebrew and Greek. In addition to numerous differences in place-names, there are several cases where the MT contains a plus vis-à-vis the Greek version. The number of cities allo-

cated to a tribe is often mentioned at the end of a list. However, in Josh 19:15, 22, 30, and 38 the MT includes the number, while the main Greek manuscripts are missing it. Those Greek manuscripts (such as *G* and *bclx*) that include the number were probably harmonized toward the MT. The passage is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Josh 19 MT	Josh 19 LXX
¹⁵וקטת ונהלל ושמרון וידאלה ובית לחם <u>ערים שתים עשרה וחצריהן</u>	¹⁵καὶ Καταναθ καὶ Ναβααλ καὶ Συμοων καὶ Ιεριχω καὶ Βαιθμαν.
²²ופגע הגבול בתבור ושחצומה ושחצימה ובית שמש והיו תצאות גבולם הירדן <u>ערים שש עשרה וחצריהן</u>	²²καὶ συνάψει τὰ ὅρια ἐπὶ Γαιθβωρ καὶ ἐπὶ Σαλιμ κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ Βαιθσαμυς, καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῦ ἡ διέξοδος τῶν ὁρίων ὁ Ιορδάνης.
³⁰ועמה ואפק ורחב <u>ערים עשרים ושתים וחצריהן</u>	³⁰καὶ Αρχωβ καὶ Αφεκ καὶ Ρααυ.
³⁸ויראון ומגדל אל חרם ובית ענת ובית שמש <u>ערים תשע עשרה וחצריהן</u>	³⁸καὶ Κερωε καὶ Μεγαλα, Αριμ καὶ Βαιθθαμε καὶ Θεσσαμυς.
¹⁵and Kattath, Nahalal, Shimron, Idalah, and Bethlehem—<u>twelve towns with their villages</u>.	¹⁵and Catanath, and Nabaal, and Symoon, and Jericho, and Baethman.
²²the boundary also touches Tabor, Shahazumah, and Beth-shemesh, and its boundary ends at the Jordan—<u>sixteen towns with towns with their villages</u>.	²²The boundaries shall border upon Gaethbor, and upon Salim westward, and Baethsamys; and the extremity of his bounds shall be Jordan.
³⁰Ummah, Aphek, and Rehob—<u>twenty-two towns with their villages</u>.	³⁰and Archob, and Aphec, and Raau.
³⁸Iron, Migdal-el, Horem, Beth-anath, and Beth-shemesh—<u>nineteen towns with their villages</u>.	³⁸and Keroe, and Megalaarim, and Baetthame, and Thessamys.

It is probable that the MT readings are the result of secondary additions.[75] Although there is no grammatical difficulty, and the additional clause is met in an expected location, as shown by Josh 19:6 where it is met in both

---

75. Thus many, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 227–30, Holmes, *Joshua*, 69, and Nelson, *Joshua*, 216–18.

versions, it is difficult to find a motive for the omission in the LXX or its *Vorlage*. As noted by Nelson, the LXX often corrects incorrect numbers, but it does not have the tendency to omit.[76] If the numbers in Josh 19:15, 22, 30, and 38 had been omitted, one would have to explain why the numbers were left in Josh 19:6, as well as throughout Josh 15–18. One should also note that both the MT and LXX lack the number after the list of allotted tribes of Dan in Josh 19:40–48, which shows that the numbers are not systematically used. It is therefore probable that the pluses in the MT of Josh 19:15, 22, 30, and 38 were influenced by passages where the number of towns was summarized (e.g., Josh 15:32, 41, 52, 54, 58; 18:28; 19:6). For example, in Josh 19:6 both versions contain the number:[77]

Josh 19:6 MT	Josh 19:6 LXX
ובית לבאות ושרוחן ערים שלש עשרה וחצריהן	καὶ Βαθαρωθ καὶ οἱ ἀγροὶ αὐτῶν, πόλεις δέκα τρεῖς καὶ αἱ κῶμαι αὐτῶν
Beth-lebaoth, and Sharuhen—thirteen towns with their villages.	and Batharoth, and their fields—thirteen cities and their villages.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Because there is a clear pattern that the number of towns is missing in four different lists in Josh 19, one can exclude an accidental omission. An intentional omission is a theoretical possibility, but it is difficult to find any motive or reason for such an omission. One would then have to explain why similar numbers were not omitted in the LXX of Josh 15, 18, and 19:6. One would also have to explain why the list in Josh 19:40–48 is missing the number in both versions. It is far more probable that there was a secondary attempt to harmonize lists with originally different prehistories in order to fit the same mold. Different prehistories are also implied by the other structural and formal differences between the lists. Some are presented as mere lists that only mention the town, while others contain a more comprehensive

---

76. Nelson, *Joshua*, 218.

77. Note that the number of towns named may differ from the amount mentioned in the summary. This is probably due to scribal corruptions. E.g., in Josh 19:6 the MT and LXX mention fourteen towns, but there is an apparent scribal mistake by dittography in Josh 19:2: באר שבע ושבע should only be read באר שבע. This is suggested by 1 Chr 4:28 and the fact that it makes little sense that *more* towns are mentioned as the summary amount at the end of Josh 19:6.

description of the area by describing the borders of the tribe (cf., e.g., Josh 19:10–16 and 17–23).[78]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The pluses in the MT of Josh 19:15, 22, 30, and 38 are harmonizing additions that sought to mention the total number of cities allotted to each tribe. Since the same kind of addition is found four times in the same chapter, it is unlikely that they are casual additions between the lines or in the margin. They were systematically added and intended to be included in the main text. The technical model for the additions was adopted from other locations that already included the number of cities allotted to a tribe. We are thus dealing with editorial interventions that sought to harmonize between passages with a different pattern originally to express the list of cities.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is very unlikely that the additions could have been noticed without the LXX, because the same summary of the number of towns is met in many other passages where it was probably original. The addition was thus fully integrated to the text by using the same model sentence and placing it at the same place after the list of cities.

Results. The longer readings in the MT of Josh 19:15, 22, 30, and 38 are probably the result of secondary additions that harmonize the preceding lists of towns with other similar lists that mentioned the number of cities. It would have been next to impossible to detect the additions without the more original readings in the LXX, because the additions imitate the form and structure used in other parts of the list.

4.10. Joshua 22:25

Joshua 22:10–34 describes the dispute about the altar built at Geliloth on the border of Canaan near the Jordan River. The Israelite tribes that settled in Canaan were angered that the tribes in Gilead had built the altar, for it was regarded as unfaithfulness toward Yahweh. The ideal of cult central-ization is presumably the main issue, although this is not made explicit. Joshua 22:25 is part of the reply by the leaders of the tribes living in Gilead

---

78. Several commentators fail to mention the LXX readings, e.g., Rösel, *Joshua*, 297–318.

by which they justify the building of the altar. They predict that without the altar future generations of Israelites living in Canaan would accuse the tribes in Gilead of not following Yahweh, and thus claiming that they are not part of Israel. The hypothetical saying, which is found in 22:24bβ–25a, contains a short variant between the MT and the LXX. Whereas the Greek version only refers to "you and us" (μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν), the Hebrew version additionally defines the people "you" as Reubenites and Gadites. Some Greek manuscripts (only minuscules) follow the MT, but this is probably due to a later recension toward the MT. The passage is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Josh 22:24–25 MT	Josh 22:24–25 LXX
24ואם לא מדאגה מדבר עשינו את זאת לאמר	24ἀλλ' ἕνεκεν εὐλαβείας ῥήματος ἐποιήσαμεν τοῦτο λέγοντες
מחר יאמרו בניכם לבנינו לאמר	Ἵνα μὴ εἴπωσιν αὔριον τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν
מה לכם וליהוה אלהי ישראל	Τί ὑμῖν κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ Ισραηλ;
25וגבול נתן יהוה ביננו וביניכם	25καὶ ὅρια ἔθηκεν κύριος ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν
<u>בני ראובן ובני גד</u>	
את הירדן	τὸν Ιορδάνην,
אין לכם חלק ביהוה	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῖν μερὶς κυρίου.
והשביתו בניכם את בנינו	καὶ ἀπαλλοτριώσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν τοὺς
לבלתי ירא את יהוה	υἱοὺς ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ σέβωνται κύριον.

24We did it from fear that in time to come your children might say to our children, "What have you to do with Yahweh, the God of Israel? 25Yahweh set a boundary between us and you— <u>the Reubenites and the Gadites</u>—the Jordan. You have no portion in Yahweh." So your children might make our children cease to worship Yahweh.	24We have done this for the sake of caution saying, lest tomorrow your sons say to our sons, "What have you to do with Yahweh, God of Israel? 25Yahweh set boundaries between us and you, the Jordan. You have no portion in Yahweh." So your children may alienate our sons, that they should not worship Yahweh.

It is quite likely that the plus in the MT is a later addition and that the LXX preserves the original text.[79] This is suggested by its awkward position, as it essentially interrupts the sentence. Although it is not grammatically

---

79. Thus many, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 238; Holmes, *Joshua*, 76; and Nelson, *Joshua*, 244–46.

impossible in its current place, one should note that the "you" have been mentioned already in 22:24, which would be the logical place for defining who is being spoken to. Compared with typical narrative conventions in the Hebrew Bible, their introduction in 22:25 is rather late. One should also note that the main text in the chapter refers to the Reubenites, Gadites, *and Manassites* (22:10, 15, 21, 30 and 31), whereas the plus only refers to the first two. In what is probably a further secondary attempt to correct the incongruence, some Greek manuscripts and the Ethiopic translation, which follow the MT plus, also add the Manassites. It is therefore likely that the plus in the MT of 22:25 derives from a different author and is a later addition.[80]

The main reason for the addition is probably the complexity concerning who is speaking. The story about the altar is found in Josh 22:10–34, and much of the passage consists of a dialogue between the representatives of the Israelites living in Canaan and those living in Gilead. Parts of the dialogue contain further quotations that easily confuse the reader. For example, 22:26 is quoting the tribes in Gilead, who, in effect, quote themselves, and 22:24bβ–25a is a hypothetical quotation of the descendants of the Israelites in Canaan. By adding "the Reubenites and the Gadites" after the word "you," the reader would understand who is now speaking.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There is no technical reason to suspect an accidental omission in the LXX or its *Vorlage*. An accidental omission of an awkward digression would have been a great coincidence. An intentional omission is a more potent possibility, and a possible reason for this would exactly be its awkwardness. In the end we are left with two possibilities. The awkwardness was created by the original author, to be clarified by a later editor, or the awkwardness was created by a later editor, who mainly sought to clarify the addressee but did not consider the consequences of the clarification for the text-fluency and who broke the convention of introducing the speakers when they were mentioned for the first time. Although a definite conclusion is difficult to reach, the latter possibility seems more likely.[81]

---

80. Note that 22:32–34 again only refers to the Reubenites and the Gadites. It is possible that these verses also contain editing, for the difference between 22:31, which includes all three, and 22:32–34 is apparent.

81. A number of scholars fail to mention the LXX variant, e.g., Rösel, *Joshua*, 344–52.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. We may be dealing with a secondary gloss, made between the lines or in the margins, but it may also have been made by a copyist editor, who by means of the addition sought to clarify the addressee.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without knowing the shorter reading in the LXX, it would have been nevertheless possible to suspect that the Reubenites and the Gadites were added. In addition to the awkwardness, the fact that only these two tribes are mentioned, while the text in the rest of 22:10–30 otherwise refers to three tribes (Reubenites, Gadites, *and Manassites*) would raise the suspicion that the reference in Josh 22:25 derives from a different author and is a later addition.

Results. The Reubenites and the Gadites, lacking in the LXX, are probably a secondary addition in the MT that sought to clarify the addressee. If we did not know the shorter version attested by the LXX, it would nevertheless be possible to suspect that we are dealing with a later addition.

4.11. 1 Samuel 31:6

The passage 1 Sam 31:1–13 contains the scene of King Saul's death in his battle against the Philistines at Mount Gilboa. Within that context, 1 Sam 31:6 contains a summary of the people who died and whose deaths had been described in the preceding narrative. There is a notable text-critical variant between the MT and Old Greek as preserved in LXX[B].

1 Sam 31:6 MT	1 Sam 31:6 LXX[B]
וימת שאול ושלשת בניו	καὶ ἀπέθανεν Σαουλ καὶ οἱ τρεῖς υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ
ונשא כליו	καὶ ὁ αἴρων τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ
<u>גם כל אנשיו</u>	
ביום ההוא יחדו	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ κατὰ τὸ αὐτό.
Saul and his three sons and his armor-bearer <u>also all his men</u> died together in that day.	Saul and his three sons and his armor-bearer died together in that day.

The MT reading is followed by the Vulgate and Targum Jonathan. Several Greek manuscripts (e.g., Codex Alexandrinus and manuscripts of the Lucianic group) and daughter translations follow the MT plus, but this is most likely the result of a later recension toward the proto-MT reading.

The verse is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts. One should further note the parallel passage in 1 Chr 10:6, which reads: וימת שאול ושלשת בניו וכל ביתו יחדו מתו, "And Saul died; he and his three sons and all his house died together." It is not obvious, whether this reading supports the MT or the LXX, for it omits the reference to the men but contains a reference to some other people, who died with Saul. It is possible that כל ביתו, "all his house" is a free rendering or an interpretation of כל אנשיו, "all his men."[82] In this case, 1 Chr 10:6 would be dependent on the MT.

It is very likely that the MT plus is a later addition.[83] This is suggested by the content as well as formal considerations. The plus is awkwardly connected to the previous list of people who died. The other members of the list are connected with the conjunction ו, whereas the plus abruptly begins with the word גם without a conjunction. This word is occasionally found at the beginning of suspected additions that introduce a new topic or aspect (e.g., 1 Kgs 14:24; 2 Kgs 17:19; 21:16). There is no apparent reason to continue the list differently and without the conjunction ו, and thus it is unlikely that the original author of the list is behind its last member.

As for its content, the text unexpectedly refers to all of Saul's men having been killed, whereas the preceding text only describes the killing of Saul (31:4), his three sons (31:2), and his armor-bearer (31:5), which corresponds with the shorter text in 31:6. The Philistines, who won the battle only found the bodies of Saul and his sons (31:8). First Samuel 31:1 does mention that some soldiers died when the army fled, but the reference to the fleeing army implies that not all died. The most peculiar contradiction with the context is with 31:7. According to this verse, after the Israelites on the other side of the valley (אנשי ישראל אשר בעבר העמק) saw that Saul was dead and that his soldiers or men had fled (כי נסו אנשי ישראל), they left their towns and fled as well. If Saul's men had died in the battle, they obvi-

---

82. One could argue that 1 Chr 10:6 seeks to avoid the contradiction of the verse with the context by changing a reference to the soldiers (what "men" in this context obviously refer to) to a reference to his house. That Saul's family members died with him would be unproblematic for the ensuing text, which suggests that Saul's men fled. See below. According to Driver, *Samuel*, 177, 1 Chr 10:6 is a "generalizing abridgement of the text of Samuel."

83. Thus many, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 147; Hugo Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels (von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea)*, SAT 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), 116; Graeme Auld, *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 346–49. Driver, *Samuel*, 177, notes the variant, but does not take a position.

ously cannot flee afterward. The verse also implies that some of the men who were with Saul fled as well as those soldiers who were on the other side of the valley. The plus in the MT of 31:6 contradicts the whole scene, where the Israelite soldiers leave the battle and the surrounding towns after they see that the king has died. Consequently, it is very likely that the MT reading is the result of a secondary addition.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. According to Karl Budde, the LXX reading is a simplified summary of the preceding events.[84] This is hardly a satisfactory explanation, for it offers no explanation for the MT contradiction with the whole context. Moreover, it is difficult to see how the LXX is simplifying if it is thereby much more accurate in terms of the whole scene. The MT reading could be seen as a careless oversimplification, but this would imply that it is secondary. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg argues that the MT is probably original, since "there seems to be no clear reason why it should have been added if it was not there originally."[85] This kind of argument implies that the evaluation starts from the MT and other variants are secondary. One could reverse his argument: There is no clear reason to omit it, as the plus does not contain anything problematic. This is also a stronger argument, since omissions are much more infrequent than additions. It should also be noted that the plus contains clear information: all his (military) men died with him.

There are no technical considerations that would have facilitated a haplography. A haphazard accidental omission should not be assumed, especially since it would have made the text clearly more consistent.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition in the MT 1 Sam 31:6 confirms the assumption of literary critics that the word גם was used by later editors to attach an expansion to the preceding text. It also shows that such additions were often awkwardly connected to the text, breaking the style used in the preceding list. The addition also confirms that later additions often contradict their context. In this case, the contradiction is particularly evident. It is thus fair to assume consistency from the original authors. The editor apparently had a much wider perspective and did not have his mind very closely in the actual scene. He

---

84. Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, KHC 8 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1902), 191.

85. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM, 1964), 230.

may have been thinking about the end of Saul's kingship. Although this is never reported in the book of Samuel, one could easily assume that all his supporters also died with the king.

The addition was probably intended to be included in the main text, because it adds substance and is not a mere interpretation or clarification of the older text. Because it is so poorly connected to the preceding sentences, it is very possible that it was originally a supralinear addition that was later included in the main text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Because of the obvious problems with the context, the addition could be detected by conventional literary criticism without access to the more original text in the LXX. As we have seen, the MT reading provides many arguments to assume that גם כל אנשיו "also all his men" was added later.

Results. The MT of 1 Sam 31:6 contains a later addition, according to which all of Saul's men died with him. The addition shows many typical signs that are assumed of later additions. Even without the older version as preserved in LXX^B, the MT addition would very probably be detected.

4.12. 1 Kings 11:33–34

First Kings 11:31–40 contains the prophet Ahijah's divine message to Jeroboam concerning the future of the kingdom. Because of Solomon's sins (11:33), the kingdom will be divided into two (11:31–32), and one piece will eventually be given to Jeroboam. For the sake of David, the whole kingdom will not be taken from David's descendants (11:34). First Kings 11:33 and 34 contain two apparently related pluses in the MT that are both missing in the Old Greek. Some Greek manuscripts (such as Codex Alexandrinus) and daughter translations (Armenian and Syro-Hexapla, but marked with an asterisk) follow the MT in both pluses and others only in the latter plus (the Lucianic group), but these readings are probably the result of later recensions toward the proto-MT.[86] Codex Vaticanus, which lacks both pluses, probably preserves the Old Greek in this respect. The

---

86. The Lucianic texts also contain some differences with the text of Codex Vaticanus presented here, but they are not pertinent to the MT pluses being discussed here.

Vulgate and the targumim imply the MT pluses. The passage is not pre-
served among the Qumran manuscripts.

Both of the pluses introduce the commandments into the text in
connection with David. Unlike Solomon, David is said to have followed
the commandments. There is also a notable additional variant in 11:34
concerning the reign of Solomon (marked in dashed underline).[87] The
Lucianic manuscripts transpose a sentence in 11:34 to the beginning of
the verse (ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς
αὐτοῦ). Other minor variants can also be found in 11:33. These other
variants, although potentially important in their own right, will not be
discussed here.

1 Kgs 11:33–34 MT	1 Kgs 11:33–34 LXX
³³יען אשר עזבוני וישתחוו לעשתרת אלהי צדנין לכמוש אלהי מואב ולמלכם אלהי בני עמון ולא הלכו בדרכי לעשות הישר בעיני וחקתי ומשפטי כדוד אביו ³⁴ולא אקח את כל הממלכה מידו כי נשיא אשתנו כל ימי חייו למען דוד עבדי אשר בחרתי אתו אשר שמר מצותי וחקתי	³³ἀνθ’ ὧν κατέλιπέν με καὶ ἐποίησεν τῇ Ἀστάρτῃ βδελύγματι Σιδωνίων καὶ τῷ Χαμως καὶ τοῖς εἰδώλοις Μωαβ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐτῶν προσοχθίσματι υἱῶν Αμμων καὶ οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ εὐθὲς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ ὡς Δαυιδ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. ³⁴καὶ οὐ μὴ λάβω ὅλην τὴν βασιλείαν ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, διότι ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ, διὰ Δαυιδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην αὐτόν.

³³This is because they forsook me, worshiped Astarte the goddess of the Sidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the Ammonites, and they did not walk in my ways, doing what is right in my sight and my statutes and my ordinances, as his father David.

³³This is because he forsook me and acted for Astarte, abomination of the Sidonians, and for Chamos and the idols of Moab and their king, offense of the Ammonites, and he did not walk in my ways, doing what is right before me, as his father David.

---

87. According to Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Könige 1–16*, 139, the MT reference to a ruler is an addition that may be connected to the promise of a נשיא, "ruler" in Ezek 34:24. The LXX may preserve the original text here, but perhaps more likely is Würthwein's assumption that we are dealing with a later expansion.

[34]I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand <u>but will make him ruler</u> all the days of his life, for the sake of my servant David, whom I chose, <u>for he kept my commandments and my statutes</u>.	[34]I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand, <u>because I will resist him</u> all the days of his life, for the sake of my servant David, whom I chose.

The following considerations suggest that the MT plus in 11:33 is a later addition.[88] The statutes and ordinances are paralleled with the idea of doing right in the eyes of Yahweh, although they are issues on a different level. Many texts assume that the Israelites do right before Yahweh when they follow the commandments, but in this text the connection is peculiarly expressed in 11:33 as if they were different and parallel things. Accordingly, the plus וחקתי ומשפטי is syntactically awkward in relation to the preceding sentence. Instead of the conjunction, one would expect a different way to express the connection. For example, 11:38 uses *infinitivus constructus* and a further verb: ועשית הישר בעיני לשמר חקותי ומצותי כאשר עשה דוד עבדי, "and do what is right in my sight by keeping my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did." Doing right before Yahweh is here clearly defined as keeping the statutes and commandments. Although 11:33 clearly seeks to express the same idea, the sentence does this in an exceedingly clumsy way. Moreover, the function of the verb עשה changes slightly and is therefore commonly translated "*doing* what is right in my sight and *keeping* my statutes and my ordinances." Otherwise, the sentence is difficult to understand. It should also be noted that the verb עשה is not commonly used in the book of Kings to express the idea of keeping the commandments. This is more common in younger books of the Hebrew Bible.[89] It is met in 1 Kgs 6:12, but this is part of a longer passage (6:11–14) that is also missing in the Old Greek and is probably more original than the MT.[90] Consequently, it is probable that the MT plus in 1 Kgs 11:33 is a later addition and that the shorter Old Greek preserves a more original text here.

---

88. The plus in 11:33 is regarded as an addition by many, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 126; Burney, *Notes*, 171, Montgomery, *Kings*, 247; Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 139; DeVries, *1 Kings*, 146–47; Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11*, 592.

89. According to Burney, *Notes*, 171, this is "characteristic of P or H."

90. See Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 101–8.

The MT plus in 1 Kgs 11:34 also connects poorly with the preceding sentence. It contains a double use of the relative word אשר, but it is not entirely clear how they are connected. Whereas the first אשר is clearly used to introduce a relative sentence ("David, whom I chose"), the second אשר may have been used in a similar way but it could also have had a different function. If the second אשר is used to introduce a relative sentence, the text would be fairly clear: "Whom I chose (and) who kept my commandments and my statutes." In this case, however, the text would necessitate a conjunction before the second אשר. The lack of conjunction suggests that the second אשר has a different function and was intended to introduce an explicative or causal clause. Although this is not particularly common, it is also met in 1 Kgs 3:19, for example.[91] In 1 Kgs 11:34, this would make an understandable sentence: "Whom I chose, because he kept my commandments and my statutes." There would be an obvious contrast with King Solomon, who did not keep the commandments. The problem with this theory is the use of the same word in two different functions in the same sentence, which would confuse the text and introduce an evident ambiguity. In either case, the plus in the MT is connected to the preceding sentence in a way that one would not expect from the original author, whereas a later author could more easily repeat a word from the older text but change its function in the expansion.

Second, 11:34 has a very close parallel in 1 Kgs 11:13, which is part of Yahweh's direct speech to Solomon. First Kings 11:13 refers to the same exact reason as 11:34 as to why the whole kingdom will not be taken by Solomon, but in this verse a reference to the commandments is missing: את כל הממלכה לא אקרע שבט אחד אתן לבנך למען דוד עבדי ולמען ירושלם אשר בחרתי, "I will not, however, tear away the entire kingdom; I will give one tribe to your son, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, which I have chosen." There is only a reference to the choosing of David (and Jerusalem) and it is not conditioned or paralleled with the commandments. In other words, Ahijah's words to Jeroboam contain an additional explanation why David was favored by Yahweh in comparison with the Yahweh's largely paralleled words to Solomon. This suggests that the MT plus in 11:34 is a later expansion.[92] The idea for the condition may have come from 1 Kgs 11:11, which gives the reason for

---

91. See Joüon §170e. See אשר שכבה עליו לילה הזאת האשה בן וימת, "Then this woman's son died in the night, because she lay on him."

92. Thus many, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 126; Burney, *Notes*, 171;

the punishment in the first place: Solomon's ultimate sin was that he did not observe the commandments.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. One can exclude the possibility that two very similar pluses in the MT would have been accidentally omitted in the transmission of the LXX or its *Vorlage*. Because of the obvious problem with the sentence, there is a slight chance that the MT of 11:33 was corrupted. One could argue that a word, such as לשמור (הישר בעיני לשמור חקותי ומשפטי >) was accidentally omitted. This theory is hampered by the conjunction before חקותי. Moreover, one would still have to explain the shorter Greek reading, which means that the theory would have to assume two separate accidental omissions. Moreover, it is apparent that the variants are connected, which strongly suggests that the differences are intentional.

However, intentional omissions would be inexplicable. A later editor could certainly be disposed to revise poor grammar and polish awkward sentences, but in 11:33 it is very unlikely that a later editor would simply omit references to keeping Yahweh's commandments. A correction of an awkward sentence would have been easily done without the omission of an important theological idea. That the awkward MT reading was preserved in the transmission again highlights the preservation of the text and reluctance of successive scribes to make corrections on the basis of language style. In any case, the Greek text is very close to the Hebrew in most parts of Ahijah's prophecy and there is no indication that the language had been secondarily revised. Moreover, there is nothing theologically problematic in the pluses, which largely correspond with conceptions that became very common in the later additions of the books from Deuteronomy to Kings.[93]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The additions in 11:33 and 34 are intentional attempts to introduce the commandments into the text. This is suggested by their content and the fact that the additions are integrated into Yahweh's speech. The expansions are also not explanations of the older text, but clearly bring new ideas and thereby

---

DeVries, *1 Kings*, 146–47. Montgomery, *Kings*, 247, merely notes the existence of the variant.

93. Nonetheless, Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11*, 593–94, sees no reason to regard them as an addition. His position does not discuss, however, how the shorter LXX emerged in the first place.

change the older text in its substance. Both additions were rather unskillfully incorporated in the older text. The addition in 11:33 is so poorly connected to the sentence that one could even suspect a later clarification or note made between the lines or in the margin as a note that this refers to the commandments. In any case, the additions correspond with observations made elsewhere as well that the emphasis on the observance of the commandments is a latecomer in many texts.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Because of the grammatical awkwardness, it is very likely that one would expect an editorial intervention in both 11:33 and 34 without the more original text preserved in the LXX. In the case of 11:34, a parallel in 11:13 would corroborate that the same idea was transmitted without the reference to the commandments. Moreover, it would not go unnoticed that the use of the verb עשה in 11:33 in reference to keeping the commandments is exceptional in Kings and in the related Deuteronomistic literature. That adjacent verses both contain problems with the same topic would further corroborate the suspicion that an editor had secondarily added references to the commandments. The text would also function well without the suspected additions.

Results. The MT of 1 Kgs 11:33–34 contains two related and rather typical additions, both of which seek to increase the importance of the commandments in the judgment over Solomon. It is probable that a careful critic would have detected the additions in the MT even if the more original text had not been preserved in the LXX.

4.13. 1 Kings 11:38–39

The pericope 1 Kgs 11:31–40 contains the prophet Ahijah's divine message to Jeroboam concerning the division of Solomon's kingdom. Yahweh's message concludes with a conditioned promise to Jeroboam about the future of his kingdom. There is a notable plus in the MT at the very end of the message. In addition to the final sentence of 11:38, the entire verse 39 is missing in the LXX. The Lucianic manuscripts follow the MT plus, but this is probably a secondary harmonization toward the MT. The Vulgate and Targum Jonathan follow the MT; the passage is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

1 Kgs 11:38–39 MT	1 Kgs 11:38 LXX
³⁸והיה אם תשמע את כל אשר אצוך והלכת בדרכי ועשית הישר בעיני לשמור חקותי ומצותי כאשר עשה דוד עבדי והייתי עמך ובניתי לך בית נאמן כאשר בניתי לדוד <u>ונתתי לך את ישראל</u> <u>³⁹ואענה את זרע דוד למען זאת</u> <u>אך לא כל הימים</u>	³⁸καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν φυλάξῃς πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαί σοι, καὶ πορευθῇς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου καὶ ποιήσῃς τὸ εὐθὲς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ τοῦ φυλάξασθαι τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ προστάγματά μου, καθὼς ἐποίησεν Δαυιδ ὁ δοῦλός μου, καὶ ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ καὶ οἰκοδομήσω σοι οἶκον πιστόν, καθὼς ᾠκοδόμησα τῷ Δαυιδ.
³⁸If you *listen to* all that I command you, and walk in my ways, and do what is right before me by keeping my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did, then I will be with you and will build you an enduring house, as I built for David, <u>and I will give Israel to you</u>. ³⁹<u>For this reason I will afflict the descendants of David, but not forever."</u>	If you *keep* all that I command you, and walk in my ways, and do what is right before me by keeping my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did, then I will be with you and will build you an enduring house, as I built for David."

It is highly likely that the MT plus in 11:38bβ–39 is a later addition.[94] First Kings 11:38abα deals with the possibility that Jeroboam's dynasty will be an enduring one (בית נאמן), like the one that Yahweh has given to David, if Jeroboam only keeps the commandments like David allegedly had kept them. The MT plus in 11:38bβ, however, slightly changes the focus, and appears to make the *giving of Israel* to Jeroboam contingent on his following the commandments. This was hardly meant by the original author, for Israel has already been promised to Jeroboam in 11:31 and 37 without any conditions, and this is also what happens. In contrast, 11:38abα deals with the question of whether Jeroboam's dynasty will endure or not. It

---

94. Thus many especially in early scholarship, e.g., Kittel, *Könige*, 101; Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 126; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 320; Benzinger, *Könige*, 84; Burney, *Notes*, 171; and DeVries, *1 Kings*, 147. Despite its length and importance, some scholars completely ignore the LXX variant; e.g., Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 158. Montgomery, *Kings*, 247; and Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11*, 598, merely note the existence of the shorter LXX reading, but do not discuss its relationship with the MT.

would undermine the preceding divine message altogether and the whole ensuing story in Kings, if the giving of Israel would also be dependent on Jeroboam's faithfulness to Yahweh's commandment. It is obvious that he is not faithful, for the ensuing narrative in 1 Kgs 12 and many other passages in Kings portray Jeroboam as the sinner par excellence, although Israel is given to him and he is, at least partly, presented as the founder of Israel as a separate kingdom from Judah.

The MT plus in 11:38bβ–39 is even more peculiar, for it is not directly clear what exactly is meant by the למען זאת, "for this reason." The reason why the descendants of David are afflicted would logically be Solomon's sins, mentioned in 11:33, whereas other possibilities are less logical. The immediately preceding verse deals with the conditioned endurance of Jeroboam's house and giving of Israel to him, but it is difficult to see how this could be the reason for afflicting David's descendants. On the other hand, למען זאת could be understood more loosely to express consecu-tiveness: Israel is given to Jeroboam, which is followed by the affliction of David's descendants.[95] Although not impossible, the author of 11:38abα mainly was thinking about the conditioned future of Jeroboam, for which the unconditioned consecutiveness of Israel's future suits poorly. For this reason, it is probable that 11:38bβ–39 was added later, while the older text is found in 11:38abα. It seems likely that a scribe who was only generally deliberating and looking at the whole passage is behind the MT plus.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There are no technical rea-sons that could have facilitated an accidental omission, and because the plus mainly confuses the text, as noted above, it is unlikely that an acciden-tal and arbitrary omission would have succeeded in improving the text so well. An intentional omission could have been motivated by the attempt to improve the text and remove the confusion and contradiction the plus causes. However, it is very unlikely that any scribe would have merely dropped the ideas in the pluses without any attempt to include them in a more consistent way in the text. For example, a sheer omission of the theo-logically important idea that the affliction of David's descendants will not last forever would be very exceptional. In pertinent chapters we have seen that omissions and replacements were only done in rare cases when other

---

95. For consecutiveness, see Joüon §168d.

solutions to alter the text did not suffice. Consequently, it is very unlikely that the shorter text in the LXX is the result of an omission.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT plus in 11:38bβ–39 shows that some additions introduce ideas that undermine or contradict the older text. The plus is also one of the many additions that change the focus, perspective, or even topic of the original text. The addition was clearly intended to be included in the text, for it continues the preceding speech in form. Since the addition is rather lengthy, it is likely that it was written when the entire manuscript was reproduced, although a supralinear addition should not be completely excluded.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is quite likely that one would notice the MT plus even without the shorter LXX readings, since 1 Kings 11:39 especially sticks out as an evident intrusion that is difficult to connect with its current context. The literary critic would also discern that 11:38abα appears to make the giving of Israel to Jeroboam contingent on his following the commandments, although Israel has already been promised to him without any conditions. Consequently, it is probable that the literary critic would be able to reconstruct the more original literary stage of the text even without the LXX.

Results. The MT plus in 1 Kgs 11:38bβ–39 is probably a later addition, while the older text is preserved in the LXX. Because the addition contradicts (11:38abα) or digresses (11:39) from the context so clearly, it is very likely that a literary critic would have identified the expansion on the basis of the MT alone.

4.14. 1 Kings 15:5

First Kings 15:1–8 records the events during the reign of King Abijam of Judah. Portrayed as evil, he is said not to have been wholly devoted to Yahweh the way King David had been (15:3). Despite Abijam's shortcomings, Yahweh allowed the Judean dynasty to continue, because David had not turned aside from anything that Yahweh had commanded him, "except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite" (11:5). The exception found in the MT of 11:5bβ is missing in many Greek manuscripts (such as Codex Vaticanus), and the shorter Greek reading probably represents the Old Greek and goes back to a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage*, while those containing the plus (such

as the Codex Alexandrinus and Lucianic manuscripts) seem to have been secondarily harmonized toward the MT.

1 Kgs 15:5 MT	1 Kgs 15:5 LXX
אשר עשה דוד את הישר בעיני יהוה ולא סר מכל אשר צוהו כל ימי חייו רק בדבר אוריה החתי	ὡς ἐποίησεν Δαυιδ τὸ εὐθὲς ἐνώπιον κυρίου, οὐκ ἐξέκλινεν ἀπὸ πάντων, ὧν ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ, πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ.
For David did what was right in the sight of Yahweh, and did not turn aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite.	For David did what was right in the sight of the Lord, and did not turn aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life.

It is probable that the shorter reading in the Greek is original, the MT containing a secondary addition.[96] This is suggested by the apparent tension within the verse. According to 15:5bα, David never turned from anything that Yahweh had commanded him. The use of words "from anything" (מכל) and "all his life" (כל ימי חייו) seem to be rather absolute statements that do not leave room for exceptions. If the original author of 15:5 had anticipated an exception later in the verse, the double use of the word כל to affirm that David never turned aside from Yahweh's commandments would be peculiar. Moreover, David's sin with Bathsheba is otherwise never mentioned in Kings, and other passages that refer to David's relationship with Yahweh's commandments do not mention any sins: 1 Kgs 3:6, 14; 8:25; 9:4; 11:6, 34, 38; 14:8. In Kings David is characterized as the ideal king who sets the standard and with whom other kings are therefore compared. It seems that most authors in Kings were either unfamiliar with David's sin with Bathsheba or did not take it as being in conflict with their ideal of him. The MT of 1 Kgs 15:5 is the notable exception. Consequently,

---

96. Thus many, e.g., Benzinger, *Könige*, 99; Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 139; Burney, *Notes*, 196; Montgomery, *Kings*, 274; Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 184; DeVries, *1 Kings*, 186; Thilo A. Rudnig, *Davids Thron: Redaktionskritische Studien zur Geschichte der Thronnachfolge Davids*, BZAW 358 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 27.

it seems likely that 15:5bβ in the MT is a secondary addition influenced by the story of David and Bathsheba in 2 Sam 11–12.[97]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An alternative to regard 15:5bβ as a secondary addition would be to assume an unintentional omission in the Greek, but this is unlikely. The text does not contain any features—such as homoioteleuton or homoioarchton—that commonly cause accidental omissions. One would have to assume a purely arbitrary omission of some words, but such an alternative should only be considered if other explanations are unlikely. Moreover, arbitrary omissions usually confuse the text and do not make them clearer as would be the case in 1 Kgs 15:5.

An intentional omission in the Greek manuscripts is a more potential possibility than an accidental omission. In parts of later biblical and other Jewish literature David gradually became the archetype of an ideal king, a picture that would be disturbed by a sin. For example, Chronicles completely ignores David's encounter with Bathsheba, although the author was probably familiar with the story in some form. Chronicles does not mention Bathsheba at all and David is portrayed as impeccable. It would thus be imaginable that an editor, following this picture and/or being influenced by Chronicles, could have removed a reference to David's sin. The omission would have been facilitated by the apparent tensions in the verse. In the end, however, this hypothesis assumes a more complicated development than the hypothesis of an intentional addition in the MT. One would have to assume that the sin was originally introduced to the book of Kings, as one would still have to explain the apparent tension between 15:5bβ and all the other passages in Kings that imply David to be without sin, and it would also be necessary to explain how the reference to Uriah in 15:5bβ emerged. That 15:5bβ is a separate and isolated gloss is the easiest explanation and, following Occam's razor, one should conclude that the shorter reading in the LXX is more original.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. First Kings 15:5bβ is a gloss possibly added in the margin or between the lines. It could be the reaction of a scribe or a reader with a pen, who wanted to make a

---

97. In contrast to the tendency in Chronicles (see below), this is comparable to the superscription of Ps 51.

brief reference to the matter with Uriah, a story that was familiar to him.[98]
A later copyist would then have included the remark in the main text. It
is unlikely that the addition is part of a wider redaction—for example,
motivated by an attempt to connect the books of Samuel and Kings more
closely—since no other passage in Kings contains a reference to the event.
If it had been part of a wider redaction, one would expect that the encoun-
ter with Bathsheba, and related events, would have been mentioned in
various contexts. It is more likely that the addition was a rather spontane-
ous addition after the stories in Samuel had become well-known and were
read as a background to Kings. It should further be noted that the words
בדבר אוריה החתי do not conceal the nature of the sin at all. This suggests
that the scribe who added the sentence implied the story to be very well-
known to anyone reading the text. It is thus probable that 15:5bβ is a very
late addition or marginal gloss. Its lateness is corroborated by the fact that
it is missing in the Greek witnesses.

The addition in the MT 1 Kgs 15:5bβ is a rather typical small editorial
change often assumed in literary criticism. In many ways it corresponds
to conventional assumptions in this methodology. It highlights the impor-
tance of expecting the original authors to be consistent, and it shows that
one should pay close attention to potential tensions within the text. One
should also note the use of the word רק at the beginning of the addition in
an attempt to provide an exception to something that has been said in the
previous text (e.g., Josh 1:7).

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without access to the shorter reading
in the Greek manuscripts, a careful literary critic would probably suspect
that 15:5bβ of the MT was added later. One would easily notice the ten-
sions between the rather absolute statements in 15:5bα and the exception
in 15:5bβ. Although there is no grammatical problem, the beginning of a
sentence with רק is occasionally found at the beginning of additions, espe-
cially when they contain information that appears to be in tension with the
preceding text.[99] In addition, the contradiction with passages in the rest of

---

98. Already Benzinger, *Bücher der Könige*, 99, remarked that the addition in the
MT 15:5bβ "ist wohl Glosse eines reflektierenden Lesers."

99. E.g., Josh 1:7; see Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung
seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*, AASF B 193 (Helsinki: Aca-
demia Scientiarum Fennica, 1975), 29.

Kings would raise the question of why David's image in Kings is otherwise taintless but not in this verse.

Results. The Old Greek of 1 Kgs 15:5 attests a shorter version of this verse, while the MT clause רק בדבר אוריה החתי, "except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite" is a secondary interpolation. This could also be concluded without the textual evidence of the LXX manuscripts, since the clause is only loosely connected to the preceding text and, in part, contradicts the context of the verse and of the book.

4.15. 1 Kings 15:23

First Kings 15:9–24 describes the reign of King Asa of Judah; 1 Kgs 15:23 is part of the standard concluding statement that refers to the book of annals of Judean kings where additional information on his achievements can be found. In addition to the typical formula "all that he did" (כל אשר עשה), the MT refers to the cities that he built. This reference is missing in most Greek manuscripts and probably represents the Old Greek, while those manuscripts that include it (such as Codex Alexandrinus) are probably the result of a later recension toward the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate and the Targum Jonathan follow the MT. The passage is not preserved at Qumran.

1 Kgs 15:23 MT	1 Kgs 15:23 LXX
ויתר <u>כל</u> דברי אסא	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ασα
וכל גבורתו ו<u>כל</u> אשר עשה	καὶ πᾶσα ἡ δυναστεία αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἐποίησεν,
<u>והערים אשר בנה</u>	
הלא המה כתובים על	οὐκ ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐστὶν
ספר דברי הימים	ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς
למלכי יהודה	βασιλεῦσιν Ιουδα;
רק לעת זקנתו	πλὴν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ γήρως αὐτοῦ
חלה את רגליו	ἐπόνεσεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

The rest of <u>all</u> the acts of Asa, all his achievements, <u>all</u> that he did, <u>and the cities that he built</u>, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Judah? But in his old age he was diseased in his feet.	The rest of the acts of Asa, and all his achievements that he did, behold, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Judah? Nevertheless in his old age he was diseased in his feet.

It is quite likely that the reference to the cities in the MT is a late addition.[100] The comment is found in an illogical place: The text has already referred to the rest (יתר) of his acts and all that he did (כל אשר עשה), which reads like a concluding statement of his deeds; one would not expect the text to continue with further deeds. The addition may have been inspired or influenced by 15:22b, which refers to the building of Geba and Mizpah.[101] The same sentence הערים אשר בנה is also found in 1 Kgs 22:39 (in both LXX and MT), which refers to the building of cities by King Ahab of Israel. Since Asa is said to have been particularly faithful toward Yahweh, while Ahab was one of the worst kings, we may be dealing with an attempt to counterbalance the building of cities: faithful kings have also made great achievements that match those of the evil ones. On the other hand, Montgomery has suggested that the addition was inspired by 1 Chr 14:6–7. This is certainly possible, for according to these verses Asa built cities. It is equally possible that the editor was inspired by both 1 Chr 14 and 1 Kgs 22:39.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. One cannot completely exclude the possibility of an accidental omission in the LXX, but the text does not contain technical reasons that would clearly facilitate an omission. To assume an accidental omission of a self-contained unit is hazardous, as accidental omissions usually confuse the text and not the opposite.[102]

An intentional omission is a possibility that could have been motivated by the superfluous information of the plus. One could argue that since 15:22b already contains a reference to the cities, there would be no reason to refer to any additional information. On the other hand, the information is not identical, as 15:23 refers to additional information in the annals. Since an omission is a radical intervention in the older text, it usually necessitates a strong motive. Such cannot be found in this case,

---

100. Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 142; Montgomery, *Kings*, 278; Noth, *Könige*, 342. Several scholars, such as Burney, *Notes*, 199, Benzinger, *Könige*, 101, Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 186; Georg Hentschel, *1. Könige*, NEchtB 10 (Würtzburg: Echter, 1984), 97; Nelson, *Joshua*, 192, make no note of the Greek variant.

101. "Then King Asa made a proclamation to all Judah, none was exempt: they carried away the stones of Ramah and its timber, with which Baasha had been building; with them King Asa built Geba of Benjamin and Mizpah" (ויבן בם המלך אסא את גבע בנימן ואת המצפה).

102. Nevertheless, DeVries, *1 Kings*, 189, evokes the possibility that the minus in the LXX could be the result of a haplography.

and therefore it is probable that the LXX preserves the original reading, while the MT contains a secondary addition.[103]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT plus is one of the many small editorial changes that have gradually increased the importance of good kings. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to see the plus as part of a broader redaction. We may well be dealing with an isolated and spontaneous addition, possibly inspired by 1 Kgs 15:22b and 22:39. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the addition was made as a note in the margins or a gloss not intended for the main text, because it claims to know that the annals contain additional information about the cities that Asa built. We are dealing with an addition intended for the main text, with the probable motive of trying to increase the achievements of Asa, who was deemed a good king. The addition can also be seen as exegetical, for it seeks to interpret what concretely were Asa's achievements.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the shorter version in the LXX, it would be very difficult to detect the MT plus as a secondary addition. There is no grammatical problem since the sentence is part of a list containing semi-independent elements connected with conjunctions: וכל גבורתו וכל אשר עשה והערים אשר בנה. Nevertheless, the preceding sentence, "all that he did" (וכל אשר עשה) is written as a conclusive statement that does not anticipate further details. It would be more logical if the building of cities had been placed before this statement. On the other hand, the same logical incongruence is found in the descriptions of other kings' reigns (such as 1 Kgs 22:39), and one cannot expect full consistency. Consequently, it is unlikely that the addition in 1 Kgs 15:23 could have been detected by literary critical methods.

Results. First Kings 15:23 contains a secondary addition in the MT, while the older text is preserved in the LXX. We are dealing with an isolated addition that slightly increases the importance of King Asa of Judah. It is unlikely that the addition could have been recognized by literary criticism, had the older version in the LXX not been preserved.

---

103. Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 392, notes the variant but does not discuss its text-critical value.

4.16. 1 Kings 16:10

First Kings 16:8–10 describes the short reign of King Elah of Israel from accession to death. He is said to have followed his father Baasha to the throne and been murdered by Zimri, a military commander in charge of half of the chariots. According to the MT, the coup took place in the twenty-seventh year of Asa. Most Greek manuscripts lack the chronological reference, and those that follow the MT (such as Codex Alexandrinus: ἐν ἔτει εἰκοστῷ καὶ ἑβδόμῳ τοῦ Ασα βασιλέως Ιουδα) are probably the result of a secondary harmonization toward the MT.[104] The shorter reading, found in most Greek manuscripts, preserves the Old Greek.

1 Kgs 16 MT	1 Kgs 16 LXX
⁸בשנת עשרים ושש שנה לאסא מלך יהודה	⁶ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει βασιλέως Ασα.
מלך אלה בן בעשא על ישראל	⁸Καὶ Ηλα υἱὸς Βαασα ἐβασίλευσεν ἐπὶ
בתרצה שנתים	Ισραηλ δύο ἔτη ἐν Θερσα.
⁹ויקשר עליו <u>עבדו</u> זמרי	⁹καὶ συνέστρεψεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν Ζαμβρι
שר מחצית הרכב	ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἡμίσους τῆς ἵππου,
והוא בתרצה שתה שכור	καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν Θερσα πίνων μεθύων
בית ארצא אשר על הבית בתרצה	ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ωσα τοῦ οἰκονόμου ἐν Θερσα·
¹⁰ויבא זמרי	¹⁰καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ζαμβρι
ויכהו וימיתהו	καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτὸν
<u>בשנת עשרים ושבע לאסא מלך יהודה</u>	
וימלך תחתיו	καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

⁸In the twenty-sixth year of King Asa of Judah, Elah son of Baasha reigned over Israel two years in Tirzah. ⁹But <u>his servant</u> Zimri, commander of half his chariots, conspired against him. When he was at Tirzah, drinking himself drunk in the house of Arza, who was in charge of the palace at Tirzah,

⁶ in the twentieth year of King Asa of Judah … ⁸Ela son of Baasa reigned over Israel two years in Thersa. ⁹But Zambri, captain of half his horses, conspired against him. When he was in Thersa, drinking himself drunk in the house of Osa the steward at Thersa.

---

104. This is strongly suggested by the fact that the Greek manuscripts that include the reference follow the masoretic chronology and refer to the twenty-seventh year, while the Old Greek very probably differed from this. According to the OG of 1 Kgs 16:6, the accession year of Elah was the twentieth year of King Asa of Judah, and therefore in the OG the coup should have taken place in the twenty-first (or twenty-second) year of Asa.

¹⁰Zimri went in and struck him and killed him, <u>in the twenty-seventh year of King Asa of Judah</u>, and reigned as king in his stead.	¹⁰Zambri went in and struck him and killed him, and reigned as king in his stead.

It is probable that the MT reading is the result of a secondary addition.[105] First, there is a slight grammatical confusion. The subject of the verb in 16:10b (וימלך) is evidently Zimri and the suffix in תחתיו clearly refers to King Elah. Without the synchronic chronological reference immediately before 16:10b, there would be no question who is referred to, but in the current MT the last person mentioned is King Asa, which creates a slight confusion. If the text had been written by a single author, a clarification of the subject would be expected. Second, the reference to the year of Elah's death is redundant, since 16:8 already refers to the accession year and the length of Elah's reign. First Kings 16:15 also refers to the accession year of Zimri, which would logically be the same as the year when Zimri killed Elah. Consequently, the synchronic reference in the MT of 16:10 is probably a later addition deduced from 1 Kgs 16:8 and 15. Third, the MT is generally more expansive in the chronological information until the reign of Jehu.[106] For these reasons, it is probable that the MT of 1 Kgs 16:10 is also the result of a secondary expansion, the shorter Old Greek preserving the more original text. It is not clear why the addition was made, since other verses already imply the same information, but the tendency to secondarily add chronological data is widespread in the Hebrew Bible.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Because chronological references are also missing in other passages of the LXX Kings in comparison with the MT, one should exclude an unintentional scribal omission. The differences are part of an intentional tendency to add or omit chronological data. According to Immanuel Benzinger, 1 Kgs 15:28 ("Baasha killed Nadab in the third year of King Asa of Judah, and succeeded him.") shows that the plus is original, but it is difficult to understand his reason-

---

105. Similarly, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 145; Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 192.

106. Thus especially James Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, HSM 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 109–11. After Jehu the chronological references do not contain any major variants between the MT and the LXX.

ing.[107] Another conceivable reason for intentionally omitting the data in 1 Kgs 16:10 would be that it sought to omit unnecessary repetition with 16:8 and 15, as especially 16:15 refers to the same year.[108] On the other hand, an omission of data is always a strong intervention in the text that is mainly done if the old text was ideologically problematical. This is not the case with 16:10. The text of Kings (and much of the Hebrew Bible) contains many repetitions and slight grammatical confusions that have not been corrected in the Greek texts. Simon DeVries suggests that the LXX secondarily omits it because of "the numerical disagreement of the two synchronisms and the two-year length of reign mentioned in v. 8."[109] In other words, twenty-six plus two cannot be twenty-seven. This is an unlikely theory, for there would only be a disagreement if the first year was regarded as full 360/365 days, but this is unlikely. Moreover, if an editor had a problem with the numbers, they would more probably have been revised than completely omitted.[110]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It is possible that we are dealing with an isolated addition with the information that was deduced from 16:8 and 15. It could also derive from the hand of a chronologically oriented scribe, who added the date to the margins or between the lines, from where it was later integrated to the main text. On the other hand, chronologies seem to have been revised rather widely—indicated by the fact that the chronologies between the LXX and the MT repeatedly differ—and thus it is possible that the addition in 1 Kgs 16:10 could be part of a wider chronological revision. As the same information is found in other verses, the addition does not add any information to the text as a whole. In any case, the addition was not very successful, as it created a slight grammatical confusion with the subjects.

---

107. Benzinger, *Könige*, 102.

108. Although there are variants in the Greek manuscripts, the Old Greek of 1 Kgs 16:15 seems to attest to the twenty-second year of King Asa.

109. DeVries, *1 Kings*, 196.

110. A number of scholars make no note of the LXX variant, e.g., Montgomery, *Kings*, 279–80; Burney, *Notes*, 200–201; John Gray, *I and II Kings: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 326–28; Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 199–201. Some scholars, such as Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 401, merely mention the variant but make no evaluation.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Because of the slight grammatical awkwardness discussed above and the unnecessary repetition, one could suspect that the MT of 1 Kgs 16:10 may have been edited. One would also note that the year of death of a king is otherwise not mentioned, so the verse differs from the rest of synchronic information in Kings. Nevertheless, these problems are so small that one could not conclude with certainty that we are dealing with an addition. On the other hand, the suspicion that the reference was secondarily added could be substantiated by other passages that contain similar problems with chronology. One would probably come to the conclusion that chronologically oriented scribes added supplemental chronological information. A similar tendency is found in other parts of the Hebrew Bible as well (e.g., Jeremiah and Ezra-Nehemiah).

Results. The MT of 1 Kgs 16:10 contains a secondary addition mentioning the year of King Elah's death, while the LXX, where the reference is missing, preserves the original reading. The addition is one of the numerous chronological additions in Kings. It could be an isolated addition or part of a wider chronological supplementation. A careful literary critic would suspect that the reference is a later addition.

4.17. 1 Kings 22:28

First Kings 22 deals with King Ahab's search for a prophetic answer for his plan to attack the Arameans. After all other prophets have predicted good things, Micaiah predicts Ahab's death in the battle between Israel and Aram in Ramoth-Gilead (22:17, 20). Angered by this Ahab ordered that Micaiah be kept imprisoned until he returns. Addressing King Ahab directly, Micaiah then notes in 22:28 that Yahweh has not spoken to him if Ahab returns from the battle in peace. This statement is found in both the MT and LXX versions. However, the MT adds that all nations should listen, perhaps implying that they should take heed of what will happen to King Ahab:

1 Kgs 22:28 MT	1 Kgs 22:28 LXX
ויאמר מיכיהו	καὶ εἶπε Μιχαίας·
אם שוב תשוב בשלום	ἐὰν ἐπιστρέφων ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐν εἰρήνῃ,
לא דבר יהוה בי	οὐ λελάληκε Κύριος ἐν ἐμοί.
ויאמר שמעו עמים כלם	

And Micaiah said: "If you return in peace, Yahweh did not speak to me." <u>And he said, "Let all nations listen."</u>	And Michaias said, "if you return in peace, the Lord did not speak to me."

Some Greek manuscripts (such as Codex Alexandrinus) and daughter translations (such as Armenian) also contain the plus, but this is probably the result of a later recension toward the proto-MT. The Vulgate follows the MT. One letter of the verse may have been preserved in 6Q4 (6Qpap-Kings; in frag. 5), but not enough to determine whether the manuscript follows the MT or LXX reading.

Although it is not fully clear what exactly is meant in the MT plus in this context, it is evident that we are dealing with a later addition.[111] This is suggested by the superfluous repetition of the ויאמר, "and he said," although the speaker remains Micaiah. One should also note the suddenly changed perspective and addressee. The original text is about Micaiah speaking to Ahab, while the plus surprisingly addresses the nations. It is very unlikely that the original author would have devised the text in this way.

It is possible that the addition was an attempt to identify or connect Micaiah, son of Imlah, with Micah of Moresheth, because Micaiah's statement in the MT plus contains exactly the same sentence that is found in the book of Micah. After the introduction of Micah in Mic 1:1, the first sentence that begins his prophecies in 1:2 is שמעו עמים כלם, "Let all nations listen."[112] This is hardly a coincidence. Although the names Micaiah and Micah (מיכיהו and מיכה) are essentially the same name, they are said to have lived in very different times and places (Micah in Judah in eighth century Judah and Micaiah in ninth century Israel), and therefore the connection is anachronistic and misguided. This strongly suggests that we are dealing with a rather poorly made later addition.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There are no technical reasons such as homoioteleuton or homoioarchton that would have facilitated the accidental omission of the plus. An intentional omission is

---

111. This is assumed by, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 173; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 497; Burney, *Notes*, 256; Ernst Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25*, ATD 11.2. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 254; DeVries, *1 Kings*, 262.

112. The connection has been noted by many commentators, e.g., Burney, *Notes*, 256, and Montgomery, *Kings*, 340.

theoretically possible and the obvious reason for such would be the inex-
plicable function of the plus in the dialogue. Although this is theoretically
possible, it would not explain why it was inserted in this location in the
first place. It is thus more probable that we are dealing with an addition in
the MT and that the LXX preserves an older stage of the text.[113]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. According to sev-
eral scholars, the addition in the MT is a gloss made by a reader (with a
pen).[114] This would imply that the addition was made between the lines
or in the margins. This is possible, but the form of the addition suggests
that it was intended to be included in the text in order to continue Mic-
aiah's speech. The addition does not explain or clarify anything in the text,
which is usually the case with marginal glosses or supralinear addition.
Because the plus is so peculiar in this context, it is doubtful whether a later
copyist would even have known where the gloss should be placed. For this
reason, it is more probable that the addition was made when the entire
manuscript was reproduced. Nevertheless, the problems with the connec-
tion between Micaiah and Micah as well as its poor placement within the
context suggest that it was a rather unplanned addition, perhaps sponta-
neously inspired by the scribe's familiarity with the beginning of the book
of Micah. There is no evidence for a wider redactional attempt to connect
Micaiah with Micah.

The additions show that later editors often create unnecessary rep-
etitions that one would not expect from the original author (here ויאמר).
Apparently unmotivated repetitions should thus always be investigated
and understood. It confirms the conventional assumption in literary criti-
cism that later editors were more prone to break literary conventions than
the original author. This addition also shows that sudden changes in per-
spective or focus are often the work of a later editor.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It would have been rather easy to
detect the addition in the MT without the shorter version in the LXX. The
critic would have been struck by the unnecessary repetition of ויאמר "and
he said," which is followed by a puzzling change of focus. The connection

---

113. Some scholars, such as Montgomery, *Kings*, 340, merely note the variant
without determining what happened.

114. Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 497; Benzinger, *Könige*, 124; DeVries,
1 Kings, 262.

with Mic 1:2 would have confirmed the suspicion that the sentence has a different origin than the rest of Micaiah's response to King Ahab.

Results. The MT of 1 Kgs 22:28 contains a peculiar addition that was inspired by Mic 1:2. It clearly sticks out from its context, and has a very different literary horizon than the rest of the passage. Accordingly, literary critics would have detected the addition even without the LXX version, which preserves an earlier reading.

<div align="center">4.18. 2 Kings 8:27</div>

Part of a passage recording the events during the reign of King Ahaziah of Judah, 2 Kgs 8:27 contains the standard evaluation of a king. Ahaziah is portrayed as evil, and his sins are compared with those of the hated house of Ahab (or Omri). The MT contains a plus in 8:27b, which explains why Ahaziah's sins were as severe as those of Ahab: "for he was son-in-law to the house of Ahab." The plus is missing in many Greek witnesses, which most likely goes back to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, while those containing the plus (such as the Lucianic MSS boc₂e₂) were probably secondarily harmonized toward a text-type similar to the MT.

2 Kgs 8:27 MT	2 Kgs 8:27 LXX
וילך בדרך בית אחאב ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה כבית אחאב <u>כי חתן בית אחאב הוא</u>	καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐν ὁδῷ οἴκου Αχααβ καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιον κυρίου καθὼς ὁ οἶκος Αχααβ.
He walked in the way of the house of Ahab, doing what was evil in the sight of Yahweh, as the house of Ahab had done, <u>for he was son-in-law to the house of Ahab</u>.	He also walked in the way of the house of Ahab, doing what was evil in the sight of the Lord, as the house of Ahab had done.

It is quite likely that the plus in the MT is a secondary addition, the shorter reading in the LXX preserving the more original text.[115] The addition refers to the close relationship of Ahaziah and house of Ahab/Omri,

---

115. Thus many, e.g., Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 323; Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 219. Burney, *Notes,* 296; Montgomery, *Kings*, 396–398; and Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, 449, note the variant reading without taking a position.

which is told already in 8:26: Athaliah, King Omri's granddaughter, was Ahaziah's mother. The relationship between Ahaziah and the house of Ahab/Omri may have been the original implicit reason why King Ahaziah was described in such negative terms in the first place.[116] A later editor would have made this as the explicit reason: Ahaziah was such an evil king, *because* he was related to the hated royal house of Israel. It should also be noted that the plus repeats the words "house of Ahab" in a way not expected from the original author.

Second Kings 8:18 could have inspired the addition in 8:27b, for it similarly provides the relationship with the house of Omri/Ahab as the reason why a Judean king was particularly sinful: Jehoram was married to the daughter of Ahab and therefore he (must have) sinned like Ahab.

2 Kgs 8:27	2 Kgs 8:18
וילך בדרך בית אחאב ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה כבית אחאב כי חתן בית אחאב הוא	וילך בדרך מלכי ישראל כאשר עשו בית אחאב כי בת אחאב היתה לו לאשה ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
He walked in the way of the house of Ahab, doing what was evil in the sight of Yahweh, as the house of Ahab had done, for he was son-in-law to the house of Ahab.	He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab had done, for the daughter of Ahab was his wife. He did what was evil in the sight of Yahweh.

Taking all considerations together, it would seem probable that the shorter reading in the LXX of 2 Kgs 8:27 is original and that the plus in the MT 8:27b is a secondary addition.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The alternative to the intentional addition in the MT would be to assume an unintentional or intentional omission in the Greek text, but this is less likely. Although one can never completely rule out unintentional scribal mistakes, the text does not contain technical features that commonly cause or facilitate omissions. For example, it is unlikely that the repetition of the words בית אחאב would

---

116. The information that Ahaziah was related to Ahab or the Israelite royal family may have been adopted from the royal annals, while the evaluations of the kings are probably later.

have caused an omission by homoioteleuton, because the words are not found at the very end of the plus as in the preceding sentence.

As for an intentional omission, it would be very difficult to find a motive for doing so, for it would go against the tendency to increase the negative evaluation of the house of Israel and especially of the house of Ahab/Omri. The plus also does not contain anything offensive that would provide a reason for an intentional scribal omission.[117]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The secondary addition of 2 Kgs 8:27b is a typical editorial change in the Hebrew Bible: Something that is already implied in the older text is made explicit by a later scribe. Such additions did not necessarily add substantial new information, but by stating something that the older text already implied they sought to highlight some aspects, thus developing the text in a certain direction. Presumably, many marginal comments are of this kind, although manuscript evidence for them may not be extensive. One should not exclude the possibility that the addition in 8:27b was originally made in the margins or between the lines by an individual scribe. In any case, the addition does not seem to be part of a larger redaction. It is more likely an isolated scribal addition or a gloss. One should also note that many additions assumed by literary critics contain a suspicious repetition of an element from the older text. Although one cannot speak of a *Wiederaufnahme* in such a short addition as 8:27b, the words בית אחאב are repeated in a way that would not be expected from the original author. The repetition is often assumed to have functioned as a hook to attach an addition to the older text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without textual evidence from the Greek manuscripts, it would be difficult to conclude with certainty that the plus in the MT is a later addition. Nevertheless, one could suspect this. The triple use of בית אחאב in the same verse is especially awkward, and a critic would wonder whether an original author had formulated the text in such a repetitive way. It is a fair assumption that biblical texts are not particularly poorly written. From a later editor, who sought to connect the addition with the older text, such a repetition would be more likely. The

---

117. Nonetheless, some scholars assume that the MT is to be given priority here, e.g., Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 75. He provides no arguments for the evaluation.

repetition of בית אחאב would be even more likely if the plus was originally a note in the margins that was not intended to be included in the text.

Results. Second Kings 8:27b is a typical variant that does not provide significant new information. It illustrates a widespread development of biblical texts, namely making explicit what is already implied in the older text. Similar additions can be suspected in cases where documented evidence is not available. The verse shows that the disturbing repetition of a textual element, such as בית אחאב, should be regarded as a sign of a possible textual intervention, or alternatively the text should provide a reason for such a repetition.[118]

4.19. 2 Kings 16:11–12

Second Kings 16:10–14 describes changes that Ahaz made in the temple of Jerusalem after the model of a temple he saw in Damascus. The MT and LXX versions of 16:11–12 contain several differences, most of which are additional sentences in the MT lacking in the Greek version. Targum Jonathan, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate largely follow the MT. With some variations many Greek manuscripts (e.g., Codex Alexandrinus and the Lucianic witnesses) also follow the MT pluses, but it is unlikely that they were included in the Old Greek. This section is marked with an asterisk in the Hexaplaric witnesses, thus showing that the pluses were secondarily added after a proto-MT witness. It is probable that they were lacking in the Old Greek and its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

2 Kgs 16:11–12 MT	2 Kgs 16:11–12 LXX
¹¹ויבן אוריה הכהן את המזבח ככל אשר שלח המלך אחז מדמשק <u>כן עשה אוריה הכהן</u> <u>עד בוא המלך אחז מדמשק</u> ¹²ויבא המלך מדמשק וירא המלך את המזבח <u>ויקרב המלך על המזבח</u> ויעל עליו	¹¹καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν Ουριας ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ θυσιαστήριον κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Αχαζ ἐκ Δαμασκοῦ. ¹²καὶ εἶδεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἀνέβη ἐπ' αὐτὸ

---

118. A repetition is one sign of an editor's intervention, but it should never be used without other apparent reasons that similarly imply editorial activity.

[11]Uriah the priest built the altar in accordance with all that King Ahaz had sent from Damascus, <u>just so did Uriah the priest build it, before King Ahaz arrived from Damascus</u>. [12]<u>The king came from Damascus</u>, the king saw the altar, <u>and the king drew near to the altar</u>, went up on it.	[11]Uriah the priest built the altar in accordance with all that King Ahaz had sent from Damascus. [12]The king saw the altar and went up on it.

It is quite likely that all of the MT pluses in these verses are later additions.[119] This is suggested by the following text-internal considerations. The MT plus in 16:11 contains an unnecessary repetition of Uriah's and Ahaz's titles or professions, priest and king respectively. Both titles have been mentioned in the verse already, and their immediate repetition is unmotivated and unlikely from the original author. One should also note that Uriah's building action is repeated—albeit with a different verb (בנה > עשה)—in a way that reads like a new comment and an interruption. Whereas the scene is otherwise expressed with consecutive imperfects (ויבן), the comment begins with a perfect (עשה). There may be a stylistic reason for using כן עשה, but the difference is nevertheless notable.

The MT pluses in 16:12 are even more disturbing. The subject, "the king," is repeated five times in these two verses and in a way that one would not expect from a single author in such a short text: "the king came … the king saw … the king drew near." Although the subject can certainly be repeated, usually this is done if there is some uncertainty about who it is. This is not the case in 2 Kgs 16:12; and, indeed, the repetition

---

119. Thus Kittel, *Könige*, 270; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 201; Christoph Levin, "Der neue Altar unter Ahas von Juda," in *Ein Herz so weit wie der Sand am Ufer des Meeres: Festschrift für Georg Hentschel*, ed. Susanne Gillmayr-Bucher, ETS 90 (Würzburg: Echter, 2006), 55–59. Nevertheless, Levin also assumes that the sentence וירא המלך את המזבח, "the king saw the altar" was also added, which is already based on literary-critical considerations. Although Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 256–57, generally assume that the LXX version is older here, they additionally assume that some of the variants in these verses may also be secondary in the LXX. Many scholars assume editing in the passage, but the exact development is disputed. The text-critical evidence partly contradicts the redaction critical reconstruction by Würthwein, *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25*, 386, but he fails to comment on the LXX variants; e.g., he assumes that the sentence "before King Ahaz arrived from Damascus" is a later addition to "just so did Uriah the priest build it" but these are both missing in the LXX.

is disturbing. One should also note the awkward and unnecessary repetition of מדמשק, "from Damascus" and the altar. Although a single author can undoubtedly write poorly or repetitively, the accumulation of unnecessary repetitions in these verses—which hardly finds many parallels in the Hebrew Bible—strongly suggests that they do not derive from a single author. A later editor is much more prone to repeat unnecessarily, because he seeks to connect an addition to the older text and he is also less sensitive to the narrative consistency than the original author.[120]

A further argument for assuming that the pluses are additions is the apparent motive. The older text refers to Ahaz being in Damascus from where he sent detailed instructions to the priest Uriah in Jerusalem what kind of an altar should be built. After the text has described the building by Uriah in 16:11, the LXX text continues with Ahaz already seeing the altar and ascending on it, which clearly takes place in Jerusalem. The text does not say that he had traveled back from Damascus to Jerusalem, but this is obviously implied. Although this information is unnecessary for the main idea that the text seeks to convey, many later scribes would have been tempted to fill in the implied parts of the narrative, and to be sure, this is a typical development in the Hebrew Bible. In the wake of the added information on Ahaz's coming in 16:11, the idea of Ahaz drawing near the altar is also added to 16:12. The older text only implies that the king drew near the altar. The pluses are all implicit in the shorter LXX text, whereas the MT makes them explicit. This shared purpose suggests that they all derive from the same editor, who drew detail from implied information.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Because the pluses are most likely connected and found in two different locations in the text, an accidental omission in the Greek transmission or in its Hebrew *Vorlage* is very unlikely. Clearly, one could argue for an omission caused by homoioteleuton in both cases (repetition of words מדמשק and המזבח), and this possibility cannot be completely excluded, but it would imply an exceptionally sloppy scribe.[121] The minuses are also of different size, which excludes the possibility that a whole line was accidentally omitted in

---

120. It stands to reason that a later editor has more the content of the addition in mind than stylistic or grammatical consistency of the narrative.

121. Otto Thenius, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 2nd ed., KEH 9 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1873), 374; Burney, *Notes*, 326; Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, 539, all argue for homoioteleuton.

both cases. It would also be quite a coincidence that two accidental omissions removed exactly those sections that contain information implicit in the shorter text. In other words, the accidental omissions would not have removed any crucial information that one cannot deduce from the remaining text, but mainly unnecessary repetitions. Therefore, an intentional intervention is much more likely.

As for an intentional omission in the LXX tradition, one could argue that an editor sought to shorten the text of unnecessary information and remove redundancy. However, such a motive cannot be found in other passages in Kings. By and large, the LXX translation and its Hebrew *Vorlage* seem to have been rather faithful in those sections that have a parallel in the Masoretic Text. To assume a general tendency of shortening, one would expect the same tendency to be found on a regular basis. What we can see in Kings is a very similar and usually even a literal equivalence between the MT and LXX, which is occasionally interrupted by one version missing an entire sentence. The text discussed here is a case in point. With the exception of the MT pluses, the MT and LXX versions are closely parallel in the rest of 16:11–12 to the extent that the Greek follows the Hebrew word order in every single word, which implies a rather faithful rendering in the LXX. It would be illogical that another mode suddenly sets in where entire sentences are omitted. It is more probable that the LXX goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that did not contain the pluses. Although all of the three possible theories are theoretically possible, the considerations tip the scale clearly to assume secondary additions in the MT.[122]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The additions were evidently intended to be included in the text. Although their information could be extracted from the older text, they are not its comments or interpretations only. The form of the additions implies that the editor sought to add detail by expanding the narrative. Had they been made as additions between the lines, they would have extended through the column and perhaps continued in the margins. Although such expansions did occur (see,

---

122. Many commentators fail to discuss the LXX variant, e.g., Benzinger, *Könige*, 171; Würthwein, *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25*, 386; Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *2 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 11 (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 185, 189; Georg Hentschel, *2. Könige*, NEchtB 11 (Würzburg: Echter, 1985), 76; and Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 378–379. Montgomery, *Kings*, 455, notes some of the LXX variants, but does not discuss their relationship with the MT reading.

e.g., 1QIsaᵃ XXVIII, XXX, XXXIII), it is more probable that the additions were made when the entire manuscript was produced.

The additions are very typical of what has been observed in other parts of the Hebrew Bible and is also often assumed in literary critical approaches. They made implicit information explicit. There is no new substance as such but they still add detail that is not found in the older text. For example, it is obvious that Ahaz has to come from Damascus to Jerusalem to see the new altar in Jerusalem, but the event is now mentioned in the addition. Similarly, Ahaz has to come close to the altar first before he can ascend on it. Behind the sentence ויקרב המלך על המזבח "and the king drew near to the altar" one may also see a motive to accommodate the text with typical priestly language used in connection with the altar (cf. Exod 40:32; Lev 1:15; 9:7, 8).

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It it highly likely that a careful literary critic would have noticed the additions without the older text preserved in the Greek. The repetitions are many and disturbing, and they accord with typical signs for an editorial intrusion that have been conventionally assumed in literary criticism. Both additions end with a word that is met prior to the addition. This may be an attempt to return to the older text, which is often assumed in literary criticism as a typical technique of addition (*Wiederaufnahme*). The literary critic would also be able to make a convincing case about the motive of the additions. Implicit is made explicit. It is very possible and perhaps even probable that a careful literary critic would be able to reconstruct the older stage of the text, as preserved in the LXX, without having access to the LXX manuscripts.

Results. The MT of 2 Kgs 16:11–12 contains several sentences that were added later in order to make implicit explicit, whereas the shorter LXX text goes back to an older version of the text. A careful literary critic would have been able to detect the additions in the MT and possibly even reconstruct the older text rather well without access to the Greek version.

4.20. Jeremiah 25:1–2

Jeremiah 25 contains the famous prophecy about the upcoming exile of the Israelites and the ensuing seventy years, during which time the land of Israel will be in ruins. The beginning of the passage contains a reference to the year when Jeremiah received the prophecy, the fourth year of King

Jehoiakim of Judah. In addition to the chronology based on Judean kings, which is found in both the MT and LXX, the MT also refers to the year of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar.[123]

Jer 25:1–2 MT	Jer 25:1–2 LXX
<div dir="rtl">¹הדבר אשר היה על ירמיהו על כל עם יהודה בשנה הרבעית ליהויקים בן יאשיהו מלך יהודה <u>היא השנה הראשנית לנבוכדראצר מלך בבל</u> ²אשר דבר <u>ירמיהו הנביא</u> על כל עם יהודה ואל <u>כל</u> ישבי ירושלם לאמר</div>	¹Ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος πρὸς Ιερεμιαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν Ιουδα ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ τετάρτῳ τοῦ Ιωακιμ υἱοῦ Ιωσια βασιλέως Ιουδα, ²ὃν ἐλάλησεν πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαὸν Ιουδα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ιερουσαλημ λέγων
¹The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the fourth year of King Jehoiakim son of Josiah of Judah—<u>it was the first year of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon</u>—²which the <u>prophet Jeremiah</u> spoke to all the people of Judah and <u>all</u> the inhabitants of Jerusalem.	¹The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the fourth year of King Jehoiakim son of Josiah of Judah ²which he spoke to all the people of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem

Although syntactically possible, the MT plus interrupts the text rather awkwardly. Moreover, the use of two different chronological systems is congested and therefore many scholars have rightly noted that this would be exceptional and consider the plus a secondary addition.[124] The begin-

---

123. It should be noted that the differences between the MT and LXX of Jeremiah are debated, and it is necessary to determine each case separately without a prejudgment. Because the translator is very faithful toward the Hebrew original in those sections that contain a parallel, it is probable that the shorter Greek version goes back a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differed from the Masoretic Text. In other words, it is unlikely that the translator made substantial changes in content.

124. Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia*, KHC (Tübingen: Mohr, 1901), 200; William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 664; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 619; Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Jeremiah at the Turning-point of History: the Function of Jer. XXV 1–14 in the Book of Jeremiah," *VT* 52 (2002): 464–65. Thus also, Georg Fischer, *Jeremia 26–52*, HThKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005), 735, although he generally rejects the priority of the LXX version (cf. p. 46 where he notes that the whole book does not contain any passages where the LXX should be given priority).

ning word היא interrupts the text, as also reflected in many translations, but this is not a major problem as such, but rather the beginning of 25:2, which is more awkward: The word אשר clearly correlates with הדבר at the very beginning of 25:1, and these words are abnormally distant from each other. Although the problem may originally be unrelated to the plus in the MT and possibly the result of an earlier expansion (note the unnecessary repetitions between 25:1 and 2), the MT plus aggravates it.[125]

As for the content, it is necessary to consider the readings in conjunction with the alternatives. Some scholars, such as Wilhelm Rudolph, have suggested an intentional omission, and according to him, the reference to the Babylonian dating could have been omitted in the Greek version on account of an editor's hostility toward Babylon.[126] This is a fair suggestion, but its weakness lies in the other textual variants concerning the Babylonians: similar differences between the MT and the LXX can be found in many other passages. The MT refers to Babylonia, the Babylonians, and Nebuchadnezzar much more often than the LXX, and this trend is found in Jer 25 as well (cf. 25:9, 11 and 12). It is thus apparent that we are dealing with a broader redactional development, where references to Babylon were systematically added or omitted. However, it is difficult to find a coherent motive for omitting so many references to the Babylonians. If one only considers Jer 25:1 in isolation, it would perhaps be possible to make a case for its intentional omission on account of an editor's hostility toward the Babylonians, but the theory is weak in explaining the more negative references to Babylon, many of which are missing in the LXX as well. For example, the MT of Jer 25:12 describes the punishment of the Babylonians and their king, but this is also missing in the LXX. Instead of naming the one who is punished, the Greek version only refers to "that nation" (τὸ ἔθνος ἐκεῖνο), which in 25:9 is defined as an unnamed tribe of the north that Yahweh will take (καὶ λήμψομαι τὴν πατριὰν ἀπὸ βορρᾶ) to punish Israel. Since it is likely that the omission or addition of the references to the Babylonians is the result of a systematic redaction—otherwise the systematic difference in this respect cannot be explained—and it is very difficult to find a motive for a systematic omission of neutral, positive, and negative references, at least by the same editor, the most probable explanation is that they were secondarily

---

125. It is possible that both chronological references where later added.
126. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 137.

added.[127] In a later historical situation it may have become necessary to take consideration of the Babylonians more comprehensively than in the original text. If Rudolph's theory is correct, one would expect the addition of passages that portray the Babylonians in a negative light in the LXX but not in the MT, as now seems to be the case. One could suggest that one editor abridged the LXX and one expanded the MT, both focusing on the Babylonians, but this theory is too complicated and thus improbable. It is far more likely that an editor in the proto-MT transmission added various references to Babylonia and the Babylonians.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Apart from Rudolph's suggestion, Jack Lundbom also assumes that the LXX is secondary, but his argumentation is largely based on his conviction that the double chronology in the MT is possible.[128] This is not a methodologically solid approach and gives an implicit preference for the MT. He does not present any arguments that would evaluate the LXX as such. Because of the systematic difference concerning the Babylonians in the MT and LXX, an accidental omission can be ruled out.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition of the Babylonian chronology in Jer 25:1 is probably part of a wider revision that increased the involvement of the Babylonians, as similar additions can be found in some other places of the MT. Although there does not seem to be any clear theological or ideological profile in the Babylonian additions, the tendency to add various references to Babylonia, Babylonians, and Nebuchadnezzar is so widespread that it could be characterized as a redaction, possibly by one editor. The addition was made immediately after the Judean chronology, and it is not very well integrated to the text. It has the air of a digression that seeks to correlate the Judean chronology with the Babylonian one. Nevertheless, on account of other clearly related expansions, it is unlikely to be a marginal gloss or an addition between the lines.

---

127. Some references to Babylon and Nebuchadnezzar in the MT are exceptionally favorable. E.g., Jer 25:9 characterizes Nebuchadnezzar as a servant of Yahweh, which would appear to be in conflict with several key passages in the Hebrew Bible where the Babylonian king is portrayed as the one who brought about the destruction of the temple and the kingdom (e.g., 2 Kgs 25).

128. Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 21B (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 242.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Because of the exceptional double chronological reference, one would suspect that the plus in the MT is a later addition even without the shorter version in the LXX. However, there may be other literary critical problems in the verse, which would easily complicate things here. The whole 25:2 is repetitive after 25:1, and the word אשר is too distant from the word הדבר, which it clearly refers to. One would certainly suspect editing in 25:1–2, for the verses are so congested that a single and original author would scarcely produce such a text. Without the LXX it would have been challenging to conclude with certainty that the synchronism with the Babylonian chronology is a separate addition probably postdating other editorial interventions in these verses, but it is probable that it would have been regarded as an addition.[129]

Results. The sentence היא השנה הראשנית לנבוכדראצר מלך בבל "it was the first year of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon," which does not have a parallel in the LXX, is a later addition. It is a typical expansion of chronological detail, and is also part of a wider revision that increased the importance and involvement of the Babylonians throughout Jeremiah. Even without the LXX a literary critic would probably suspect that the sentence in Jer 25:2 is an added element.

4.21. Jeremiah 26:20–23

Jeremiah 26:20–23 (Jer 33:20–23 LXX) describes the killing of the prophet Uriah. After hearing Uriah's unfavorable prophecies, King Jehoiakim sought to kill him. The prophet fled to Egypt (26:21), but the king sent men to bring him back, which they did, and eventually the prophet was killed by the king himself (26:23). In addition to several minor differences, 26:21–23 contain several minor pluses in the Hebrew text, all of which can be argued to be later additions. Particularly interesting is the plus in 26:22b. According to the Hebrew text, the king sent Elnathan son of Achbor and some other men to bring back Uriah, while the LXX does not mention anyone by name.

---

129. Clearly this does not exclude the possibility (or probability) that there are other, possibly earlier additions, not witnessed by documented evidence, as well.

Jer 26:21–23 MT	Jer 33:21–23 LXX
²¹וישמע המלך יהויקים וכל גבוריו וכל השרים את דבריו ויבקש המלך המיתו וישמע אוריהו וירא ויברח ויבא מצרים	²¹καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ιωακιμ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες πάντας τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν, καὶ ἤκουσεν Ουριας καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον.
²²וישלח המלך יהויקים אנשים מצרים	²²καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἄνδρας εἰς Αἴγυπτον,
את אלנתן בן עכבור ואנשים אתו אל מצרים	
²³ויוציאו את אוריהו ממצרים ויבאהו אל המלך יהויקים ויכהו בחרב וישלך את נבלתו אל קברי בני העם	²³καὶ ἐξηγάγοσαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ εἰσηγάγοσαν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ καὶ ἔρριψεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ μνῆμα υἱῶν λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

²¹When King Jehoiakim, <u>and all his warriors</u> and all the officials heard his words, the <u>king</u> sought to kill him; and when Uriah heard (it), <u>he was afraid and fled</u> and went to Egypt.	²¹When King Joakim and all the princes heard all his words, and (they) sought to kill him; and Urias heard (it) and went to Egypt.
²²And King <u>Jehoiakim</u> sent men to Egypt, <u>Elnathan son of Achbor and men with him to Egypt</u>,	²²And the king sent men into Egypt;
²³and they took <u>Uriah</u> <u>from Egypt</u> and brought him to King <u>Jehoiakim</u>, and he struck him down with the sword and threw <u>his dead body</u> into the burial place of the people.	²³and they took him <u>from there</u> and brought him to the king; and he struck him down with the sword, and threw <u>him</u> into the burial place of the people.

It is quite likely that 26:22b of the MT is a late addition and that the LXX preserves the more original text. This is suggested by the peculiar and disturbing repetition of Egypt, which is found at the end of 26:22a and 22b, both having the same grammatical function to express the location of Uriah's flight. In the current form the sentence is confusing, since 26:22b does not contain a verb. Now both references to Egypt have the same grammatical function in the sentence. Moreover, 26:22a is written as an inclusive statement that the king sent some men, after which the naming of the leader of the group is unexpected. Similarly unexpected is the further reference to men (אנשים) who went with Elnathan. The grammatical structure in 26:22 is thus as follows: verb + subject + object + adverb + object + adverb. The object is divided into two locations, separated by an

adverbial of location, and the adverbial of location is also repeated in a disturbing way. It is very unlikely that a single author would have created such a peculiar grammatical structure.[130]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The alternative to postulating an addition in the MT would be to assume an omission in the transmission of the LXX or its *Vorlage*. Because 26:22a and 22b both conclude with the word *Egypt*, an accidental omission by homoioteleuton (אנשים מצרים ... ואנשים אתו אל מצרים) is a possibility that cannot be excluded. Nevertheless, the text contains several references to Egypt in its immediate context (26:21 and the first sentence in 26:23 are concluded by this word) and it would be a coincidence that the sentence that contains notable problems had been accidentally omitted. The problems outweigh the possibility of an accidental omission.

As for intentional omissions, one could argue that some of the unnecessary repetitions had been omitted. This is certainly a possibility in some cases where the MT is repetitive and congested. For example, it would be understandable if some of the double references to Egypt and men (אנשים) would have been omitted for being too repetitive. However, this does not explain the omission of "Elnathan son of Achbor and men with him," which is significant information. Its omission would run counter to the rather faithful transmission behind the LXX version, which can be seen in those sections that are paralleled by the MT. Rudolph has suggested that the LXX left the sentence out because it tried to avoid the impression that a Jew executed such a command, but this is a very unlikely argument.[131] The order comes from the Judean king, who also strikes Uriah down. Moreover, already the preceding sentence refers to men being sent, which clearly refers to Judean military. The omission of a commander's name would hardly change anything to the effect assumed by Rudolph. Many other passages in Jeremiah show that the proto-MT has a tendency of adding detail (cf. also in the immediate context in 26:21 and 23), and this also appears to be the case in 26:22. Taking together all these consid-

---

130. Thus also a number of scholars, such as Friedrich Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, HKAT 3.2.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907), 146; Duhm, *Jeremia*, 216; Claus Rietzschel, *Das Problem der Urrolle: Ein Beitrag zur Redaktionsgeschicte des Jeremiabuches* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1966), 99.

131. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 146: "𝕲 wollte wohl nicht Wort haben, dass ein Jude einen solchen Auftrag ausführte."

erations, it is quite likely that the MT of 26:22b goes back to a secondary addition, the LXX preserving the more original text.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Jeremiah 26:22b is a rather typical expansion that adds detail. Because it is so awkwardly connected to the preceding text, it does not seem to be a particularly well-planned addition. One would have achieved the same additional information by adding Elnathan son of Achbor immediately after King Josiah and before the word "men" in 26:22a. This suggests that the addition may have been made between the lines or in the margins, which was later taken as part of the main text. On the other hand, the content of the addition—a name that implies knowledge of the actual events—suggests that it was meant to be included as part of the main text. It does not appear as a comment where the information arises out of the older text. Since the addition is concluded with the same word as the text where it took off, there appears to be a conscious attempt to return to the older text. This would suggest that we are not dealing with an addition between the lines. The practice of returning to the older text by repeating some of the final words after an addition has been assumed as a common technique of redactors (resumptive repetition or *Wiederaufnahme*), and Jer 26:22 provides documented evidence for this. The fact that 26:22b is a somewhat clumsy addition increases its detectability.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Because of the evident awkwardness, repetitions, and grammatical peculiarity, it is very likely that even without the LXX reading literary critics would have suspected the MT of 26:22b to be an addition. The addition left several traces in the text and it is thus an exemplary case for additions in the Hebrew Bible.

Results. Jeremiah 26:22b is a late addition in the MT. Similar additions of detail have been detected throughout the MT of Jeremiah. Even without the shorter reading preserved in the LXX, it is probable that one would have been able to suspect that 26:22b was added.

4.22. Jeremiah 28:3

Jeremiah 28:2–3 (35:2–3 LXX) describes the prophecy of Hananiah that Yahweh will reverse Judah's fate and break the yoke of the king of Babylon. In addition to the smaller pluses in the MT, which are probably later addi-

tions caused in the transmission of the MT, 28:3b contains an additional sentence in the MT that is missing in the LXX. Because of the faithfulness of the translation, it is probable that the Greek reading goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The MT plus defines the vessels mentioned in 28:3a as those that Nebuchadnezzar had taken from the temple in Jerusalem.

Jer 28:2–3 MT	Jer 35:2–3 LXX
²כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל לאמר שברתי את על מלך בבל ³בעוד שנתים ימים אני משיב אל המקום הזה את כל כלי בית יהוה אשר לקח נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל מן המקום הזה ויביאם בבל	²Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος Συνέτριψα τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος· ³ἔτι δύο ἔτη ἡμερῶν ἐγὼ ἀποστρέψω εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τὰ σκεύη οἴκου κυρίου
²Thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: I have broken the yoke of the king of Babylon. ³Still two years (and) I will bring back into this place all the vessels of the house of Yahweh, which King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon took away from this place and carried to Babylon.	²Thus says Yahweh: I have broken the yoke of the king of Babylon. ³Still two years (and) I will bring back into this place the vessels of the house of Yahweh.

It is likely that the MT in 28:3b is a later addition and that the shorter LXX is more original.[132] There is no reason why the reference should have been omitted in the transmission of the Greek version. The text refers to the vessels that, according to Jer 52 and 2 Kgs 25, had been taken by Nebuchadnezzar. Without the plus in verse 3b, Jer 28:2–3 also alludes to the Babylonians and the vessels, which could easily prompt an editor to add a more specific reference to the taking of the vessels and mention Nebuchadnezzar by name. Moreover, there appear to be several other related pluses in the MT that similarly increase detail connected to the deportation of vessels. This is apparent especially in Jer 27:18–22, which contains a number of large pluses in the MT that are likely to be later additions:

---

132. This is assumed by several scholars, such as Duhm, *Jeremia*, 223; Wilhelm Erbt, *Jeremia und seine Zeit: Die Geschichte der letzten fünfzig Jahre des vorexilischen Juda* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902), 97; J. Gerald Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah,* HSM 6 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 48; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 711; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 539.

Jer 27:18–22 MT	Jer 34:18–22 LXX
[18]If they are prophets, and if the word of Yahweh is with them, then let them intercede with Yahweh of hosts, that the vessels left in the house of Yahweh, in the house of the king of Judah, and in Jerusalem may not go to Babylon.	[18]If they are prophets, and if the word of Yahweh is in them, let them meet me, for thus has Yahweh said.
[19]For thus says Yahweh of hosts concerning the pillars, the sea, the stands, and the rest of the vessels that are left in this city, [20]which King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon did not take away when he took into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon King Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim of Judah, and all the nobles of Judah and Jerusalem—	[19]And as for the remaining vessels, [20]which the king of Babylon did not take away, when he carried Jechonias prisoner out of Jerusalem,
[21]thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, concerning the vessels left in the house of Yahweh, in the house of the king of Judah, and in Jerusalem:	[21]
[22]They shall be carried to Babylon, and there they shall stay, until the day when I give attention to them, says Yahweh. Then I will bring them up and restore them to this place.	[22]they shall go into Babylon, says Yahweh.

Since both Jer 27:18–22 and 28:2–3 otherwise also refer to the lost vessels, it is very likely that we are dealing with a redactional attempt to highlight the loss of the vessels, add detail, and explicitly connect the event to the description of the destruction of the temple in Jer 52 and 2 Kgs 25.[133]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There is no evidence to assume an accidental omission in Jer 28:3b. The plus is rather long, which decreases the possibility of a scribal lapse and the text does not contain any elements that regularly facilitate accidental omissions (such as by homoioteleuton). Moreover, the existence of several similar differences between the MT and the LXX in Jer 27:18–22 strongly suggests that the different

---

133. Thus several scholars, e.g., Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 47; Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 161; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 694; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 529.

readings are the result of an intentional scribal intervention. An intentional omission is thus a much more potent possibility than an accidental omission. Further, Jer 28:3b does not contain anything offensive that would have given a reason to omit. Together with those in Jer 28:18–22, the MT pluses do not bring any essentially new information, but merely connect passages and highlight certain issues. It would be very difficult to explain why an editor intentionally removed such details. The theory of abbreviation, implied by some scholars such as Friedrich Giesebrecht and Georg Fischer, is also unlikely as the parallel sections are mostly very similar in the Greek and Hebrew.[134] Giesebrecht argues that the MT pluses mainly repeat what is already said and were thus dispensable. This is correct only on a general level, but it is notable that the pluses partly add important detail, and they also establish a connection with 2 Kings. Regarding the rather faithful translation, it is very unlikely that the translator would have omitted an allegedly repetitive section. His theory would also imply that an editor cut the connection with 2 Kgs 25, but it is a known tendency that later editors connected different texts in the Hebrew Bible, while the opposite would be unlikely. In view of Jer 27:22, for example, a prophecy on the return of the vessels would have been omitted for reasons of abbreviation. It would also go against the development of many texts that details on the temple utensils had been removed, for they were often added during the Second Temple period. The pluses also contain certain theological aspects, whose omission cannot be merely a neutral abbreviation of unnecessary data. For example, the idea that the temple vessels are returned to Jerusalem is a significant theological concept that would not be omitted lightly. The theory of abbreviation would thus have to assume an intentional detheologization of the passages in question, but this seem very unlikely. The theological aspect of the pluses in this passage thus strongly suggest that the LXX goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that preserves readings predating those of the more expansive MT.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Jeremiah 28:3b is a typical addition that increases detail. Although the older text already refers to the vessels taken by the Babylonians, 28:3b makes it explicit and

---

134. Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 150. Fischer, *Jeremia 26–52*, 66, 70, makes no mention of the Greek variant, which is understandable on the basis of his general observation or disposition to assume that the LXX variants are mostly secondary developments; see Fischer, *Jeremia 1–25*, 37–46.

thus more clearly connects the text with the events described in Jer 52/2 Kgs 25. The addition in 28:3b as such could have been made in the margins, but since it is apparently connected with several related additions elsewhere in Jeremiah (e.g., 27:18–22), it is more probable that we are dealing with a systematic redaction that sought to highlight the history of the vessels and increase detail concerning their deportation and restoration to Jerusalem. It is also apparent that the MT of Jeremiah contains a large number of additions that added detail on the Babylonians, their king, or their involvement in Israel's history.

From a technical point of view, one should note the repetition of elements from the older text (מלך בבל and המקום הזה), which is typical of additions that seek to attach to the older text. This technique, *Wiederaufnahme*, is often assumed in literary criticism to have been utilized by later editors.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the shorter reading preserved in the LXX, it would be difficult to detect the addition in Jer 28:3. It is well integrated with the older text, and there is no confusion of grammar: an element in the older text—the holy vessels—is specified by continuing the sentence with a relative clause. Although some of the pluses in Jer 27:18–22, for instance, would have raised the suspicion that some editing has taken place concerning the temple vessel in some parts of Jeremiah, it is unlikely that this would have given enough reason to suspect an addition in Jer 28:3b.

Results. Jeremiah 28:3b is a historicizing addition in the MT. Without the more original reading in the LXX, it would have been very difficult to detect the addition. It is probable that Jer 28:3b is part of a wider redaction that seeks to historicize the narrative and focus on the temple vessels. Parts of the same or otherwise connected redaction may be found in the MT of Jer 27:18–22 and 29:1bβ.

4.23. Jeremiah 28:14

Jeremiah 28:14 (35:14 LXX) contains a separate prophecy concerning an iron yoke that all the nations have to serve the king of Babylon. In addition to the minor pluses in the MT, 28:14b of the MT is missing in the LXX. According to the plus even the animals will serve the Babylonian king.

Jer 28:14 MT	Jer 35:14 LXX
כי כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל על ברזל נתתי על צואר כל הגוים האלה לעבד את נבכדנאצר מלך בבל ועבדהו וגם את חית השדה נתתי לו	ὅτι οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος Ζυγὸν σιδηροῦν ἔθηκα ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐργάζεσθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ Βαβυλῶνος.
For thus says Yahweh <u>of hosts, the God of Israel</u>: I have put an iron yoke on the neck of all these nations so that they may serve King <u>Nebuchadnezzar</u> of Babylon, <u>and they shall indeed serve him</u>; <u>I have also given him the wild animals.</u>	For thus says Yahweh: I have put an iron yoke of iron on the neck of all the nations, so that they may serve the king of Babylon.

It is likely that the MT 28:14b is a late addition and that the Greek preserves an earlier stage of the text.[135] Although there is no grammatical problem—the plus is a separate sentence—the content in 28:14b is loosely connected to the main idea. The context deals with the nations and their relationship with Babylon, so that a sudden reference to animals given to the Babylonian king is surprising and digressive. The perspective is changed in 28:14b from the idea that the nations serve Nebuchadnezzar to the idea that the Babylonian king rules over animals. Not only is the idea peculiar but it is also irrelevant in the passage, which deals with the yoke on the neck of all nations. Moreover, an identical sentence is found in both MT and LXX of Jer 27:6 (34:5 LXX), where it also fits much better to its context: According to Jer 27:5 (34:4 LXX), Yahweh has the power to give all people and animals to whom he pleases. It is probable that the MT Jer 28:14b was adopted from 27:6, where it is more original. One should also note וגם "and also" at the beginning of 27:14b, which is sometimes used as a bridge to begin an addition (e.g., 1 Sam 31:6). Consequently, it is probable that 28:14b derives from a different author than 28:14a.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There is nothing to suggest an accidental omission. The plus is rather long, which decreases the possibility of a scribal lapse, and the text does not contain any elements

---

135. Thus many scholars, e.g., Duhm, *Jeremia*, 226–27; Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 153; Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 164; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 713–14; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 540.

that regularly facilitate accidental omissions (such as a homoioteleuton). One should also be very critical of accidental omissions of self-coherent units. The intentional omission is a more potent possibility. The content according to which the animals have been given to the Babylonian king could be seen as offensive, since it implies that a foreign ruler is somehow in charge of the creation and not Yahweh. On the other hand, the afore-mentioned Jer 27:6 also contains the sentence, and if one would assume an intentional omission because of theological reasons, one would expect that Jer 27:6 (34:5 LXX) in particular had been censored because there it is given a justification in 27:5. Since this is not the case, it is more probable that the MT of 28:14b is a secondary addition, the LXX preserving the original reading.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition in Jer 28:14b was intended to be part of the main text. This is suggested by the word וגם as well as the fact that it is part of Yahweh's speech. A marginal note not intended to be included would not connect to the form and content of the preceding text in this way, but would rather be more neutral, perhaps presented as a third-person note. The addition seeks to highlight the power of the Babylonian king. It is probable that the addition was inspired by Jer 27:6, which also dealt with the power of the Babylonian king. The editor adopted the sentence but somewhat unsuccessfully placed it in a context that does not deal with creation.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the shorter reading in the LXX, it would be possible to conclude that we may be dealing with an addition. The sudden digression in topic is peculiar to the extent that it begs an explanation. As the sentence is also syntactically somewhat loose at the end of the verse, and begins with the word גם, occasionally assumed to begin expansions, it is probable that a critic would suspect that 28:14b is not original.

Results. Jeremiah 28:14b is a secondary addition made in the proto-MT transmission. Even without the shorter and more original reading pre-served in the LXX, one would suspect that we are dealing with an addition, probably influenced by 27:6, from which the sentence was adopted.

4.24. Jeremiah 29:1

Jeremiah 29:1–3 (36:1–3 LXX) contains the introduction to the letter Jeremiah is said to have sent to the exiles in Babylon (29:4–23). In addition to the minor pluses in the MT, 29:1bβ is only found in the MT and is missing in the Greek version. The plus defines the people, to whom the letter is sent, as those exiled to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar. The Greek version also contains a plus in relation to the MT, a reference to the words of the book as a letter (ἐπιστολή) to the Babylonian captives.

Jer 29:1 MT	Jer 36:1 LXX
ואלה דברי הספר	Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι τῆς βίβλου,
אשר שלח ירמיה <u>הנביא</u> מירושלם	οὓς ἀπέστειλεν Ιερεμιας ἐξ Ιερουσαλημ
אל <u>יתר</u> זקני הגולה	πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἀποικίας
ואל הכהנים	καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς
ואל הנביאים	καὶ πρὸς τοὺς <u>ψευδοπροφήτας</u>
	<u>ἐπιστολὴν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα τῇ ἀποικίᾳ</u>
ואל כל העם	καὶ πρὸς ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν
<u>אשר הגלה נבוכדנאצר מירושלם בבלה</u>	
These are the words of the letter that the <u>prophet</u> Jeremiah sent from Jerusalem to the <u>remaining</u> elders among the exiles, and to the priests, the prophets, and all the people, <u>whom Nebuchadnezzar had taken into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon</u>.	And these are the words of the book that Jeremias sent from Jerusalem to the elders of the captivity, and to the priests, and to the <u>false</u> prophets—<u>an epistle to Babylon for the captivity</u>—and to all the people;

It is probable that the MT plus in 29:1bβ is a later addition and that the Greek version preserves the more original reading here.[136] There is a contrast between the idea assumed in 29:4 that Yahweh exiled the Jerusalemites and 29:1bβ according to which the Babylonian king did it. The idea is expressed with an almost identical sentence, but the subject is different:

Jer 29:1bβ: אשר הגלה נבוכדנאצר מירושלם בבלה
Jer 29:4: אשר הגליתי מירושלם בבלה

---

136. Thus many scholars, e.g., Duhm, *Jeremia* (1901), 228; Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 154–55; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 727–28.

It is not likely that the same author would have written exactly the same sentence in the same passage by using Yahweh as the subject in one place and the Babylonian king as the subject in another. More probable are two authors with slightly different ideas about the actor behind the exile. Although the context in the MT of Jer 29:1 does not contain any technical or syntactic reasons that would clearly suggest an addition—the plus is a relative sentence that further specifies the actors of the preceding sentence—the shorter LXX and other similar additions in the MT Jeremiah that emphasize the role of Nebuchadnezzar strongly suggest that the plus is secondary. In particular, one should note a clear similarity between Jer 29:1bβ and 28:3b:

Jer 29:1bβ	Jer 28:3b
אשר לקח נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל מן המקום אשר הגלה נבוכדנאצר מירושלם בבלה הזה ויביאם בבל	
whom Nebuchadnezzar had taken into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon.	which King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon took away from this place and carried to Babylon.

We have seen in a separate analysis that Jer 28:3b is a later addition in the proto-MT transmission, and it is quite possible that both additions were made by the same author, who sought to highlight Nebuchadnezzar's role and connect the events more closely with the description of the events in 2 Kgs 25 or Jer 52. The addition may also have been motivated by the lack of reference to the people in exile. Only the elders are defined as those living in the exile (זקני הגולה), whereas "all the people" (כל העם) is somewhat unspecific. Although the context makes it explicitly clear that the letter was intended for all the exiles (see esp. Jer 29:3–5), the general reference would have easily called for a clarifying addition.

Note also a plus in the LXX of Jer 36:1 (29:1 MT) that is missing in the MT: ἐπιστολὴν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα τῇ ἀποικίᾳ "an epistle to Babylon for the captivity." It awkwardly interrupts the list of addresses, and its content appears to be a heading that describes the whole chapter. It is possible it was originally added as a heading placed in the margins, not even intended as part of the main text, but was accidentally placed there by a later scribe who did not understand its intended location or purpose. It may have had a similar function as the addition in MT 29:1bβ. Both seek to clarify that the following letter is for all Israelites in the exile.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Nothing suggests that 29:1bβ was accidentally omitted in the LXX. The length of the plus decreases the possibility of an *aberratio oculi* and there are no technical elements (such as homoioteleuton) that would facilitate a large accidental omission. At any rate, the existence of a similar difference between the MT and the LXX in Jer 28:3b suggests that the variants were not accidental but occasioned by an intentional scribal intervention.

As for an intentional omission, it is conceivable that the contrast between Jer 29:1bβ and 29:4 could have motivated an omission. The contrast could occasion a harmonization and the idea of Nebuchadnezzar having the same power as Yahweh could give a theological motivation to omit. On the other hand, the conflict between 29:1bβ and 4 is a strong argument in favor of different authors as well. If one were to argue that 29:1bβ was omitted because of its contrast with 29:4, one would still have to take into consideration the possibility that it was an earlier addition. Although it is not impossible that an earlier addition was later removed, following the principle of economy it is more likely that the conflict was created by the addition of 29:1bβ and that the LXX preserves an earlier stage of the text. Moreover, if the contrast would have been the reason for the omission, rather than omitting the whole sentence, it is more probable that Nebuchadnezzar would have been merely replaced by Yahweh. Considering the faithfulness of the LXX version in those sections where there is a parallel text, it would be very unlikely that the whole sentence could have been omitted due to the contrast or a harmonizing motive in the translation process, and thus the omission would have taken place in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. All in all, the theory of addition in the MT seems more likely.[137]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Jeremiah 29:1bβ is a typical addition that clarifies and slightly increases detail. Although the older text already implies that exiles are addressed, the addition makes it explicit and removes all doubt. On account of similar additions that mention Nebuchadnezzar and his involvement in Israel's history, especially in Jer 28:3b and 29:1bβ, they may be part of a wider revision in Jeremiah that made similar historicizing additions where the Babylonians in par-

---

137. Notably, several commentators make no note of the shorter LXX reading, e.g., Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 166; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 552–53.

ticular are additionally mentioned (cf. also Jer 27:18–22; 28:14). Although
the revision could be called a redaction, it does not correspond to typi-
cally assumed redactions, as a clearly theological profile or motive of the
revision is difficult to distinguish. It is also not entirely clear that the same
scribe is behind the different added references to Babylon and the Baby-
lonians.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the shorter reading pre-
served in the LXX, it is unlikely that one would be able to detect the
addition on account of its immediate syntactic context. It is well inte-
grated with the older text and there are no syntactic problems: An element
in the older text was further defined and specified with a relative clause.
Although the contrast with 29:4 would have raised the suspicion that
29:1bβ and 29:4 may not derive from the same author, it would have been
difficult to conclude that only 29:1bβ was added later. One could, per-
haps, suspect that the entire 29:1 derives from a different author than 29:4,
or that there is another editorial intervention, but the suspicions would
not gain any corroboration from technical or syntactic considerations. In
other words, the critic would be rather toothless to detect the addition in
the MT alone. Nevertheless, the addition does not introduce any signifi-
cant new information.

Results. The MT Jer 29:1bβ is a historicizing addition that may be part of
a wider revision of Jeremiah that highlights the involvement of the Baby-
lonians and Nebuchadnezzar in Israel's history. Without the more original
reading in the LXX, it would have been very difficult to detect Jer 29:1bβ
as a later addition.

4.25. Jeremiah 32:30

Jeremiah 32:26–35 (39:26–35 LXX) contains a prophecy against Jerusa-
lem and Judah that predicts the destruction of the city and the exile of its
people. Jeremiah 32:30 is part of a section that lists the sins that caused the
punishment. According to this verse, Israel and Judah have only done evil,
but the MT describes this more comprehensively and refers to Yahweh's
anger that the sins provoked. Jeremiah 32:30b, which refers to Yahweh's
anger, is missing in the LXX.

Jer 32:30 MT	Jer 39:30 LXX
כי היו בני ישראל ובני יהודה אך עשים הרע בעיני מנערתיהם <u>כי בני ישראל אך מכעסים אתי במעשה ידיהם נאם יהוה</u>	ὅτι ἦσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ιουδα μόνοι ποιοῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμούς μου ἐκ νεότητος αὐτῶν·
For the people of Israel and the people of Judah have done nothing but evil in my sight from their youth; <u>for the people of Israel have done nothing but provoke me to anger by the work of their hands, says Yahweh.</u>	For the people of Israel and the people of Juda alone did evil in my sight from their youth (onward).

As assumed by the majority of Jeremiah scholars, it is very likely that the MT plus is the result of a later expansion.[138] First, it is repetitive by containing a double description of Israel's sinful behavior. The main difference between 32:30a and 32:30b is that the latter emphasizes Yahweh's anger provoked by the deeds of Israel, while the focus in 32:30a is the continuous sinning of the Israelites since their youth. The repetition is also seen in the vocabulary: the words כי ... בני ישראל ... אך ... עשה are repeated. It is often assumed that later editors sought to connect to the older text by repeating some of its words. The mix of repetitions combined with slight differences in terminology to express a similar idea to add an aspect also implies different authors. Jeremiah 32:30a refers to the sins of Israelites and Judahites, while 32:30 only refers to the Israelites, which suggests a change in perspective from seeing Judah and Israel as separate entities to the perhaps later conception in 32:30b of a religious community of Israel, which includes all who were regarded as part of the (Jewish) community. The separation between Judah and Israel gradually became outdated in the Second Temple period, and the focal issue became which community would represent the legitimate Israel. Had the verse been written by the same author, one would expect less repetition and a consistent reference to Israel (or Judah and Israel). All these considerations suggest that the MT plus is a later addition.

---

138. Duhm, *Jeremia*, 269; Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 180; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 846–47; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 626–27.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An accidental omission is a theoretical possibility. The plus begins with כי, which is also found at the beginning of 32:31. One could thus argue that this caused a scribe to skip a line or sentence (homoioarchton). One should further note that 32:30a also begins with the same conjunction, which could have contributed to the confusion: Three subsequent sentences begin with the same word. Since 32:30a and 30b are of approximately equal length, a scribe could have missed one line. Although a technical lapse cannot be completely ignored, one cannot put too much weight on a similar beginning of one short word only, especially when the accidentally omitted section is a self-contained repetitive unit. The above-mentioned other factors suggest that we are more probably dealing with an intentional editorial intervention.

An intentional omission is a more potent possibility than an accidental omission, and the reason could be that 32:30b is so disturbingly repetitive. Not only does it repeat the main idea of 32:30a, but the idea of Israelites provoking Yahweh to be angered is also found in 29:29, 31, and 32. One could thus argue that an editor wanted to decrease some of the unnecessary repetitions by omitting 32:30b. Although this possibility exists, there is no trace of a similar tendency in the rest of the passage, which contains many other repetitions as well (cf. 32:29 and 35; 32:30 and 32). The other differences between the MT and LXX of 32:26–35 are limited to individual words such as names (the MT adds the names Jeremiah and Nebuchadnezzar) and other minor technical details, which implies an otherwise rather faithful rendering in this passage as well. An attempt to shorten the text would thus only be limited to 32:30b, which undermines the theory that there is an abbreviating tendency in the LXX of the passage. Moreover, the LXX is generally known to be very close to the MT and even in many cases where the MT is very repetitive (e.g., in Jer 32:29, 31, 32), which would be contradicted by an abbreviation of repetitions in some punctual cases. It is thus more likely that the MT contains a secondary expansion.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Jeremiah 32:30b is a separate addition, which is influenced by Deuteronomistic ideology and phraseology. Yahweh's anger is found particularly often in late Deuteronomistic additions in Deuteronomy as well as in the historical books from Joshua to 2 Kings, as shown by Kari Latvus.[139] Jeremiah 32:30b is generally

---

139. See Kari Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and*

redundant in the passage, as it does not include any idea not already present in the passage. The idea of Yahweh's anger caused by the sins of Israel is found in 32:29. A similar tendency to add the same idea using similar terminology over and over again can be found in many parts of Deuteronomistic literature. Illustrative examples can be found in the parenetic sections of Deuteronomy (see Deut 5–11; 29–31) as well as in the beginning of Joshua (e.g., Josh 1:6–9).

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Even without the shorter reading preserved in the LXX, the text provides several signs to suspect an addition in Jer 32:30b. The repetition of the main idea and of some words from 32:30a would suggest that 32:30a and 32:30b cannot derive from the same author. That 32:30a refers to Judah and Israel, while 32:30b only to Israel, would be a further reason to suspect two authors. The redundancy with 32:29, 31, and 32, which also refer to Yahweh's anger, would give an additional argument to assume that 32:30b is a secondary addition. That Yahweh's anger is often found in suspected additions throughout the historical books would give the final corroboration to conclude that 32:30b is not part of the older text.[140]

Results. Jeremiah 32:30b is a secondary expansion, influenced by Deuteronomistic language. Similar additions have been found in other parts of the Hebrew Bible (see the discussion of Josh 23:16b at §5.4, below). The text contains enough indications that even without the shorter reading in the LXX it would have been possible to conjecture that Jer 23:30b is not part of the original text.

4.26. Added Headings in the Psalms

Most psalms begin with a heading or superscription that introduces the respective psalm and separates it from the preceding one.[141] These headings contain various information on the psalms, including, on the one hand, designations that seem related to genre, performers, and other aspects of musical performance—which are often difficult to understand in detail—

Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings, JSOTSup 279 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), passim.

140. Thus Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology*, passim.

141. In the MT Psalter, a heading is found in 116 psalms.

and, on the other, references to persons such as David and Solomon or to certain groups such as the Korahites or the Asaphites, which seem to purport notions of authorship or transmission.[142] The latter indicate that the book of Psalms was composed of smaller psalm collections that originated independent of each other, such as the first and second "Psalters of David" (Pss 3–41; 51–70) or the psalms of the Korahites (Pss 42–49; 84–88) and the psalms of the Asaphites (Pss 50; 73–83). Some psalms also refer to the alleged context of writing, often related to a story (e.g., Pss 51; 52; 54).

The textual attestation of these headings is not coherent. The most prominent phenomenon is related to the mention of David in the headings, which is exemplarily discussed here. In the MT, David is mentioned in the headings of seventy-five psalms, while the LXX Psalter contains eighty-five to eighty-seven references to David in the headings, plus the reference in the heading of Ps 151, which finds no counterpart in the masoretic Psalter.[143] This textual evidence, which is supplemented by the Dead Sea Scrolls and other witnesses, sheds light on late developments in the history of the respective psalms and psalm collections.[144]

Verse	MT	LXX	Qumran
Ps 33:1	—	Τῷ Δαυιδ. Pertaining to Dauid.	4Q98 (4QPs^q) לדויד שיר מזמור Of David. A song, a psalm.
Ps 43:1	—[145]	Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ. A Psalm. Pertaining to Dauid.	not attested

---

142. It remains unclear what was originally meant with the frequent designation לדוד, and it is debated whether it indicated the notion of authorship from the outset.

143. I.e., eighty-five references in Pss 1–150 LXX, according to the preliminary edition *Psalmi cum Odis,* ed. Alfred Rahlfs, 3rd ed., SVTG 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979). There are further references in parts of the Greek tradition in Pss 66 (65 LXX) and 67 (66 LXX).

144. Verse numbers according to the counting based on the Hebrew textus receptus, which thus excludes Ps 151 LXX (note that Codex Leningradensis and some other Hebrew manuscripts take Pss 114 and 115 as a single one and thus count only 149 psalms; Ps 122 is in the Leningradensis therefore counted as 121, etc.).

145. Four medieval Hebrew manuscripts have לדוד, according to Benjamin Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1780), 2:342.

Ps 66:1	—	Εἰς τὸ τέλος· ᾠδὴ ψαλμοῦ· ἀναστάσεως. {Τῷ Δαυιδ.}[146] Regarding completion. An Ode. Of a Psalm. Of the resurrection. {Pertaining to Dauid.}	not attested
Ps 67:1	למנצח בנגינת מזמור שיר To the leader: with stringed instruments. A Psalm. A Song.	Εἰς τὸ τέλος, ἐν ὕμνοις· ψαλμὸς {τῷ Δαυιδ.}[147] ᾠδῆς. Regarding completion. Among hymns. A Psalm. {Pertaining to Dauid.} Of an Ode.	4Q83 (4QPsᵃ) למנצח̇ בנגינת מזמור שיר To the leader: [with stringed instruments. A Psalm, a song.][148]
Ps 71:1	—	Τῷ Δαυιδ· υἱῶν Ιωναδαβ καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωτισθέντων. Pertaining to Dauid. Of the sons of Ionadab and the first of those taken captive.	4Q83 (4QPsᵃ)[149] —
Ps 91:1	—	Αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυιδ. A laudation. Of an Ode. Pertaining to Dauid.	11Q11 (11QapocrPs) [לדויד] [Of David.][150]

146. According to the Vetus Latina Psalter of St.-Germain-des-Prés (sixth century CE); see Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 185.

147. According to Codex Vaticanus, the Sahidic Codex B, parts of the Lucianic manuscripts, and the Greek MS 55 (tenth century CE); other traditions attest the τω Δαυιδ after ωδης or have ωδη τω Δαυιδ; see Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 187.

148. Reconstructed; see Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 647.

149. Psalm 71 is here seamlessly placed after the end of Ps 38, which provides evidence for the composition of a new psalm by combining blocks of older material; on this editorial technique, see Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 159–77.

150. Reconstructed; see Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 654.

Ps 93:1	—	Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτε κατῴκισται ἡ γῆ· αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυιδ. Regarding the day of the pre-Sabbath, when the earth had been settled. A laudation. Of an Ode. Pertaining to Dauid.	11Q5 (11QPsᵃ) הללויה Praise Yah![151]
Ps 94:1	—	Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ, τετράδι σαββάτων. A Psalm. Pertaining to Dauid. Pertaining to the fourth day of the week.	4Q84 (4QPsᵇ) [—][152]
Ps 95:1	—	Αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυιδ. A laudation. Of an Ode. Pertaining to Dauid.	not attested
Ps 96:1	—	Ὅτε ὁ οἶκος ᾠκοδομεῖτο μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν· ᾠδὴ τῷ Δαυιδ. When the house was being rebuilt after the captivity. An Ode. Pertaining to Dauid.	4Q84 (4QPsᵇ) [—][153]
Ps 97:1	—	Τῷ Δαυιδ, ὅτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται. Pertaining to Dauid. When his land is being brought to order.	not attested
Ps 98:1	מזמור A Psalm.	Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ. A Psalm. Pertaining to Dauid.	4Q84 (4QPsᵇ) [מזמור] [A Psalm.][154]

---

151. See below on added הללויה formulas.
152. According to the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 657.
153. According to the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 659.
154. According to the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 659; however, the manuscript is so fragmentary in this case that a decision whether it had מזמור "A Psalm" or מזמור לדוד "A Psalm of David" seems impossible.

Ps 99:1	—	Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ. A Psalm. Pertaining to Dauid.	4Q92 (4QPs^k) לדׄוׄׄ]ד מזמור Of Davi[d. A Psalm.
			4Q98e (4QPs^v) [לדוד מזמור] [Of David. A Psalm.][155]
Ps 104:1	—	Τῷ Δαυιδ. Pertaining to Dauid.	4Q86 (4QPs^d) [—][156]
			4Q87 (4QPs^e) [לדויד] [Of David.][157]
			11Q5 לדויד Of David.
Ps 122:1	שיר המעלות לדוד Song of ascent. Of David.	—	4Q522 (4QProphecy of Joshua) [שיר המעלות לדוי]ד Song of pilgrimage. Of David.
			11Q5 שיר המעלות לדויד Song of pilgrimage. Of David.
Ps 124:1	שיר המעלות לדוד Song of ascent. Of David.	—	not attested
Ps 131:1	שיר המעלות לדוד Song of ascent. Of David.	Ὠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν· {τῷ Δαυιδ.}[158] An Ode of the steps. {Pertaining to David.}	not attested

---

155. According to the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 661.

156. According to the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 690.

157. According to the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 680.

158. Lacking in Coptic manuscripts (including the Greek-Sahidic MS 2017), the Lucianic recension, Theodotion, the Psalterium Gallicanum, and the Greek MSS 1219 (fifth century CE) and 55 (tenth century CE).

Ps 133:1	שיר המעלות לדוד	Ὠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν· {τῷ Δαυιδ.}[159]	11Q5 שיר ה מעלות לדויד
	Song of ascent. Of David.	An Ode of the Steps. {Pertaining to David.}	Song of pilgrimage. Of David.
			11Q6 (11QPs[b]) [שיר המעל]ות לדויד [Song of pilgrim]age. Of David.
Ps 137:1	—	Τῷ Δαυιδ./Ιερεμιου. / Τῷ Δαυιδ {διὰ} Ιερεμιου.[160] Pertaining to Dauid./Of Jeremiah./Pertaining to David {through} Jeremiah.	11Q5 —
Ps 138:1	[161]לדוד Of David.	Τῷ Δαυιδ.[162] Pertaining to David.	11Q5 לדויד Of David.
Ps 151:1	—	Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ· ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιαδ. This Psalm is autobiographical. Regarding Dauid and outside the number.	11Q5 הללויה לדויד בן ישי Praise Yah! Of David, son of Jesse.

159. Lacking in Coptic manuscripts (including the Greek-Sahidic MS 2017), the Lucianic recension, Theodotion, and the Greek MS 55 (tenth century CE).

160. The Greek textual attestation is highly divergent; see Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 319–20; Τῷ Δαυιδ is attested by the Codex Sinaiticus, the Greek-Latin Codex Verona, some Lucianic manuscripts, and the Codex Alexandrinus; Ιερεμιου is attested by the Sahidic translation and the Greek MSS 2009 and 2017; Τῷ Δαυιδ Ιερεμιου is attested by the Bohairic translation, the Psalterium Gallicanum, and a larger group of Lucianic manuscripts; Τῷ Δαυιδ διὰ Ιερεμιου is attested by a smaller group of Lucianic manuscripts and in Vulgate manuscripts.

161. Lacking in five medieval Hebrew manuscripts, while one manuscript has למנצח "to the leader" instead of לדוד "of David," according to Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* 2:428; see *BHS*.

162. Lacking in Aquila and the sexta of Origen's Hexapla; see Frederick Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (Oxford Clarendon, 1875), 2:291; some LXX witnesses add a reference to Zechariah.

With the exception of Ps 151, there are thirteen additional references to David in the psalm headings of the LXX when compared with the MT (i.e., in Psalms 33; 43; 71; 91; 93–99; 104; 137).[163] In some cases, these additional references are also found in Qumran manuscripts, which indicates that they were not added by the Greek translator but probably already belonged to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.[164] The MT, by contrast, contains references to David lacking in the LXX of Pss 122 and 124. Some witnesses of the Greek tradition, including the Lucianic text, also lack the reference to David in Pss 131 and 133, where it is found in the MT; it should not be a priori excluded that these cases of *lectio brevior* go back to the OG.[165] In Ps 138, the reference to David, attested by MT, 11Q5, and most of the LXX witnesses, is lacking in Aquila, Origen's *sexta*, and some medieval Hebrew manuscripts. In Ps 43 (42 LXX), by contrast, the reference to David, attested by the LXX, is also found in Theodotion and some medieval Hebrew manuscripts.

In all likelihood the divergent textual traditions give insights into the late literary history of the Psalter. The additional references to David, which are variably found in the LXX, Qumran manuscripts, and the MT, probably bear witness to a tendency of secondarily inserting such references in places where they were lacking. In some cases it is easy to see the reason for the supplementation. The addition of the reference to David in Ps 33 (32) LXX/4Q98, for example, appears most logical in this regard, since Ps 33 is the only psalm in the so-called First Psalter of David (Pss 3–41) that lacks both the heading and reference to David in the MT.[166] A similar case is the added heading containing a reference to David in Ps 71, since this heading completes the sequence of references to David in the Second Psalter of David (Pss 51–71), which precedes the concluding psalm "of Solomon," Ps 72. In the Second Psalter of David, a reference to David is also missing in Ps 67 MT—a *lectio brevior* that in this case

---

163. The numbers are according to the counting based on the Hebrew textus receptus (see n. 144).

164. I.e., 4Q98 in Ps 33; 11Q11 (reconstructed) in Ps 91; 4Q92 and 4Q98e (reconstructed) in Ps 99; 4Q87 (reconstructed) and 11Q5 in Ps 104. Other Qumran manuscripts support the *lectio brevior* of the MT (i.e., 4Q83 in Ps 71; 4Q84 [reconstructed] in Pss 94, 96, and 98; 4Q86 in Ps 104; 11Q5 in Pss 93 and 137).

165. *Pace* Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 312, 314.

166. Apart from Ps 10, which is, however, originally not a separate psalm but part of Ps 9.

seems to be also attested by the OG; some LXX witnesses, however, attest a reference to David also here, and this may go back to a supplementation made within the Greek tradition. Most conspicuous are the additional references to David in Pss 93–99 (92–98 LXX), partly attested by 4Q92 and 4Q98e (reconstructed) in Ps 99, by means of which another collection of "Davidic" psalms was formed. Other additional references are more isolated in their respective contexts, such as Ps 43:1 (42:1 LXX) in the context of the Korahite psalms 42–49, 104:1 (103:1 LXX), also attested by 4Q87 (reconstructed) and 11Q5, and Ps 137:1 (136:1 LXX).

Although the LXX contains more references to David than the MT, the latter also attests added references, albeit on a smaller scale. References to David in the MT that are not attested in most of the Greek manuscripts can be found in Pss 122 and 124 (see also 4Q522 and 11Q5). In some cases, such as Pss 131 and 133, the references are only lacking in some Greek manuscripts (including L), but it stands to reason that these references are late additions to the MT and other LXX witnesses as well. Rather than assuming a linear development from one version to the other, the proto-Masoretic Psalter and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek Psalter seem to go back to a shared textual tradition that lacked both the MT pluses (i.e., in Pss 122; 124; possibly also in Pss 131 and 133) and the LXX pluses (i.e., in Pss 33; 43; 71; 91; 93–99; 104; 137). In the case of Ps 138 the reference to David is lacking in some witnesses (i.e., Aquila, Origen's *sexta*, and some medieval Hebrew manuscripts) but it may nevertheless represent the more original reading.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. To be sure, the textual evidence is diversified, and an alternative explanation is possible for some of the cases. Technical mistakes in the textual transmission cannot be fully excluded, although in the case of the references to David no textual features in the respective passages are discernible that may have easily triggered an accidental omission. Moreover, an unintentional omission in the headings seems improbable, since a copyist is not likely to make such a mistake at the very beginning of a new psalm. In the case of Pss 93–99 (92–98 LXX), such mistakes can even be excluded, since it would be highly unlikely that they happened nine times in a row. On the other hand, in Ps 104 (103 LXX), for example, an unintentional skipping of the opening לדוד "Of David," attested by the LXX and 11Q5, is theoretically possible, since Ps 104 begins with the same phrase with which Ps 103 ends (ברכי נפשי את יהוה "Bless, Yahweh, my soul!" in Ps 103:22/104:1). However, a typical

parablepsis caused by homoioteleuton could then have caused an omission of the repeated phrase. An addition of לדוד seems much more probable, since this editorial intervention established a connection between Ps 103 and 104, both of which thus began with the לדוד superscription in the MT. It stands to reason that an editor created a pair of "Davidic" psalms, which are also thematically somewhat connected.

In some cases, a more original reference to David may have been intentionally omitted because it seemed out of place. This is conceivable in the MT version of Ps 43 (lacking in the LXX parallel Ps 42), which belongs to a collection of Korahite psalms (Pss 42–49). Psalms 42 and 43 also seem to have been originally composed as a single psalm, as indicated by the repetition of Ps 42:12 in 43:5, for example. Because of these problems, an editor in the proto-MT transmission may have deliberately omitted the reference to David attested in Ps 43:1. It has to be noted, however, that Codex Alexandrinus attests a further heading containing a reference to the Korahites similar to Ps 42:1 (LXX 41:1) *prior to the reference to David*, which indicates a tendency of keeping the reference to David once it had become part of the textual tradition. In light of this, an intentional omission of the reference to David in the proto-MT seems less likely, but remains a possibility.

The reference to David in the heading of Ps 122 (121 LXX), as attested by the MT, 4Q522, and 11Q5, could have been secondarily omitted because the psalm refers to "the house of Yahweh" (בית יהוה) in Jerusalem (122:1–2), which presupposes the completion of Solomon's temple. An editor may have sought to correct the apparent tension with 1 Kings. However, there are many other examples where a psalm ascribed to David refers to the temple (e.g., Pss 5:8; 23:6; 26:8), and there has been no attempt to remove the reference. In fact, in Ps 93 (92 LXX), which mentions the temple in 93:5, a reference to David was even added to the LXX version. Thus, it seems more likely that in Ps 122 MT the reference to David is secondary in relation to the *lectio brevior* attested by the LXX. In the MT Pss 122 and 124 form a pair of "Davidic" psalms that frame the "non-Davidic" Ps 123, although it is difficult to see for which particular reason this structure was created.

Perhaps the highest probability for a deliberate omission of the reference to David is found in Ps 137 (136 LXX), since this psalm unambiguously presupposes the Babylonian exile (cf. Ps 137:1: "By the rivers of Babylon, / there we sat down and there we wept"). An editor in the proto-MT transmission may have found a reference to David in the heading, as

attested by major parts of the LXX witnesses and possibly going back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG, irritating, and therefore decided to leave it out. This is suggested by the following group of "Davidic" psalms—the Third Psalter of David (Pss 138–145 [137–144 LXX]—which includes a reference to David's life in the heading of Ps 142 (141 LXX), and the LXX Psalter attests two further mentions of David's biography in Pss 143–144 (142–143 LXX). Accordingly, it may seem as if the references to David were understood biographically, which would make the contradiction with the exilic situation as portrayed in Ps 137 even more obvious. Notably, some LXX witnesses ascribe the psalm to Jeremiah instead, which fits the exilic situation much better.[167] However, some other witnesses combine the two references, which could have been understood as David's prophecy concerning the exile, which was proclaimed by Jeremiah during the exile.[168] A similar combination of references is found in Ps 71 (70 LXX), where the heading of some Greek manuscripts refer to David and the first expatriates (Τῷ Δαυιδ· υἱῶν Ιωναδαβ καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωτισθέντων "Pertaining to Dauid. Of the sons of Ionadab and the first of those taken captive"). These combined references do not fit a narrow biographical understanding of the references to David in the headings.

In sum, it is possible that a more original reference to David in Ps 137 (136 LXX) was secondarily omitted in the transmission of the proto-MT, which is also attested by 11Q5, and replaced or combined with a reference to Jeremiah in the transmission of the LXX. However, the opposite development remains more probable. The reference to David could have been secondarily added to Ps 137 (136 LXX), either in the transmission of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG or by the Greek translator, to incorporate the psalm into the Third Psalter of David, that is, into the group of Davidic psalms beginning with Ps 138 (137 LXX); without a heading, Ps 137 appears rather isolated after the resounding hymn of Ps 136, which concludes a preceding sequence of psalms. It should further be noted that the reference to David may have been secondarily added to the main witnesses

---

167. See n. 160. However, according to Jer 44 Jeremiah ended his life in Egypt, not in Babylon.

168. See n. 160. This notion could be indicated by the different cases with which the references to David and Jeremiah are construed; David seems always construed with the dative Τῷ Δαυιδ "Pertaining to David," while Jeremiah is mentioned in the genitive Ιερεμιου "Of Jeremiah" or with the preposition διὰ "through" which also has the genitive.

of Ps 138 as well, if the seemingly marginal witnesses (i.e., Aquila, Origen's *sexta*, and some medieval Hebrew manuscripts) go back to a more original reading. This would indicate a tendency of expanding the Davidic group of Pss 139–145 by incorporating the two preceding psalms.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The added references to the headings of psalms seem to be a wider phenomenon that took place in the transmission of different textual strands. The documented textual evidence suggests that, for example, the references to David were added to a number of psalms in the late stages of their textual transmission. The Davidization of the Psalms was clearly not done by a single editor who followed a comprehensive master plan. It took place on several stages in different traditions. The added references are mostly found in single passages, and only in the case of Pss 93–99 (92–98 LXX) one may find a more comprehensive plan to create a new group of Davidic psalms. The underlying reason for ascribing psalms to David may be his elevated status as an ideal and pious king with which other kings are compared, especially in Kings. Psalms by the pious king would undoubtedly be given a certain authority that an untitled psalm would not have.

Although documented evidence only bears witness to some added references in the headings, it is reasonable to assume that similar processes took place also in earlier stages of the literary development. One may even see the phenomenon of successively added headings as indirectly corroborating the secondary character of all headings, as classically assumed in Psalm exegesis.[169] The headings are a crucial place to guide the reader to a specific interpretation of a psalm. For example, if a reader understands the psalm as being authored by King David, the reader easily creates various associations for the various details in the text. Further biographical information in the headings has a similar effect.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Vitually all headings of single psalms, wherever attested, seem detached from the corpus of the respective psalm, and in most cases it is difficult to see unambiguous content-related connections between the heading and the psalm itself. Accordingly, critical scholarship since early research has suspected that the headings in general,

---

169. See esp. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Commentar über die Psalmen nebst beigefügter Uebersetzung,* 5th ed. (Heidelberg: Mohr, 1856), 21–22.

and particularly the references to David, were secondarily added at some stage of the literary development. This is irrespective of the documented evidence for the added references.

In some cases, the intrusive character of a late addition would be evident without comparison with documented textual variants. The reference to David in Ps 43 (42 LXX), attested by the LXX, Theodotion, and some medieval Hebrew manuscripts, seems clearly out of place since Pss 42–49 are marked by other references in their headings as a group of Korahite psalms. In the LXX version of Ps 137 (136), the secondary character of the reference to David may be suspected in light of the particular content of the psalm (see above). The references to David in the MT of Pss 122, 124, 131, and 132 can easily be suspected as secondary, since they appear as rather isolated within the Psalms of Ascent in Pss 120–134, which can be discerned as a separate and independent collection of psalms, as suggested by the recurrent heading שיר המעלות "song of ascents."[170] In other cases, by contrast, it would be difficult to discern that exactly the reference to David was later inserted. For example, if we possessed only the LXX, and 4Q98, one would hardly suspect that there existed a form of the First Psalter of David, Pss 3–41, in which only Ps 33 bore no heading and no reference to David. The same can be said of the textual traditions that attest references to David in Pss 66 (65 LXX); 67 (66 LXX), and 71 (70 LXX).

Results. Documented textual evidence indicates that a considerable number of psalms were ascribed to David on the latest stages of the literary history of the Psalms. This process is clearly attested by the LXX, but to some degree it also affected the MT transmission. Overlaps between the LXX and Qumran manuscripts suggest that at least some of the additional references to David go back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. In some cases, the textual attestation of the headings is diversified among the LXX witnesses, which may indicate late textual growth within the Greek tradition, or alternatively secondary harmonization toward a proto-Masoretic Text. The documented evidence also suggests that similar editing happened on earlier stages of the literary history. The Davidization of the Psalms was not done by one editor but emerged in a complex and largely uncoordinated process by several scribes in different textual traditions.

---

170. See *DCH* 5, s.v. "מַעֲלָה."

This does not preclude a more comprehensive revision to create a new
sequence or collection of Davidic psalms, as documented by the LXX ver-
sion of Pss 93–99 (92–98 LXX).

4.27. Added Phrases in the Psalms

The psalms attest to a number of additional phrases in one or more of the
textual witnesses. There are two basic explanations for these pluses: the
phrase was either intentionally added to the longer version or omitted,
mistakenly or deliberately, in the shorter version. A third model explains
the divergences by the fluidity and orality of transmission, which would
make it impossible to decide which textual witness preserves the oldest
reading (cf. the methodological discussion on Ueberschaer's model in
transpositions and especially the examples from 1 Kgs 11, at §10.6, below).
As the following discussion will show, the first model, deliberate literary
additions, is the most probable one in all analyzed cases. The documented
textual divergences give insights into late editorial or compositional pro-
cesses in which the psalms were gradually expanded with additional
poetical lines and motifs. Some of these cases will be discussed here, but
more cases can be found in the documented textual transmission. It stands
to reason that the earlier transmission, although not attested by docu-
mented evidence, contained similar additions.

Ps 13:6b MT	Ps 12:6b LXX
אשירה ליהוה כי גמל עלי	ᾄσω τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ εὐεργετήσαντί με, καὶ ψαλῶ τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου τοῦ ὑψίστου.
I will sing to Yahweh, because he has dealt bountifully with me.	I will sing to the Lord, my benefactor, and make music to the name of the Lord, the Most High.

The LXX preserves an additional colon in the final verse of the psalm: καὶ
ψαλῶ τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου τοῦ ὑψίστου "(and I will) make music to the name
of the Lord, the Most High." Exactly the same sentence is found in Ps 7:18b
LXX, where it has a parallel in the MT: ואזמרה שם יהוה עליון.[171] Nothing
specifically indicates an omission in the MT. The sentence is not theologi-

---

171. Cf. also the similar phrase in Ps 9:3.

cally problematic and therefore does not appear to trigger an accidental omission.[172] We are thus probably dealing with an addition influenced by Ps 7:18b LXX, as the influence of other passages is a very common reason for additions. There are three possibilities as to in which stage it was added. It could have been added by the Greek translator, by a copyist in the later Greek transmission, or by an editor in the Hebrew transmission, whereby it was already found in the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage*.[173] The poetic structure may suggest that the addition was made already in Hebrew, and the poetic structure may also be the reason for the addition in the first place.

The MT version of Ps 13:6b seems to be composed of two short cola ("I will sing to Yahweh/because he has dealt bountifully with me"). However, if the words אשירה ליהוה כי גמל עלי are read as a single longer colon, which in view of the longer cola in 13:2–3, 4b is perfectly possible, a second colon would be missing. By inserting a fitting additional colon taken from another psalm, a resounding new parallelism was created to the end of the psalm. At the same time, the text was theologically supplemented since the new colon praises Yahweh as "the Most High" (עליון) and highlights the importance of the divine name by referring to שם יהוה עליון "the name of Yahweh the Most High." Thus, the addition can be explained as an editorial intervention that rounds off the psalm's poetic structure and expands its theology.

The addition is rather well integrated into the psalm's text. If we only knew the version attested by the LXX, it would be difficult or even impossible to detect the secondary character of the final colon in 13:6 ואזמרה שם יהוה עליון "and I will make music to the name of Yahweh the Most High." To be sure, it would be noted that the same colon is also found in Ps 7:18, and one would have to explain the evident connection. Nevertheless, since

---

172. The final word of the sentence is Hebrew would be עליון while the preceding text ends with עלי. Although the words resemble each other, they are hardly enough to be regarded as a probable reason for an omission by homoioteleuton.

173. That the translation is identical in Ps 7:18 and 13:6 could indicate that the addition was made in the later Greek transmission or by the translator. On the other hand, it is also possible that already the Hebrew text contained identical sentences and they were translated identically in both cases. Perhaps the least probable explanation is the translation, because then one would expect more such similar supplementations throughout the Greek text, but this is not the case. It is likely that we are dealing with an isolated addition in the transmission of Ps 13, either in Hebrew or Greek.

verbatim or almost verbatim parallels occasionally occur in the psalms, they per se would hardly justify literary critical conclusions.[174]

Ps 18:2–3 MT	2 Sam 22:2–3 MT
²ויאמר ארחמך יהוה חזקי ³יהוה סלעי ומצודתי ומפלטי אלי צורי אחסה בו מגני וקרן ישעי משגבי	²ויאמר יהוה סלעי ומצדתי ומפלטי לי ³אלהי צורי אחסה בו מגני וקרן ישעי משגבי ומנוסי משעי מחמס תשעני
²He said: I love you, Yahweh, my strength. ³Yahweh (is)[175] my rock, my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my rock in whom I take refuge, my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my stronghold.	²He said: Yahweh (is) my rock, my fortress, and my deliverer for me, ³my God, my rock, in whom I take refuge, my shield and the horn of my salvation, my stronghold and my refuge, my savior, who saves me from violence.

Psalm 18 is attested twice in the Hebrew Bible, as the psalm is also found in 2 Sam 22 where it forms a complete chapter in the so-called annex to the book of Samuel, 2 Sam 21–24. By comparing both versions, numerous mostly small divergences between the textual versions can be discerned, which, in part, overlap with variants in the textual transmission of each version. The double attestation of the psalm gives insights into the textual transmission of psalmody and bears witness to certain fluidity in the wording of the psalms. The fluidity may partly be due to memorization and oral transmission of psalms, and different circumstances of textualization (note the methodological discussion in the introduction to this volume). A case in point is the added לי "for me," inserted after the term ומפלטי "and my deliverer" in 2 Sam 22:2, which linguistically rounds off the expression but does not change the content.

The additional cola in both Ps 18:2 and 2 Sam 22:3 are a different phenomenon, for their nature suggests compositional activity historically conceptualized as late editing of a textual nature. Although this editing could also be rooted in the oral transmission of poetic traditions, the

---

174. Cf., e.g., Ps 6:8a with Ps 31:10.

175. It is not clear whether Ps 18:3 was meant to be read as a nominal clause speaking about Yahweh in the third-person singular or as a sequence of vocatives addressing Yahweh in the second-person singular.

psalm's parallel attestation in 2 Sam 22 and Ps 18 documents first and fore-most a deliberate expansion of the actual *written* wording. These additions distinctly altered the textual outlook of the psalm.

This is especially the case in Ps 18:2, since it altered the psalm's very opening. The additional colon was inserted in front of the seemingly older opening of the psalm in Ps 18:3: ארחמך יהוה חזקי "I love you, Yahweh, my strength."[176] By means of "revision through introduction" the colon placed the psalms under a new theological theme:[177] The phrase "I love you, Yahweh, my strength" leads the following poem to be understood as an expression of human love to God (cf. Deut 6:5) and praise of Yahweh as the source of the supplicant's strength, which is particularly fitting to the psalm's latter parts (see Ps 18:33–43). These ideas may seem perfectly fitting to the psalm, and one may even argue that they were implicitly con-tained in the older psalm. Nevertheless, placing this explicit statement in the very opening was a clear editorial intervention that changed the out-look of the psalm distinctly.

A secondary omission of this element in 2 Sam 22:2–3 is improbable. The phrase ארחמך יהוה חזקי does not have graphical features that could have easily triggered an unintentional omission in the process of copying. Against such an omission is also the fact that after the heading (Ps 18:1–2*) this is the very first line of the psalm. The opening colon is prominent and memorable, and it is not likely that a copyist would have accidentally skipped the opening colon. An intentional omission is likewise difficult to imagine, since the colon does not contain any stylistic or theological ten-sions with its context. Although the colon seems poetically isolated (see below), the three cola of 18:3 can be read as a rather smooth continuation of 18:2. Both verses use the divine name in a prominent position, and the term חזקי "my strength" is a synonym of the further divine epithets that follow in 18:3. The colon is theologically fitting to the general message of the psalm, but guides the reader to a specific understanding. Against this

---

176. In 2 Sam 22 this plus is attested by the Syriac translation and the Lucianic MSS boc₂e₂. The latter also combine it with a further colon στερεων με εκ θλιψεως μου και διασωζων με, thus creating a bicolon in the opening of the psalm. It is missing in both the MT and the rest of the Greek tradition, which suggests that it was not part of the original text of the psalm.

177. Term from Sara J. Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

backdrop, the theory that the colon was secondarily added and therefore is a case of late editorial expansion seems the only reasonable explanation.

It is difficult to determine whether the secondary character of the additional colon in Ps 18:2* would be detectable if the psalm's variant version in 2 Sam 22:2 were not available. On the one hand, the colon is stylistically and theologically fitting with the following psalm, but on the other hand, to some extent the colon sticks out from its immediate context. It is a single colon, while the rest of the psalm is composed of bicola and some tricola. Moreover, the first colon of 18:3 (יהוה סלעי ומצודתי ומפלטי "Yahweh [is][178] my rock, my fortress, and my deliverer") can be read as a further opening of the psalm that does not necessarily require the preceding colon of 18:2*. Another indicator for expansion would be the form of speech, for the addition clearly speaks to Yahweh in the second person, while the older text uses only the third person. These observations could have led to the conclusion or at least to the suspicion that 18:2* was secondarily placed in front of the older opening of the psalm in 18:3.

A further expansion is attested in 2 Sam 22:3. Although 2 Sam 22 seems to preserve an older version of the very opening of the psalm, it contains an additional colon not found in Ps 18 at the end of 22:3: ומנוסי משעי מחמס תשעני "and my refuge, my savior, who saves me from violence." These words round off the poetical structure of the psalm's opening, since the opening cola in 2 Sam 22:2b, 3 can be read as two synonymous bicola. Regarding the content, the colon adds further synonyms to the preceding series of divine epithets, thus fittingly concluding the verse. Although they do not change the meaning substantially, the added words and phrases increase the theological weight of the opening passage. The term מנוס "refuge" can be understood as an appropriate synonym of the preceding divine epithets, particularly of the immediately preceding משגבי "my stronghold," even though מנוס "refuge" is not frequently used as a divine epithet.[179] The following phrase משעי מחמס תשעני "my savior, who saves me from violence" further increases the theological weight, particularly by applying the term "savior" to Yahweh.[180] The addition also strengthens the connection between the psalm's opening and its further content; the

---

178. See n. 175.

179. Only in Jer 16:19 and Ps 59:17. Cf. the remaining attestations in Jer 25:35; 46:5; Amos 2:14; 142:5; Job 11:20.

180. Notably this does not have many parallels in the psalms: Pss 7:11; 17:7; 106:21.

term מושיע "savior" is also found in verse 42, albeit with a different meaning. חמס "violence" is also mentioned in verse 49 (2 Sam 22:49: חמסים/Ps 18:49: חמס), and the verb ישע "to save" is also used in verses 4 and 28.

In sum, the added colon in 2 Sam 22:3 seems rather well embedded in its context. Without access to the shorter version attested by Ps 18:3, it would be difficult to detect its secondary nature. Perhaps the only feature that could draw attention is the repeated use of words derived from the root ישע "to save": After the preceding expression קרן ישעי "the rock of my salvation" the text is slightly redundant and perhaps stylistically awkward, but such redundancy could always be attributed to poetic freedom and would not provide a firm basis for postulating an addition. Consequently, the added colon in 2 Sam 22:3 is much less detectable than the colon that was inserted in Ps 18:2.

Added poetical elements were probably not pure scribal interventions, as can be the case of editorial expansions in prose. Since both additions discussed here have the form of the basic poetic unit, the colon, both of them may have been conceived in the process of memorizing and/or reciting the psalm, and would therefore be part of the psalm's oral transmission history. In any case, it seems evident that an older form of the psalm's opening comprised neither of the two additions, and this form can only be reconstructed by comparing the two versions. In the *literary* context of Ps 18, an additional colon is found in 18:2, and in the *literary* context of 2 Sam 22, an additional colon is found in 22:3. Regardless of how these additional cola originated, they ended up in divergent textual versions of the psalm. The divergent versions allow the reconstruction of the psalm's older opening.

Ps 135:6 MT	Ps 135:6 11Q5
כל אשר חפץ יהוה	אשר חפץ יהוה[181]
עשה בשמים ובארץ	עשה בשמים ובארץ
	לעשות יעשה
	אין כיה
	אין כיהוה
	ואין שיעשה כמלך אלוהים
בימים וכל תהומות	בימים ובכול תהומות

181. The Tetragrammaton is written in 11Q5 in Paleo-Hebrew script, but this is not rendered here.

Whatever Yahweh pleases he does, in heaven and on earth, in the seas and all deeps.	Yahweh does what pleases him, in heaven and on earth, <u>by doing as he does; there is none like Yah, there is none like Yahweh, and there is none who acts like the king of gods</u>, in the seas and <u>in</u> all deeps.

Psalm 135:6 praises Yahweh's mighty deeds in the cosmos. The verse is attested in two divergent versions, one in the MT and the other in the great Psalms scroll 11Q5. The MT reading is largely followed by the other witnesses, while the plus seems also witnessed by the highly fragmentary manuscripts 4Q92 and 4Q95 (4QPsⁿ). The MT reading is comparatively short in comparison with the substantially expanded version in 11Q5.

It is obvious that the plus is a secondary insertion, for nothing indicates why the plus would have been accidentally skipped in the process of transmission; an omission by scribal parablepsis seems unlikely. In fact, several aspects betray the secondary character of the expansion.[182] First, the plus splits apart the phrases בשמים ובארץ "in heaven and on earth" and בימים וכל תהומות "in the seas and all deeps," which logically belong together. If the plus were original, it would be difficult to explain why these sentences had been placed in separate locations in the first place. Second, the redundant use of the verb עשה "to do" is conspicuous; in the expanded version it occurs four times, which creates a peculiarly verbose style. Such style is not found in the rest of the psalm, and thus a different authorship can be assumed. Third, the hymnic descriptions of Yahweh and his deeds in the plus are poorly connected with its immediate context. The threefold praise of Yahweh's incomparability אין כיה אין כיהוה ואין שיעשה כמלך אלוהים "there is none like Yah, there is none like Yahweh, and there is none who acts like the king of gods" is not particularly fitting in its place since it is continued with בימים וכל תהומות "in the seas and all deeps," although it seems difficult to imagine that Yahweh's singular acting "like the king of gods" is only found in the seas and depths. Fourth, the longer version is poetologically difficult. Despite the mentioned threefold praise of Yahweh, it does not have a clear poetic structure, which contrasts with the rest of the psalm composed of mostly bicola and some tricola

---

182. Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPsᵃ aus Qumran*, STDJ 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 188.

(135:6, 7, 11) in a clearly poetic structure. Finally, the term מלך אלוהים "king of the gods" may raise some suspicions, since it is not known from other psalms and other canonical literature. It is found in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice from Qumran, which could indicate that we are dealing with a Qumranic addition.[183]

This case provides a clear sample for a late editorial expansion in the Psalms. Even without the shorter version of Ps 135 in the MT, 11Q5 provides several signs of later editing, and the critic would be able to reconstruct the older version of the psalm. There is no reason to assume that the expansion of Ps 135:6 was an exception, and in fact similar additions in other psalms can be suspected, including the MT.

Ps 149:9 MT	Ps 149:9 11Q5
לעשות בהם משפט כתוב הדר הוא לכל חסידיו	לעשות בהם משפט כתוב הדר הוא לכול חסידיו לבני ישראל עם קודשו הללו יה
הללו יה	
To execute on them the judgment decreed; this is glory for all his faithful ones. Praise Yah!	To execute on them the judgment decreed; this is glory for all his faithful ones, for the children of Israel, his holy people. Praise Yah!

The final verse of Ps 149 is attested in two different versions in the MT and in the Psalms scroll 11Q5. Apart from the concluding הללו יה "Praise Yah!" formula, the MT can be read as two cola, while 11Q5 has an additional colon, לבני ישראל עם קודשו "for the children of Israel, his holy people."[184] The additional phrase is an apposition to the preceding לכול חסידיו "for all his faithful ones," and thereby syntactically possible, but a comparison with the MT suggests that the phrase was secondarily inserted. Although

---

183. 4Q400 frag. 1 II, 7; frag. 2 5; 4Q401 frag. 1 II, 5; 4Q402 frag. 3 II, 12; 4Q405 frag. 23 I, 13.

184. Note that the "Praise Yah!" formula is not attested in the LXX, while 11Q5 does not attest the formula at the opening of Ps 150. Comparison between the MT, the LXX, and the psalms manuscripts from Qumran indicates a certain fluidity in the use of the hallelujah formula; it seems difficult to decide whether the double use of the formula at the end of one psalm and the beginning of the next, as attested in the MT and particularly in Pss 146–150, was secondarily avoided by omitting one of the formulas, or the formula was secondarily added in order to frame psalms.

it cannot be completely ruled out that the phrase was unintentionally skipped by a copyist in the proto-MT transmission, there are no particular features that would trigger a haplography. The final consonant of the plus is identical with that of the preceding text, but this is hardly a convincing trigger for an *aberratio oculi* (חסידיו לבני ישראל עם קודשו). It is much more probable that the additional phrase was deliberately inserted between the word חסידיו "his faithful ones" and the concluding הללו יה "Praise Yah." This is suggested by the purpose it serves.

First, the phrase rounds off the final verse of Ps 149. Given that the formula הללו יה does not belong to the psalm's actual corpus, the masoretic version of Ps 149 consists only of bicola, while the added phrase expands the concluding verse to a tricolon. Concluding an otherwise bicolic passage with a tricolon occurs in several poetic texts and is also found in Ps 150:5–6a, which is following Ps 149 in the MT and in 11Q5.[185] One may thus argue that Ps 149 was harmonized to accord with Ps 150. Second, the addition interprets the preceding term חסידיו "his faithful ones" by equating the faithful ones with "the Israelites" (בני ישראל) and calling them עם קודשו "his holy people." The added phrase reads very similar to the final colon of Ps 148 (v. 14) לבני ישראל עם קרבו "for the Israelites, the people who are close to him."[186] The terms used by the addition are of particular interest. בני ישראל "the Israelites" is attested in the biblical material very broadly, while the term is found much less in the nonbiblical material from Qumran. The synonymous use of חסידיו "his faithful ones" and בני ישראל "the Israelites" implies that the true Israelites are his faithful ones and vice versa, which is a significant theological interpretation.[187] The same is expressed in Ps 148:14 in a similar sequence (תהלה לכל חסידיו לבני ישראל עם קרבו "praise for all his faithful ones, for the people of Israel who are close to him!"). The term עם קודשו "his holy people," by contrast, has only one biblical parallel, Isa 63:18 (עם קדשך "your holy people"), while it is much more often found in the nonbiblical writings from Qumran, particularly in the War Scroll 1QM (X, 10; XII, 1, 8; XIV, 12). The term may

---

185. Psalm 148 even ends with two tricola (vv. 13–14), but in 11Q5 the psalm is found in a different place, i.e., between Ps 146 and Ps 120.

186. Psalm 148 is found in another place in 11Q5; see n. 185.

187. Thus Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum*, 225–26, who refers to about thirty attestations of בני ישראל in the Qumranic texts (except for the attestations in 11Q19, which due to the connection with Deuteronomy is a special case).

have been used as a self-designation of the community, and the addition in the 11Q5 version of Ps 149:9 seems to have served this purpose.[188] All this indicates that the added phrase has a particular interpretive function.

A potential alternative to this model may be that both versions of the psalm were rooted in the same oral transmission of the psalms, and such fluidity may have resulted in different versions. In this case the question of priority would lie beyond literary history. Although such a model is theoretically possible and perhaps took place in earlier stages of some psalms, it does not seem probable in this case, for it is rather evident that the added colon in the 11Q5 version served an interpretive purpose, as shown above. It is also to be noted that the rest of Ps 149, as far as it is attested in 11Q5, is textually relatively fixed.[189] The same can be said of the LXX transmission of the entire Ps 149, as far as it is currently accessible.[190] This does not speak for a general fluidity of transmission that would imply fluctuation and thus variants throughout the psalm. An isolated variant is better explained as a textual intervention. This does not rule out the possibility that other elements in the psalm were secondarily inserted in earlier stages of the literary history, but the addition of a third colon in Ps 149:9 seems to have been an isolated and deliberate editorial intervention that happened in a rather late stage of the psalm's compositional history.

Would it be possible to identify the phrase לבני ישראל עם קודשו "for the children of Israel, his holy people" as a secondary addition, without the shorter version? In this regard the case differs from the addition in Ps 135:6 (see above), since here the phrase is smoothly integrated into the verse. The terms בני ישראל "the Israelites" and עם קודשו "his holy people" are fitting synonyms of the preceding כול חסידיו "all his faithful ones." The added colon forms a rather classic synonymous *parallelismus membrorum* with the preceding colon, thus expanding the verse to a tricolon that nicely

---

188. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum*, 226.

189. I.e., Ps 149:7–9; the first six verses are unfortunately not extant, and there are no futher attestations of Ps 149 among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

190. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 338. It should be noted, however, that in the Vetus Latina manuscript of St.-Germain-des-Prés verses 5b and 6b are lacking. But since 149:7 seems to continue the mention of the sword in the hands of the faithful ones in 149:6b, it is difficult to imagine that the cola of 149:5b and 6b were secondarily inserted. It nevertheless remains difficult to explain how the *lectio brevior* attested by the Vetus Latina manuscript originated. Did it result from accidental omission of both cola or from deliberate skipping of the enigmatic 149:5b and the theologically seemingly improper 149:6b?

rounds off the end of Ps 149. Furthermore, the conclusion of Ps 149:9 reads very similar to Ps 148:14. Only the conspicuous term עם קודשו "his holy people" may have raised some suspicion since it is exceptional in biblical texts. Nonetheless, the psalm also contains other rare and exceptional terms such as the singular expression משפט כתוב "the judgment written" (149:9), the term בני ציון "the children of Zion" (149:2; see Joel 2:23; Lam 4:2), and the enigmatic phrase ירננו על משכבותם "let them sing for joy on their beds" (149:5). In light of these it would be difficult to argue that the third colon of 149:9, as attested in 11Q5, is not an original element of the psalm. Without the textual evidence of the shorter MT, the compositional unity of the 11Q5 version of Ps 149:9 would probably not be questioned.

Results. The examples discussed here give insights into the literary history of the Psalms. In all cases the variants were occasioned by a secondary expansion. The additions may form an entire new colon (i.e., in Ps 13:6 LXX; Ps 18:2; 2 Sam 22:3; Ps 149:9 11Q5) or merely contain a unit without a clear poetic structure that breaks the poetic structure of the older psalm (Ps 135:6 11Q5). In Ps 13:6 LXX, 2 Sam 22:3, and Ps 149:9 11Q5 the additions were rather smoothly integrated into the older text so that it would be difficult if not impossible to detect their secondary character without documented evidence. In contrast, the secondary character of the added material in Ps 135:6 11Q5 is clearly discernible even without the shorter MT version. Similarly, even without knowledge of 2 Sam 22 it would be possible to hypothesize that the opening single colon of Ps 18 (v. 2b) was later inserted. These cases confirm that similar additions may be suspected in the earlier transmission not documented by variant versions. If a phrase, colon, or other unit sticks out from its context, and clear syntactical, poetological, or content-related arguments can be formulated, it is reasonable to suspect an addition even without textual evidence for it.

4.28. Nehemiah 9:6

Nehemiah 9:6–37 consists of a prayer and a confession of sins by the Israelites. The prelude to the prayer introduces the scene and main actors. The prayer appears to be led by the Levites (9:4–5) who are also introduced as the main speakers (9:5), although the whole community is implied to participate. However, at the beginning of 9:6, the LXX (2 Esd 19:6) introduces Ezra as the prayer's main speaker, which essentially replaces the Levites in this function.

Neh 9:5–6 MT	Neh 9:5–6 LXX
⁵ויאמרו הלוים ... ⁶אתה הוא יהוה לבדך אתה עשית את השמים שמי השמים וכל צבאם	⁵καὶ εἴποσαν οἱ Λευῖται ... <u>⁶καὶ εἶπεν Εσδρας</u> Σὺ εἶ αὐτὸς κύριος μόνος· σὺ ἐποίησας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν στάσιν αὐτῶν
⁵The Levites said … ⁶"You are Yahweh, you alone; you have made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host	⁵The Levites said … ⁶<u>And Ezra said:</u> "You are Yahweh, you alone; you have made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host

It is probable that the LXX plus is a later addition, while the MT represents the more original text. This is suggested by the following considerations. In the Greek text the Levites only praise God (in 9:5) and appear to have no other function in the text. This would be peculiar since in 9:4 the Levites are introduced as the main actors who stand on the stairs in front of the nation. Their only function would remain the short call to the people to stand up and praise Yahweh in 9:5. Notably, it is not mentioned that Ezra is present at all, before he suddenly starts speaking in the LXX version of 9:6. Ezra is also missing in the scene that follows the prayer in chapter 10, although there is an apparent thematic connection between the chapters. After confessing their past sins in chapter 9, in chapter 10 the Israelites promise by agreement to be committed to Yahweh's law in the future. Although a great number of people—including many of the same Levites—are mentioned in Neh 10 as signatories of the agreement, Ezra is missing. Despite the possibly complicated redaction history of Neh 9–10, the lack of any reference to Ezra among the many names of both chapters strongly suggests that the reference to Ezra as speaker in Neh 9:6 is rather late. If Ezra had been the main speaker, one would expect that he would have been introduced already in Neh 9:1–5, and he would be among the first ones to sign the agreement. One should also note that the prayer has already begun in 9:5b, thus initiated by the Levites. The sudden switch to Ezra in the middle of a prayer is unexpected.[191] Consequently, it seems probable that the LXX plus is a later addition.[192]

---

191. Thus also Antonius Gunneweg, *Nehemia,* KAT 19.2 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1987), 123.

192. Thus many, e.g., Loring W. Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on*

The reasons for adding Ezra are apparent. Loring Batten has argued that "the prayer must come from an individual," which he explains as a reason why the LXX reading emerged.[193] Moreover, Ezra is the main actor in Neh 8, where he reads the law to the people, but he suddenly disappears after this scene. A later scribe could easily be led to assume that he must continue to be the main actor in the prayer as well, for it would be logical that the one who instructed the Israelites about the Torah in Neh 8 would also lead them in confessing its violation in Neh 9. The reason for the original incongruence between the chapters is their different origins. Nehemiah 8 was probably not in its original location, and Neh 9 is a late addition to the book.[194] A later scribe in the LXX tradition sought to harmonize the incongruence. Although there is no textual evidence like in Neh 9:6, a similar attempt may be found in Neh 8:9: Nehemiah was secondarily introduced as a main actor in the middle of a scene where otherwise Ezra was the leader.[195] In both cases, in Neh 8:9 and Neh 9:6 later editors sought to stitch together texts that had a different origin.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is theoretically possible that the plus had been accidentally omitted. However, there are no technical features such as homoioteleuton that could easily trigger an omission: καὶ εἶπεν Εσδρας would be a rendering of ויאמר עזרא. It would also be quite a coincidence that exactly these words that interrupt the prayer to introduce a new speaker had been accidentally omitted.

Ezra-Nehemiah, ICC 9 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913), 365; and Gunneweg, *Nehemia*, 123. Some scholars only make note of the reading, e.g., Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 300, but rightly imply it to be secondary.

193. Batten, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 365, 372, but he failed to explain why this is so, and in fact, parts of the confession clearly refer to first-person pl. (9:9, 10, 16, 32, 33, 34, 36), which contradicts his suggestion.

194. Thus, e.g., Gustav Hölscher, *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia*, HAT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1923), 544; Sigmund Mowinckel, *Die nachchronistische Redaktion des Buches, Die Listen*, vol. 1 of *Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), 62–58; and Reinhard G. Kratz, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*, UTB 2157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 88–90.

195. In what is a parallel to Neh 8:9, 1 Esd 9:49 lacks a reference to Nehemiah, but this may be a later development. First Esdras omits all of the Nehemiah material, but this probably does not represent an earlier stage of the text. See discussion in Fried, *Was 1 Esdras First?*

An intentional omission of Ezra is also very unlikely, for Ezra is the main actor in Ezra 8, and there is no evidence of an attempt to suppress him in Ezra-Nehemiah.[196] Quite the contrary, the role and importance of Ezra seems to have increased in the later development of Ezra-Nehemiah.[197] Originally presented as a scribe, Ezra is later made a priest and in 1 Esdras a high priest (1 Esd. 9:39, 40, and 49). The intentional omission of Ezra would thus run counter to the general development, and were this the case, one would then also expect other attempts to suppress him in the composition. A theory that would advocate the priority of the LXX reading in Neh 9:6 is very unlikely and, accordingly, it has not received support among scholars.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. By adding him as the speaker, the LXX of Neh 9:6 made Ezra the main actor of the scene, which suppresses the Levites so that they only have an assisting role. The Levites only call for the prayer and initiate it, but Ezra leads the actual prayer. Although a small addition, it thus had crucial impact on the text and its hierarchies. The addition was probably intended to be included in the text, for it does not seek to clarify any detail in the text. It is a clear intervention in the text and a statement that Ezra must be the leader here. The model and hierarchy was adopted from Neh 8, where Ezra was the main actor and the Levites merely assisted him; apparently, the editor was convinced that the same setting should have continued in Neh 9 as well. However, since no other attempts to introduce Ezra in Neh 9–10 were made, the addition seems isolated and not part of any wider redaction. The addition is not particularly well placed, for one would expect that Ezra would have been added at the beginning of the scene, or at least at the beginning of the list of names who are said to speak in 9:5. This speaks for a rather unplanned addition, possibly made in the margins or between the lines. One should not exclude the possibility that the marginal addition was later misplaced by the scribe or copyist who eventually included the addition in the main text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the older version preserved in the MT version, it would have been possible to notice the addition in

---

196. That Ezra is not mentioned in Ben Sirah could indicate that there was at some point a problem with the figure of Ezra, but this theory is not without problems.
197. See Pakkala, *Ezra the Scribe*, 255–90.

9:6 of the LXX. Although the addition is a separate sentence that did not disturb the grammar of a sentence, it interrupts the prayer begun already in 9:5b in a way that begs for an explanation. Moreover, the peculiar lack of reference to Ezra in the rest of Neh 9 and in the following chapter would also have raised the suspicion that the reference to Ezra may not be original. Especially the fact that he is not mentioned as one of those who stood at the stairs in front of the people in 9:4 contradicts his sudden appearance after the prayer has already begun. The critic would thus also be able to reconstruct the earlier literary phase of the text as preserved in the MT.

Results. The LXX of Neh 9:6 contains a small addition that made Ezra the main speaker in the prayer of 9:6–37. The addition introduced Ezra as the main actor of the scene thus replacing the Levites in this function. Because of its poor placement, it would have been possible to detect the addition without knowing the older version preserved in the MT.

5
Additions: Small Sections, Scenes,
and Clusters of Connected Sentences

Although noticeably less frequent than smaller additions, documented evidence from different parts of the Hebrew Bible shows cases where small scenes or clusters of connected sentences have been secondarily added. This editorial technique is methodologically significant for historical criticism, since such additions have been widely assumed in literary criticism. In some redaction-critical models they are the most common type of expansion in the Hebrew Bible.[1] Most of such expansions clearly add information or develop the text in a new direction, while many of the smaller expansions merely interpret, clarify, or comment on the older text. Nevertheless, some larger expansions are primarily harmonizations with a parallel text. The Samaritan Pentateuch in particular contains many cases where a passage, often in Deuteronomy, has influenced a related passage in another part of the Pentateuch so that a missing scene or section is added to the parallel or related text. A typical example is found in Gen 30:36, after which the SP adds a large section: in a slightly modified text from Gen 31:11–13 where an angel of God appears to Jacob in a dream.[2] A well-known example of Deuteronomy's influence on Exodus is the Samaritan

---

1. This is apparent, e.g., in Veijola, *Deuteronomium*; and in Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*; and Würthwein, *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25*.

2. The added section reads: ויאמר מלאך אלהים אל יעקב בחלום ויאמר יעקב ויאמר הנני ויאמר שא נא עיניך וראה [את כל העתוד]ים [העלים על הצאן] עקודים נקודים וברודים כי ראיתי את כל אשר לבן עשה לך אנכי האל בית אל אשר משחת שם מצבה ואשר נדרת לי שם ויאמר. Cf. Gen 31:11–13: נדר ועתה קום צא מן הארץ הזאת ושוב אל ארץ אביך ואיטיב עמך אלי מלאך האלהים בחלום יעקב ואמר הנני [12]ויאמר שא נא עיניך וראה את כל העתודים העלים על הצאן עקודים נקודים וברודים כי ראיתי את כל אשר לבן עשה לך [13]אנכי האל בית אל אשר משחת שם מצבה ואשר נדרת לי שם נדר ועתה קום צא מן הארץ הזאת ושוב אל ארץ מולדתך.

version of the Sinai pericope: passages of Deuteronomy, especially Deut 5:24–30, have been secondarily added in different parts of Exod 20–21.

An illustrative case of a large expansion that has no clear parallel in another biblical passage but adds detail and information can be found in Lev 17. The Samaritan Pentateuch, 4Q26 (4QLev[d]), and the LXX contain a large plus that is missing in the Masoretic Text:

Lev 17:4 MT	Lev 17:4 SP/LXX/4Q26
and does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting,	and does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting, <u>to make it a burnt offering or a peace offering to Yahweh, at your own will, for a sweet-smelling savor, and (who) slaughters it outside, and does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting</u>
to present (it) as an offering to Yahweh before the tabernacle of Yahweh, he shall be held guilty of bloodshed; he has shed blood, and he shall be cut off from the people.	to present it as an offering to Yahweh before the tabernacle of Yahweh, he shall be held guilty of bloodshed; he has shed blood, and he shall be cut off from the people.

While the MT version only generally refers to sacrifices that should be presented (להקריב קרבן) to Yahweh at the tent of meeting, the plus gives details as to which sacrifices should be offered. It seems probable that the more detailed version is the result of a later addition that goes beyond the older text in the information it provides. Burnt and peace offerings, which are mentioned in the addition, are typical animal offerings and are therefore an expected further development. One should also note the repetition of the sentence "does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting," which corresponds to a *Wiederaufnahme*, which classic literary criticism has assumed to be a possible sign of a later expansion. There is no reason to assume that the MT is the result of a secondary abbreviation.[3]

An addition that forms a small independent scene can be found in 1 Kgs 6:11–14. First Kings 6 mainly describes the architecture of the temple and its building process, but in the middle of this description the MT contains an additional divine oracle in 6:11–13 where Yahweh reminds

---

3. For discussion and arguments in favor of this theory, see Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 19–25.

Solomon to keep his commandments. The scene is concluded in 6:14 by a repetition of a sentence from 6:9. However, 6:11–14 are missing in LXX witnesses, which probably goes back to the Old Greek:

1 Kgs 6:9–15 MT	1 Kgs 6:9–15 LXX
[9]And he built the house and finished it; he roofed the house with beams and planks of cedar. [10]He built the structure against the whole house, each story five cubits high, and supported the house with cedar beams. [11]And the word of Yahweh came to Solomon, [12]"As for this house that you are building, if you will walk in my statutes, obey my ordinances, and keep all my commandments by walking in them, then I will establish my word with you, which I spoke to David your father. [13]I will dwell among the Israelites, and not forsake my people Israel." [14]Solomon built the house and finished it.	[9]So he built the house and finished it; he made the ceiling of the house with cedars. [10]He built the partitions through all the house, each five cubits high, and enclosed each partition with cedar boards.
[15]And he built the walls of the house on the inside with cedar boards.	[15]And he built the walls of the house with cedar boards.

It is quite likely that the Old Greek preserves the original text, for the MT plus clearly differs from the rest of the passage in content, language, and genre.[4] Moreover, the repetition of a sentence from 6:9 is a typical technique, the so-called resumptive repetition, that literary critics commonly assume to be a potential sign of a later addition. By repeating a sentence, a later editor returned to the older text in an attempt to make the transition smoother after the expansion (cf. "And he built the house and finished it" > "And Solomon built the house and finished it" ויבן > ויבן את הבית ויכלהו שלמה את הבית ויכלהו). As in Lev 17:4, this would be a very typical *Wieder-aufnahme*, which often indicates a later addition. It is also notable that the MT corresponds to typical nomistic additions where the importance of the laws is stressed by conditioning Yahweh's promise of benediction on

---

4. For discussion and arguments, see Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 101–8.

the observance of the laws. It is apparent that even without the older text preserved in the Greek version, a critic would have suspected the addition of 6:11–14.

Other documented cases of similar subscenes can be found in different parts of the Hebrew Bible: Judg 6:7–10; 2 Kgs 13:23 (missing in the Antiochian text in what is possibly the Old Greek); Jer 29:14, 25; 35:17–18 (in all these cases in Jeremiah, the much shorter Old Greek is probably original). In many of these cases, the literary critic would have been able to suspect an addition. This further corroborates the suspicion that the increase in the size of an addition increases the critic's possibilities of detecting it without documented evidence for the older version. Many of the examples analyzed in detail show a similar picture.

5.1. Exodus 32:9–10

The famous story about the golden calf, Israel's first apostasy after the conclusion of the Sinaitic covenant (Exod 24:1–8), is attested twice in the Hebrew Bible, first in Exod 32 in the context of the Sinai pericope, and for the second time in Deut 9:8–21(29) in the context of Moses's farewell speech to Israel. The relationship between these two accounts is complex. While the storyline is basically the same, several details differ, and the outline of both versions seems closely connected with their respective contexts. The substantial textual variants in Exod 32:9–10 give insights into late stages of literary growth of the chapter. The variants may indicate that Exod 32 was assimilated in two subsequent steps to the version of Deut 9. Exodus 32:9–10 is attested in three different versions by the MT, the LXX, and the SP; the plus that is contained in the SP is also attested by the Qumran manuscript 4Q22 (4QpaleoExod[m]) and by a small group of LXX manuscripts.[5]

---

5. For 4Q22, see Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 98–99. 4Q22 seems to have some connection with the textual tradition behind the SP; however, this connection seems to have been pre-Samaritan; see the concise discussion in Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, 66. The group of LXX manuscripts includes 58-767 318; see Wevers, *Exodus*, 357.

Exod 32:9–10 LXX	Exod 32:9–10 MT	Exod 32:9–10 SP
καὶ νῦν ἔασόν με καὶ θυμωθεὶς ὀργῇ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκτρίψω αὐτοὺς καὶ ποιήσω σὲ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα.	⁹ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא ¹⁰ועתה הניחה לי ויחר אפי בהם ואכלם ואעשה אותך לגוי גדול	⁹ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא ¹⁰ועתה הניחה לי ויחר אפי בם ואכלם ואעשה אתך לגוי גדול ובאהרן התאנף יהוה מאד להשמידו ויתפלל משה בעד אהרן
¹⁰And now allow me, and, enraged with anger against them, I will destroy them and make you into a great nation."	⁹Yahweh said to Moses, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are. ¹⁰Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; and of you I will make a great nation."	⁹Yahweh said to Moses, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are. ¹⁰Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; and of you I will make a great nation." And Yahweh was so angry with Aaron that he was ready to destroy him, but Moses interceded on behalf of Aaron.

The LXX contains the shortest version, comprising only 32:10. The MT and SP both contain a larger plus that consists of all of 32:9. The SP also contains a further plus in 32:10, which is shared by 4Q22 and some LXX manuscripts. Both pluses are almost identical with parallel passages in Deut 9: Exod 32:9 MT/SP corresponds to Deut 9:13, while Exod 32:10 is similar in content with Deut 9:14 but in most parts formulated differently. On the other hand, the SP plus in Exod 34:10 has an almost identical counterpart in Deut 9:20. The pluses will be discussed separately, because they shed light on two different literary processes.

 That Exod 32:9 is missing in the LXX indicates that a late editor secondarily aligned the passage more closely with the parallel passage Deut 9:13–14 by adding an almost verbatim equivalent of Deut 9:13. While the presumably older form of the Exodus passage (Exod 32:7–8, 10 LXX) roughly corresponds to Deut 9:12–14, the MT plus in 32:9 tied the pas-

sages much closer together, as the plus is almost verbatim identical with Deut 9:13.[6]

Exod 32:9–10 MT/SP	Deut 9:13–14
⁹ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא ¹⁰ועתה הניחה לי ויחר אפי בהם ואכלם ואעשה אותך לגוי גדול	¹³ויאמר יהוה אלי לאמר ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא ¹⁴הרף ממני ואשמידם ואמחה את שמם מתחת השמים ואעשה אותך לגוי עצום ורב ממנו
⁹And Yahweh said to Moses, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are. ¹⁰Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them, and of you I will make a great nation."	¹³And Yahweh said to me, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are. ¹⁴Let me alone that I may destroy them and blot out their name from under heaven, and of you I will make a nation mightier and more numerous than they."

Exod 32:7–10	Deut 9:12–14
⁷And Yahweh said to Moses, "Go down, for your people whom you brought up out of the land of Egypt have acted perversely; ⁸they have been quick to turn aside from the way that I commanded them; they have cast for themselves an image of a calf, and have	¹²And Yahweh said to me, "Get up, go down quickly from here, for your people whom you have brought from Egypt have acted perversely; they have been quick to turn from the way that I commanded them; they have cast for themselves an image."

---

6. The similarities between both versions of the story suggest literary dependencies also on earlier levels of the compositional history. Moses's intercession in Exod 32:11–14 logically continues Exod 32:7–10* but is missing in Deut 9, which indicates that the author of this version was not yet aware of the intercession (Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 231 n. 646). It is therefore probable that Exod 32:7–10* was from the outset drafted in light of Deut 9:12–14 and continued by the additional element of Moses's intercession in Exod 32:11–14. If the LXX in fact attests the older text of Exod 32:7–10*, as proposed above, the repetition of the speech-introduction of Deut 9:12 in 9:13 ("And Yahweh said to me") together with the following reference to the "stiff-necked" nature of the Israelite people seems to have been skipped when Exod 32:7–14* was drafted. This may indirectly indicate that Deut 9:13 also was only secondarily added to Deut 9:12–15*; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 231–32, by contrast, proposes that 9:13–14 were secondarily added to Deut 9:12–15*—which however cannot explain why an equivalent to Deut 9:13 was at first missing when Exod 32:7–14* was drafted.

worshiped it and sacrificed to it, and said, 'These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt!' "

[9 missing in the LXX And Yahweh said to Moses, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are.]

10Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; and of you I will make a great nation."

13And Yahweh said to me, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are.

14Let me alone that I may destroy them and blot out their name from under heaven; and I will make of you a nation mightier and more numerous than they."

The second plus in Exod 32:10, attested by SP, 4Q22, and LXX^ms, is almost identical with Deut 9:20.

Exod 32:10 SP/4Q22/LXX^MS58	Deut 9:20
ועתה הניחה לי ויחר אפי בם ואכלם ואעשה אתך לגוי גדול ובאהרן התאנף יהוה מאד להשמידו ויתפלל משה בעד אהרן	ובאהרן התאנף יהוה מאד להשמידו ואתפלל גם בעד אהרן בעת ההוא
Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; and of you I will make a great nation."	
And Yahweh was so angry with Aaron that he was ready to destroy him, but Moses interceded on behalf of Aaron.	And Yahweh was so angry with Aaron that he was ready to destroy him, but I interceded also on behalf of Aaron at that same time.

This textual divergence between the SP/4Q22/LXX^MS58 and the MT suggests that another late editor added an almost verbatim equivalent of Deut 9:20 to align Exod 32:10 more closely with the parallel version of the story in Deut 9. Information found in one of the versions was added to the other one, since both versions were regarded as reliable accounts of the same event.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An alternative explanation would imply that the textual divergences in Exod 32:9–10 were, at least in part, occasioned by accidental or intentional omission of the

respective pluses. Such an omission could have happened in both cases, or only in one of them. An accidental omission, although never completely impossible, is an unlikely explanation for the variants. There are no textual features in Hebrew that could have easily triggered a scribal parablepsis. This can be illustrated with the version of the SP, which attests both pluses:

<div dir="rtl">

⁸ויאמרו אלה אלהיך ישראל אשר העלוך מארץ מצרים

⁹ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא

¹⁰ועתה הניחה לי ויחר אפי בם ואכלם ואעשה אתך לגוי גדול

ובאהרן התאנף יהוה מאד להשמידו ויתפלל משה בעד אהרן

¹¹ויחל משה את פני יהוה אלהיו ויאמר

</div>

⁸"and they said, 'These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt!'" ⁹Yahweh said to Moses, "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are. ¹⁰Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them, and of you I will make a great nation." And Yahweh was so angry with Aaron that he was ready to destroy him, but Moses interceded on behalf of Aaron. ¹¹But Moses implored Yahweh his God and said.…

The transitions from 32:8 to 32:9 and from the first half of 32:10 (until לגוי גדול "a great nation") to 32:11 do not contain similar words, word endings, or phrases that may have caused a scribe to unintentionally skip 32:9 and/or the second half of 32:10 (ובאהרן … בעד אהרן "And with Aaron … on behalf of Aaron."). A haphazard omission would thus accidentally leave out a self-contained unit that finds a close parallel in Deuteronomy, but here we are beyond any probabilities.

An intentional omission for stylistic or ideological reasons is another alternative, as both pluses contain highly significant motifs and theological ideas. The repeated speech-introduction in 32:9a (ויאמר יהוה אל משה "Yahweh said to Moses") is redundant after the speech-introduction in 32:7a (וידבר יהוה אל משה "Yahweh said to Moses"), and one could suspect that an editor skipped 32:9 in order to avoid this redundancy.[7] However, such a stylistic improvement would only have necessitated the omission of 32:9a, while 32:9b (ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא "I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are") is theologically too weighty to have been left out for stylistic reasons. Another option is an ideologically motivated omission: 32:9 could have been regarded as too harsh a verdict of

---

7. Note that a similar redundancy is found in Deut 9:12–13.

the Israelite people.[8] However, the ensuing text in Exod 33–34 refers three times to the "stiff necked" character of the Israelite people (עם קשה ערף in Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9), and these passages are included in the LXX version (translated with λαὸς σκληροτράχηλος). This undermines any theory of an intentional omission due to its harsh or otherwise problematic content, and therefore a clear content-related reason for the omission of Exod 32:9 cannot be found.

The plus in Exod 32:10 SP is a similar case. Stylistically the short reference to Yahweh's wrath against Aaron and to Moses's intercession on behalf of Aaron is awkward, since it consists of a brief narrative passage, whereas the preceding and ensuing text contains mainly direct speeches by Yahweh and Moses (32:7–8, 9, 10 MT, 11–13). In addition, the reference to Aaron can be seen as a slight digression from the main line of thought, since 32:7–10 MT and 32:11–13 revolve around the relationship between Yahweh and the Israelite people that is shaken by the people's sin. Yet, all this cannot sufficiently explain why an editor would have skipped the reference to Aaron for stylistic or content-related reasons. The content of the plus in the SP is theologically weighty, since Aaron played a crucial role in the making of the golden calf (see 32:1–5), and it is very understandable that Yahweh was particularly angry with him. The plus in Exod 32:10 SP adds an important motif by stating that Aaron was only spared from Yahweh's wrath because of Moses's intercession for him. No reason can be discerned why this motif would have been deliberately omitted.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Both late additions (Exod 32:9 MT and the plus in Exod 32:10 SP) align the text of Exod 32 more closely with the parallel passage in Deut 9:8–21. Exodus 32:9 MT corresponds almost verbatim to Deut 9:13, and the plus in Exod 32:10 SP corresponds almost verbatim to Deut 9:20. Thus, the expansions not only add weighty theological motifs but also harmonize Exod 32 with Deut 9. The editors who inserted these two passages seem to have attributed to Deuteronomy a high authority. Since both passages were describing the

---

8. A similar argument has been applied to the alleged omission of Judg 6:7–10 in the Qumran manuscript 4Q49 by Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, VTSup 63 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 147 n. 178. The fact that the passage is missing in 4Q49 is, however, best explained as indicating the late origin of Judg 6:7–10, see Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 59–68.

same event, the additions were not regarded as somehow violating the older text.

To be sure, one may call these expansions harmonistic and therefore disregard their value for the shape and theological outline of Exod 32. However, one of them is found in the MT, which indicates that the MT was not unaffected by late harmonistic tendencies in the transmission of the Pentateuch, which are more common in the SP and LXX.[9] Both expansions of Exod 32, verse 9 MT and the plus in verse 10 SP belong to the same editorial processes, and therefore it is unjustified to discount the manifold harmonistic expansions of the SP as a separate phenomenon. In fact, they may have been one of the most common types of expansions in the literary development of the Pentateuch.

The editorial techniques in the two additions were applied slightly differently. The editor who inserted 32:9 after Deut 9:13 inserted the missing passage at exactly the same place where it is found in Deut 9:12–14. This was facilitated by the fact that Exod 32:7–8, 10 already corresponds roughly to Deut 9:12, 14. The plus in Exod 32:10 SP, by contrast, is taken from Deut 9:20, which is much later in the narrative sequence, and additionally the sequence of events in Deut 9:15–21 does not correspond to Exod 32. To insert the missing reference to Moses's intercession on behalf of Aaron in Exod 32:10 SP (⇐ Deut 9:20) effectively created an entirely new sequence of events.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Both additions left discernible traces in the resulting texts that would allow literary critics to reconstruct these additions even without divergent textual traditions. Exodus 32:9 is conspicuous because of the speech-introduction in 32:9a (ויאמר יהוה אל משה "Yahweh said to Moses"), which is redundant after the speech-introduction in 32:7a (וידבר יהוה אל משה "Yahweh said to Moses"). Such unnecessary speech-introductions are found in several texts, and literary critics have commonly suspected that they indicate a literary seam. The same phenomenon is found in the parallel passage in Deut 9:12–13, which may indicate an earlier literary seam. An additional argument for the secondary character of Exod 32:9 may be seen in the fact that the ensuing 32:10 refers to the Israelite people in the third-person plural (בהם ואכלם

---

9. The harmonizing tendency of the SP is commonly acknowledged. Emanuel Tov has recently highlighted a similar tendency in the LXX; see, e.g., Tov, "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24."

"against *them*, and I may consume *them*"), which continues the preceding references to the Israelites in 32:8 (סרו מהר מן הדרך אשר צויתם עשו להם ויאמרו לו ויזבחו לו וישתחוו מסכה עגל … "*they have* been quick to turn aside from the way that I commanded *them*; *they have* cast for *themselves* an image of a calf, and *have* worshiped it and sacrificed to it, and *said*"), while the intrusive 32:9 refers to העם הזה "this people."

The plus in Exod 32:10 SP is awkward, both stylistically and in content. The plus is a short narrative sequence that stands out from its context, for the preceding and ensuing passages are mainly in direct speech. The reference to Aaron has its logic within the broader context of the narrative, as shown above, but it nevertheless is a thematic digression in its immediate context in 32:7–14, since these verses revolve around the people's sin and Yahweh's wrath against the people. Also in this case, even without the variant editions, literary critics would suspect that the plus in Exod 32:10 SP may have been secondarily added.

Results. Exodus 32:9–10 contain two separate cases of late expansion, one attested by the MT/SP plus of 32:9 in relation to the LXX and one by the SP/4Q22/LXX[MS58] plus in 32:10 in relation to the other textual traditions. Both pluses are almost verbatim parallels of Deut 9, where the story of the golden calf is retold. Although found in different textual traditions and therefore added by different scribes, they attest to the same editorial tendency of harmonizing parallel passages in the Pentateuch. The passage shows that the MT was not unaffected by this process, although the tendency is more commonly attested in the SP and LXX. Both additions discussed here would be detectable even without the variant traditions.

5.2. Deuteronomy 34:1–3

Before his impending death (Deut 34:5), Moses climbs Mount Nebo where Yahweh shows him the land that was promised to the fathers (34:1–4). The description of the land in 34:1b–3 is attested in two widely divergent versions in the MT and SP:

Deut 34:1b–3 MT	Deut 34:1b–3 SP
¹ויראהו יהוה את כל הארץ את הגלעד עד דן ²ואת כל נפתלי ואת ארץ אפרים ומנשה ואת כל ארץ יהודה עד הים האחרון ³ואת הנגב ואת הככר בקעת ירחו עיר התמרים עד צער	¹ויראהו יהוה את כל הארץ מנהר מצרים עד הנהר הגדול נהר פרת ועד הים האחרון
¹ and Yahweh showed him the whole land: <u>Gilead as far as Dan,</u> ²<u>and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah</u> as far as the Western Sea, ³<u>and the Negeb, and the Plain— that is, the valley of Jericho, the city of palm trees—as far as Zoar.</u>	¹ and Yahweh showed him the whole land: <u>from the river of Egypt to the great river, the River Euphrates,</u> and as far as the Western Sea.

Except for some minor variants, the MT reading is largely shared by the LXX, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and the targumim, while the alternative description in the SP is only shared by a single Greek manuscript from the tenth century CE, which first contains the MT version and adds at the end of the verse, as an apparent harmonization, a reading that corresponds to the SP.[10] In spite of the broad textual support for the MT and the seeming isolation of the SP reading, the question of priority is not clear and one should not regard manuscript support as the main consideration in assessing the variants. Although the SP contains numerous secondary readings in relation to the MT, there are cases where it contains more original readings, with Deut 27:4 as a case in point. Inner criteria need to be adduced for reconstructing the literary historical development.

The literary contexts of the respective descriptions of the land should especially be taken into consideration. The description of the MT lists regions in Palestine counterclockwise. It begins in the eastern Jordanian

---

10. See also the note in Syh^m (attested by Andreas Masius): "sunt in Hexaplo Origenis notata obelisco eo quod in Hebraico exemplari quod apud Samaritanos extabat pro illis fuerant scripta haec *et ostendit ei dominus omnem terram a flumine aegypti usque ad flumen magnum flumen euphratem usque ad mare postremum*"; Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 373. The Greek manuscript is MS 15 (Paris, Coisl. 2): + απο του ποταμου αιγυπτου εως του ποταμου του μεγαλου ποταμου ευφρατου (Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 373).

Gilead, north of Mount Nebo, and proceeds to the land of Dan in the far north, to Naphtali in Galilee, to the large mountain range in the (north) west with the "land of Ephraim and Manasseh and all the land of Judah as far as the Western Sea," and to the Negev in the far south. The description ends with the surroundings of the Dead Sea, the plain of Jericho, "as far as Zoar." The regional perspective of the MT seems, at first glance, a fitting preparation for the ensuing book of Joshua and its detailed descriptions of the boundaries of the tribal land in chapters 13–19, since it refers to Dan, Naphtali, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah. However, Deut 34:1–3 MT does not mention all areas where, according to Josh 13–19, the Israelite tribes settled. In addition, Deut 34:1–3 MT refers to regions not explicitly related to the tribal geography, such as Gilead or "the valley of Jericho."[11] "Dan" and "all Naphtali" are primarily mentioned as regions, which does not exclude a connection with the respective tribes but does not focus on or specify this connection. In the case of Dan, the reference to this region implies that it lies in the far north.[12] This is not—at least not explicitly—related to the conception that the Danites, according to Josh 19:40–48 (cf. Judg 13–16; 17–18), originally settled in the south close to Judah but lost their territory, conquered the region around the Jordan springs, and moved there (Josh 19:47; Judg 18). The geographical terms ארץ אפרים ומנשה "the land of Ephraim and Manasseh" and ארץ יהודה "the land of Judah" are also not typical for the book of Joshua. Besides the current passage, the term ארץ אפרים is only met in Judg 12:15 and 2 Chr 30:20. The reference to Judah, in particular, seems implicitly related to its later political history in the monarchic age, and accordingly the term ארץ יהודה is only met here in the entire Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges.[13] Mentioning Dan, Naphtali, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah is anachronistic in this context, since in Moses's days these regions could hardly have had these names. Gilead, the

---

11. Note that the term בקעת ירחו "the plain of Jericho" is attested only here. The ensuing term עיר התמרים "the city of palm trees" is further only found in Judg 1:16; 3:13; 2 Chr 28:15.

12. Cf. the formulaic phrase "from Dan to Beersheba" in Judg 20:1; 1 Sam 3:20; 2 Sam 3:10; 17:11; 24:2, 15; 1 Kgs 5:5; Amos 8:14; 1 Chr 21:2; 2 Chr 30:5—which, however, refers to the city of Dan.

13. ארץ אפרים ומנשה "the land of Ephraim and Manasseh" is further only attested in 2 Chr 30:10, ארץ אפרים "the land of Ephraim" alone only in Judg 12:15; ארץ יהודה "the land of Judah" is attested much more frequently, mainly in certain parts of the book of Jeremiah (31:23; 37:1; 39:10; 40:12; 43:4–5; 44:9, 14, 28; see also, e.g., 1 Sam 22:5; 2 Kgs 25:22; Amos 7:12; Ruth 1:7; Neh 5:14; 1 Chr 6:40; 2 Chr 9:11).

Negev, Jericho, and Zoar, on the other hand, would fit into the historical fiction of Moses's days; while the reference to Jericho seems to prepare the narrative for the conquest that commences with the conquest of Jericho (Josh 2; 6), Zoar refers back to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, where it is mentioned as a place of refuge for Lot (Gen 19:22–23, 30; see also Gen 13:10; 14:2, 8).[14] In sum, the description of the land in the MT is not closely connected with the detailed geographical system of Josh 13–19. Rather, it gives a certain view on the promised land by mentioning those regions that figure most prominently in Israel's later history. It looks forward to the conquest by Joshua and the future life in the monarchic period.[15]

The description of the land given by the SP, by contrast, has much larger dimensions, and it implies a Greater Israel that would encompass much of the Levant. These dimensions are implied in some texts (e.g., Gen 15:18; Exod 15:18; 23:31; Deut 1:7; 11:24; Josh 1:4), where Yahweh promises to give the Israelites all land from the Euphrates to Egypt, and some texts (e.g., 1 Kgs 4:21, 24) have also adopted this conception for the Solomonic period. Whereas the MT version is more closely connected with the history of Israel as portrayed in the Hebrew Bible, the SP version represents an idealistic view more connected with Yahweh's promise to Abraham in Gen 15:18 and related texts.

There are basically three alternatives to explain the variants. Since the texts partly overlap, one of the versions could be the result of replacements. If this took place in the SP, an editor would have removed the more specific description and smaller borders, as preserved in the MT, because it contradicted Yahweh's promise to Abraham that all of the land from the Euphrates to Egypt belongs to Israel (Gen 15:18). A second alternative is to assume that an unrealistic extent of Israel was moderated in the MT. The third alternative is to assume that neither MT or SP is more original but both contain later expansions, in which case the original text would be found in the shared reading "and Yahweh showed him the whole land as far as the Western Sea," ויראהו יהוה את כל הארץ עד הים האחרון. A very definite conclusion is hardly possible here, but the third alternative may be the most probable one for the following reasons. Rewriting implies the omission of parts of the text, but they are very rare and mainly took place

---

14. Apart from these instances, Zoar is mentioned only in Isa 15:5 and Jer 48:34.
15. Thus also Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 394–95.

when the older text contained something clearly problematic. This speaks against the assumption that one of the variants derives from the other. The expansion of the territory, if the SP is regarded secondary to the MT, could easily have been reached without omissions, and therefore it is unlikely that the MT variant was the basis for the SP variant. The intentional contraction of the territory would be more difficult to reach without omitting a reference to the Euphrates and Egypt, but this alternative is improbable in any case, because it is difficult to see a motive to do so, especially since the larger territory is mentioned elsewhere in Deuteronomy (Deut 1:7; 11:24) and it also accords with Yahweh's promise to Abraham (Gen 15:18). If the SP were older, one would have to assume that an editor in the proto-MT transmission intentionally challenged the promise. This is very unlikely, since the following verse (Deut 34:4) explicitly refers to the promise. Therefore, it is unlikely that the SP variant lies behind the MT variant. It is also significant that the reading shared by both versions ("and Yahweh showed him the whole land as far as the Western Sea") is fully consistent in a context that does necessitate a definition, because the text is about Moses's death before he can enter the promised land.

The SP version contains a detail that may imply an editorial intervention. The idea that the whole land was shown from Egypt to the Euphrates is, as such, logical, but after this, the reference to "as far as the Western Sea" is superfluous. Already the double use of "as far as" (עד) for the same referent is unusual. It is also possible to see a motive for an expansion in the SP. As Deut 34:4 refers to the promise to Abraham, an editor would have been tempted to expand the text to accord with the promise in Gen 15:18.

The MT may be somewhat more realistic, but it also contains details that imply two authors, the latter of which may have had a different literary horizon. In the MT the first object את כל הארץ "the whole land" is, in terms of content, on a different level than the following ones, which thus specify what exactly "the whole land" included; herein lies a problem. If the initial statement referred to the whole land, how does it relate to "the land of Ephraim" and "the land of Judah"? In all these cases the text uses the word ארץ. Without any further details, כל הארץ "the whole land" merely refers to the area in front of Moses until the Western Sea, and the question does not even arise what exactly was meant by the word ארץ. In the MT plus the same word defines the borders rather clearly, and the word ארץ implies a different understanding than כל הארץ. In other words, כל הארץ is clear by itself, but after the MT plus the reader is puzzled as to what exactly was

meant by the first use of the word. This problem is crystallized when we compare את כל ארץ יהודה and את כל הארץ. Although not entirely impossible from a single author, it is more probable that the MT plus derives from a later editor who had a different conception of the promised land than the older text. A further argument is the change of focus from Moses's death before he can enter the promised land to Israel's future life in the land. Notably, apparently without any reference (or familiarity?) to the SP reading, Carl Steuernagel assumed that the sentence ויראהו יהוה את כל הארץ, "and Yahweh showed him the whole land" derives from a different author than the following text.[16] Similarly, many other scholars have divided the verse into two or more different literary layers, which indicates that the MT version is problematic.[17]

Consequently, the most probable explanation for the variants is that both pluses are later and independent additions. It is also significant that the text runs very smoothly without either plus, so the text does not necessitate a closer definition of the area. That the land area was left unspecified would have easily occasioned an expansion, and this would explain that the text was separately expanded in two different traditions, the SP following a more idealistic conception and the MT following a more limited conception.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. As accidental changes can be excluded, the two realistic alternatives are intentional replacements in one of the versions. One could argue that the proto-SP transmission removed the detailed description, because it was too much centered on Judah. Although the MT version also mentions other areas, including those in the ancient Northern Kingdom, by mentioning Judah and areas south of Judah, it can easily be read as leading to the monarchic Judah. The use of the term ארץ יהודה could further enhance this understanding. Although this is not an impossible course of events, the same effect would have been reached by removing the reference to Judah. If the Judah-centeredness were the problem, there would be no reason to omit references to the heartland of the Northern Kingdom, Manasseh and Ephraim. On the other hand, if the motive was mainly to expand the area to accord with the more idealistic conceptions of ancient Israel, one

---

16. Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 129–30.
17. See the chart of positions in early research in Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 112–13.

could do so without omitting many of the details. It would be unproblematic to include a reference of Moses seeing the heartland of the Northern Kingdom, and its extension to Egypt and the Euphrates would certainly not be objectionable to a proto-Samaritan reviser. The revision by omitting would also go against the apparent tendency of the SP to harmonize by expansion. In most cases the SP includes both versions in its attempt to harmonize between accounts or passages (e.g., Exod 20–21). Consequently, the SP variant is unlikely to be dependent on the MT variant.

The other alternative is to assume an omission of an inclusive portrayal of Israel in the proto-MT transmission, but this would be unmotivated and run counter to a typical development in the Hebrew Bible. There is no text-critical evidence of such a tendency in other passages where an idealistic description had been reduced, and in this case it would also imply that a specific connection with Yahweh's promise to Abraham had been partially and intentionally severed (cf. Gen 15:18 and Deut 34:4). Although we can hardly gain any certainty in this case, the most probable solution appears to be that the shared reading is original, because it can explain how both pluses emerged, and it avoids the problems involved if one of the variants is dependent on the other. Notably, most commentators ignore the SP reading and follow the MT.[18] Nevertheless, many assume that the passage contains various different elements.[19]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The variant readings in the MT and SP are theologically very consequential. Both show a very typical development where a general reference was given more substance in the additions, and in this case a general reference to the land was defined. Although the result was different, both were influenced by conceptions in other passages of the Hebrew Bible. The SP, which attributes much larger

---

18. Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 113; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 129–30; Driver, *Deuteronomy*; 417–19; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 411–12; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 394–95. A notable exception to this is Georg Braulik, *Deuteronomium II: 16:18–34:12*, NEchtB 28 (Würzburg: Echter, 1992), 245, but he merely notes that the Samaritan version has a different description of the land connected with Gen 15:18 and Deut 11:24.

19. E.g., according to Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 394–95, "the chapter is a fusion of Priestly and Deuteronomistic materials." Similarly since early research, e.g., Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 209–10; Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 245. For an illustrative chart of different positions in early research, see Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 112–13.

boundaries to the promised land than the MT, is primarily influenced by passages that rise out of Yahweh's promise to Abraham (Gen 15:18; Exod 15:18; 23:31; Deut 11:24; Josh 1:4; 1 Kgs 4:21, 24). It is understandable that the SP was more prone to adopt a more inclusive conception, because the more specific one is more clearly centered on Judah. The MT, on the other hand, connected the definition of the land with the conquest and especially with Israel's future in the land. In this respect, both the proto-MT and the proto-SP were very similarly developed by exegetical additions, but in two different directions.

The variants are also remarkable from a technical perspective. This is not a case of linear textual growth, where a given text was successfully expanded. The SP's reading is in fact shorter than the MT, but this does not say anything about which version is older, or how both versions relate to each other. At the same time, both descriptions, although widely divergent regarding the geographical dimensions of the land, overlap in one passage: ו]עד הים האחרון["[and] as far as the Western Sea." This is an important detail for reconstructing the literary historical development.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Both versions contain details that could raise suspicions as to whether the text was edited. For example, a careful critic would have asked what lies behind the concept of the whole land, since the ensuing text also uses the same Hebrew word for land, ארץ. The wider literary horizon and future life in the land would also beg for an explanation. Although it is unlikely that one would have been able to identify the exact addition and reconstruct the here-assumed original text, many literary critical reconstructions from early research clearly show that even without the SP, which was not mentioned as an argument, one would have detected tensions within the passage. With the exception of the sentence ועד הים האחרון, "as far as the Western Sea," Carl Steuernagel, for example, assumed that the reference to the whole land derives from a different author than the detailed description.[20] The SP is less conspicuous than the MT, and it is very possible that despite the unusual double use of the word עד "as far as" a critic would probably not be able to detect an editorial intervention based on this textual tradition alone.

---

20. Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 129–30.

Results. Although certainty can hardly be reached, the shared reading of Deut 34:1–3 probably represents the older text, while both the MT and SP contain independent additions. Both are typical exegetical additions where a general reference was specified by linking the text with other biblical passages or conceptions. Without the variant readings, one could have noted the tensions in the MT and perhaps assume two different authors, but it would have been difficult to reconstruct the older text precisely. The SP addition would probably go undetected without the variant.

5.3. Joshua 8

Joshua 8:1–29 describes the conquest of Ai. Telling Joshua to take the whole army with him for the attack, Yahweh promises to deliver the city and its possessions to the Israelites (8:1–2). Joshua 8:4–8 contain Joshua's instructions to the people concerning the conquest. There are several text-critical variants between the LXX and the MT throughout the passage, but our focus here is on 8:7–8, which contains a particularly illuminating addition. Joshua's instructions are concluded by a large plus in the MT. In the LXX version Joshua's instructions are solely tactical in nature, while in the MT version Joshua already reveals to the army that Yahweh will deliver the city to them, which thus introduces a theological aspect. Moreover, in the MT Joshua tells the soldiers that after the conquest they should set the city on fire. Besides the plus, two small variants seem to be connected to the plus. Several Greek manuscripts and daughter translations follow the MT and include the plus, but this is most probably due to a later harmonization toward a proto-MT tradition. Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, for example, lack the plus and probably preserve the OG. Targum Jonathan and the Vulgate follow the MT plus.[21] A fragment of Josh 8:7–8 is preserved in 4Q47 (4QJosh[a]) and it seems to contain a reference to the burning of the city (...את הע[יר באש]...), which is lacking in the LXX.[22]

---

21. Note that the Vulgate lacks a reference to the word of Yahweh in 8:8 and thereby may partly follow the LXX, but the text is not unambigious in this respect: [7]*Nobis ergo fugientibus et illis sequentibus consurgetis de insidiis et vastabitis civitatem tradetque eam Dominus Deus vester in manus vestras* [8]*cumque ceperitis succendite eam sic omnia facietis ut iussi.*

22. Eugene Ulrich, "4QJosh[a] (Pls. XXXII–XXXIV)," in Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to King*, 145–47, characterizes 4Q47 as an independent textual

Josh 8:7–8 MT	Josh 8:7–8 OG
⁷ואתם תקמו מהאורב והורשתם את העיר ונתנה יהוה אלהיכם בידכם ⁸והיה כתפשכם את העיר תציתו את העיר באש כדבר יהוה תעשו ראו צויתי אתכם	⁷ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐξαναστήσεσθε ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας καὶ πορεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν. ⁸κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ποιήσετε· ἰδοὺ ἐντέταλμαι ὑμῖν.

³So Joshua and all the soldiers set out to go up against Ai. Joshua chose thirty thousand warriors and sent them out by night ⁴with the command, "You shall lie in ambush behind the city.… ⁷And you shall rise up from the ambush and <u>seize</u> the city, <u>for Yahweh your God will give it into your hand. ⁸And when you have taken the city, you shall set the city on fire</u>; you shall do according to the word <u>of Yahweh</u>; see, I have commanded you."	³And Joshua and all the soldiers set out to go up against Ai. Joshua chose thirty thousand warriors and sent them out by night ⁴with the command, "You shall lie in ambush behind the city.… ⁷And you shall rise up out of the ambush and <u>approach</u> the city. ⁸You shall do according to <u>this</u> word; see, I have commanded you."

Despite somewhat stronger textual support, it is likely that the plus in the MT is a later addition. The text appears to refer to the word of Yahweh, according to which one should set the city on fire, but Yahweh's message to Joshua in 8:1–2 does not mention the burning of the city. Yahweh only tells Joshua to do "to Ai and his king" as he did "to Jericho and his king," and, according to Josh 6:24, Jericho was burned after being conquered. In other words, in his command to Joshua in Josh 8:1–2, Yahweh could be understood to have implied that Ai should also be burned down, and, according to 8:19 and 28, the Israelites did in fact set the city on fire. It stands to reason that the actual description of the burning, the implicit commandment, and the example of Jericho were the causes for the addition. The editor who inserted the MT plus made explicit what was implicitly meant by the preceding command.

---

witness. Nevertheless, in the variant readings it more often than not disagrees with the MT (only twice with MT and twenty-four times against MT); see Lange, *Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran*, 187. According to Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.), 116, 4Q47 belongs to nonaligned manuscripts that "diverge significantly from the other texts."

The addition of 8:7b, 8aα seems to have accompanied two other adjustments in the text. A closer examination reveals that only a direction of development from a shorter text-form, as implied by the Greek version, to the longer version, as preserved in the MT, is conceivable. The small variant between כדבר יהוה תעשו "you shall do according to the word of Yahweh" and κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ποιήσετε "you shall do according to this word," which seems to attest the Hebrew *Vorlage* כדבר הזה תעשו, gives hints about the editor's motives. By inserting the theological term דבר יהוה "the word of Yahweh," MT stresses that the instruction was of divine origin, while the version attested by the OG implies that the people simply were called to follow Joshua's instruction.[23] By replacing כדבר הזה "according to this word" with כדבר יהוה "according to the word of Yahweh"—using the widespread formulaic term דבר יהוה "the word of Yahweh"—the text was theologized and Yahweh's involvement was increased.[24]

According to 8:7aβ MT the Israelites should "seize the city" (והורשתם את העיר), but according to the OG they are commanded to "approach the city" (πορεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν); in 8:11, the verb πορεύειν is used to translate the Hebrew ויגשו "and they approached," which implies that the *Vorlage* in 8:7 similarly referred to approaching and not seizing. It would be understandable that the idea of approaching the city was changed to seizing the city, because if they are told to set the city on fire, it is clear that they also approach the city.[25] Moreover, the MT variant is more Deuteronomistic in nature, and it is possible that the text was changed to accord more clearly with a model of conquest implied in Deuteronomy: the idea of seizing conquered territories is frequently mentioned in Deuteronomy. One should also note the Deuteronomistic nature of the conceptions in the MT plus that Yahweh delivers the enemies in Israel's hand. Consequently, the LXX πορεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν probably goes back to a more original reading than the MT והורשתם את העיר.[26]

---

23. Thus also Holzinger, *Josua*, 25.

24. The term is paricularly frequent in Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Cf. the similar replacement in 1 Sam 1:23 MT (see ch. 9, "Replacements").

25. Notably, the LXX parallels to the MT verb ירש differ. Although not systematically throughout the book, the LXX often has an equivalent that does not necessarily go back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* with the same verb; thus in Josh 3:10; 13:12; 14:12; 15:14; 17:12: 23:5, 9. This phenomenon should be investigated in more detail.

26. Thus many, e.g., Holzinger, *Josua*, 25, Holmes, *Joshua*, 41, Nelson, *Joshua*, 109.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. According to some scholars, the LXX reading is the result of an accidental omission.[27] For example, Nelson argues that the Greek variant was caused by "an inner-Greek haplography," as there is a "graphic similarity in uncial letters between *kai* and *kata*."[28] This is certainly a theoretical possibility, but the parallel is two letters only. With the other differences in these verses and in many other parts of the passage, this theory should only be preferred if other explanations are questionable. Another accidental mistake could be suggested between כדבר יהוה תעשו and κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ποιήσετε: כדבר הזה and כדבר יהוה could have been confused.[29] This also cannot be completely excluded, and taken in connection with the large minus in the LXX (in 8:7b–8aα), one could then suggest that the Greek version was particularly poorly transmitted. However, when one looks at the other differences in the passage, there seems to be a clear tendency in the MT to contain pluses in relation to the LXX: 8:1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 26, 29. Since many of these pluses are also not found in 4Q47, one can exclude inner-Greek mistakes or omissions in the translation.[30] In most cases, the pluses add detail that is not indispensable for the story, and it is hardly a coincidence that the MT version is generally much more expansive than the LXX. Although accidental omissions can never be fully excluded, one should only prefer such a theory if there is a clear technical reason that could have triggered the omission and the theory is more probable than an alternative theory. If the omission is dispensable and the resulting text without the lacking text is clear, the probability of a haplography is substantially decreased. Moreover, there seems to be a connection between all three variants in these verses. The MT version is more theological and Deuteronomistic than the LXX. It

---

27. Thus Holzinger, *Josua*, 25, and Nelson, *Joshua*, 109. Holmes, *Joshua*, 41–42, also mentions this possibility—"the omission … in the LXX may be accidental"—but he also evokes the possibility that the MT is the result of "a harmonizing or 'anticipatory' insertion from v. 19." Some commentators, such as Rösel, *Joshua*, 124–25, make no mention of the Greek variant, thus implying that it is a secondary reading.

28. Nelson, *Joshua*, 109.

29. Thus Holmes, *Joshua*, 42, who points out that a similar confusion may have taken place in 1 Sam 2:23. Similarly Nelson, *Joshua*, 109.

30. Clearly, one should discuss each difference on its own account. It is certainly possible that some of the minuses in the Greek are indeed accidental omissions. E.g., the Greek of 8:12 is somewhat clumsy, and therefore A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus*, BSCS (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 148, suggests that it may be "the remnant of a longer sentence such as we find in the MT."

would be quite a coincidence that the text had been accidentally corrupted in the Greek version in three different issues that effectively de-theologized and de-Deuteronomized the passage. One would have to assume that Yahweh and Deuteronomistic elements were accidentally omitted. Therefore, the balance tips strongly in favor of assuming intentional additions in the MT version. The preference for the MT is possible only by an a priori position against other textual witnesses.[31] Such a position should be rejected, and therefore the LXX variants in Josh 8:7–8 should not be regarded as the result of accidental omissions and other mistakes.[32]

One could also argue that the Greek version is the result of an intentional shortening, but this theory would imply that a later editor secondarily de-theologized the text by removing Yahweh's involvement.[33] It would be very difficult to find any motive for this, and it would also run counter to the direction of development one can see in Joshua and in other parts of the Hebrew Bible.[34] It is more probable that a later editor wanted to increase Yahweh's involvement and Deuteronomistic conceptions in the conquest story of Ai.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Joshua 8:7–8 was substantially and intentionally revised in the MT version. The revision is part of a wider theologizing tendency to increase Yahweh's involvement and to link events with conceptions implied in Deuteronomy. This is a

---

31. E.g., Rösel, *Joshua*, 21, discusses the general priority between the MT and LXX, and notes that "most opt for the MT version, probably rightly so." According to him, "[a] safe option is to choose the MT as the basis, but always to note and discuss important LXX variants." Nevertheless, he fails to discuss any of the variants in Josh 8:7–8 (see pp. 124–25). This is a very typical practical consequence of taking the MT as the basis. Although one does not completely reject the variant, this is easily what happens in practice.

32. See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, CBET 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 106. Nelson, *Joshua*, 22, notes that the Greek version of Joshua has a "textual value at least equal to that of MT."

33. To our knowledge the intentional shortening theory has not been explicitly argued, but it is not uncommon that biblical scholars disregard the LXX readings by implying that the LXX tends to shorten. Many commentators make no reference the LXX variants in Josh 8:7–8, thus, e.g., Rösel, *Joshua*, 124–25.

34. E.g., De Troyer, "History of the Biblical Text," 243–44, has shown a similar tendency to secondarily increase Yahweh's power and involvement in the events.

very typical development observed and assumed in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. The revision was inspired by different parts of Joshua and Deuteronomy.[35]

The revisions in Josh 8:7–8 are so extensive that they were probably made when the entire manuscript was reproduced. In addition to a rather long expansion, some words in the older text had to be replaced. Although there seems to be no unequivocal thematic connection with the other MT pluses found in this passage, it is possible that some of them derive from the same editor who added detail. On the other hand, 4Q47 sometimes follows the MT pluses (e.g., Josh 8:4, 8) and sometimes the LXX minuses (e.g., Josh 8:9, 13, 14), which implies that the changes took place in different stages and different literary traditions. If many of the variants are indeed additions in the MT version, it would imply that the MT transmission generally allowed more freedom of revising the text than the transmission of the LXX and its *Vorlage*.[36] The Deuteronomistic nature of the text-critical variants in other parts of Joshua should be investigated more systematically, but this lies beyond the possibilities of the current volume.[37] Nevertheless, the MT plus in Josh 23:16b, also discussed in the current volume, seems to have a similar tendency.

One should also note that the addition was skillfully made. It continues with consecutive perfects already begun in the older text and switches to the imperative that continues in the ensuing text. The repetition of words from the older text, Josh 8:19 (note the nearly identical sentences ויציתו את העיר באש and תציתו את העיר באש), is a typical technique suspected and found in many later additions. Nevertheless, the plus does not repeat any elements from its immediate context.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the older textual stage, as preserved in the Greek version, it would have been difficult to detect the

---

35. According to Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 181, the addition was made in order to prepare for Josh 8:19, but it is probable that the revision has an even wider focus.

36. Many additions were made to the MT according to some, e.g., Nelson, *Joshua*, 108–10.

37. De Troyer, "History of the Biblical Text," 243–44, has similarly observed theologizing MT variants in different parts of Joshua. Ville Mäkipelto, *Uncovering Ancient Editing: Documented Evidence of Changes in Josh 24 and Related Texts*, BZAW 513 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 220–24, has observed text-critical variants in Josh 24, which have a theologizing tendency with Deuteronomistic features.

later revision on the basis of the MT alone. Although it increases Yahweh's involvement, the addition does not essentially stick out from its context, and the contents of the addition do not contradict the older text. Yahweh has a clear role in the conquest story in any case (e.g., Josh 8:1–2). There are also no syntactic problems that would lead the critic to suspect an editorial intervention. The only factor that could suggest an addition is the reference to Yahweh's word that the city should be burned, because Yahweh's instructions in the preceding text does not refer to burning. In Josh 8:1–2 he only orders Joshua to seize the city that he gives into their hand and take its spoil. The secondary features do not give much room for arguing a later editorial intervention, although the MT changes correspond very well to the type of changes that are often assumed in literary criticism: utilizing Deuteronomistic conceptions and expressions, Yahweh's involvement was increased.

Results. The MT of Josh 8:7–8 is the result of a substantial revision where Yahweh's involvement in the events and Deuteronomistic characteristics were increased. Similar changes have been observed and assumed in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. The editorial changes were skillfully made and therefore it would have been very difficult to detect and reconstruct the older text, had it not been preserved in the LXX version.

5.4. Joshua 23:16

Joshua 23 contains Joshua's farewell speech where he instructs the Israelites on how they should live in the land in order to keep it in their possession. In 23:15–16 he warns that the worship of other gods and transgression of the covenant will lead to banishment from the land. This warning contains a notable text-critical variant. The LXX version lacks 23:16b, which refers to Yahweh's anger as an additional result to the sins. The MT plus is followed in the Vulgate, Peshitta, and Targum Jonathan. The same applies to some Greek manuscripts (e.g., Cambridge sigla: eb-hjkm-qstvxy^{a}zb$_2$) and daughter translations of the LXX (Syro-Hexapla, Armenian, and Ethiopic), but this is probably due to a later harmonization toward a proto-MT, while the shorter reading goes back to the Old Greek. The passage is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Josh 23:15–16 MT	Josh 23:15–16 LXX
¹⁵והיה כאשר בא עליכם כל הדבר הטוב אשר דבר יהוה <u>אלהיכם</u> אליכם כן יביא יהוה עליכם את כל הדבר הרע עד השמידו אותכם מעל האדמה הטובה הזאת אשר נתן לכם יהוה <u>אלהיכם</u> ¹⁶בעברכם את ברית יהוה אלהיכם אשר צוה אתכם והלכתם ועבדתם אלהים אחרים והשתחויתם להם <u>וחרה אף יהוה בכם ואבדתם מהרה</u> <u>מעל הארץ הטובה אשר נתן לכם</u>	¹⁵καὶ ἔσται ὃν τρόπον ἥκει ἐφ᾿ ὑμᾶς πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τὰ καλά, ἃ ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς, οὕτως ἐπάξει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐφ᾿ ὑμᾶς πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τὰ πονηρά, ἕως ἂν ἐξολεθρεύσῃ ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς ταύτης, ἧς ἔδωκεν κύριος ὑμῖν, ¹⁶ἐν τῷ παραβῆναι ὑμᾶς τὴν διαθήκην κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, ἣν ἐνετείλατο ὑμῖν, καὶ πορευθέντες λατρεύσητε θεοῖς ἑτέροις καὶ προσκυνήσητε αὐτοῖς.
¹⁵As all the good things that Yahweh <u>your God</u> promised you have come upon you, so Yahweh will bring upon you all the bad things, until he has destroyed you from this good land that Yahweh <u>your God</u> has given you. ¹⁶If you transgress the covenant of Yahweh your God, which he commanded you, and go and serve other gods and worship them, <u>then the anger of Yahweh</u> <u>will be kindled against you, and you</u> <u>shall perish quickly from the good land</u> <u>that he has given to you</u>.	¹⁵As all the good things that the Lord promised you have come upon you, so the Lord <u>God</u> will bring upon you all the bad things, until he has destroyed you from this good land that the Lord has given you, ¹⁶if you transgress the covenant of the Lord your God, which he commanded you, and go to serve other gods and worship them.

It is highly probable that the MT plus in Josh 23:16b is a later addition and that the shorter Greek text preserves the more original textual stage.[38] This is suggested by the redundant additional punishment in the MT 23:16b. Joshua 23:16a is the condition for the punishments that have already been mentioned in 23:15. However, if 23:16a is the condition for the punishment in 23:16b, as implied in the MT version, the punishments in 23:15

---

38. Thus many, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 241; Holmes, *Joshua*, 78; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 1st ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), 228; Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology*.

hang in the air.[39] It is syntactically and logically awkward and thereby improbable that 23:16a could reasonably function as the condition for the punishments in both 23:15 and 16b at the same time. Moreover, 23:15 and 16b partly describe the same punishment—banishment from the land—partly duplicating the same sentence. It is very unlikely that the same author would have created the text in this way placing the same punishment for the transgression before and after it, thus creating a confusing syntactical and logical relationship between the sections:

Josh 23:16b: ואבדתם מהרה מעל הארץ הטובה אשר נתן לכם

Josh 23:15: עד השמידו אותכם מעל האדמה הטובה הזאת אשר נתן לכם יהוה אלהיכם

Although the sentences are otherwise similar, 23:16b uses a different word to refer to the land than does 23:15, האדמה for הארץ, which strongly suggests different authorship and may also reveal the origin of the addition. The context in Josh 23 does not provide any reason why the word for land should be different when the sentences are otherwise similar and the same punishment is meant in both cases. Moreover, the destruction caused by Yahweh is also expressed with a different verb: 23:16b uses אבד instead of השמיד, which is used in 23:15. The reason for the different vocabulary may be the background of 23:16, which appears to be a partial quotation of Deut 11:16–17:[40]

Josh 23:16	Deut 11:17
ועבדתם אלהים אחרים	ועבדתם אלהים אחרים
והשתחויתם להם	והשתחויתם להם
וחרה אף יהוה בכם	וחרה אף יהוה בכם ועצר את השמים
	ולא יהיה מטר והאדמה לא תתן את יבולה
ואבדתם מהרה מעל הארץ הטובה	ואבדתם מהרה מעל הארץ הטבה
אשר נתן לכם	אשר יהוה נתן לכם

Joshua 23:16b uses different vocabulary than 23:15, and the vocabulary of

---

39. As noted by Holmes, *Joshua*, 78, about 23:16b: "Its insertion arose from the Hebrew editor not perceiving that v. 16 is the protasis of v. 15; otherwise v. 15 is an unconditional threat."

40. Thus many since early research, e.g., Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua*, 238. Joshua 23:16b skips a large section of Deut 11:17, but apparently the reference to the lack of rain was unnecessary in Josh 23.

Deut 11:17 differs from Josh 23:15. It is very likely that the partial quota-
tion of Deuteronomy in Josh 23:16b is a secondary addition. The link with
Deut 11 was made already in Josh 23:16a, but a later editor has empha-
sized it by quoting an even longer section of Deuteronomy. Similar links
with the Pentateuch and Deuteronomy in particular can be found in many
parts of Josh 23–24 (cf. Josh 23:12–13 and Deut 7:3, 16), and it stands to
reason that these links are the result of many successive later editors.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. According to some schol-
ars, such as Robert Boling and Richard Nelson, 23:16b was accidentally
omitted by haplography in the LXX.[41] This theory, rejected by most schol-
ars of Joshua with a text-critical approach, would mean that the omission
is nearly haphazard. The final words of 23:16a and 16b are similar but not
identical (להם and לכם), and the omission is rather long. Although this
alternative cannot be completely ruled out, it would be quite a coincidence
that a scribal lapse of one similar looking word produced a coherent unit
and resulted in a fully logical text. In view of the evident problems with
23:16b, as shown above, the arguments in favor of an intentional addition
are far weightier.

     Another possibility is to assume an intentional omission in the
LXX tradition. This is even less likely than an accidental omission. One
could suggest that an editor sought to erase the repetition and tensions.
Although this is theoretically possible, it would imply a broader tendency
to this effect in the LXX. It is also unlikely that the idea of Yahweh's anger
would have been omitted. An editor seeking to improve the text would not
remove important theological concepts in the process, but would certainly
seek to include them in the improved text. In any case, there are no signs in
the LXX of Joshua of the removal of repetitions. For example, Josh 23–24
contain many repetitions of the same ideas, but the LXX still largely pre-
serves them. The differences between the MT and the LXX are of different
nature. For these reasons, it is more likely that the MT plus in Josh 23:16b
is secondary in relation to the shorter Old Greek reading.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Joshua 23:16b was
inspired by Deut 11:17. Similar additions that seek to connect a narra-

---

41. Robert G. Boling, *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*, AB
6 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), 521; Nelson, *Joshua*, 254–55.

tive with the commandments in the Pentateuch can be found in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. There are several links between Josh 23–24 and the Pentateuch, although not all are necessarily later additions. The links were probably made in successive stages by different editors. The addition of Josh 23:16b introduces Yahweh's anger into the passage. It is a good example of where an editorial intervention made a notable theological difference by introducing a new concept.[42] It also highlights the existence of additions inspired by Deuteronomy, and it can also be characterized as an example of harmonizing between passages. Joshua 23:16b thus provides documented evidence for a very typical addition that has often been assumed in historical criticism.

The addition also confirms a common assumption that an expansion often repeats elements of the older text, in what is often called the *Wiederaufnahme*. This was done in order to connect the addition in some way with the older text, which thus often created a disturbing repetition as in Josh 23:16b. In this case, the repetition also created a logical and narrative confusion as the punishment for the same sins is presented twice in the MT.

Because of the length of the addition, it is probable that it was made when the whole text was reproduced. Nevertheless, it would have been technically possible to add the plus between the lines. Such additions can be found, for example, in the great Isaiah Scroll of Qumran. Another possibility is to assume that Josh 23 originally concluded the book, in which case there may have been space at the end of the manuscript at some point of transmission to make the addition without reproducing the entire manuscript.[43]

Detectability by Literary Criticism. The problems with Josh 23:16b are apparent. Because of partly different vocabulary and the apparent tension between 23:15 and 16b, it would have been possible for a literary critic to detect the addition in the MT without the shorter LXX version. By using conventional criteria and methods of literary criticism, one could also have reconstructed the older stage of the text. This passage thus cor-

---

42. The concept of God's anger appears to be a latecomer throughout the historical books from Joshua to Kings; see Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology*.

43. Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 94–98, argues for Josh 23 concluding the book.

roborates the observation made in other analyses that a more substantial addition provides more tools for literary critics to detect the addition. We have seen many examples of very short additions, which are clearly much more difficult to detect without documented evidence.

Results. Joshua 23:16b MT is a later addition that introduced the idea of Yahweh's anger, which will be kindled if the Israelites sin against him. The addition is typical of assumed later additions and accords with the assumption that Deuteronomy secondarily influenced other parts of the Hebrew Bible. It is very likely that a literary critic would have detected the addition and been able to reconstruct the older stage without the older text as preserved in the LXX.

5.5. 2 Samuel 18:8–21

The relationship between the MT and LXX versions of 1 Sam 17–18 has been heavily debated since early research and the priority of both versions has had supporters. Some scholars have assumed that the LXX has omitted much of the material in the translation process, while others have argued that the LXX generally preserves an earlier version of the text.[44] In the latter case, the MT would have been secondarily expanded.[45]

------

44. For those assuming omitted material, see, e.g., Abraham Kuenen, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig 1890), 1.2:61; Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel: Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Giessen: Ricker, 1890), 212; Joseph Schmid, "Septuagintageschichtliche Studien zum 1. Samuelbuch" (PhD diss., University of Breslau, 1941), 118; Dominique Barthélémy, "La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel," in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna*, ed. Emanuel Tov (Jerusalem: Academon, 1980) 1–44, esp. 17–20; contributions by Barthélémy and Gooding in Barthélémy, *Story of David and Goliath*; Arie van der Kooij, "The Story of David and Goliath—The Early History of Its Text," *ETL* 68 (1992): 118–31.

45. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels*, 67; Henry P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899), 150; Carl Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), 317; Norman C. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament*, GBS (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 10–11; Hans Joachim Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. XVII 1–XVIII 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta," *VT* 6 (1956): 410–13. Most recently this position is argued by Christian Seppänen, "The Hebrew Text of Samuel: Differences in 1 Sam 1–2 Sam 9 between the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Qumran Scrolls"

Emanuel Tov and others have convincingly shown that the transla-
tion technique of the LXX has been rather faithful in the sections that
both versions share, which makes it difficult to explain how the transla-
tor could have omitted about 44 percent of the text in 1 Samuel 17–18.[46]
It is therefore probable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX was already
essentially different from the MT, which implies the existence of two
essentially different Hebrew editions of the episode. With many scholars,
Tov assumes that the MT pluses in 1 Sam 17–18 derived from a merger of
two different versions of the same story, whereas the LXX would preserve
the earlier stage of the text that is familiar with only one account. The LXX
would thus generally preserve the older text. This seems to be the most
convincing theory that explains the differences between the versions. Nev-
ertheless, each text-critical difference between the two versions should be
determined separately, and other textual witnesses need to be considered
as well. It is very possible that the LXX also contains some later additions
that are not included in the MT version. Many scholars have assumed
that the MT pluses derived from an external source. Although this theory
seems possible and perhaps even persuasive for some pluses of 1 Sam 17,
the pluses in 1 Sam 18 can also be explained as exegetical expansions that
do not necessitate an external source.

Many Greek manuscripts follow the MT and include the pluses (e.g.,
Codex Alexandrinus and the Lucianic group), but it is generally assumed
that these are due to later recensions toward the MT. The shorter reading
is found, for example, in Codex Vaticanus and this probably goes back to
the Old Greek and its Hebrew *Vorlage*. 4Q51 may preserve some words of
18:4–5 (in frag. 7), while 1Q7 (1QSam) preserves some words of 18:17–18.
Since these verses are missing in the LXX, it seems probable that at least
1Q7, which is generally characterized as a manuscript close to the proto-
MT, generally follows the MT.[47] The textual affiliation of 4Q51 is some-

---

(PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2018), 117–53; http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:ISBN 978-
951-51-4297-9.

46. Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Differences between MT and the LXX",
"Response by E. Tov," and "Conclusion by E. Tov." in Barthélémy, *Story of David and
Goliath*, 19–46, 92–94, 129–137. The LXX translation of Samuel is generally regarded
as rather faithful to its *Vorlage*; see, Siegfried Kreutzer, "5.4 Septuagint (Samuel)", in
Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, 5.4.4.1; http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-
4107_thb_COM_0005040000.

47. Thus, e.g., Lange, *Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran*, 214.

what more complicated, but Frank Moore Cross and Eugene Ulrich have shown connections with the assumed *Vorlage* of the Old Greek.[48] In 1 Sam 18:4–5, 4Q51 would thus go against its proposed affiliation. Nonetheless, the fragment is too poorly preserved—only some letters are visible—to determine how 4Q51 relates to the other variants between the MT and OG in 1 Sam 18.

First Samuel 18:6–30 describes the aftermath of the battle between David and Goliath. King Saul gradually becomes suspicious of David (18:9), because the people celebrate the new hero more than him (18:7–8). Thereafter Saul's actions are motivated by fear of David (18:12, 15, 29). Saul's fear of David only grows gradually, and therefore he still ascribes David a military unit (18:13) and gives his daughter to him in marriage (18:17–20). In addition to several minor differences between the MT and the LXX, the passage contains two large pluses in the MT: There is an additional scene where Saul seeks to kill David with a spear (18:10–11) and an episode where David's planned marriage to Saul's daughter Merab fails because she was unexpectedly given to another man (18:17–19). Our focus here is on these two larger pluses, but some of the other variants are connected to them and will thus also be discussed.

1 Sam 18:8–14 MT	1 Sam 18:8–14 LXX
⁸ויחר לשאול מאד	
וירע בעיניו הדבר הזה	⁸καὶ πονηρὸν ἐφάνη τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Σαουλ περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου,
ויאמר נתנו לדוד רבבות	καὶ εἶπεν Τῷ Δαυιδ ἔδωκαν τὰς μυριάδας
ולי נתנו האלפים	καὶ ἐμοὶ ἔδωκαν τὰς χιλιάδας.
ועוד לו אך המלוכה	
⁹ויהי שאול עון את דוד	⁹καὶ ἦν Σαουλ ὑποβλεπόμενος τὸν Δαυιδ
מהיום ההוא והלאה	ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἐπέκεινα.
¹⁰ויהי ממחרת ותצלח רוח אלהים רעה אל	
שאול ויתנבא בתוך הבית ודוד מנגן בידו	
כיום ביום והחנית ביד שאול	
¹¹ויטל שאול את החנית ויאמר אכה בדוד	
ובקיר ויסב דוד מפניו פעמים	

48. Frank Moore Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 18–25; Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1978), 92.

<table>
<tr><td>¹²וירא שאול מלפני דוד</td><td>¹²καὶ ἐφοβήθη Σαουλ ἀπὸ προσώπου Δαυιδ</td></tr>
</table>

¹²וירא שאול מלפני דוד	¹²καὶ ἐφοβήθη Σαουλ ἀπὸ προσώπου Δαυιδ
<u>כי היה יהוה עמו ומעם שאול סר</u>	¹³καὶ ἀπέστησεν αὐτὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
¹³ויסרהו <u>שאול</u> מעמו	καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ χιλίαρχον,
וישמהו לו שר אלף	καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο
ויצא ויבא לפני העם	ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ.
¹⁴ויהי דוד לכל דרכו משכיל	¹⁴ καὶ ἦν Δαυιδ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς
ויהוה עמו	αὐτοῦ συνίων, καὶ κύριος μετ' αὐτοῦ.

⁸<u>Saul was very angry,</u> for the matter appeared evil in <u>his</u> eyes. He said, "They ascribed to David ten thousands, and to me they ascribed thousands; <u>what more can he have but the kingdom?</u>" ⁹So Saul eyed David from that day on and beyond. ¹⁰<u>The next day an evil spirit from God rushed upon Saul, and he raved within his house, while David was playing the lyre, as he did day by day. Saul had his spear in his hand;</u> ¹¹<u>and Saul threw the spear, for he thought, "I will pin David to the wall." But David eluded him twice.</u> ¹²Saul was afraid of David, <u>because the Lord was with him but had departed from Saul.</u> ¹³And so <u>Saul</u> removed him from his presence, and made him a commander of a thousand for himself; and he marched out and came in leading the people. ¹⁴David had success in all his undertakings, for the Lord was with him.

⁸And the matter appeared evil in <u>Saul's</u> eyes <u>concerning</u> this <u>word</u>. He said, "They ascribed to David ten thousands, and to me they ascribed thousands." ⁹So Saul eyed David with suspicion from that day and beyond.

¹²Saul was afraid of David, ¹³and so he removed him from his presence, and made him a commander of a thousand for himself; and he marched out and came in leading the people. ¹⁴David was prudent in all his ways, for the Lord was with him.

First Samuel 18:8 contains three pluses, one in the LXX and two in the MT. The LXX plus περὶ τοῦ λόγου, "concerning the word" seems to be a secondary clarification that adds no new substance. The text already refers to the matter (τὸ ῥῆμα/הדבר), after which the plus is unnecessary and of little consequence. The MT plus ויחר לשאול מאד "Saul was very angry" is probably not part of the oldest text. It seeks to give the impression that Saul was strongly emotional (note the מאד) about the events and it may be connected to the addition of the larger plus in 18:10–11, where Saul is enraged because of David (see below).

The second MT plus ועוד לו אך המלוכה "what more can he have but the kingdom" in 18:8b is probably a later addition, for it already raises Saul's concern that David will take the whole kingdom. However, Saul's concern over David only rises gradually and the narrative has not yet reached a point where David is really threatening Saul's kingship. From the narrative point of view this anticipatory comment thus weakens the narrative plot. Saul is angry that the people have celebrated him so greatly (18:6–7) and he begins to keep an eye on him (18:9), but it is illogical that he would already be concerned about the loss of his kingdom, especially since he will still give David a military unit (18:13) and his daughter in marriage (18:20–27). The addition is thus anachronistic and probably derives from an editor who goes ahead of the events and already looks at the whole context and its outcome, thereby losing sight of the narrative sequence.

As many scholars have noted, the MT plus in 1 Sam 18:10–11 is out of place in this scene.[49] According to the plus, Saul openly tries to kill David. As with the MT addition in 18:8b, verses 10–11 confuse the narrative sequence. The context implies that Saul is still trying to stay in good terms with David and to avoid an open confrontation. He has a plan to do harm to David, but indirectly using the Philistines as the instrument. The secrecy of the plan contradicts the explicit attempt to kill him. One should also note that after the incidence in 19:10–11, the relationship between David and Saul continues as if nothing had happened. It is illogical that after Saul has unsuccessfully tried to kill David, he would still ascribe him a military unit and also give his daughter to him.[50] One would also expect David to flee or be afraid of Saul after Saul has revealed his murderous intentions, but the text mentions no reaction of David. According to 18:17, Saul notes that his hand should not be raised against David (אל תהי ידי בו), but this is illogical since he has already done so in 18:10–11. These inconsistencies within the narrative suggest that 18:10–11 cannot be original to their immediate context. This is corroborated by a comparison with 1 Sam 19:9–10, which contains a very similar scene. Because of the exten-

---

49. Thus already Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 111–12, and many others after him.

50. As noted by Smith, *Samuel*, 170, about 18:10–11: "Here the attempt has no noticeable consequences, and everything goes on as if it had not been made. [ממחרת—] must refer to the day after the triumphal entry. But this was too early for Saul's jealousy to have reached such a height, and David certainly would not have entertained thoughts of becoming the king's son-in-law after such an exhibition of hatred."

sive parallels in vocabulary, it seems probable that 18:10–11 are dependent on 19:9–10.

1 Sam 18:10–11	1 Sam 19:9–10
¹⁰ויהי ממחרת ותצלח רוח אלהים רעה אל שאול	⁹ותהי רוח יהוה רעה אל שאול
ויתנבא בתוך הבית	והוא בביתו יושב
ודוד מנגן בידו כיום ביום	וחניתו בידו
והחנית ביד שאול	ודוד מנגן ביד
¹¹ויטל שאול את החנית	¹⁰ויבקש שאול להכות בחנית בדוד ובקיר
ויאמר אכה בדוד ובקיר	ויפטר מפני שאול ויך את החנית בקיר
ויסב דוד מפניו פעמים	ודוד נס וימלט בלילה הוא

¹⁰The next day an evil spirit from God rushed upon Saul, and he raved within his house, while David was playing the lyre, as he did day by day. Saul had the spear in his hand, ¹¹and Saul threw the spear, for he thought, "I will pin David to the wall." But David eluded him twice.

⁹Then an evil spirit from the Lord came upon Saul, as he sat in his house with his spear in his hand, while David was playing the lyre. ¹⁰Saul sought to pin David to the wall with the spear, but he eluded Saul, so that he struck the spear into the wall. David fled and escaped that night.

First Samuel 19:9–10 is much more at home in its context than 1 Sam 18:10–11. For example, it is reasonable that in 1 Sam 19:9–10 Saul finally tries to kill David by himself after several attempts to do so by the hand of the Philistines have failed. In 1 Sam 19 the conflict between David and Saul is already open and now David is also aware of Saul's real intentions. Unlike in the MT 1 Sam 18, David logically flees after he realizes that Saul intends to kill him (ודוד נס וימלט בלילה הוא). On account of the extensive literary parallels, the MT plus in 1 Sam 18:10–11 is a later addition that was essentially influenced by 19:9–10.[51] All features of the MT plus in 1 Sam 18:10–11 can be explained as exegetical expansions of the older text in Samuel and there is no reason to assume an external source other than 1 Sam 19.

---

51. Some of the vocabulary may also suggest a late origin of the plus. As noted already by Burney, *Notes*, 118, the expression כיום ביום, "day by day" is otherwise never met in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament and the related expression יום ביום, "day by day" is known only in the younger books of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament (e.g., 1 Chr 12:22. 2 Chr 8:13; 24:11; 30:21; Ezra 3:4; 6:9; Neh 8:18.). The expression יום ביומו, "(duty) of each day" is more common, but this has a different meaning.

Although the MT plus in 18:12b seems well integrated with its present context, some text-internal observations suggest that it is not original.[52] Like 18:12b, 18:14 contains the idea that Yahweh was with David (ויהוה עמו), but the latter reference is redundant if 18:12b has already said the same (כי היה יהוה עמו). It is unlikely that the original author would repeat exactly the same idea only two verses later. One should also note that the subject, Saul, is included in the MT of 18:13, whereas it is missing in the OG. This MT plus is probably dependent on the expansion in the MT of 18:12b. Because 18:12b makes Yahweh the subject of the preceding sentence, it had to be added to 18:13, where Saul is again the subject as in 18:12a. Otherwise one would understand Yahweh to be the subject of 18:13 as well. In the LXX, however, there is no need to specify the subject in 18:13, because Saul continues to be the subject. In other words, the addition of 18:12b would have necessitated the addition of the subject, whereas—if the LXX would be the result of a secondary omission of 18:12b—there would be no need to omit the subject. It thus seems likely that MT 18:12b was added later. The addition gives a theological explanation why Saul began to fear David: Yahweh had abandoned Saul in favor of David. The original reason seems to be what has already been told: David had become very popular among the people. The addition thus provides a more theological explanation for the events.

The addition in 18:12b seems to be dependent on 1 Sam 16:14, according to which "the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul", ורוח יהוה סרה מעם שאול (cf. 1 Sam 18:12b: כי היה יהוה עמו ומעם שאול סר). These verses are also linked by the shared ideas of an evil spirit that tormented Saul (see 16:14: ובעתתו רוח רעה מאת יהוה). The MT plus in 18:12b seems to be connected with the MT plus in 1 Sam 18:10–11, which similarly describes how an evil spirit comes to Saul.[53] Both 16:14 and 18:10–11, 12b also connect the idea of an evil spirit coming upon Saul with the idea of Yahweh or his spirit leaving him.

The text continues with a story about David's marriage to Saul's daughter. After Merab, who had been promised to David, was given to another

---

52. Many scholars since early research have assumed that 18:12b is a later addition; thus, e.g., Smith, *Samuel*, 170.

53. On the basis of slightly different terminology (cf. רוח רעה מאת יהוה and רוח אלהים), it is probable that 1 Sam 16:14 and 18:10–11, 12b were written by different authors. This is also suggested by the fact that 1 Sam 16:14 is not missing in the OG; 1 Sam 18:10–11, 12b was probably written after 16:14.

man, David marries Michal. The interlude with Merab is missing in the Old Greek.

1 Sam 18:15–21 MT	1 Sam 18:15–21 LXX
¹⁵וירא שאול אשר הוא משכיל מאד ויגר מפניו	¹⁵καὶ εἶδεν Σαουλ ὡς αὐτὸς συνίει σφόδρα, καὶ εὐλαβεῖτο ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ.
¹⁶וכל ישראל ויהודה אהב את דוד כי הוא יוצא ובא לפניהם	¹⁶καὶ πᾶς Ισραηλ καὶ Ιουδας ἠγάπα τὸν Δαυιδ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐξεπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο πρὸ προσώπου <u>τοῦ λαοῦ</u>.
<u>¹⁷ויאמר שאול אל דוד הנה בתי הגדולה מרב אתה אתן לך לאשה אך היה לי לבן חיל והלחם מלחמות יהוה ושאול אמר אל תהי ידי בו ותהי בו יד פלשתים ¹⁸ויאמר דוד אל שאול מי אנכי ומי חיי משפחת אבי בישראל כי אהיה חתן למלך ¹⁹ויהי בעת תת את מרב בת שאול לדוד והיא נתנה לעדריאל המחלתי לאשה</u>	
²⁰ותאהב מיכל בת שאול את דוד ויגדו לשאול וישר הדבר בעיניו	²⁰Καὶ ἠγάπησεν Μελχολ ἡ θυγάτηρ Σαουλ τὸν Δαυιδ, καὶ ἀπηγγέλη Σαουλ, καὶ ηὐθύνθη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ.
²¹ויאמר שאול אתננה לו ותהי לו למוקש ותהי <u>בו</u> יד פלשתים ויאמר שאול אל דוד בשתים תתחתן בי היום	²¹καὶ εἶπεν Σαουλ Δώσω αὐτὴν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ εἰς σκάνδαλον. καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ Σαουλ χεὶρ ἀλλοφύλων·

¹⁵And Saul saw that he had great success, he was afraid of him. ¹⁶And all Israel and Judah loved David, for he went out and came in before them. <u>¹⁷Then Saul said to David, "Here is my elder daughter Merab; I will give her to you as a wife; only be valiant for me and fight the Lord's battles." For Saul thought, "I will not raise a hand against him; let the Philistines deal with him." ¹⁸David said to Saul, "Who am I and who are my kinsfolk, my father's family in Israel, that I should be son-in-law to the king?" ¹⁹But at the time when Saul's daughter Merab should have been given to David, she was given to Adriel the Meholathite as a wife.</u>

¹⁵And Soul saw how he acted prudently, and he was afraid of him. ¹⁶And all Israel and Judah loved David, for he went out and came in before <u>the people</u>.

²⁰Saul's daughter Michal loved David. Saul was told, and it was right in his eyes. ²¹Saul thought, "Let me give her to him that she may be a snare for him and that the hand of the Philistines may be against <u>him</u>." <u>Therefore Saul said to David a second time, "You shall now be my son-in-law."</u>

²⁰Saul's daughter Michal loved David, Saul was told, and it was right in his eyes. ²¹Saul said, "I will give her to him that she will be a snare to him. And the hand of the Philistines was against Saul,

---

It seems probable that the MT plus in 18:17–19 is a later expansion.[54] This is suggested by the following considerations. There is an obvious connection between 18:16 and 18:20, which is interrupted by 18:17–19. According to the former, all Israel and Judah loved David, and this topic is continued in 18:20 with the note that Saul's daughter Michal also loved him. The giving of Michal to David in 18:20–27 is presented without any reference to the preceding episode with Merab. For example, in 18:23 David is greatly surprised and honored by Saul's proposal to give Michal to him in marriage, but this would be peculiar if Saul had just given an already promised daughter Merab to another man. It is also surprising that 18:20 introduces Michal as the daughter of Saul (מיכל בת שאול), without any reference to her being the second daughter. Note that Merab is presented as the elder daughter (בתי הגדולה) in 18:17. One would certainly expect some kind of introduction that Saul had a second daughter, if 18:20 derives from the same author as 18:17–19. One should also note that in 18:17–19 the initiative to give the daughter to David comes from Saul. This is in line with 1 Sam 17:25, according to which the king will give his daughter to anyone who kills Goliath. However, in 1 Sam 18:20 the initial action is the love of Saul's daughter Michal to which Saul reacts by regarding it right in his eyes (וישר הדבר בעיניו). It is certainly no coincidence that 1 Sam 17:25 is part of the MT plus that is missing in the Old Greek. It appears that the MT pluses give a different impression of how the marriage between Saul's daughter and David came about than the account shared by the MT and OG.[55]

---

54. Thus many since early research, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 111–12; Smith, *Samuel*, 172; Johan Lust, "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and in Greek," in Barthélemy, *Story of David and Goliath*, 5–18; Christian Seppänen, "David and Saul's Daugters" in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström, CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 353–64.

55. It should be noted that according to the MT of 2 Sam 21:8 Michal was given

First Samuel 18:21b, which is also missing in the Old Greek, is evidently connected to 18:17–19, for it refers to Saul's second promise to David that he may marry his daughter (בשתים תתחתן בי). That 18:21b is a later addition is seen in the following verse. Saul has already been in a direct dialogue with David in 18:21b (like in 18:17–19) and promised Michal to him, but in 18:22–26 Saul had to send his messengers to tell David the same but in different words. First Samuel 18:22–23 are written as if the preceding text has not yet mentioned Saul's promise to David. Moreover, 18:22–26 imply that Saul and David are in different places and never met in this episode. This is in accordance with 18:13, according to which Saul had sent David away from him to lead a military unit. In fact, 18:13 contradicts both 18:17–19 and 18:21b, which assume that Saul and David are still in the same place and can discuss without any need for messengers. This suggests that the MT pluses in 18:17–19 and 21b are later intrusions in this text.[56]

With the exception of some minor clarifications (such as the one in 18:8), the text-critical differences in 18:8–21 are best explained as secondary additions in the MT. The Old Greek seems to preserve the original text in most cases.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. As accidental omissions can be excluded, the only possible alternative explanation for the text-critical variants is that the LXX is the result of intentional shortenings, as assumed by several scholars.[57] Despite the tensions and partial doublets, it is very unlikely that the translator would have omitted significant infor-

---

to Adriel son of Barzillai the Meholathite. However, according to 1 Sam 18:19, Merab was given to Adriel. Moreover, it is peculiar that Michal's marriage to David is not mentioned at all in 2 Sam 21:8. Besides 1 Sam 18:17–19 Merab is only mentioned in 1 Sam 14:49. See discussion below.

56. There is another small text-critical variant in 1 Sam 18:21aβ, which is connected to the MT plus in 18:17–19. According to 18:17, Saul urges David to "fight the Lord's battles", which is Saul's plan to let the hand of the Philistines deal with David, because he himself should not raise his hand against him: אל תהי ידי בו ותהי בו יד פלשתים. This idea is in accordance with the MT version of 18:21aβ: the Philistines will become a snare to David. In the LXX, however, the hand of the Philistines are on *Saul* (καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ Σαουλ χεὶρ ἀλλοφύλων). The reference to the Philistines seems to be a separate sentence in the LXX, while in the MT it is part of Saul's monologue.

57. E.g., Kuenen, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung,* 61; Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, 212; van der Kooij, "Story of David and Goliath," 118–31.

mation from 1 Sam 17–18. The LXX translation was relatively faithful and does not have the tendency to abridge, which is seen in the shared sections. A radical abridgment would be exceptional in the translation and only be possible in an early stage of textual development when the text had not yet become highly authoritative and was still transmitted in Hebrew. Theoretically it is possible that a scribe could have removed some unnecessary repetitions and tensions in an early stage. However, in 1 Sam 18 it would have meant the omission of entire scenes, ideas, and essential information. For example, one would have to assume that a scribe intentionally omitted all references to Saul's first daughter Merab. If the motive was to remove tensions and inconsistencies, one would expect that the dialogue form of 18:17–19 and 21b had been altered, or that there would be a reference to Michal as being the second daughter, but this is not the case in the LXX version. One would have to assume that Merab was simply erased, but this is unlikely. In other words, it would be understandable that a later scribe omitted those details in the story that are in contradiction and remove some disturbing repetitions, but this does not explain the complete omission of scenes and ideas.[58]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Conventional theories assume that the pluses in the MT derive from a variant account of David and Goliath. This may be the best explanation for the MT pluses in 1 Sam 17 and in 1 Sam 18:1–5. However, it is not necessary to assume an external source behind the pluses in 1 Sam 18:8–21. They can be understood as exegetical expansions rising out of the older text in the book of Samuel, as reactions to it and as further developments. For example, 1 Sam 19:9–10 probably functioned as the source for the addition of 18:10–11, as we have seen. It is basically the same scene but in a modified form.

Unlike 1 Sam 18:10–11, the addition in 18:17–19 does not have a clear precedent in Samuel, but it is clearly connected to some older passages. A reason for the addition may be 2 Sam 21:8, according to which Saul's daughter was married to Adriel the Meholathite. Although the MT of 2 Sam 21:8 refers to Michal, it is probable that it originally referred to Merab, as argued by Christian Seppänen.[59] The name was changed in order

---

58. For a comprehensive evaluation of the variants and alternative explanations, see Seppänen, "Hebrew Text of Samuel," 117–53.

59. Seppänen, "David and Saul's Daughters," 353–75. The reading Merab in 2 Sam 21:8 is attested in two Hebrew manuscripts from the Middle Ages and in some Greek

to avoid the problem with 2 Sam 21:8. First Samuel 18:17–19 would have been added as the prehistory of the marriage of Merab to Adriel.[60] One should note that 18:17–19 may also have been influenced by 1 Sam 25:28 (David fighting Yahweh's battles: מלחמות יהוה), 1 Sam 18:21a (the hand of the Philistines: יד פלשתים), and 1 Sam 18:25 (the humility of David).[61] The reference to the hand of the Philistines is relevant only if the ensuing story contains a description of David's further encounter with them. However, there are no further MT pluses after 1 Sam 18:17–19. One could assume that the external source from which 1 Sam 18:17–19 was taken contained such a story, but it was not used by the editor who added 18:17–19 to the composition. Rather than assuming lost stories, 18:17–19 can be understood as dependent on the ensuing encounter between David and the Philistines in 18:26–27. That 1 Sam 18:17–19 was primarily written for its current context is also suggested by the reference to the elder daughter (בתי הגדולה), which implies a second daughter and may thus anticipate the following story about Saul's other daughter being married to David. Consequently, it is probable that 1 Sam 18:17–19 is an exegetical expansion that essentially arises out of the older text in Samuel and is its further development. It is not necessary to assume an external source.

The additions in 1 Sam 18:8–21 could only have been made when the entire manuscript was reproduced. They are too extensive to have been supralinear or marginal insertions. This applies to the main additions in 18:10–11 and 17–19, and to other additions that are clearly connected with them (18:21aβ and 21b). It is possible that 18:10–11 and 17–19 derive from different editors. In fact, it is not consistent that after being enraged about David in 18:10–11, Saul still proposes a marriage between his daughter and David in 18:17–19. Since 18:21b, and thereby also 18:17–19, is dependent on the MT plus in 1 Sam 17:25, it is very possible that the same author who is behind the large expansion in 1 Sam 17

---

manuscripts (e.g., in manuscripts of the Lucianic group) as well as in daughter translations of Greek. Other Greek manuscripts follow the Hebrew, but this is probably a later harmonization.

60. Second Samuel 21–24 is usually assumed to be a late appendix to the composition; see, e.g., Cynthia Edenburg, "2 Sam 21–24: Haphazard Miscellany or Deliberate Revision?," in Müller and Pakkala, *Insights into Editing*, 189–222.

61. In 18:21a the hand of the Philistines was on Saul, but with the expansion Saul devises a plan so that their hand will be on David.

is also behind 18:17–19 and 21b. Altogether this would thus be a major editorial intervention in the story.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is quite likely that a careful critic would have been able to detect many of the additions in the MT without the older version in the LXX. This is especially the case with the larger additions in 18:10–11 and 17–19, for the insertions occasioned several tensions and inconsistencies within the narrative. For example, one would easily note the contradiction between those sections that assume that David was not in Saul's presence (18:13, 22–26) and those where David and Saul are able to discuss directly (18:17–19, 21b). Saul's attempt to murder David in 18:10–11 would also stick out from its context, because the ensuing story seems surprisingly unaware of its dramatic content. That a similar passage is found in 1 Sam 19:9–10, where it is much more at home, would certainly lead to the suspicion that the scene is not original in 1 Sam 18.

With some of the smaller additions the critic would certainly suspect that they are not original, although the evidence is not as clear as with the larger additions. For example, the addition of a reference to Yahweh being with David and having departed Saul in 18:12b would probably be a candidate for being a later addition. It introduces a theological explanation to the events and is a partial repetition of 18:14. One would also notice its connection with 1 Sam 16:14. The critic would probably have difficulties in detecting the addition in 18:8b, which refers to Saul's concern that David will take the whole kingdom. Although it gets ahead of things and is much more at home in a later scene when David's power has risen, literary critical arguments to assume an editorial intervention would not be strong: there are no syntactic problems or evident tensions with the immediate context.

It is evident that literary criticism would have the most difficulties with the one-word interventions. Saul's name was added in 18:8 (LXX) and 18:13 (MT), but the method would hardly be able to detect them as later additions. By the same token, these changes are inconsequential. More important is the replacement of "Saul" with "him" (בו) in 18:21. This essentially changes the meaning of the sentence. In what is probably the original text as preserved by the LXX, the Philistines are said to be against Saul, whereas in the MT, the sentence is changed into Saul's deliberation to use his daughter's marriage to have the Philistines deal with David. As with other replacements, literary criticism would be at its limits when parts of the older text were left out by a scribe.

Significant for literary criticism, most additions of greater consequence could have been detected by its conventional methods. This corroborates the observation made in other passages that the larger the insertion is, the easier it is to identify as a later addition. Smaller additions are more difficult, but in many cases their impact on the passage has been smaller. The main exception to this is the replacement of "Saul" with "him" in reference to David in 18:21. In addition, the more the addition introduces new ideas and changes the nature of the text, the more it sticks out from its context.

Results. First Samuel 18:8–21 contains several later additions in the MT, some or many of which may derive from the same hand that expanded the David and Goliath story in 1 Sam 17 as well. Unlike some of the additions in 1 Sam 17, the pluses in 18:8–21 can mostly be understood as exegetical developments rising out of the older text of Samuel. There is no reason to assume an external source in the here-discussed cases. Without the older version preserved in the LXX it would have been possible to detect most of the additions.

5.6. 2 Samuel 5:4–5

Second Samuel 5:1–16 is a key passage in Samuel as it describes the anointing of David as king over Israel (5:3), the conquest of Jerusalem (5:6–8), and the beginning of his reign in Jerusalem (5:9–16). Second Samuel 5:4–5, which contain chronological information on David's reign, are missing in 4Q51, Codex Vindobonensis, and the parallel passage in 1 Chr 11:3–4, while other witnesses, including the MT, all LXX manuscripts, Targum Jonathan, and the Peshitta, contain them. Josephus's rendering of the passage in *Ant.* 7.53–55 also skips over the information in these verses.

1 Chr 11:3–4 MT	2 Sam 5:3–6a MT
³ויבאו כל זקני ישראל אל המלך חברונה	³ויבאו כל זקני ישראל אל המלך חברונה
ויכרת להם דויד ברית בחברון לפני יהוה	ויכרת להם המלך דוד ברית בחברון לפני יהוה
וימשחו את דויד למלך על ישראל	וימשחו את דוד למלך על ישראל
כדבר יהוה ביד שמואל	
	⁴בן שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה
	מלך
	⁵בחברון מלך על יהודה שבע שנים וששה
	חדשים ובירושלם מלך שלשים ושלש שנה
	על כל ישראל ויהודה

⁶וַיֵּלֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ וַאֲנָשָׁיו יְרוּשָׁלִַם
אֶל הַיְבֻסִי יוֹשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ ...

⁴וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִיד וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל יְרוּשָׁלִַם
הִיא יְבוּס וְשָׁם הַיְבוּסִי יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ

³All the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron, and David made a covenant with them at Hebron before the Lord, and they anointed David king over Israel, according to the word of the Lord by Samuel. ⁴David and all Israel marched to Jerusalem, that is Jebus, where the Jebusites were, the inhabitants of the land.

³All the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron; and King David made a covenant with them at Hebron before the Lord, and they anointed David king over Israel. ⁴David was thirty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years. ⁵At Hebron he reigned over Judah seven years and six months, and at Jerusalem he reigned over all Israel and Judah thirty-three years. ⁶The king and his men marched to Jerusalem against the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land.…

4Q51 is fragmentary here and preserves only some words, but it is probable that it contains a passage from 2 Sam 5 (frags. 61, 63, and 64). Crucial for the verses in question are lines 14 and 15 of column ii, which begin with the words בחברון (line 14) and ואנשיו (line 15). These words correspond to words in 5:3 and 6. Although only two words of these lines are preserved, the reconstruction of the previous and ensuing lines shows that we are dealing with 5:3 and 5:6. The reconstruction also shows the length of the columns, and thereby it is indisputable that the lost space of line 14 could only fit the end of 5:3 and the beginning of 5:6.[62]

10 [ובשרך אנחנו. ²גם א[תמול ג[ם של[שום בהיו[ת ש[אול] מלך עלינו]
11 [אתה היית המוציא והמביא את] יש[רא]ל[ויאמר יהוה לך אתה]
12 [תרעה את עמי את ישראל ואתה תהיה לנגיד על ישראל ³ויבאו]
13 [כול זקני ישראל אל המלך חברונה ויכרת להם המלך דויד ברית]
14 בחברו[ן] לפני יהוה וימשחו את דויד למלך על ישראל ⁶וילך דויד]
15 ואנ[שיו] ירושלים אל היבוסי יושב הארץ ויאמר לדויד לאמור]
16 לוא ת[ב]וא הנה כי הסית[וך ה[עֹוֹרי]ם וה[פסחים לאמור לוא יבוא]

---

62. Thus in the reconstruction by Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 296; and Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel*, DJD XVII (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

From this it follows that 4Q51 did not contain 5:4–5. It should also be noted that 4Q51 does not contain other major variants in this passage, which corroborates its value as an important witness for these verses as well.[63]

Although Codex Vindobonensis is a poorly known Old Latin witness, it cannot be neglected here, especially since it shares a reading with 4Q51. These two witnesses, a Hebrew one from the first century BCE and a medieval Latin one, can hardly have a direct relationship. That Josephus and Chronicles also lack a parallel to these verses shows a very special web of witnesses from different contexts and times. Although the shared reading of the MT and all LXX manuscripts is rather solid, the apparent unrelatedness of the minus in the other witnesses begs for an explanation. An original text that lacked the verses would explain the variants.

Apart from textual witnesses, the following text-internal considerations strongly suggest that 2 Sam 5:4–5 have been added later.[64] The actual content of 5:4–5 is anachronistic. It refers to David's reign in Jerusalem, although he has not even conquered the city yet. The conquest takes place in 5:9, which sets the beginning of the reign in Jerusalem. Second Samuel 5:4–5 also interrupt the narrative sequence, which describes events as they evolve. David is anointed king in Hebron in 5:3, after which he sets out to march to Jerusalem to conquer it in 5:6. This sequence is interrupted by an unexpected reference to the length of his whole reign. The style and perspective of the verses is also very different from the rest of the passage, and similar chronological references have been shown to derive from later

---

63. On the text-critical importance of 4Q51, see discussion in Armin Lange, "5.3.1 Ancient and Late Ancient Manuscript Evidence," in Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0005030100, who writes: "The statistical evidence describes the text of 4Q51 as a non-aligned witness that evolved out of the Hebrew parent text of OG-Sam." Similarly Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.), 116, 4Q51 is "closely related to the *Vorlage* of the 𝔊, while reflecting independent features as well." Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, VTSup 169 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 80, characterizes 4Q51 as follows: "more often than not, it is superior to the faulty MT, which has suffered numerous confusions in its transmission."

64. Thus also some scholars, e.g., Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, 84.

editors in many parts of the Hebrew Bible.[65] Accordingly, many scholars
have assumed that 2 Sam 5:4–5 have been added later.[66]

The preceding text also provides a potential trigger for the addition.
The reference to David's anointing as king in 5:3 could have led a scribe
to make a reference to his age at the time of ascension, which would be
logically followed by the length of his entire reign. The references to the
length of the reign may have been inspired by 2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11.
With the exception of the word כל "all" before the word Israel, every word
in 2 Sam 5:4–5 has a parallel in 2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11.[67] Much of the
text is identical to the word, which implies a direct borrowing:

2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11	2 Sam 5:4–5
2 Sam 2:11 ויהי מספר הימים אשר היה דוד מלך בחברון על בית יהודה שבע שנים וששה חדשים 1 Kgs 2:11 והימים אשר מלך דוד על ישראל ארבעים שנה בחברון מלך שבע שנים ובירושלם מלך שלשים ושלש שנים	⁴בן שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה מלך ⁵בחברון מלך על יהודה שבע שנים וששה חדשים ובירושלם מלך שלשים ושלש שנה על כל ישראל ויהודה

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It would be difficult to
assume an accidental omission, as there are no technical reasons, such as
homoioteleuton, that would have easily triggered it. It would also be quite
a coincidence to skip over a digressive unit accidentally. An intentional
omission is a more potent possibility. One could argue that the disrupting
location of 5:4–5 led a scribe to omit the passage, but in this case one would
expect a transposition of the content, perhaps to another position in 2 Sam
5. Another possibility is to assume that since the information is already
found in 2 Sam 2:11 and 2 Kgs 2:11, a later editor omitted the unneces-

---

65. E.g., Jer 25:1, discussed above at §4.20, above.

66. Thus, among others, Smith, *Samuel*, 286; Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung*,
324; and Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 395. Auld writes that the "joint negative testimony of
4QSamᵃ and 1 Chr 11 makes it virtually certain that at this point the older book of
Samuel … did not include the summary chronology of David's reign in Hebron and
Jerusalem."

67. Note the difference between David's reign in Hebron: According to 2 Sam
2:11 he reigned seven and a half years, while 1 Kgs 2:11 refers to seven years. 2 Sam 5:5
shares the reading with 2 Sam 2:11.

sary repetition. This is indeed what has been assumed by some scholars, such as Karl Budde. Only discussing the shorter reading in Chronicles, he argues that the Chronicler omitted these verses because 2 Kgs 2:11 already contains much of the same information. Budde also notes that the chronological reference to David's reign is located where they are regularly met in the rest of Deuteronomistic literature.[68] This leads him to assume that the verses are indeed original as far as the parallel in Chronicles is concerned, However, he also maintains that the verses are Deuteronomistic, which implies that he presumes a Deuteronomistic insertion that was secondarily omitted in the Chronicler's rendering.[69] Many others, such as Samuel R. Driver, imply a similar position as Budde, and appeal to the Chronicler's allegedly typical tendency to shorten.[70] However, these arguments predate the discovery of the Qumran scroll, which notably complicates the issue, and it is not possible anymore to use the Chronicler's tendency as the main argument. It is also apparent that Codex Vindobonensis and Josephus were not considered as notable witnesses that were taken into consideration. Thereby the discussion was primarily based on text-internal observations as far as the Kings text is concerned.

If one nevertheless assumes that the text was intentionally shortened, one would have to assume that it took place independently in witnesses that show no obvious connection. Otherwise one needs to explain the shared reading of 4Q51, Codex Vindobonensis, 1 Chr 11:3–4, and Josephus's *Ant.* 7.53–55 and the above-discussed text-internal problems with the MT/LXX reading. In contrast, an originally shorter text that lacked 5:4–5 would explain the shared reading in these unrelated witnesses and the text-internal problems. Consequently, it is more probable that 2 Sam 5:4–5 is not original.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition of 2 Sam 5:4–5 is very typical as it draws most of its information from other passages. The only new information is David's age at the time of anointment. The scribe added these verses to a location that is somehow logical, but the wider context, narrative sequence, and genre were neglected, which resulted in a unit that digresses from the narrative. A possible model for adding the chronological information in this location may have

---

68. Budde, *Samuel*, 219.
69. Budde, *Samuel*, 219.
70. Driver, *Samuel*, 197, who assumes that the Chronicler shortened the passage.

been the regnal accounts in Kings, which provide similar information at the beginning of a king's reign as well as 2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11. The large size of the addition suggests that it was most likely added when the entire manuscript was copied, although one cannot completely disregard the possibility of a marginal insertion. In any case, the addition seems to have been intended to be included in the text, as the text is formed of full sentences that follow 1 Kgs 2:11 and 2 Sam 2:11 very closely.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. On account of the text-internal problems noted above, one would certainly suspect a later addition in 2 Sam 5:4–5 even if the shorter variants had not been preserved. This is corroborated by the fact that many scholars argued so before 4Q51 was found and without reference to Codex Vindobonensis. One would also notice that these verses repeat, almost verbatim, sentences from 2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11, which would lead to the question about the relationship of these verses. The addition in 2 Sam 5:4–5 is a prime example of a case where literary critics would be able to detect a later addition on the basis of text-internal problems and considerations.

Results. It seems probable that 2 Sam 5:4–5 are a later addition influenced by 2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11. The addition is typical in drawing information from other passages, then adding one piece of information, David's age at the time of anointing as king. Already before the discovery of 4Q51, some scholars argued that 2 Sam 5:4–5 is a later addition, which shows that it could be detected without the text-critical evidence.

5.7. 1 Kings 16:34

In what is a typical annalistic description in Kings, 1 Kgs 16:29–34 lists the main events during King Ahab's reign.[71] The end of the passage in 16:34 reports the rebuilding of Jericho, which is said to have taken place during his reign. Except for the Lucianic manuscripts boc$_2$e$_2$ (and Josephus, *Ant.* 8.318), the verse is found in all witnesses (the MT, other LXX manuscripts, Vulgate, Targum Jonathan, and the Peshitta). The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea fragments of Kings.

---

71. Exceptionally, the account of his death is found separately in 1 Kgs 22:29–40.

1 Kgs 16:33–34 MT	1 Kgs 16:33–34 LXX
³³ויעש אחאב את האשרה ויוסף אחאב לעשות להכעיס את יהוה אלהי ישראל מכל מלכי ישראל אשר היו לפניו ³⁴בימיו בנה חיאל בית האלי את יריחה באבירם בכרו יסדה ובשגיב צעירו הציב דלתיה כדבר יהוה אשר דבר ביד יהושע בן נון	³³καὶ ἐποίησεν Αχααβ ἄλσος, καὶ προσέθηκεν Αχααβ τοῦ ποιῆσαι παροργίσματα τοῦ παροργίσαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐξολεθρευθῆναι· ἐκακοποίησεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς Ισραηλ τοὺς γενομένους ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ. [³⁴ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ᾠκοδόμησεν Αχιηλ ὁ Βαιθηλίτης τὴν Ιεριχω· ἐν τῷ Αβιρων τῷ πρωτοτόκῳ αὐτοῦ ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν καὶ τῷ Σεγουβ τῷ νεωτέρῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπέστησεν θύρας αὐτῆς κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου, ὃ ἐλάλησεν ἐν χειρὶ Ιησου υἱοῦ Ναυη.]
³³Ahab also made a sacred pole. Ahab did more to provoke the anger <u>of Yahweh, the God of Israel</u>, than had all the kings of Israel who were before him. ³⁴<u>In his days Hiel of Bethel built Jericho; he laid its foundation at the cost of Abiram his firstborn, and set up its gates at the cost of his youngest son Segub, according to the word of Yahweh, which he spoke by (the hand of) Joshua son of Nun.</u>	³³Ahab also made a sacred pole. Ahab did more to <u>provoke the anger so that his life might be destroyed</u>, than had all the kings of Israel who were before him. [³⁴<u>In his days Hiel of Bethel built Jericho; he laid its foundation at the cost of Abiram his firstborn, and set up its gates at the cost of his youngest son Segub, according to the word of Yahweh, which he spoke by Joshua son of Nun.</u>]

The case is complicated by the fact that a similar account about the rebuilding of Jericho is found in the LXX of Josh 6:26. In this case, the MT, Targum Jonathan, Peshitta, and the Vulgate lack the account.

Josh 6:26 MT	Josh 6:26 LXX

וישבע יהושע בעת ההיא לאמר ארור האיש לפני יהוה אשר יקום ובנה את העיר הזאת	καὶ ὤρκισεν Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐναντίον κυρίου λέγων Ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὃς οἰκοδομήσει τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην
את יריחו בבכרו ייסדנה ובצעירו יציב דלתיה	ἐν τῷ πρωτοτόκῳ αὐτοῦ θεμελιώσει αὐτὴν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστήσει τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς. καὶ οὕτως ἐποίησεν Οζαν ὁ ἐκ Βαιθηλ. ἐν τῷ Αβιρων τῷ πρωτοτόκῳ ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ διασωθέντι ἐπέστησεν τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς.
Joshua swore at that time saying, "Cursed before the Lord be anyone who tries to build this city, Jericho. At the cost of his firstborn he shall found it, and at the cost of his youngest he shall set up its gates!"	Joshua swore on that day before the Lord, saying, "Cursed be anyone who tries to build this city. At the cost of his firstborn he shall found it, and at the cost of his youngest he shall set up its gates." Thus did Ozan of Bethel; at the cost of Abiron, his firstborn, he founded it, and at the cost of his youngest, although he escaped, he set up its gates.

The following considerations suggest that 1 Kgs 16:34 is a later addition. The report about the building of Jericho's walls is unrelated to Ahab's deeds and does not connect with anything in its immediate context or in the rest of Kings. It is an isolated report about the fulfillment of a prediction, and it is only connected with its context by the alleged occurrence during Ahab's reign. As noted by some scholars, such as Ernst Würthwein, the verse interrupts the connection between Ahab's sins in 1 Kgs 16:30–33 and the proclamation of the punishment in 1 Kgs 17.[72] It stands to reason that the latter was meant as an immediate consequence of the sins. According to some scholars, the expression "in his days," בימיו, which is found at the beginning of 16:34, often implies a loose connection with the preceding text, and accordingly, Charles F. Burney notes that the expression is often used by the Deuteronomistic redactor "in synchronizing an event with the preceding narrative."[73] Although it would be difficult to connect the addi-

---

72. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 203.
73. Burney, *Notes*, 207. For בימיו, see, e.g., Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 203;

tion with the Deuteronomists, the reference to an entirely different book may also be considered as a sign of lateness.

Investigating the textual problems in Josh 6:26 and the relationship of this verse with 1 Kgs 16:34, Lea Mazor concludes that Josh 6:26 was used as the source for 1 Kgs 16:34.[74] She notes that 1 Kgs 16:34 must be younger, since it is familiar with the words את יריחה "Jericho," which were secondarily added to Josh 6:26, as implied by the LXX version that lacks the reference.[75] First Kings 16:34 would thus be dependent on a rather late version of Josh 6:26, and be an even later addition from a stage when Joshua and Kings are regarded as being part of the same broader narrative. One should also note that Josh 6:26 only refers to Joshua's prediction without any divine aspect, while 1 Kgs 16:34 assumes that the prediction is a word of God that Joshua received (כדבר יהוה אשר דבר ביד יהושע בן נון). This implies a more advanced stage in the interpretation of the prediction. According to Mazor, other parts of the text had to be slightly altered for its context in Kings. The names Ozan and Sheerah were changed to Hiel and Segub in order to conceal "that the tradition belonged to the period of Joshua."[76] Nevertheless, Mazor's argumentation does not rely on the shorter Lucianic reading and she only carefully suggests that it "may point to a stage" when the verse "had not yet been included in Kings."[77]

A number of literary critics have regarded 1 Kgs 16:34 as a late addition without apparent familiarity with the Antiochian text.[78] With the

---

and Lea Mazor, "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho: A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography," *Text* 14 (1988): 23.

74. Mazor, "Origin and Evolution," 1–26.

75. Mazor, "Origin and Evolution," 23–24.

76. Mazor, "Origin and Evolution," 24–25.

77. Mazor, "Origin and Evolution," 23. Although her paper is mainly a text-critical approach to the issue, she also argues on the basis of lacking evidence for ninth century settlement from Jericho. However, arguments using archaeological evidence from Jericho are problematic. The text is very likely a literary construction and its historicity is questionable in any case. The presence or nonpresence of archaeological remains in Jericho in the eighth century cannot validate or refute the dating and position of the verse in its present context. The verse can be historical and still be a late addition in Kings, or it can be a pure fiction and still be an ancient notice.

78. E.g., Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 203; O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*, OBO 92 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 278, 280; and DeVries, *1 Kings*, 203–7, assume that 1 Kgs 16:34 is a late addition, but make no note of the Lucianic reading.

Lucianic reading in mind, the evidence tips in favor of assuming a later addition. This would imply that the Antiochian witness goes back to the Old Greek here and eventually to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is more original than the other Greek witnesses.[79] Since 1 Kgs 16:34 is not part of the kaige section of Kings, this conclusion would mean that the other LXX witnesses had been revised after a proto-MT reading in a nonkaige section, while typically the Antiochian text preserves older readings against other LXX witnesses in kaige sections. This phenomenon has been noted in other nonkaige sections as well.[80] It is also worth noting that the Lucianic recension does not have a typical tendency to shorten. Quite the opposite. It often fills the gaps, expands and adds clarifying sections, and especially does not omit, as noted by many text critics.[81] This tendency increases its value as a witness in cases where is contains a shorter text.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. There are no particular reasons, such as homoioteleuton, that could have triggered an accidental omission of 1 Kgs 16:34. It would also be a great coincidence that an accidental omission left out a digressive unit thus making the text more consistent. An intentional omission is a more potent possibility. According to James A. Montgomery, 1 Kgs 16:34 was secondarily omitted, because its information was "unimportant or too brutal."[82] This is an unlikely theory. The stories in Kings contain several more severe brutalities and there is no other evidence that brutal texts were censored. It is also difficult to see the unimportance of the information. It contains the fulfillment of Joshua's prediction that was made in the name of Yahweh. It is highly unlikely that the Antiochian text tradition or the Lucianic recension had taken the freedom to omit such information. As noted, the Lucianic recension has the tendency to add, and this can be said of other textual traditions as well. An

---

79. Thus some scholars, such as Holmes, *Joshua*, 37; and Holzinger, *Josua*, 18.

80. See, Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 127–41; Tuukka Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1–2 Kings*, SCS 68 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 110–11, discusses a case in 1 Kgs 13:25 where similarly only the Antiochian text seems to have preserved the Old Greek, while other Greek witnesses had been revised after the MT.

81. See, e.g., Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. W. G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 230–32, who writes on the Lucianic recension that "The result is a full text with no omissions" (230).

82. Montgomery, *Kings*, 286.

intentional omission needs a weighty motive and such cannot be found in this passage.

According to Immanuel Benzinger, 1 Kgs 16:34 may derive from an ancient source, but noticing the problems in its current context, he suggests that it could have been transposed from another location.[83] The theory of transposition is certainly possible, and a potential source, though not mentioned by Benzinger, is Josh 6:26. In this case, the transposition would also have necessitated further additions to accommodate its present context: the additional reference to the days of Ahab as well as the reference to the word of Yahweh that was spoken to Joshua (כדבר יהוה אשר דבר ביד יהושע). This theory cannot be completely excluded, but it remains hypothetical and for the passage in 1 Kgs 16, the text would regardless be an addition, whether inspired by Josh 6:26 or transposed from another location.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. First Kings 16:34 is a rather typical addition often assumed by literary critics. It connects Kings with Joshua by adding a fulfillment notice of Joshua's curse or prediction. It may have been added to this passage by way of association, because Ahab is characterized as the evil king par excellence and the ensuing passage deals with the consequences of evil. It would be logical that Joshua's prediction, which was altered to a word of God in Kings, finds its fulfillment in the time of the most evil king in Israel's history. The idea of Joshua's prediction being a word of God may have been inspired by 1 Kgs 17 (cf. vv. 2, 5, 8), where Elijah receives divine messages. The expression דבר ביד, "to speak by the hand of" is not particularly frequent, and is mainly met in Kings.[84] Most of its uses are in connection with a prophetic message, one of them in 1 Kgs 17:16, which may have influenced the addition in 1 Kgs 16:34.

The verse's new information implies that it was intended to be included in the text and was not a marginal note merely seeking to clarify or interpret the older text. The length of the addition suggests that it was added when the entire manuscript was copied, although it would have been technically possible to add it between the lines or in the margins. The addition intends to show that Israel's history is a continuity where predictions by early fathers and/or God's prophecies are fulfilled later and that sin will

---

83. Benzinger, *Könige*, 105.

84. The expression is met eleven times in Kings, and only three times outside Kings: 1 Sam 28:17; Jer 37:2; 2 Chr 10:15.

always be followed by a punishment. The addition connects the monarchic times with the conquest of the land, which implies a rather late stage when Joshua and Kings were seen as part of the same narrative history of Israel. In this respect the addition is similar to many other very late additions found in Samuel and Kings (e.g., 2 Sam 7:13; cf. 1 Kgs 8:20; 11:29–39; 13).[85]

Abiram has received some attention in other early Jewish literature as well. Based on Joshua's prediction in Josh 6:26, the so-called Rewritten Joshua Scroll 4Q379 (frag. 22 II, 8–13) implies a further development of the theme. Similarly building on Josh 6:26, 4Q175 (4QTest), 21–30 predicts that with its rebuilding Jericho will become "a fortress of wickedness" that will terrorize Judah and Ephraim. Consequently, there seems to have been a tradition that preserved a *typos* where Abiram, who may have been merged with the Abiram of Num 16, was regarded as a particularly wicked person. The rebuilding was regarded as such an evil act that it deserved a very severe punishment even for later generations. This tradition also brought about the addition in 1 Kgs 16:34, where the context mentions a particularly evil king, which apparently triggered an editor to add a reference to an evil act that was connected with Israel's past.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is likely that a critic would have suspected 1 Kgs 16:34 to be a later addition. The incident is not related to Ahab, and the cross-reference to the book of Joshua gives the impression of a very late stage in the development of the book. One would also notice that Josh 6:26 only refers to Joshua's prediction, while 1 Kgs 16:34 changes this into a word of God, which implies a developed conception. That critics would have noticed the addition without the Antiochian text is substantiated by the fact that critics have regarded 16:34 as an addition without using this witness as an argument. It is very possible that some of them were even unfamiliar with the shorter reading and still assumed an addition. This implies that text-internal considerations would disclose the addition without the text-critical evidence.

Results. First Kings 16:34 is an isolated addition that functions as a fulfillment notice of Josh 6:26. The addition is very typical in literarily linking two books in a rather late stage in the development of the Hebrew Bible.

---

85. For more passages and discussion of this phenomenon, see Gerhard von Rad, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings," *Studies in Deuteronomy*, trans. David Stalker (London: SCM, 1953), 74–91.

Without using the shorter reading in the Antiochian text as an argument, critics have argued that 1 Kgs 16:34 is an addition, which shows that text-internal considerations would have disclosed the addition.

5.8. Nehemiah 11:20–21

The Greek and Hebrew versions of Neh 11–12 contain repeated differences, the most notable of which are several pluses in the Hebrew version in relation to the Greek translation. The following verses are entirely lacking in the LXX: Neh 11:16, 20–21, 28–29, 32–35; 12:4–6, 9. In addition, the LXX version of many verses is much shorter: e.g., 11:12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24. The Vulgate follows the MT in the additional verses and in most pluses. There is no known targum of Ezra-Nehemiah, and no manuscript of Nehemiah has been preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Most of the additional information in the MT version consists of persons or towns in name-lists. Although each difference should be discussed separately, it seems likely that in most cases the MT pluses are later additions.[86] One example will suffice to illustrate the general development of the chapter. The MT 11:20–21 are missing in the Greek translation.

Neh 11:19–23 MT	Neh 11:19–23 LXX

---

86. Gary N. Knoppers, "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9," *Text* 20 (2000): 150, has argued that the LXX version in Neh 11 is generally "the shorter, less corrupt text," whereas the "MT Nehemiah is the longer text, because it furnishes longer headings and summaries (vv. 3, 18), fuller genealogies (vv. 7, 13, 14, 15, 17), an additional numerical total (v. 12), more administrative information (vv. 16, 17), and more descriptions of functions (vv. 17, 19). Hence the most likely explanation for the disparities in length is that the MT Nehemiah 11 has undergone expansion."

<table>
<tr><td>

¹⁵ומן הלוים ...
¹⁸מאתים שמנים וארבעה
¹⁹והשוערים עקוב טלמון ואחיהם <u>השמרים</u>
<u>בשערים</u> מאה שבעים ושנים
²⁰<u>ושאר ישראל הכהנים הלוים</u>
<u>בכל ערי יהודה איש בנחלתו</u>
²¹<u>והנתינים ישבים בעפל וציחא וגשפא על</u>
<u>הנתינים</u>
²²ופקיד הלוים בירושלם עזי בן בני בן
חשביה <u>בן מתניה</u> בן מיכא מבני אסף
המשררים לנגד מלאכת בית האלהים
²³כי מצות המלך עליהם
<u>ואמנה על המשררים דבר יום ביומו</u>

</td><td>

¹⁵καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Λευιτῶν ...
¹⁸διακόσιοι ὀγδοήκοντα τέσσαρες.
¹⁹καὶ οἱ πυλωροὶ Ακουβ, Τελαμιν, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν ἑκατὸν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο.

²²καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Λευιτῶν υἱὸς Βανι, Οζι υἱὸς Ασαβια υἱὸς Μιχα. ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ασαφ τῶν ᾀδόντων ἀπέναντι ἔργου οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ·
²³ὅτι ἐντολὴ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπ᾿ αὐτούς.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

¹⁵Also from the Levites … ¹⁸two hundred eighty-four. ¹⁹ The gatekeepers, Akkub, Talmon and their associates, <u>who kept watch at the gates</u>, were one hundred seventy-two.
²⁰<u>The rest of Israel, the priests and the Levites, were in all the towns of Judah, all of them in their inheritance.</u> ²¹<u>But the temple servants lived on Ophel, and Ziha and Gishpa were over the temple servants.</u> ²²The overseer of the Levites in Jerusalem was Uzzi son of Bani son of Hashabiah <u>son of Mattaniah</u> son of Mica, of the descendants of Asaph, the singers, in charge of the work of the house of God, ²³because there was a command of the king for them, <u>and a settled provision for the singers, as was required every day.</u>

</td><td>

¹⁵And from the Leuites … ¹⁸two hundred eighty-four. ¹⁹The gatekeepers, Akoub, Telamin and their brothers were one hundred seventy-two.

²²The overseer of the Leuites was Ozi son of Bani son of Hasabia—he being son of Micha, of the descendants of Asaph, who sing opposite the work of the house of God, ²³because there was a command of the king for them.

</td></tr>
</table>

The following considerations suggest that 11:20–21 is a latecomer in its context and that the Greek version probably preserves a more original stage of the text than the MT. The immediate context in 11:15–24 lists Levites who settled in Jerusalem, providing their names and some of their numbers. These verses are part of a larger passage, namely, Neh 11:4–24, that lists people who had settled in Jerusalem. The passage is followed by a list of people who lived elsewhere in Judah (11:25–30) and Benjamin

(11:31–36). Nehemiah 11:20–21 thus digresses in many ways. It refers to "the rest of Israel, the priests and the Levites," who had settled "in all towns of Judah" and to the temple servants who lived on Ophel. It widens the perspective to include "the rest of Israel" (ושאר ישראל) and priests, which is out of place in a list of Levites. The list of priests is already met in 11:10–14, and a reference to their locale would be expected there and not in a name list of Levites. Moreover, the list of Levites in 11:15–24 (or the list of priests in 11:10–14) does not otherwise specify where the people lived, because the whole section is a list of people who lived in Jerusalem. That the differing location in 11:20–21 is a latecomer in the name lists is highlighted by the MT plus in 11:22, according to which the overseer of the Levites lived in Jerusalem; the reference to Jerusalem is missing in the LXX version. This addition in 11:22 was necessary after 11:20–21 digressed to include another locale. There is thus an apparent connection between the variant in 11:22 and the large MT plus in 11:20–21, which effectively excludes the possibility of an accidental omission (see below).

That 11:25 begins a list of people who lived in the villages further confirms that 11:20–21 does not derive from the same author as 11:25. Nehemiah 11:20 comes too early and repeats the same idea as 11:25 but uses different vocabulary (cf. ואל החצרים בשדתם and בכל ערי יהודה).[87] Nehemiah 11:20 also overlaps with 11:3, which is part of the introduction to the name-lists, repeating much of its information. One should further note that the temple servants, or the Nethinim (נתינים), seem to have been added to 11:3 as well. In addition to the MT of Neh 11:3, they are found in most Greek (and other) witnesses. However they are missing in Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Although Robert Hanhart's edition of the LXX includes them ("καὶ οἱ ναθιναῖοι"), this is probably incorrect, for there must be a connection between the addition in 11:3 and 11:21.[88]

Neh 11:20–21 MT	Neh 11:3 MT

---

87. That the החצרים does not refer to merely small villages is implied by the list of towns that follows in 11:25–30, which includes Lachish and Beersheba.

88. Thus also Deirdre N. Fulton, *Reconsidering Nehemiah's Judah: The Case of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12*, FAT 2/80 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 36–40.

²⁰ושאר ישראל הכהנים הלוים בכל ערי יהודה איש בנחלתו ²¹והנתינים ישבים בעפל וציחא וגשפא על הנתינים	ואלה ראשי המדינה אשר ישבו בירושלם ובערי יהודה ישבו איש באחזתו בעריהם ישראל הכהנים והלוים <u>והנתינים</u> ובני עבדי שלמה
²⁰The rest of Israel, the priests and the Levites, were in all the towns of Judah, all of them in their inheritance. ²¹But the temple servants lived on Ophel; and Ziha and Gishpa were over the temple servants.	These are the leaders of the province who lived in Jerusalem; but in the towns of Judah all lived on their property in their towns: Israel, the priests, the Levites, <u>the temple servants</u>, and the descendants of Solomon's servants.

It is possible the temple servants were added to 11:3 by the same editor, who partly duplicated its information in 11:20–21. A partial motive for the addition would have been to add where the temple servants settle. It is thus more probable that the pluses in 11:3 and 11:20–21 were secondarily inserted into the proto-MT tradition than omitted in the Old Greek or its *Vorlage*. Taking all this together, it is likely that in lacking 11:20–21 the Old Greek represents an earlier stage of the text than the MT.[89]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. According to Ralph Klein, the differences between the MT and LXX of Neh 11 are mainly scribal mistakes in the LXX tradition "due to *homoioarkton*, *homoioteleuton*, or similar processes."[90] Although one cannot exclude scribal mistakes in some of the cases, such a general characterization of the LXX variants is highly problematic. One would have to assume a mistake in nearly every verse of Neh 11–12. If one maintains this position, it would have to be strictly based on demonstrated homoioarktons and homoioteleutons in each assumed accidental omission, but in fact most of the variants do not contain potential triggers for accidental mistakes. One can find several short homoioarktons of a conjunction or similar words, but one must ask whether they could have caused repeated omissions in the LXX transmission or in its *Vorlage*, especially in Neh 11–12. This would necessitate a particularly careless scribe who copied these chapters. Notably, the LXX

---

89. A similar conclusion (but with largely different arguments) has been reached by Knoppers, "Sources, Revisions, and Editions," 150; and Fulton, *Reconsidering Nehemiah's Judah*.

90. Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 264.

text is not confusing in comparison with the MT. If one assumes repeated accidental mistakes, this would presumably result in several problems, as an accidental omission takes place in an arbitrary section of the text. There is no indication of such, and in many respects the LXX is clearer than the MT.

One could indeed argue that 11:20–21 were accidentally omitted due to a homoioteleuton of three letters, compare ושנים … הנתינים. However, the chapter is full of masculine plural endings, and in 11:19–23 alone there are fourteen plural endings. It would necessitate a very unskilled scribe to confuse them, and in a text that contains repeated plural endings a scribe would probably pay particular attention to them. It is also notable that the suggested accidental omission would have improved the text in 11:20–21, for in many respects the LXX is much less digressive and more consistent than the MT, as we have seen. Consequently, Klein's theory of a general abridgment by mistake is very unlikely in 11:20–21 as well as in many other variants of Neh 11–12.[91] We have also seen that the MT version of 11:22 refers to Jerusalem, while the LXX is lacking it. This cannot be unconnected to the fact that 11:20–21 specifically adds the location of settlement. Klein's theory would have to assume that 11:20–21, the temple servants in 11:3, and Jerusalem in 11:22 were accidentally omitted in the LXX, but the chances for these obviously connected omissions to take place accidentally are practically zero, and therefore Klein's theory on 11:20–21 is very unlikely.

As for the other large variants in Neh 11–12, one should note that the LXX version of Ezra-Nehemiah otherwise extensively follows the MT, and it is mainly in the name-lists (and in Neh 11–12 in particular) where we find repeated variants. If the LXX version had been peppered with accidental scribal mistakes in these sections, which implies an exceptionally poor copying process, one would expect to find them throughout the composition. However, in Nehemiah there are repeated text-critical variants mainly in the name-lists, which are also otherwise known to have been prone to expansions and other editing (in addition to Neh 11–12, see Neh 3:7; 8:4, 7; 10:11; a case in point is 1 Chr 1:8–28, discussed in this chapter), while in the rest of the composition text-critical variants are clearly

---

91. For further criticism of Klein's theory, see a discussion of different variants between the MT and LXX of Neh 11 by Fulton, *Reconsidering Nehemiah's Judah*, 55–62.

less frequent. This further decreases the probability of accidental mistakes behind the variants in Neh 11–12.

One should also exclude the possibility of an abridgment by free translation. The LXX translation of Ezra-Nehemiah is otherwise fairly literal (cf. 1 Esdras, which is far from literal) and it is not known for its interpretations or abridgments. As noted by Zipora Talshir, "The first feature that strikes the user of 2 Esdras is its utter literalism, at the expense of a decent target language."[92] In the sections that the LXX and MT share a text (including in Neh 11–12), the Greek translation follows the MT very closely. This is evident, for example, in 11:19 and 22, where the translation corresponds to the MT nearly word-for-word to the extent that the Greek translation largely follows the Hebrew word order. This undermines any theory that assumes large-scale thematic omissions in the translation process. The omission of entire verses with additional information is thus especially implausible.

Loring Batten discusses the possibility that the order between 11:3, 20–21, and 25–30 could have been secondarily confused. He notes that 11:20 "would be more appropriate as an intr. to vv. 25ff."[93] Although one should not exclude the possibility that the problems were caused by an accidental misplacement, the theory of a later expansion is more probable. We have already seen that 11:25 uses different vocabulary than 11:20–21, and 11:25 already contains an introduction. The connected addition of "Jerusalem" in 11:22 especially suggests that 11:20–21 was intentionally placed in its current location, which excludes an accidental transposition from 11:25. It is also difficult to see any motive for secondarily transposing 11:20–21 to this location.[94] Despite the similarities between 11:3 and 20–21, it is also apparent that 11:20–21 are not an accidental duplicate of 11:3. Consequently, the best theory for the MT and LXX variants is that 11:20–21 are a later addition.

---

92. Zipora Talshir, "19.3.1 Septuagint", in Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0019030100.

93. Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 267, 271.

94. Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 271, considers the possibility that 11:20 serves "as a transition to mark the fact that the Neth. did not dwell in Jerus. proper." It is not clear what he means by this, as 11:20 shifts the focus to the other towns in Judah, where "the rest of Israel etc." lived, while according to 11:21 the Nethinim are said to live in Ophel, which is in Jerusalem.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition in 11:20–21 was rather poorly placed in a juncture of the passage, before the introduction of Uzzi, the overseer of the Levites, but the text still continues with the Levites. It is not easy to see why the addition was placed exactly here, which explains the theories of accidental or intentional displacement. It is possible that the scribe overlooked that the text still continues with the Levites who settled in Jerusalem. The expansion is also rather uncharacteristic as it does not try to attach to the older text in any apparent way.

One can see the motives for the addition. It highlights the other towns of Judah (כל ערי יהודה), while the older text in 11:25 merely refers to the settlements as "villages" (חצרים). The addition thus gives the impression of Judah being slightly more important than it is in the older text. That the temple servants were added to 11:3 and 21—probably by the same scribe—implies that the inclusion of this group was very important for the scribe. Because of the connections between 11:3, 20–21, and 22 (Jerusalem) we are probably dealing with, what some would call, a redaction where the same hand edited large sections of a text by certain motifs or themes. Nehemiah 11:20–21 is thus not an isolated addition.

From a technical perspective the addition of Jerusalem in 11:22 is also important, because it is an accommodating adjustment of the older text that was necessary after the addition in 11:20. In the older text the whole list mentions people who settled in Jerusalem and therefore a reference to Jerusalem was unnecessary, but it became necessary to mention it again after the expansion referred to other towns as well. This shows that additions were often not mere blocks, but the scribes often also adjusted (or had to adjust) the older text with small words.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is very likely that a critic would have suspected a later intervention in 11:20–21. At least the unexpected reference to the rest of Israel, who live in other towns would hardly go unnoticed; it begs for an explanation. Besides suspecting a misplacement (cf. Batten, above, who does not appeal to the LXX at all in discussing this problem), several literary critical criteria could be amassed to assume that 11:20–21 cannot be original in its context.[95] Nevertheless, the critic might have difficulties in showing the exact expansion and be further misled by the reference to Jerusalem in 11:22 (and perhaps also by the addition of

---

95. See Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 271.

the temple servants in 11:3). Such accommodating adjustments are a challenge to biblical criticism that needs to be taken into consideration better.

Results. The MT of Neh 11:20–21 can be identified as a later addition, while the shorter LXX preserves the more original reading. The addition, which is probably part of a wider revision of the whole passage, was not particularly well made, and therefore some scholars suspect a misplacement, especially of 11:20. Because the verses stick out so clearly from their context, it is likely that even without the LXX a careful critic would suspect that MT 11:20–21 is intrusive.

6

Additions: Larger Passages

Documented large additions are less frequent than small additions, but examples can be found in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. The Greek witnesses of younger books in particular contain a number of illustrative cases of large additions. For example, the Greek versions of Esther contain six to seven large additions of seven to twenty-three verses.[1] Similar examples are also found in the Greek versions of Daniel and 1 Esdras. Despite the heavy concentration of the examples in the younger books, documented evidence for large additions can also be found in other parts of the Hebrew Bible, for example, at the end of Exodus, in the first half of 1 Kings, in Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. On the basis of the available evidence, large additions were in the toolbox of many editors in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible.

A good example of a large addition is Mordecai's dream, the so-called addition A in Esther, which is only found in the two Greek versions and missing in the Masoretic Text. Its style, expressions, language, content, and theology are clearly different from the rest of the book. Whereas the Hebrew version of Esther never mentions God and is largely untheological, Mordecai's dream contains a dream vision where God reveals to Mordecai what he plans to do. Placed at the beginning of the book, the addition gives the whole ensuing story a much more theological perspective and interpretation. Accordingly, it has been generally acknowledged that Mordecai's dream is a later addition in Greek and not an omission in Hebrew. Even without the shorter and more original version preserved in the MT, the critic would easily note the contrast between addition A and the following text. In addition to the different genre, style, theology, and language, technical details suggest that the dream was added later. The

---

1. Addition C is often divided into two different additions C^1 and C^2.

beginning of the addition introduces King Artaxerxes (in v. A1) but after
the addition, in the original beginning, he is introduced again and in a way
that would be expected of an initial introduction (in Esth 1:1): "This hap-
pened in the days of Ahasuerus, the same Ahasuerus who ruled over one
hundred twenty-seven provinces from India to Ethiopia."[2] For a critic, the
new beginning would already raise the suspicion that the preceding intro-
duction cannot be original. Similarly, Mordecai is introduced in Esth 2:5
as if for the first time: "Now there was a Judean man in Susa the city, and
his name was Mardochaios the son of Iairos son of Semeias son of Kisaios,
from the tribe of Beniamin." However, addition A has already introduced
him in verse A1–2, using partly the same words:

> [1]Mardochaios the son of Iairos son of Semeias son of Kisaios, from the
> tribe of Beniamin, saw a dream. [2]He was a Judean man dwelling in the
> city of Susa, a great man, serving in the court of the king.
> [A1]ἐνύπνιον εἶδεν Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ τοῦ Ἰαΐρου τοῦ Σεμεΐου τοῦ Κισαίου ἐκ
> φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, [A2]ἄνθρωπος Ἰουδαῖος οἰκῶν ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει, ἄνθρωπος
> μέγας θεραπεύων ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ βασιλέως.

Many other small details would corroborate that the dream has been
added later. The other large additions in Greek Esther, additions B to F,
similarly differ from their respective contexts and provide several clear
signs for assuming a different origin than their context.

   Although all the examples in Esther are found in the Greek versions,
they are very typical of large additions. They are often self-contained units
without which the text would still function flawlessly, and their language,
style, topic, and theological conceptions often differ. Although slightly
shorter, a very illustrative example can be found in Jer 10:6–8, which are
missing in the LXX. After a criticism of idols of the nations in 10:2–5, the
MT suddenly introduces a small praise of Yahweh who is said to be mighty
and incomparable (10:6–7). The text then returns to ridicule the idols in
10:8–9, 10:8 functioning as a transition by *Wiederaufnahme* that brings
the narrative back to the theme of 10:2–5. One should also note that in the
shared text in 10:2–5 and 8–9 Yahweh speaks in the first person, while the

---

   2. A1: Ἔτους δευτέρου βασιλεύοντος Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μεγάλου, "In the second year
when Artaxerxes the Great was king." Esther 1:1: ויהי בימי אחשורוש הוא אחשורוש המלך
‏מהדו ועד כוש שבע ועשרים ומאה מדינה.

MT plus addresses him in the second-person. There is no transition from
Yahweh's speech to the apparent praise by the community.

Most documented large pluses clearly stick out from their contexts
in style, language, and conceptions, as in Mordecai's dream in Esther and
Jer 10:6–8.[3] The critic would thus easily suspect that such sections are not
original in their contexts. The reason for this is their size, which gives
abundant material for comparing the language, use of expressions, style,
theology, and content of the addition with its context. In such cases the
critic does not have to rely on isolated observations that leave considerable
uncertainties for the hypothesis, as is often the case with small additions.
This is corroborated in the sample texts that will be analyzed in detail.
Because of the apparent similarities in detectability, only a few texts will
be discussed here.

6.1. Jeremiah 29:16–20

Jeremiah 29:16–20 predicts a gloomy future for the reigning Judean king
and the people of Jerusalem, because Yahweh will let various calamities
face them. The reason for the punishments is their neglect of Yahweh's
words that he sent through his prophets. These verses are missing in most
LXX manuscripts. The Antiochene manuscripts include them, but they are
placed before 29:15. As already implied by the variant location, it stands to
reason that the Antiochene reading is the result of a later harmonization
with the proto-MT and an additional improvement of the text, for the new
location is somewhat more suitable for these verses. Other witnesses, such
as the Peshitta, Targum Jonathan, and the Vulgate, follow the MT. The pas-
sage is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Jer 29:15–21 MT	Jer 36:15–21 LXX
¹⁵כי אמרתם הקים לנו יהוה נבאים בבלה	¹⁵ὅτι εἴπατε Κατέστησεν ἡμῖν κύριος προφήτας ἐν Βαβυλῶνι,
¹⁶כי כה אמר יהוה אל המלך היושב אל כסא דוד ואל כל העם היושב בעיר הזאת אחיכם אשר לא יצאו אתכם בגולה ¹⁷כה אמר יהוה צבאות הנני משלח בם את החרב	

_____

3. Several similar examples can be found in Jeremiah, e.g., 39:4–13. Some of them
will be discussed in this chapter in detail.

את הרעב ואת הדבר ונתתי אותם כתאנים
השערים אשר לא תאכלנה מרע ¹⁸ורדפתי
אחריהם בחרב ברעב ובדבר ונתתים לזועה
לכל ממלכות הארץ לאלה ולשמה ולשרקה
ולחרפה בכל הגוים אשר הדחתים שם
¹⁹תחת אשר לא שמעו אל דברי נאם יהוה
אשר שלחתי אליהם את עבדי הנבאים
השכם ושלח ולא שמעתם נאם יהוה
²⁰ואתם שמעו דבר יהוה כל הגולה אשר
שלחתי מירושלם בבלה

²¹כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל אל
אחאב בן קוליה ואל צדקיהו בן מעשיה
הנבאים לכם בשמי שקר הנני נתן אתם ביד
נבוכדראצר מלך בבל והכם לעיניכם

²¹οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος ἐπὶ Αχιαβ καὶ
ἐπὶ Σεδεκιαν Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτοὺς
εἰς χεῖρας βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος, καὶ
πατάξει αὐτοὺς κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.

¹⁵Because you have said, "Yahweh has raised up prophets for us in Babylon," ¹⁶Thus says Yahweh concerning the king who sits on the throne of David, and concerning all the people who live in this city, your kinsfolk who did not go out with you into exile: ¹⁷Thus says Yahweh of hosts, I am going to let loose on them sword, famine, and pestilence, and I will make them like rotten figs that are so bad they cannot be eaten. ¹⁸I will pursue them with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, and will make them a horror to all the kingdoms of the earth, to be an object of cursing, and horror, and hissing, and a derision among all the nations where I have driven them, ¹⁹because they did not heed my words, says Yahweh, when I persistently sent to you my servants the prophets, but they would not listen, says Yahweh. ²⁰But now, all you exiles whom I sent away from Jerusalem to Babylon, hear the word of Yahweh: ²¹thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, concerning Ahab son of Kolaiah and Zedekiah son of Maaseiah, who are

¹⁵Because you have said, "Yahweh appointed prophets for us in Babylon,"

²¹thus says Yahweh concerning Achiab and Sedekias:

prophesying a lie to you in my name:

Behold, I am going to deliver them into the hand of King <u>Nebuchadnezzar</u> of Babylon, and he shall kill them before your eyes.	Behold, I am going to deliver them into the hands of the king of Babylon, and he shall strike them before your eyes.

The MT version of Jer 29 contains problems of narrative sequence, which are probably due to later editing. One can discern a clear sequence in the criticism of false prophets in 29:8–9, 15, and 21–23. They form a logical story where Jeremiah, after addressing the exiles in Babylon in 29:4–7, quotes a word of Yahweh that they should not let themselves be deceived by false prophets, who are telling lies and will therefore be punished. The message is unmistakably for the Judean exiles living in Babylonia. Two passages, namely 29:10–14 and 16–20 interrupt this sequence, although the digression is clearer in 29:16–20, and its nature as a later addition is further suggested by the shorter Greek version. Jeremiah 29:10–14 is preserved in both versions, but many scholars, such as William McKane and Robert Carroll, assume that 29:10–14 were also added later.[4]

The following considerations suggest that the MT plus in Jer 29:16–20 is not part of the original text. The plus is thematically unconnected to the question of false prophets, which is the topic of the immediate context in 29:15 and 21–23. It is difficult to see how an author would write an introduction to the prophetic problem in Babylonia in 29:15, then suddenly continue the text with a different topic. The context also addresses the Babylonian community and discusses its problems, but it then unexpectedly refers to the sins of the Jerusalemite community. This is particularly peculiar in a letter that was allegedly sent from Jerusalem. The prediction of an upcoming punishment in 29:16–19 is primarily relevant for the Jerusalemites, but has little bearing on the Babylonian community. Jeremiah 29:20 shows the problem, for it was necessary to specify that the audience is the Babylonian community in the ensuing verses 29:21–23: "But now, all you exiles" כל הגולה ... ואתם שמעו. Jeremiah 29:20 thus seems to function as a transition to the older text, after the expansion had digressed in topic and audience. That 29:20 is not original is shown by its redundancy in relation to 29:21: "[20] But now, all you exiles whom I sent away from Jerusalem to Babylon, hear the word of Yahweh: [21] thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel." Even with the necessary and planned transition,

---

4. McKane, *Jeremiah*, 735–39; and Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 558–60.

the return to the older text is clogged. Jeremiah 29:20 refers to Yahweh, after which his name is repeated but with additional epithets. That the transition cannot be original is highlighted by the peculiar transition from Yahweh's first-person speech in 29:20 to the third person in 29:21. In 29:20 Yahweh speaks in the first person and quotes his own prophecy, but before the prophecy begins, the text refers to him in the third-person in 29:21: "thus says Yahweh" כה אמר יהוה. Jeremiah 29:15 likewise refers to Yahweh in the third-person. It is thus likely that 29:15, where Jeremiah is the speaker, originally preceded 29:21, where Jeremiah is also the speaker. Jeremiah 29:20 is a secondary attempt to accommodate for the digressive verses 29:16–19 within its context. Already Bernhard Duhm noted that the כי-sentence in 29:15 connected poorly to the following text and essentially hangs in the air in the MT.[5] The most logical conclusion is that the כי-sentence was originally continued in 29:21, with which it connects very well: כי אמרתם הקים לנו יהוה נבאים בבלה כה אמר יהוה "Because you have said, 'Yahweh has raised up prophets for us in Babylon,' thus says Yahweh." The text then continues with the punishment of the false prophets. Accordingly, but also with further arguments, many scholars have concluded that Jer 29:16–20 are a later addition.[6]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Georg Fischer briefly notes that these verses are missing in the LXX, but without any arguments; he merely implies that the LXX reading is secondary.[7] In view of the rather clear signs in favor of an addition in this passage, it is peculiar that Fischer, in the introduction of the commentary, notes that in not a single case is the LXX "more probable or to be preferred" ("wahrscheinlicher oder zu bevorzugen").[8] Such a position can only be maintained by a strong disposition to favor the MT, whereas an equal evaluation of the two witnesses would strongly suggest that in Jer 29:16–20 the MT is secondary. Fischer's position does not stand the scrutiny of closer inspection in many example texts. In this volume we have seen many other cases where the LXX is

---

5. Duhm, *Jeremia*, 231.

6. Duhm, *Jeremia*, 231–32; Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 157; Rudoph, *Jeremia*, 186; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 739–40; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 559–60; Hermann-Josef Stipp, *Jeremia 25–52*, HAT 1/12,2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 185–88.

7. Fischer, *Jeremia 26–52*, 101.

8. Fischer, *Jeremia 1–25*, 46.

probably more original than the MT of Jeremiah, but each case has to be argued separately.

As for concrete arguments for an alternative theory, Wilhelm Rudolph mentions the possibility of a homoioteleuton (בבלה … בבלה), but on grounds of its differing style and content he nevertheless concludes that Jer 29:16–20 is more probably a secondary addition.[9] However, Jack Lundbom maintains that an accidental omission is the most probable solution, and he notes that these verses are "simply one of the fifteen arguable cases of haplography in the chapter."[10] He further presents counterarguments against the theory that the verses were added later, but they are largely on a general level and based on the idea that the content of 29:16–20 is not impossible in Jeremiah's context. This is slippery ground, since we do not know enough about Jeremiah's message, and methodologically many topics are "possible." Methodologically one cannot assume something original if it is possible, for in practice, this would always be a bias toward the more expansive text. In the evaluation of variants it is more important to address the problems in the narrative coherence, text-internal inconsistencies or contradictions, as well as differences in language and style.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The reason or trigger for the expansion may have been the earlier expansion in 29:10–14, which predicts an upcoming return of the exiles to the land. This would have necessitated an explanation of what will happen to those who remained in the land: According to the expansion, they will be destroyed and banished, which lays ground for an empty land when the exiles return. The question of the relationship between the remainees and exiles is apparent, since the context of the chapter implies the existence of both communities. In other words, the later expansions gave an answer as to what will happen to both communities. Two apparently separate editors sought to clarify the issue, each from a different perspective. That we are dealing with two separate editors is suggested by the fact that the LXX contains 29:10–14 and lacks 29:16–20. It stands to reason that the first addition was made before the proto-MT and the transmission of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX diverged as separate traditions, while 29:16–20 were apparently added in the proto-MT transmission.

---

9. Rudoph, *Jeremia*, 186.
10. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, 345–48.

Although rather poorly placed, the addition in 29:16–20 may have been written for its context and thus does not have a prehistory in another source. This is suggested by the formal address to the Babylonian community, for example, 29:16: "your kinsfolk who did not go out with you into exile." The text also consistently refers to the Jerusalemites in the third person. The idea of the Jerusalemites as bad figs in 29:17 is probably dependent on Jer 24, which presents the idea of the exiles as good figs and the remainees as bad figs. The same picture is given in Jer 29, especially after both expansions, verses 10–14 and 16–20. On the basis of its similarity, Jer 29:20 may also have been influenced by Jer 24:5. One cannot completely exclude the possibility that Jer 29:16–19 (29:20 is a transition that only has a function in this text) has an external origin but in this case one would have to assume that the text was extensively rewritten to accommodate for its present context and for the whole book of Jeremiah. In any case, Jer 29:16–20 is a further development of conceptions that essentially rise out of the older text in Jeremiah.

From a technical perspective, 29:20 is noteworthy, for it shows an editorial technique that was necessary after a larger expansion. Although it is not a classical *Wiederaufnahme* in the sense that it repeats a sentence or other elements from the text preceding the expansion, it similarly functions as a bridge between the addition and the older text that is continued after the expansion. In this example, such a bridge was necessary, because the thematic digression of 29:16–19 was so prominent.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. The problems of Jer 29:16–20 in relation to its context are so apparent that it would have been rather easy to detect the addition without the Greek version. The critic would certainly note the thematic digression, the difference in reference to Yahweh (first-person speaker in 29:16–20), 29:15 as a sentence that hangs in the air, and the repetitive and clogged transition from 29:20 to 21. Accordingly, Hermann-Josef Stipp, who is otherwise critical of our possibilities of detecting undocumented additions, mentions this passage as one that could be identified as a later addition without a variant edition that documents it.[11]

Results. The MT plus in Jer 29:16–20 is a later addition that could be detected even without the shorter version as preserved in the LXX. Several

---

11. Stipp, "Semi-Empirical Example," 312–13.

indicators suggest that all of 29:16–20 cannot derive from the same author as the surrounding text. The addition was not very well placed within the narrative, and the editor seems to have had the fate of the remainees more in mind than narrative consistency, which was effectively disrupted by the addition.

<center>6.2. Jeremiah 33:14–26</center>

The MT version of Jer 33:14–26 contains a large plus that reminds the Israelites of Yahweh's unbreakable covenant with the Davidic dynasty and the Levites. This is the largest section of the MT Jeremiah that is missing in the LXX version. Although the majority of scholars now regard the Greek version as a generally older version of the book and assume Jer 33:14–26 to be a later addition, each case still has to be argued on its own terms.[12] In any case, some scholars still maintain the priority of the MT version in Jer 33:14–26, as we will see. 4Q72 (4QJer^c) preserves some lines of 33:16–20, which clearly show that the manuscript follows the MT in the plus. Targum Jonathan, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta also contain the plus.

14הנה ימים באים נאם יהוה והקמתי את הדבר הטוב אשר דברתי אל בית ישראל ועל בית יהודה 15בימים ההם ובעת ההיא אצמיח לדוד צמח צדקה ועשה משפט וצדקה בארץ 16בימים ההם תושע יהודה וירושלם תשכון לבטח וזה אשר יקרא לה יהוה צדקנו 17כי כה אמר יהוה לא יכרת לדוד איש ישב על כסא בית ישראל 18ולכהנים הלוים לא יכרת איש מלפני מעלה עולה ומקטיר מנחה ועשה זבח כל הימים 19ויהי דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו לאמור 20כה אמר יהוה אם תפרו את בריתי היום ואת בריתי הלילה ולבלתי היות יומם ולילה בעתם 21גם בריתי תפר את דוד עבדי מהיות לו בן מלך על כסאו ואת הלוים הכהנים משרתי 22אשר לא יספר צבא השמים ולא ימד חול הים כן ארבה את זרע דוד עבדי ואת הלוים משרתי אתי 23ויהי דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו לאמר 24הלוא ראית מה העם הזה דברו לאמר שתי המשפחות אשר בחר יהוה בהם וימאסם ואת עמי ינאצון מהיות עוד גוי לפניהם 25כה אמר יהוה אם לא בריתי יומם ולילה חקות שמים וארץ לא שמתי 26גם זרע יעקוב ודוד עבדי אמאס מקחת מזרעו משלים אל זרע אברהם ישחק ויעקב כי אשוב [אשיב] את שבותם ורחמתים
14The days are surely coming, says Yahweh, when I will fulfill the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 15In those days and

---

12. That the Greek is older is noted by many, e.g., Stipp, "Semi-Empirical Example," 295. For Jer 33:14–26 as a later edition, see Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 157; Erbt, *Jeremia und seine Zeit*, 29; Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 156; Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 118; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 739; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 637.

at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to spring up for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. [16]In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will live in safety. And this is the name by which it will be called: "Yahweh is our righteousness." [17]For thus says Yahweh: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, [18]and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings, to make grain offerings, and to make sacrifices for all time. [19]The word of Yahweh came to Jeremiah: [20]Thus says Yahweh: If any of you could break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night would not come at their appointed time, [21]only then could my covenant with my servant David be broken, so that he would not have a son to reign on his throne, and my covenant with my ministers the Levites. [22]Just as the host of heaven cannot be numbered and the sands of the sea cannot be measured, so I will increase the offspring of my servant David, and the Levites who minister to me. [23]The word of Yahweh came to Jeremiah: [24]Have you not observed how these people say, "The two families that Yahweh chose have been rejected by him," and how they hold my people in such contempt that they no longer regard them as a nation? [25]Thus says Yahweh: Only if I had not established my covenant with day and night and the ordinances of heaven and earth, [26]would I reject the offspring of Jacob and of my servant David and not choose any of his descendants as rulers over the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will restore their fortunes, and will have mercy upon them.

The following considerations suggest that Jer 33:14–26 is a secondary addition: It is thematically (and technically) an independent unit, it contains theological ideas that go beyond the rest of the book, it uses concepts not otherwise found in Jeremiah, and it is only poorly connected to its context. As noted by William McKane "verses 14–26 have no points of contact with vv. 1–13," and indeed the lack of shared themes and theological conceptions with the preceding text is apparent.[13] Although there are references to the future of David's dynasty in other parts of Jeremiah (see below), the plus makes a clear statement in this regard and thereby partially shifts the book's theological message.

The theological shift can be seen in the immediate context. Jeremiah 33:1–13 discusses the revival of community life with an emphasis on the people, the land, and Jerusalem, which is in line with conceptions and future perspectives presented in many other parts of the book. Taking on the general idea about the future of Israel, the MT plus in 33:14–26 shifts

---

13. McKane, *Jeremiah*, 2:clxii–clxiii.

the focus to the continuity of the Davidic line as well as to the position of the Levites in the upcoming revival. In the plus the future of Judah and Israel is essentially about the dynasty and the Levites, while in many other parts the book is largely silent about the future of the dynasty. The Levites are never even mentioned in the rest of the book, which thus strongly contrasts with 33:14–26. Instead of the multitude of Israelites, the plus emphasizes the multitude of the Davidides and the Levites (33:22). The importance of the Davidides and the Levites is further highlighted by the idea about Yahweh's unbreakable covenant with them (33:20–21). There is no reference to a covenant with Israel or the Israelites, which is peculiar in view of the rest of the book (cf. Jer 11:10; 22:9; 31:31–33; 32:40; 34:13, 15, 18; 50:5). In fact, the idea of a covenant with David is met only in this passage in the entire book, while otherwise David is mainly mentioned in connection with his throne and the king who sits on it.[14] The most obvious connection between 33:14–26 and the rest of Jeremiah is with 23:5–6, and there appears to be a clear literary dependency:

Jer 33:14–16	Jer 23:5
<div dir="rtl">¹⁴הנה ימים באים נאם יהוה והקמתי את הדבר הטוב אשר דברתי אל בית ישראל ועל בית יהודה ¹⁵בימים ההם ובעת ההיא אצמיח לדוד צמח צדקה ועשה משפט וצדקה בארץ ¹⁶בימים ההם תושע יהודה וירושלם תשכן לבטח וזה אשר יקרא לה יהוה צדקנו</div>	<div dir="rtl">⁵הנה ימים באים נאם יהוה והקמתי לדוד צמח צדיק ומלך מלך והשכיל ועשה משפט וצדקה בארץ ⁶בימיו תושע יהודה וישראל ישכן לבטח וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו</div>
¹⁴The days are surely coming, says Yahweh, when I will fulfill the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. ¹⁵In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to spring up for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. ¹⁶In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will live in safety. And this is (the name) by which it will be called: "Yahweh is our righteousness."	⁵The days are surely coming, says Yahweh, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. ⁶In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. And this is the name by which he will be called: "Yahweh is our righteousness."

---

14. In Jer 13:13; 17:25; 22:2, 4, 30; 29:16; 36:30.

Although the beginning is extensively similar, the rest of Jer 33:14–26 goes theologically much further. Whereas 23:5 merely refers to a righteous branch of David that Yahweh will raise up, 33:14–26 introduces the idea of an eternal covenant between Yahweh and the Davidic dynasty.[15] It is apparent that 33:14–26 is also dependent on 31:35–37. Although the connections are not as extensive as with 23:5–6, there is a clear literary connection.[16]

An even more conspicuous novelty of the plus is the position of the Levites in the upcoming society. Not only is this passage the only one in the entire book that mentions this group, the passage implies that they are at the very top of the society, implicitly sharing power with the Davidides. Although the emphasis on the Davidides can be seen as a further development of ideas in the rest of the book, the Levites and their position are an entirely new idea. In this respect the plus implies very different conceptions of the society, its hierarchies, and political order than the older text. The Levitical sections are accompanied by sacrificial language (33:18), which is untypical in Jeremiah but which becomes more common in many late sections of the Hebrew Bible. A further indicator of a different origin is the reference to the patriarchs Abraham and Isaac in 33:26. This is the only passage in the entire book that mentions them, and the whole triad Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is rare in the whole Hebrew Bible as well. Outside the Pentateuch they are mentioned together only in 2 Kgs 13:23 and Jer 33:26. It may not be a coincidence that 2 Kgs 13:23 is missing in the Antiochene manuscripts, which may preserve the Old Greek and go back to an older stage of the text. It stands to reason that the conception of these three patriarchs as the backbone of Israel's prehistory is a construction that presumes a late form of the Pentateuch. This would imply a late origin of Jer 33:26, and thereby of the whole MT plus in 33:14–26 as well.

Besides peculiar features in content, William Holladay and Johan Lust have noted that the language and style in 33:14–26 differs from the rest of

---

15. Johan Lust, "The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case," *JNSL* 20 (1994): 38–39, demonstrates several details between the passages that imply a different authorship and context.

16. For a discussion of the relationship between 31:35–37 and 33:14–26, see Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "Urtext, texte court et relecture: Jérémie XXXIII 14–26 TM et ses preparations," in *Congress Volume, Leuven, 1989*, ed. John A. Emerton, VTSup 43 (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 237–47.

the book.[17] For example, Lust notes that "the use of קטר *hiphil* with מנחה is a *hapax*."[18] All these considerations—and many more have been presented by Lust in particular—strongly suggest that the plus in 33:14–26 is a late addition and that the shorter Greek version goes back to a Hebrew version that did not yet include this passage.[19] Accordingly, many scholars have regarded 33:14–26 to be a late addition to the book.[20] The reason for the addition is the lack of any vision or of what will come of the royal house and the cult in the upcoming revival. According to Bernhard Duhm, 33:14–26 was added to the proto-MT text after the second century BCE translation.[21] Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Lust have suggested an origin a century earlier.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Some scholars argue that the passage was accidentally omitted. According to Lundbom, "the verses were lost by (vertical) haplography (homoeoarcton: *h … h*)."[22] With this he presumably refers to the beginnings of 33:14 and 34:1, both of which begin with the letter *he* (הנה … הדבר). However, the omission of thirteen verses on the basis of one letter (!) is methodologically a very questionable explanation. This would not only necessitate a particularly sloppy scribe but it would also be an extreme coincidence that such an accidental omission very precisely left out an independent unit that is theologically different from the rest of the book, as we have seen. Statistically, an arbitrary omission mostly confuses a passage. In this passage alone the letter *he* is found seventy-three times, out of which eighteen are at the beginning of a word. Lundbom's theory assumes that accidentally the homoioarchton of *he* took place exactly at a theologically intrusive passage. The statistical probability for changes like this are close to zero. One could argue that an entire page of a codex had been ripped out and that a passage with a coherent theme had been placed on two pages intentionally, but this would be very hypothetical and also imply a very late omission. In view of the second-century

---

17. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1–25*, 228; Lust, "Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah," 37–38.

18. Lust, "Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah," 31–48.

19. Lust, "Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah," 38.

20. Duhm, *Jeremia*, 274, Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 184–85, McKane, *Jeremiah*, 2:clxii–clxiii, 861–65; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 637; Stipp, *Jeremia 25–52*, 364–66.

21. Duhm, *Jeremia*, 274. According to Mowinckel, *Jeremia*, 47–48, the passage is later than the main redactors of his analysis.

22. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, 538.

BCE translation of the LXX, this is very unlikely. Consequently, an attempt to explain the shorter LXX reading on account of an accidental omission has very little that can counterbalance the strong considerations for an intentional late addition in the proto-MT transmission.

An intentional omission in the LXX is another alternative, and indeed Georg Fischer has recently maintained that this is what happened. According to him, the reason for the omission would have been the translation's context in the second century BCE when it was already realized that the predictions of 33:14–26 would not come about and that the Davidic line would not continue any more.[23] This is a logical conjecture, but the LXX contains many other passages that were not realized and that contradicted other passages. There is no evidence of an intentional revision to this effect, and it is unlikely that a punctual omission with this intention in mind took place in some isolated passages, especially since the LXX is very close to the MT in parallel sections. An omission of Yahweh's unbreakable promise to the Davidides would have been a considerable theological intervention that simply runs counter to the nature of the LXX translation, which is mostly very faithful. For example, 25:14–16, which Fischer also refers to in this connection, is preserved in the Greek very faithfully although its promise was also without fulfillment. In any case, a sheer omission of Yahweh's promise is much less likely than adjustments that seek to accommodate for the apparent contradictions, and in any case, there is not much evidence for such interventions in the LXX version. Fischer additionally refers to the general context of the translators, which would have occasioned the omission, but he does not specify this suggestion any further.[24]

Many other scholars make only a brief note about the shorter Greek version and imply it to be secondary. According to Paul Volz, the LXX omits arbitrarily (*willkürlich*) and therefore it proves very little about the time when the passage was written.[25] Such a general characterization of the LXX Jeremiah should be rejected. As is evident in texts that the LXX and MT share, the translation was very faithful or even literal, and there-

---

23. Fischer, *Jeremia 26–52*, 233.

24. Fischer, *Jeremia 26–52*, 233, refers to an article by Arie van der Kooij, "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele," *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995*, ed. John A. Emerton, VTSup 66 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 185–202, who argues that some changes to the LXX version are dependent on the time and context of the translators in the second century BCE.

25. Paul Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, KAT 10 (Leipzig: Scholl, 1922), 311.

fore an intentional arbitrary omission of large and theologically important passages would be peculiar. Jonathan Grothe argues that 33:14–26 was omitted simply because an editor was not interested in the content, but this would again imply that the translator was contradictory, relating to some passages faithfully and to others rather carelessly.[26] This is seen in Jer 33 as well. The LXX translation follows the MT nearly word-for-word in verses 1–13, and therefore an assumption that an entire passage is then omitted out of disinterest would be inexplicable. It is also unclear how we can argue on the basis of the translator's disinterest without a detailed analysis of the translator's profile. Artur Weiser briefly notes that LXX omits the passage, but he is skeptical about our possibilities of determining why it was omitted, which implies that the LXX reading is somehow secondary in any case.[27] All in all, these views are not based on a fair and balanced evaluation of the two witnesses but on an implicit priority of the MT version.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The addition is connected to the preceding passage only loosely, and the main connection is the future of Israel. Whereas 33:1–13 portray the future of the Israelite society, 33:14–26 discuss the future of the Davidic line and the Levites. As we have seen, Jer 23:5–6 functioned as an essential springboard for the addition, but in many respects the content goes much beyond. The connection shows how editors connected to the older text, but notably, the new passage was placed in a very different location and not immediately after the possible trigger for the addition. The reason for expanding Jer 33 is its discussion about the future revival of Judah, which in the view of the editor was apparently lacking a focus on the Davidides and the Levites.

In contrast with most other large pluses in the MT of Jeremiah that extract most or all of their information from elsewhere in the book, this passage largely contains entirely new material. In this respect 33:14–26 corresponds to conventional conceptions about the nature of additions. It introduces new theological ideas and thereby partly even changes, or at least seeks to change, the book's theological message. According to Stipp, this passage is in this respect exceptional among the documented proto-

---

26. Jonathan F. Grothe, "An Argument for the Textual Genuineness of Jeremiah 33:14–26 (Masoretic Text)," *ConJ* 7 (1981): 188–91.

27. Artur Weiser, *Das Buch Jeremia: Kapitel 25,15–52,34*, ATD 21 (Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 1982), 306.

MT additions to Jeremiah, which otherwise do not have a clear theological focus or profile.[28]

From a technical perspective the addition was placed between two passages, and thereby it does not interrupt the older text in any particular way. A juncture is a very logical place to insert a large addition, for it is otherwise more difficult to return to the older text and its topics after the text has been developed in a new direction. In many cases an expansion seeks to attach to the older text by repeating its elements, vocabulary, phraseology, and topics, and then developing them further. This is also the case in Jer 33:14–26, especially in relation to Jer 23:5–6 and 31:35–37. However, the expansion was not placed after these passages but in a passage that deals with the future revival more extensively. The current passage is thus an example of a kind of *Wiederaufnahme* in a broad sense, because it was clearly disconnected from the passages that may have functioned as springboards for the addition. This technique nevertheless has had the effect that the expansion is thematically somehow connected to the older text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Even without the shorter version as preserved in the LXX, literary-critical considerations would have strongly suggested that the MT Jer 33:14–26 was added later. Although technical considerations for an addition are not compelling—the addition was placed in a junction between two passages—the theological differences between these verses and the rest of the book are particularly evident, and some of the vocabulary is also distinct from the rest of the book. Accordingly, even Stipp, who is otherwise rather skeptical about our possibilities of detecting later additions without documented evidence, assumes that Jer 33:14–26 would have been identified as an addition without the Greek version.[29]

Results. Jeremiah 33:14–26 is a late addition made in the proto-MT transmission. Its content differs so much from the rest of the book that it would

---

28. According to Stipp, "Semi-Empirical Example," 316, the scribes who added material to the book "pursued rather blurry theological ideas."

29. Stipp, "Semi-Empirical Example," 312–13, notes: "It seems reasonable to say that even without the testimony of the Old Greek, numerous critical scholars would still advocate the secondary status of these passages [Jer 29:16–20; 33:14–26; 39:4–13] within their contexts."

have been detected as an addition without the older version preserved in the LXX. The addition corresponds to conventional assumptions about redactions that introduce new theological conceptions and thereby make a clear change in relation to the older text.

6.3. 1 Chronicles 1:8–28

The beginning of Chronicles contains several genealogical lists, and they contain repeated variants between the Hebrew and Greek versions. Many names are found in different, sometimes considerably divergent forms, some names are different or in different order, and others are entirely missing in the other version. Although some variants were caused by copying errors, misunderstandings of names, and other corruptions, mistakes can only explain some of the variants. It is apparent that the lists were intentionally expanded and otherwise revised. After a list of the early genealogy of humans from Adam to the sons of Javan in 1:1–7, verses 8–27 contain the genealogies of Ham and Shem, the latter of which concludes with Abram. The MT version of both genealogies contains a large plus that is missing in the LXX. The Vulgate, Targum Chronicles, and the Peshitta share the pluses with the MT. Many Greek manuscripts (such as Codex Alexandrinus) and daughter translations (such as Ethiopic) also contain the pluses, but it seems likely that they are due to a later harmonization toward a proto-MT and that the Old Greek lacked them. Codex Vaticanus and some other manuscripts do not include the pluses. In some manuscripts parts or all of 1:11–23 are marked sub asterisk, and accordingly Leslie Allen notes that "Origen's basic text apparently lacked these verses and he added them to correspond to MT."[30] The passage is not preserved at Qumran.

1 Chr 1:8–28 MT	1 Chr 1:8–28 LXX
⁸בני חם כוש ומצרים פוט וכנען וⁿבני כוש סבא וחוילה וסבתא ורעמא וסבתכא ובני רעמא שבא ודדן	⁸Καὶ υἱοὶ Χαμ· Χους καὶ Μεστραιμ, Φουδ καὶ Χανααν. ⁹καὶ υἱοὶ Χους· Σαβα καὶ Ευιλατ καὶ Σαβαθα καὶ Ρεγμα καὶ Σεβεκαθα. καὶ υἱοὶ Ρεγμα· Σαβα καὶ Ουδαδαν.

---

30. Leslie C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of 1 and 2 Chronicles to the Massoretic Text.* VTSup 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 2:98.

¹⁰καὶ Χους ἐγέννησεν τὸν Νεβρωδ·οὗτος ἤρξατο τοῦ εἶναι γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

¹⁰וכוש ילד את נמרוד
הוא החל להיות גבור בארץ

¹¹ומצרים ילד את לודיים ואת ענמים ואת
להבים ואת נפתחים ¹²ואת פתרסים ואת
כסלחים אשר יצאו משם פלשתים ואת
כפתרים ¹³וכנען ילד את צידון בכרו ואת
חת ¹⁴ואת היבוסי ואת האמרי ואת הגרגשי
¹⁵ואת החוי ואת הערקי ואת הסיני ¹⁶ואת
הארודי ואת הצמרי ואת החמתי ¹⁷בני שם

¹⁷Υἱοὶ Σημ·
Αιλαμ καὶ Ασσουρ καὶ Αρφαξαδ,

עילם ואשור וארפכשד ולוד וארם ועוץ וחול
וגתר ומשך ¹⁸וארפכשד ילד את שלח ושלח
ילד את עבר ¹⁹ולעבר ילד שני בנים שם
האחד פלג כי בימיו נפלגה הארץ ושם אחיו
יקטן ²⁰ויקטן ילד את אלמודד ואת שלף
ואת חצרמות ואת ירח ²¹ואת הדורם ואת
אוזל ואת דקלה ²²ואת עיבל ואת אבימאל
ואת שבא ²³ואת אופיר ואת חוילה ואת

²⁴Σαλα,

יובב כל אלה בני יקטן ²⁴שם ארפכשד שלח
²⁵עבר פלג רעו ²⁶שרוג

²⁵Εβερ, Φαλεκ, Ραγαυ, ²⁶Σερουχ,
Ναχωρ, Θαρα, ²⁷Αβρααμ.

נחור תרח ²⁷אברם הוא אברהם

---

⁸The descendants of Ham: Cush, Egypt, Put, and Canaan. ⁹The descendants of Cush: Seba, Havilah, Sabta, Raama, and Sabteca. The descendants of Raamah: Sheba and Dedan. ¹⁰Cush became the father of Nimrod; he was the first to be a mighty one on the earth.

¹¹Egypt became the father of Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, Naphtuhim, ¹²Pathrusim, Casluhim, and Caphtorim, from whom the Philistines come. ¹³Canaan became the father of Sidon his firstborn, and Heth, ¹⁴and the Jebusites, the Amorites, the Girgashites, ¹⁵the Hivites, the Arkites, the Sinites, ¹⁶the Arvadites, the Zemarites, and the Hamathites. ¹⁷The descendants of Shem: Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, Aram, Uz, Hul, Gether, and Meshech. ¹⁸Arpachshad became the father of

⁸The descendants of Cham: Chous, Mestraim, Phoud and Chanaan. ⁹The descendants of Chous: Saba, Heuilat, Sabatha, Regma, and Sebekatha, and the descendants of Regma: Saba and Oudadan. ¹⁰Chous became the father of Nebrod; he was the first to be a giant hunter on the earth.

¹⁷The descendants of Sem: Ailam and Assour and Arphaxad,

Shelah; and Shelah became the father
of Eber. ¹⁹To Eber were born two sons:
the name of the one was Peleg (for in
his days the earth was divided), and the
name of his brother Joktan. ²⁰Joktan
became the father of Almodad, She-
leph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, ²¹Hadoram,
Uzal, Diklah, ²²Ebal, Abimael, Sheba,
²³Ophir, Havilah, and Jobab; all
these were the descendants of Joktan.

²⁴Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah; ²⁵Eber,	²⁴Sala, ²⁵Eber, Phalek, Ragau,
Peleg, Reu; ²⁶Serug, Nahor, Terah;	²⁶Serouch, Nachor, Thara, ²⁷Abraam.
²⁷Abram, that is, Abraham.	

Although only supported by the Old Greek, it is likely that the pluses in
1:11–16 and 17aβ*–24* are later additions. The list in 1:11–16 sticks out
from its context by containing names of nations and not of ancestors as
in the rest of the genealogy. Some of the names are otherwise unknown
and could theoretically be names, but the plural endings disclose that the
author primarily referred to nations and not to their ancestral fathers. For
example, 1:12 refers to Caphtorim (כפתרים) and not Caphtor (cf. Caph-
tor in Jer 47:4 and Amos 9:7). The difference becomes evident when we
compare 1:11 with the otherwise formally similar 1:10 (cf. "Cush became
the father of Nimrod" and "Egypt became the father of Ludim, Anamim,
Lehabim"). Immediately after the plus, the text continues in 1:17 with
typical names without the plural ending (Shem, Elam, etc.). It is hardly a
coincidence that exactly the MT plus in 1:11–16 contains names that are
formally and in reference different than in the surrounding verses 10 and
17. This suggests that 1:11–16 have a different origin than 1:10 and 17, and
this corresponds to the text-critical variant.

    As for the MT plus in 1:17aγ*–24*, one should note the repetition of
Shem, Arpachshad Eber, and Peleg in 1:17–19 and 24–25. Clearly, both
refer to the same ancestors, as they are in the exact same order, but there
is no apparent reason why part of the genealogy suddenly goes back in
1:24. Moreover, the repeated genealogies are formally presented in a dif-
ferent way. In the shared text of the LXX and MT the genealogy is merely
a list of names without any other elements (except for two conjunctions
in 1:17), whereas in the MT plus the same genealogy and some additional
names are presented with full sentences, such as "to Eber were born two
sons: the name of the one was Peleg" (ולעבר ילד שני בנים שם האחד פלג).

It is highly unlikely that the same author would have repeated the same genealogy in this way and changed the form of genealogy for a section and then returned to a paratactic list of names later. Since the Old Greek/LXX[B] is missing the section that differs, it is likely that the plus in the MT is a secondary addition.

A further argument for the secondary origin of the pluses is their probable source. As noted by some scholars, such as Sara Japhet, the lists in 1:13–16 and 17–23 were probably taken from Gen 10:13–18a and 22–29, respectively.[31] Genesis 10 refers to the same ancestors as 1 Chr 1, but the genealogy in Genesis also contains names missing in the LXX version of 1 Chr 1. For example, Gen 10:26 refers to Joktan and his sons Almodad, and Sheleph, and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah, which are found in the MT version of 1 Chr 1. Notably, Gen 10 is so extensively similar to the MT pluses in 1 Chr 1 that a direct borrowing has to be assumed (cf., e.g., Gen 10:25–27 and 1 Chr 1:19–21). It stands to reason that the genealogy in the MT version of 1 Chr 1 was later supplemented by the additional information in Gen 10, which also created some unnecessary repetitions as well as formal differences within the Chronicler's genealogy.[32] The less repetitive and shorter Old Greek goes back to a version of 1 Chr 1 that predates these borrowings.[33]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Hugh Williamson briefly notes that the absence of verses 17b–24a in LXX[B] is "clearly the result of homoioteleuton." Although a homoioteleuton is unlikely in verses 11–16, he assumes that the reading in LXX[B] is secondary, because "it unnaturally truncates the otherwise complete genealogy of the sons of Ham (v. 8)."[34]

---

31. Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 57–60.

32. Some of the parallels between Gen 10 and 1 Chr 1 also extend to Gen 10:22 and 1 Chr 1:17 which is shared by LXX[B]. Although one cannot exclude an earlier literary connection between the genealogies, this parallel is rather small. Notably, after the plus in 1 Chr 1:17aγ*–24*, the parallel with Gen 10 ceases, which strongly suggests that the MT version of 1 Chr has been revised according to Gen 10.

33. Apparently, most scholars assume that the MT is more original in both of the main pluses. Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 12A (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 267–68, notes on 1:11–16 that it is "uncertain whether they are original to Chronicles." He assumes that the plus in 1:17aγ*–24* is more original than the LXX[B] reading.

34. Hugh G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 41.

Japhet repeatedly refers to the LXX[B] reading and extensively discusses the relationship between Gen 10 and 1 Chr 1 but markedly does not discuss the possibility that the Old Greek could generally preserve a literary stage predating the MT.[35] Similarly, Edward Curtis notes that "the Chronicler had our present Gn. text before him," and that "these verses are wanting in" the LXX[B], but these important observations are not developed further in the commentary.[36] Curtis's only concrete argument for the priority of the MT is that the LXX contains Υἱοὶ Σημ· Αιλαμ καὶ Ασσουρ καὶ Αρφαξαδ, "The descendants of Sem: Ailam and Assour and Arphaxad," which would have to be "a remnant of v. 17." Therefore, he assumes that "the original 𝔊 contained the whole passage."[37] This is a peculiar argument, and implies a neglect of the LXX as an important witness for the development of the text. He apparently assumes corruption of some kind.

Wilhelm Rudolph assumes that all of 1:4–23 is a later addition, but he does not use the LXX[B] reading as an argument for this theory. However, he does note that the LXX[B] reading in 1:11–16 is probably due to an earlier stage of the text, but he explains the LXX[B] reading in 1:17*–24* as a result of a homoioteleuton caused by the name Arpachshad. Rather than assume the name as a trigger for a homoioteleuton, one should rather ask why the name is repeated and whether both pluses are connected. Moreover, the names are so far apart that one would then have to assume an accidental omission of at least two lines or more. This decreases the possibility of an accidental omission, while the considerations for the secondary addition are rather strong. There are no potential technical triggers for the accidental omission of 1:11–16. In principle an accidental omission of 1:17*–24* is possible through homoioteleuton, and, for example, Thomas Willi argues that LXX[B] clearly ("*eindeutig*") goes back to a scribal mistake.[38] Although this would be technically possible, he does not consider the possibility that the LXX could be more original than the MT, and at the background seems to be an unjustified bias against the LXX. As for 1:11–16, Willi also assumes that LXX[B] is secondary, for it mutilates the otherwise complete

---

35. See Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 56–60.

36. Edward L. Curtis, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), 65.

37. Curtis, *Books of Chronicles*, 57.

38. Thomas Willi, *Chronik: 1Chr 1–10*, BKAT (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 16. Similarly, Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, but with less certainty ("probably lost through haplography").

genealogy of Ham.[39] This is a very problematic argument, since it implicitly rejects the possibility that the genealogy may be composite and the result of a complicated textual history.

Another alternative is to assume an intentional shortening in the LXX by arguing that the unnecessary repetitions were omitted. This is theoretically possible for the plus in 1:17aγ*–24*, but since the LXX is also lacking names that are not repeated (such as Joktan, Almodad, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, and Jerah), one would have to assume that some names were intentionally left out. This is very unlikely, for it would be difficult to find a good motive for such an intervention. On the basis of the lack of genealogies of Egypt and Canaan, Leslie Allen asks, "did a nationalistically minded Jew delete the passage?"[40] This also seems very unlikely, because Egypt and Canaan are still mentioned in the passage and it would be quite exceptional to shorten the text in this way. The plus in 1:11–16 contains information found in Gen 10, and its secondary omission in 1 Chr 1 would be peculiar, for Chronicles seems to develop in a more inclusive direction in terms of genealogies, and not vice versa. Many of the genealogies in the Hebrew Bible seem to have been expanded by successive editors over the centuries.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The pluses in the MT are typical additions where a passage that deals with the same topic has secondarily influenced another. The more inclusive passage influenced the one that lacked some information. In this case the longer genealogy in Gen 10 was used to supplement a shorter version of the same family lines in 1 Chr 1. The more original genealogy in 1 Chr 1 only mentioned Egypt and Canaan as sons of Ham, but it did not mention their descendants. The older text only referred to the descendants of Cush, the firstborn of Ham, after which the genealogy already continued with Shem. Finding a list of descendants of Egypt and Canaan in Gen 10, an editor added them to 1 Chr 1, where they could rather easily be inserted after Cush's descendants. Genealogies and name-lists in particular seem to have been prone to additions, as the different versions in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah contain repeated differences between the witnesses. The different name lists in Ezra 2 and Neh 7 are a case in point, as the same list is preserved

---

39. Willi, *Chronik: 1Chr 1–10*, 16.
40. Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, 2:159.

in five different versions (Ezra 2 MT, Ezra 2 LXX; their parallel in 1 Esd 5; Neh 7 MT, and Neh 7 LXX) that contain repeated variants.

Notably, the addition in 1:17aγ*–24* used a technique that is often assumed in historical criticism, namely *Wiederaufnahme* or resumptive repetition. After the expansion, the editor repeated an element of the older text—in this case two names, Shem, Arpachshad—in order to return to it smoothly. Without the repetition it would have been unclear which part of the genealogy the following names (Shelah, Eber, etc.) are connected to. The addition in 1:11–16 did not necessitate such a repetition, because the ensuing text continues with a heading, "the descendants of Shem," that introduces the following text and thus makes clear who are now meant.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Although it would have been difficult to detect precisely which section was added, it is probable that a critic would have been able to approximate which sections are additions. The word-for-word parallels with Gen 10 especially beg for an explanation and lead to an assumption of literary dependency. Moreover, although the added sections partly imitate the lists in the older text, especially in the *Wiederaufnahme*, there are clear formal differences. The reference to nations in 1:11–16 sticks out from its context, which refers to persons. Although some nations in 1:11–12 cannot be connected with historical entities, the plural endings indicate that nations rather than persons were meant in the addition. Other differences are also apparent. For example, 1 Chr 1:24–28 continues the name list, but, unlike in the preceding verses, the names are now introduced without the object marker את. The text offers no apparent reason for the change; different authors would explain the difference. There are also other stylistic differences between the MT plus and the text shared by the LXX and MT. For example, 1 Chr 1:19 uses the passive form ילד "were born," in contrast with the rest of the genealogy in 1 Chr 1. The critic would also notice the repetition of several names in 1:24–25 that implies an expansion of parts of the text. Consequently, many small signs of editing would have led the critic to suspect later editing. The signs to determine which part was expanded are present, and it is possible that the critic would have been able to come to the conclusion that much of 1:11–24 was added later. It is nevertheless clear that some uncertainties would have remained concerning individual names.

Results. The MT version of 1 Chr 1 contains two large additions, namely 1:11–16 and 17aβ*–24*, while the Old Greek, which lacks these sections,

in all likelihood goes back to an older version. The additions are typical harmonizations with another passage, in this case with Gen 10, which contains the same genealogies but in a longer version. It is probable that even without knowledge of the LXX variants, literary critics would have been able to suspect that part of the genealogy was added later.

7
Additions: Results

7.1. Additions Often Attested by Textual Evidence

Documented textual evidence suggests that additions were, by far, the most frequent type of editorial intervention. For each other type, multiple additions are attested by divergent textual traditions. On the basis of our review of the evidence, we roughly estimate that additions constitute well over 90 percent of all documented editorial changes. A similar picture is gained in different parts of the Hebrew Bible, which underscores the dominance of additions and suggests that the documented evidence is in this respect generally representative of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible in the Second Temple period.

There are basically two factors that may explain the dominance of additions. First, adding words, and phrases, sometimes even entire paragraphs, may have been technically much easier than omitting, replacing, or transposing parts of the transmitted text. To begin with the latter, it seems reasonable to assume that transpositions of given textual elements usually required drafting a new copy. Omitting or replacing something may have been easier if only single words or short phrases were affected; a word or a phrase could be deleted by adding dots, or it could be cautiously sponged off or erased from the manuscript. However, correcting manuscripts in this way on a larger scale would have been laborious and could have damaged the scroll. This has an economic dimension since writing material—papyrus or parchment—was expensive and had to be used parsimoniously.[1]

---

1. See Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 19, etc.

Second, the scribal preference for making additions implies an elevated respect for the transmitted text. It stands to reason that the scribes assumed that they were transmitting texts of particular importance that could not easily be challenged by omitting or rewriting its parts. Unlike omissions or rewritings, additions do not necessarily challenge the older text, because it remains preserved in full, at least in words and letters, albeit not necessarily in the originally intended meaning. Additions may also have been easier to apply than other techniques of editing because they seem to have been regarded as clarifications and explanations that update and enhance the meaning of the received text. In other words, many additions aim at making explicit what was perceived as being implicitly expressed in the earlier version. Additions may thus have been regarded as necessary for keeping the text relevant. Clearly, additions could effectively alter the meaning as substantially as omissions, as many of the sample texts in this volume show, but in light of the multiple documented cases throughout the Hebrew Bible, this was apparently perceived as less problematic for scribes than omitting or replacing parts of the transmitted text, which seems to have been done only in exceptional cases.

7.2. Detectable and Undetectable Additions

Although the existence of other techniques of editing partly challenges conventional conceptions of how the text was transmitted (see the general introduction), historical criticism stands or falls on its ability to detect additions and reconstruct an earlier form of the text. The documented evidence and our hypothetical tests in the analyzed cases suggests an ambiguous result on the detectability of additions: A substantial number of documented additions would clearly remain undetected if no variant textual traditions existed, but also a substantial number of additions left enough traces to be detected and reconstructed without documented evidence.

That a number of additions could not be detected is highlighted by the analyzed cases where it was not evident which reading is more original, despite the fact that we had two versions to compare. It is obviously even more difficult to determine what happened to the text if documented evidence is lacking and the argumentation is only based on text-internal considerations in an edited text. At the other end of the spectrum are a number of cases where an addition could easily be detected without the older version. Distinguishing between different kinds of additions and their detectability is therefore a necessary step for moving historical

criticism forward. The evidence suggests that there are clearly discernible correlations between the size of an addition and its detectability.

7.3. Added Words and Short Phrases

Small additions of one or two words proved to be difficult to detect without documented evidence. They rarely disturb the syntax or cause evident tensions in their context, and therefore the text often contains no clear signs that something was added. To be sure, there are exceptions to this rule. Some minor additions are in some way unnatural in their syntactic contexts and result in syntactic tensions. A case in point is the reference to the torah in Josh 1:7 MT which was not integrated into the syntax smoothly, leaving an incongruence between feminine and masculine.

Another case is related to the conspicuously redundant use of titles, professions, and patronyms. In original texts they seem to be largely mentioned when a person is introduced for the first time in a passage; this information is usually not repeated without clear narrative reason. However, later editors often disregarded the narrative logic and added titles, professions, and patronyms in places where they seem unnecessary from a narrative point of view. A comparison between the MT and the LXX of Jeremiah provides examples, as both versions—the MT in particular— have a tendency to make such small additions in places unnecessary for the narrative. Reasons for adding titles, professions, and patronyms may be attempts at highlighting a certain aspect of a person by creating an overprecise and redundant style. For example, Jeremiah's title as a prophet may have been added to highlight his prophetic character and authority as the assumed author of the book. Although the older text already clearly depicts Jeremiah as a prophet, the divergences between the MT and the LXX indicate that later editors were much more prone to emphasize his prophetic role.

Another sign that could disclose a very small addition is an unexpected theological concept otherwise unknown in the passage or story. Examples are the somewhat sudden references to the commandments in 1 Kgs 18:18 and to the covenant in 1 Kgs 19:10 and 14, for these theological concepts are not met elsewhere in these passages or in the broader context. Even without documented evidence the critic would thus be asking why these concepts are suddenly mentioned here but play no further role in the respective contexts. Their isolated appearance is especially peculiar considering their theological centrality, as they have an essential impact

on how Israel's relationship with Yahweh is conceptualized (see further discussions in the respective analyses).

Nevertheless, it is evident that very small additions remain a challenging area for historical criticism. Most of them could not be detected, and even when the critic might be able to suspect that an editorial intervention took place, it would be difficult to reconstruct very precisely what happened to the transmitted text. For example, in 1 Kgs 18:18; 19:10, 14, the critic might not necessarily be able to determine that only one word was added but may instead be misled to assume a larger addition.

7.4. Added Clauses and Full Sentences

The critic's prospects for detecting an addition increase substantially when the addition forms a clause or a full sentence. Although self-contained sentences may not disrupt the syntax, in several cases they thematically diverge from the older text (e.g., 1 Kgs 22:28), introduce an unexpected turn (e.g., Gen 43:28; Exod 22:19), or otherwise break the narrative consistency (e.g., Josh 2:12), which make them recognizable as additions. More clearly than very small additions, added sentences reveal the editor's own conceptions that may differ from those of the older text. An added sentence also implies a stronger intention to change the text's originally intended meaning in some way. We have seen examples where an added sentence sticks out from its context by introducing a new concept, perspective, or theme (e.g., Gen 43:28; Josh 4:10; 10:13; 1 Kgs 22:28). By the same token, other added sentences appear like an inherent part of the context and provide no clues of being additions (e.g., the added numbers in the MT version of Josh 19). The latter would obviously be a challenge for historical criticism, but their number in the analyzed texts is small. The critic would mostly be able to detect the added sentence and to reconstruct the precise seams of the addition. In fact, this is the case in nearly all analyzed cases in the Pentateuch and the Historical Books.[2] In several cases the additions were rather obvious (e.g., Exod 22:19; Deut 17:3; 1 Kgs 22:28; Jer 26:22), while in other cases there is more room for doubt (e.g., 2 Kgs 8:27).

----

2. Notable exceptions to this are the added numbers of cities in the MT of Josh 19:15, 22, 30, and 38 as well as 1 Kgs 15:23.

In the psalms and other poetic texts, the analyzed examples reveal a somewhat different picture; the critic would have more difficulty in detecting many of the additions (e.g., Ps 13:6 LXX; Ps 18:2; 2 Sam 22:3; Ps 149:9). This may be dependent on the poetic form and the textual genre that do not follow such a clear logical consistency as narratives and other prose texts and thus tend to conceal separate additions. Although the relatively small number of documented cases from poetic texts does not permit a comprehensive conclusion, a difference in this respect between prose and poetic texts is evident.[3]

7.5. Added Connected Sentences and Smaller Sections

In comparison with small additions and added sentences, instances of the third category analyzed, added smaller sections and connected sentences, are noticeably less common. Although several cases were discussed in this chapter, it was more difficult to find such examples in the documented textual tradition than smaller additions. To be sure, there are notable exceptions. The Samaritan Pentateuch contains several harmonizations between related passages, and especially Deuteronomy evidently influenced other parts of the Pentateuch. The harmonizations in the SP range from added or harmonized words (e.g., שמור in Exod 20:7) to sentences, sections (e.g., Num 10:10 from Deut 1:6–8; Num 21:12 from Deut 2:9), and larger passages (e.g., in Exod 20–21; 26:35).[4] Particularly many of them are smaller sections consisting of several sentences.[5] The MT version of the Pentateuch contains very few documented examples of added small sections, but a potential exception is Exod 35–40, which, if the longer MT is taken as generally younger than the LXX, would contain several examples (e.g.,

---

3. There is thus a marked need for further investigations into poetic texts from this perspective.

4. Although harmonizations are better documented in the SP, the phenomenon is found especially in the LXX as well; see discussion in Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts," *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29; and Tov, "Textual Harmonization in the Five Books of the Torah: A Summary," in *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*, ed. Magnar Kartveit and Gerald Knoppers, Studia Samaritana 10 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 31–56.

5. See, e.g., Exod 18:25; 20:17, 19, 21; 27:19; 32:10; 39:21; Num 4:14; 10:10; 12:16; 13:33; 14:40, 45; 20:13; 21:12, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23; 27:23; Deut 2:7. In the majority of these cases Deuteronomy influenced another part of the Pentateuch, but the opposite influence is also possible (e.g., Num 20:14, 17–18 influenced Deut 2:7).

Exod 35:8; 38:4, 12, 14, 16–18; 40:7–8, 26–28).[6] On the other hand, the MT versions of Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel contain many added small sections which are missing in the LXX, and in many of these cases it seems probable that the longer MT is the result of an expansion.

It has become evident that added smaller sections are frequently detectable without documented evidence. We have seen several cases where the intrusive character of the addition would be evident to the critic even without comparing it with the earlier version (e.g., Josh 23:16b; 2 Sam 5:4–5; 1 Kgs 6:11–14; 16:34; Jer 32:30; Neh 11:20–21). In other cases, the addition left clear traces of intervention but some doubt would remain and the precise extent of the addition could not necessarily be determined (e.g., Exod 32:9–10; several examples in 1 Sam 18; Jer 28:14). There are also cases where it would be more challenging—but perhaps not impossible—to detect the addition (e.g., Josh 8; Jer 28:3; 29:14).

The reason why added small sections are relatively easy to recognize is their substance. They often add an entirely new aspect, theme, scene, or a theological interpretation that leads the text in a direction not found in the context. This entailed language and concepts that differed from that of the older text. Added sections also break the narrative consistency more clearly than smaller additions, and therefore the editors often used the so-called resumptive repetition (*Wiederaufnahme*) or similar literary features to bring the narrative back to its original point of departure; a very typical example of a *Wiederaufnahme* can be found in the MT plus in 1 Kgs 6:11–14. That the technique was found in many of the analyzed passages and other documented cases (e.g., Jer 29:15–20 MT; the SP expansions in Exod 7:18, 29; Lev 17:4) corroborates the assumption in literary criticism that resumptive repetition is a potential sign of a later addition.[7] Needless to say, it is applied with considerable variation and cannot be used alone but only in conjunction with other signs.[8] On the other hand, added small sections mostly do not disrupt the syntax in any way because they largely form semi-independent units that begin a new section. However, this does

---

6. Some of these examples are connected to transpositions, which were also frequent in Exod 35–40, regardless of which version is more original.

7. See Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 22, 25, 103, 131, etc.

8. Sometimes a repeated element occasioned an accidental omission by homoioteleuton or homoioarchton, and therefore it always needs to be determined whether an accidental omission or an intentional addition is more probable.

not essentially hinder the detection of added small sections because other signs are mostly rather strong and/or numerous.

7.6. Added Large Passages

Added passages comprising a substantial number of verses and forming semi-independent subunits, stories, poems, or theological comments are rare in the documented evidence from the Hebrew Bible. Exceptions to this are 1 Kings (but mainly in the nonkaige section 1 Kgs 2:12–21:29), Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and younger compositions such as 1 Esdras, Daniel, and Esther. In the rest of the Hebrew Bible added large passages are only infrequently documented in the textual evidence. In addition to the cases discussed here, the MT of Ezekiel and Exod 35–40 potentially contain some cases as well (and some of them are connected to transpositions), but their textual history is exceedingly complicated and insufficiently known. In most large additions it is very likely that the critic would have detected the addition even without being familiar with the shorter version. This is logical, for large passages contain more material for comparison than smaller ones and thus more easily disclose different authorship. Although some of the larger additions could have been written for the context where they were added, and therefore the editor may have adopted or sought to imitate the older style and use of language, in a number of cases the addition has an external source, elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., the examples in 1 Chr 1:8–28) or in another source (some of the additions in Esther, Daniel, and 1 Esdras). It is also difficult not to digress from an original narrative consistency when a passage is very large, for it easily leads the story or narrative in a different direction from that which the older text or earlier author(s) intended. The motive of adding a new idea, topic, or perspective is often the reason for adding a large passage in the first place. Consequently, a large addition usually contains several signs of being intrusive in its context.

Jeremiah 33:14–26 is a case in point, for it is thematically independent, it digresses from the narrative, it contains theological ideas not found in the rest of the book, and it uses different vocabulary. Even without the shorter LXX version, it would be very difficult to maintain that these verses derive from the same author as the surrounding text. From the perspective of historical criticism, Jer 29:16–20 and the additions in Greek Esther and 1 Esdras are also easily detectable. For example, all the large additions in the Greek versions of Esther differ so clearly in language,

style, and conceptions that they would not go undetected even if the MT version had not been preserved. Whereas the MT never even mentions God, theological interpretation of the events is key in the Greek additions.

7.7. Additions: Size, Frequency, and Theological Importance

It has become apparent that there is a correlation between detectability and the size of the addition. The larger an addition is, the more probable it would be detectable without documented evidence for the shorter version. A larger addition inevitably introduces more material for the critic to detect differences between the addition and the context. A larger addition also more easily leads the narrative in a new direction from the older text. Clearly, there are exceptions to the correlation between size and detectability. Some very small additions could nevertheless be suspected as additions (e.g., unnecessarily repeated titles, patronyms, etc. and unexpected theological concepts, e.g., 1 Kgs 18:18), while some larger additions could go undetected (e.g., Jer 28:3; 29:14).

We have also observed a clear correlation between size and frequency of additions. Whereas very small additions of one or two words can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible in considerable numbers, large passages were only infrequently added. The reasons for this may be partly technical but the attitude of the scribes toward the transmitted text may also play a role. Short additions could be written between the lines of an existing manuscript and thereby a new copy was not necessary when a word or sentence was added (cf. additions in the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran). A learned reader with a pen was a potential author of small additions, whereas entire sections could be squeezed into the margin only with difficulty (e.g., in 4Q70 [4QJer[a]], col. III), and large passages could mainly be added when the entire manuscript was reproduced, which was only done infrequently.[9] Exceptions to this are the beginnings and ends of compositions. If a manuscript had space on the last column, a later editor could insert a large section. It is thus probably not a coincidence that many later additions are documented (e.g., addition F of Esther and Bel and the

---

9. For 4Q70, see Eugene Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudg[a] and 4QJer[a]," in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen, PFES 95 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008), 494–501.

Dragon after Dan 12:13) or suspected (e.g., Josh 23–24; 2 Sam 21–24; Neh 9–13) at the ends of compositions. Related phenomena are additions at the beginnings of compositions.[10] A new column could be stitched in front of a manuscript without copying or cutting it. Accordingly, there are many well-known, documented, suspected, or potential large additions at the beginning of compositions (e.g., Deut 1–3; Judg 1:1–2:5; 1 Kgs 1–2; 1 Esd 1; addition A of Esther; Susanna and the Elders in Greek Daniel; 5 Ezra).

As for the scribe's respect for the existing text having a role in limiting additions, smaller additions mostly clarify or explain the older text, or they otherwise draw information or inspiration out of the older text. Such additions may not have been considered as changing anything and therefore could have been added more easily. Quite the contrary, at least a partial intention of the smaller clarifying additions may have been to preserve the older text and its implied meaning. To some extent, this may be true of larger additions as well, but they more probably add something entirely new to the text, as many of the discussed examples show. An intention to alter the text rather than just explain it would be dependent on the scribe's understanding of the text. If the text was regarded as something highly authoritative and normative, a conscious intention to change it would require much more consideration than a clarifying addition that merely seeks to explain what the authoritative text supposedly meant.

A further correlation revealed by the investigated texts is between detectability and introduction of new ideas and conceptions. The more an addition draws its information from the older text and the more it shares its conceptions, the less detectable it is, and vice versa. An addition that introduces something entirely new sticks out from its context more easily (e.g., Josh 23:16b introduces the idea of Yahweh's anger). To some extent this may be self-evident, but it has a significant methodological consequence that needs to be underlined. For historical criticism it is more central to identify the introduction of new ideas than additions that mainly draw their information from the older text, such as harmonizing and clarifying additions. In other words, it is not fatal for the method if it cannot identify additions that primarily repeat the same ideas, words, and conceptions that are found in the older layers. It would be more problematic if the method could not identify an addition

---

10. For more details on this editorial technique, see Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe.*

that clearly alters the text and introduces something entirely new. Here we are at the core of historical criticism, because it seeks to reconstruct the development of ideas and conceptions by distinguishing between different literary stages that may represent entirely different historical, sociological, political, and theological contexts. The present study demonstrates that the method has rather good potential for identifying additions *when it is important to identify them*.

7.8. Types of Additions

Apart from the various correlations concerning detectability, it is possible to discern different types of additions, each with a specific function in relation to the older text. To be sure, categorization is a modern abstraction of a complicated reality, and it may appear to a certain extent arbitrary. However, attempting to distinguish different types of additions may help to understand the reasons for the changes as well as the techniques that were used. Differentiating between these types will also help in detecting other potential additions in texts where no documented evidence is available, which is an important step for improving historical criticism as a method. Certainly, some additions may fall under several types, while others may be difficult to group more closely. As an initial proposal for distinguishing different types of additions in light of documented evidence, we suggest the following types—a list that certainly needs to be supplemented and modified by further research.

(1) Harmonizing additions stand out as very common, and they are met in all sizes from one word to complete passages (e.g., SP in Exod 20–21).[11] In most of these cases another biblical passage within the same book (e.g., Deut 26:17) or in another book (e.g., 2 Kgs 17:16) influenced the passage in question. Sometimes harmonizations also took place within a passage.[12] In some cases, harmonizations sought to remove tensions and contradictions between related passages. For example, Josh 11:19 tries to reconcile Josh 9–10 and 11:16–23. According to Josh 11:16–23, Joshua did not make peace with anyone in the land, while in Josh 9–10 the Gibeonites are said to have made peace with the Israelites.

---

11. For further examples in the SP, see Num 2:16b; 20:13b; 21:12a; 27:23b; 31:21a. In these cases, Deuteronomy has influenced a related passage in Numbers.

12. For diverse examples, see Tov, "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24," 1–16.

(2) Exegetical additions are met in considerable numbers and in various forms. An exegetical addition arises primarily out of the scribe's understanding or interpretation of the older text that may be developed further in some way by adding a new perspective, idea, or conception, but where other passages in the Hebrew Bible function as the main source of interpretation or explanation. For example, the older text of 1 Kgs 15:23 refers to King Asa's deeds only generally, but an editor has interpreted this to include building of cities, probably to match the achievements of the evil king Ahab, which are mentioned in 1 Kgs 22:39. In Ps 149:9, an editor interpreted the "faithful ones" mentioned in the older text as referring to the "children of Israel." In Ezra 10:3, a reference to the commandments was expanded to include the whole Torah. A reference to the land that Moses saw in Deut 34:1–3 was later developed in two different versions into a more detailed description of what exactly was the extent of the land, and one of these versions has distinct parallels in other parts of the Hebrew Bible.

(3) Added detail is common and can be seen as a subcategory of exegetical additions. For example, the additions in Deut 34:1–3 add detail by extracting information from other related passages. Jeremiah 26:21–23 MT adds detail on King Jehoiakim's feelings, companions, and doings, as well as names and patronyms, that are all missing in the LXX. Lists supplemented with additional members can also be counted in this type of addition, and in some of these cases the new information is not an exegetical extraction out of the older text (e.g., Josh 8:1 MT).

(4) Partly overlapping with added detail, some additions fill assumed gaps in the narrative. In these cases, the older text may have left some issues open, which is common in many literary styles. A later editor may then have filled the gap with something that naturally arose from the context or from another text. In the latter case, the addition could also be a harmonization. An example of a filled narrative gap is found in Gen 43:29, which anticipates a reaction from Joseph. Since there is no response in the older text, a later editor added, as a response, Joseph's blessing of his father.

(5) Related to the previous two types, some additions take information that is implicit in the older text and make it explicit. A typical case is found in the LXX of 1 Sam 21:10, where an editor added the idea that the priest gave Goliath's sword to David. The older text only implies this as an unmentioned consequence of David's preceding reply: "give it to me." A similar addition can be found in Josh 8:9; the MT specifies that Joshua

spent the night in the camp, while the older reading in the LXX only seems to imply this.

(6) Clarifications and explanatory comments are also related to and partly overlap with exegetical additions. In such cases, the addition does not necessarily provide much new information or develop the text substantially, but instead explains an already existing idea. For example, in 1 Kgs 18:26 a later editor in the proto-MT transmission specified that the bull mentioned in the verse is the one given to Baal's prophets. Such additions may also only fill gaps in the narrative or make explicit what is already implicit in the older text (for typical examples, see Gen 31:53; Deut 1:39; 17:5; 1 Kgs 21:15; 2 Kgs 8:27; and Ezra 10:3).

(7) Added titles, professions, patronyms, subjects, and so on seem quantitatively common, but they rarely have significant impact on the meaning of the older text (e.g., repeatedly added titles in the MT of Jeremiah). They are partly related to harmonizations, because they add information from other parts of the passage or the composition. Some of these additions have a probable theological motive (e.g., the emphasis on Jeremiah's prophetic role or Yahweh's epithets). Typical added subjects can be found in 2 Kgs 23:29 (see the discussion of this verse in the introduction to additions).

(8). Some additions can be characterized as theologically significant alterations. In these cases, the addition introduces a new theological or ideological idea that changes the perspective or interpretation of the events. Examples are the added references to the Torah, the commandments, or the covenant (e.g., Josh 1:7; 1 Kgs 11:33–34, 38–39). In Josh 23:16b an editor added the idea that Israel's sins provoked Yahweh's anger. Other typical theologically significant additions that have been discussed in this volume are, for example, Gen 14:22; Exod 3:1; and Ezra 10:3. This type of addition is important for understanding the development of concepts and ideas, and thereby methodologically crucial for historical criticism.

(9) Added involvement of a person or a group is common, especially in later priestly additions. In many cases, the involvement of priests and Levites was added to places where they were not mentioned in the older text but where a later editor was convinced, on the basis of his own sociohistorical context, that they should have been included in the events. The MT addition in Neh 11:20–21 is a case in point; a later editor added priests, Levites, and temple servants to a list that mentioned places where the Israelites settled after their exile. A very similar case can be found in Neh 9:6:

a later editor added Ezra as the main speaker of the following prayer and confession of sins in 9:7–37.

(10) Accommodating additions are mainly small additions that seek to integrate larger additions better into their context. Nehemiah 11:20–22 contains a representative case, for the same scribe responsible for adding 11:20–21 added the word "Jerusalem" in the middle of a sentence in 11:22 because otherwise the reader would not know that the list returned to those who settled in Jerusalem. Although in the case of Neh 11:20–21 other indicators clearly show that we are dealing with an addition, the addition of Jerusalem slightly diminished the digressive nature of 11:20–21 and thereby concealed the main addition (the LXX lacks all of 11:20–21 as well as the word "Jerusalem"; see discussion in the analysis). Accommodating additions and related adjustments are a neglected area of biblical transmission, but they need to be taken into consideration because they may impair our ability to detect some larger additions.

(11) Marginal glosses and comments between the lines may have been common. These additions may not have been originally intended as part of the text but were included in it by later copyists who assumed that they were part of the main text. Such additions may interpret, clarify, or comment on the older text, and thereby overlap with some of the other types of additions. For example, the addition "the God of their father" in Gen 31:53 MT/SP may have been a marginal gloss, because it interrupts the sentence so awkwardly and seems ill placed (see also Gen 31:53; Exod 22:19; Deut 17:3).

(12) Added new semi-independent sections, scenes, and passages are a further type of addition. Some of the larger additions are only loosely connected to their contexts and in effect discuss or introduce a new topic. They may derive from a different source, although some of them (such as some of the Greek additions to Esther) may also have been written for their current contexts (at least some of the MT additions in 1 Sam 18; some of the additions in 1 Kgs 3–12). As very characteristic examples, one should mention the MT pluses Jer 10:6–8 and 39:4–13. The context of Jer 10:6–8 ridicules idols, but the addition unexpectedly addresses Yahweh in praise. Clearly, not all large additions can be characterized as semi-independent sections. For example, the MT addition in 1 Chr 1:8–28 mainly expands the genealogy by linking it with Gen 10:13–18a and 22–29, and in this sense it is rather a harmonization between genealogies.

(13) Compositional additions are partly related to harmonizing additions, but their main goal is to create literary bridges between different

parts of the literature and to link events that appear separate and unrelated in older versions. For example, 1 Kgs 16:34 adds a link to events in Joshua's time and thereby increases the impression of coherence and continuity in Israel's history. Compositional additions may also try to remove contradictions and tensions between passages. For example, the MT addition in 1 Kgs 15:5 attempts to accommodate the assumed unblemished piety of King David in the older text of Kings with his wrongdoing with Bathsheba in Samuel; this contradiction emerges when Samuel and Kings are read together as a continuous history of Israel, which may have consequences for the compositional history of these books.

Regardless of the types described here, most additions were created in a close continuum with the older text, which forms the primary hotbed for additions. Some additions merely harmonize between texts and thus provide very little new in terms of the whole composition, while others introduce entirely new topics, events, and conceptions. Even additions that are only loosely connected to the older text are still in some way the result of interpretative interaction with the older text or a reaction to it. Sometimes only a detail, topic, or conception in the older text triggered or justified the addition (e.g., 1 Kgs 16:34 and 22:28), and in such cases the main information or conceptions derive from the scribe's sociohistorical context. It seems evident that later editors were not free to introduce any new idea at will. The older text was the main source of exegesis and its details functioned as midrashic hooks for the additions. When a text had to be updated to accord with substantially changed circumstances, the updating was still done in close correspondence with the older text. The more an addition altered the text, the more it was in tension with the older material, which may have put the addition at risk of being recognized as a foreign element that would not have been accepted by the transmitting community. All additions thus had to be rationalized or justified in order to be included in the normative text.

7.9. Traces of Scribal Additions

The analyzed sample texts make apparent some technical features that are typical of additions. Most of them correspond to editorial techniques classically postulated by literary critics. Prominent phenomena are disturbances in syntax and logic coherence. In several documented cases the older text is more consistent and follows rules of syntax better, as well as common literary conventions and expectations of coherence, than the expanded

text. The focus of an addition on a specific topic, idea, or perspective often seems so important that it takes precedence over narrative consistency, literary conventions, and rules of syntax.[13] For example, in Josh 1:7 an expansion introduced a tension between the feminine referent (Torah) and the masculine suffix, which is an unlikely mistake from an original author. Although there are obviously exceptions and one cannot be overly rigid in this regard (some authors may have been bad writers), irregularities in the text were more likely caused by later editors than the original authors. For literary criticism, this means that one should expect lack of contradiction, lack of inexplicable repetition, narrative consistency, and correct Hebrew; if irregularities in these areas are detected, they can be used as *potential* signs of later editing. Such signs should not automatically lead to assuming an addition. They should always be used in conjunction with other considerations, for example, content-related tensions and developments of divergent theological concepts. The greater the lack of such arguments, the more uncertain and weaker is the literary-critical conclusion.

Unexpected turns in the narrative often introduce an addition, as many of the sample texts have shown (e.g., Jer 29:16–20; 33:14–26). Although an original author can obviously introduce a turn in narrative and theme, an *unmotivated* and *sudden* turn is a potential sign of a literary intervention that can be used in conjunction with other indicators of an editorial intervention. A mere turn in the narrative plot is obviously not a sign of lateness at all, and even an inexplicable turn is not enough to assume an intervention, unless there are also other signs to assume a different author. In each case it is necessary to understand why the turn takes place, what the following text introduces, and the function of the following text vis-à-vis the surrounding narrative. In some cases, the addition largely neglects the immediate context and is factually looking at a completely different text or a broader composition. Although there may be loose links with the context, 1 Kgs 16:34; 22:28 and Jer 29:16–20; 33:14–26 are prime examples of additions that introduce unexpected and partly puzzling thematic turns that strongly suggest an editorial intervention, and in these cases documented evidence confirms the assumption. There are also unexpected turns on a sentence or verse level. In these cases, the additions may have been introduced by words such as גם (e.g., 1 Sam 31:6) or רק (Josh 6:15b;

---

13. Although the older text may already be the result of earlier editing, additions further took the texts away from following texts that a single author would have written.

equivalent missing in the LXX), which sought to soften the unexpected turn. For example, according to 1 Kgs 15:5abα King David did not do anything wrong in his life, but the MT addition in 15:5abβ unexpectedly relativizes the preceding apparently unconditional statement: "*except* [רק] in the matter of Uriah the Hittite."

All in all, the study of additions in light of documented evidence is of preeminent importance for testing and refining the methodological basis of historical criticism. The evidence shows beyond any reasonable doubt how important additions have been in the development of biblical texts. Since this editorial method was so extensively applied by the ancient scribes, any historical study of the Hebrew Bible cannot neglect them and their impact on the text. This chapter has also shown that many additions and most meaningful additions left traces in the resulting text, which undermines a skeptical position that they cannot be detected or reconstructed anymore. This position is methodologically unjustified. On the other hand, the evidence also clearly highlights that not every addition could be reconstructed without documented textual evidence. This undermines models based on the assumption that every single detail of the literary development can be reconstructed if the critic is careful enough.[14]

---

14. Cf. Levin, *Verheissung*, 68–69, who writes: "Die 'unglaublichsten Konfusionen' … sind … handfeste Anhaltspunkte, mit deren Hilfe die literarische Tiefendimension des gewachsenen Textes sich freilegen läßt. So sehr die Hakigkeit auf den ersten Blick als Unglück erscheint, erweist sie sich für die Literarkritik als Glücksfall; denn an den Verwerfungslinien läßt eine exakte Analyse sich festmachen. Abschnitt für Abschnitt läßt der Text seine literargeschichtliche Stufung erkennen. … Unsere Analyse kann ausgehen von der Möglichkeit einer lückenlosen Stratigraphie, und das Bemühen muß nur sein, die einzelnen Fortschreibungsstufen richtig zu unterscheiden und in die richtige historische Folge zu bringen."

8

Omissions

8.1. Introduction

Omissions refer to cases where parts of the text were deliberately left out in the course of the transmission: a word, a phrase, a clause, or even a longer section was intentionally left out because it was considered problematic and dispensable.[1]

Intentional omissions as an editorial technique is much more controversial than additions. Conventional historical criticism has widely neglected or rejected this editorial technique. To be sure, it is much more difficult to demonstrate omissions than additions. If a certain textual element attested in one version is lacking in the other(s), in most cases the reason is a secondary expansion. On the other hand, there are cases where an assumed omission demonstrably provides a better explanation. This is particularly so if the shorter version refers to something that is not explicitly mentioned in the context and clear reasons that motivated an omission can be seen. While some omissions may be stylistic simplifications of complicated expressions, theological reasons seem to have given the strongest motivation for omitting a meaningful element from the older text: an editor regarded a word or an expression problematic or it contradicted the theological conceptions and understanding of his own context.

Many scholars, especially redaction critics, have been reluctant to assume intentional omissions, in some cases denying their possibility altogether. They presuppose that the texts would have been too holy and authoritative from the outset for scribes to have omitted anything.

---

1. Unintentional omissions through mechanical mistakes, such as haplography, must be differentiated from deliberate editorial omissions; this chapter focuses on the latter.

According to this model, the texts would have evolved only through successive additions.[2] If this is the a priori starting point for reconstructing a text's literary history, whenever a textual variant has a plus and a minus, the plus is inevitably judged to be an addition. In the following case studies we reject such a presupposition and seek to evaluate each case on the basis of evidence in that particular text, regarding an intentional omission as at least a possibility.

A further challenge with omissions is that they have potentially far-reaching repercussions for historical criticism. If omissions took place in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible, scholarship largely lacks the means for reconstructing what precisely has been omitted. Omissions are inconvenient for the literary-critical method, as its application is, at least in part, based on the assumption that no omissions took place.[3] This is seen in the principle that a reconstructed text, when stripped of all later additions, should be coherent and contain no gaps. However, the so-called *Gegenprobe* (cross-check), which is conducted after a textual unit has been argued to be an addition, only works if nothing has been omitted. If the cross-check fails to demonstrate a coherent text, it is conventionally assumed that the analysis is not correct. In this chapter we will show beyond reasonable doubt that omissions have taken place under certain circumstances, which casts a shadow on such conventional assumptions regarding literary historical development. Since this conclusion has already been argued prior to this volume, the main focus here will be its impact on methodology.[4]

Abbreviations in the Greek Translation?

It is methodologically noteworthy and also somewhat contradictory that many scholars take for granted that omissions or shortenings were made by the Greek translators but hesitate to think that intentional omissions took place in the transmission of the Hebrew text. In books where the Greek version is notably shorter than the MT, several scholars regard the LXX

---

2. See discussion and literature in Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 16–25.

3. Here one has to distinguish two levels: On the one hand, some scholars categorically reject omissions as an editorial technique. On the other hand, there are many scholars who, without having a dogmatic stand, de facto imply that no omissions took place in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. This is seen in the analyses, which are constructed on that implicit assumption.

4. In Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 351–85.

as the result of intentional shortenings. There seems to be little attempt to even justify this assumption, despite the fact that the Greek translations were made in a rather late stage in the development of the biblical texts when these texts already had gained a considerable status and importance (this was the reason for their translation into Greek in the first place). The book of Jeremiah is a case in point, where several scholars assume the shorter Greek text to be secondary.[5] In many exegetical models one can see a presupposition to favor the longer MT readings as more original.[6] In addition to Jeremiah, the tendency to favor the longer MT is particularly apparent in Joshua, Samuel, Kings, and Ezekiel.[7] In some books in the Hebrew Bible the Greek translations are rather free (e.g., Isaiah, 1 Esdras, Esther), which may have occasioned shortenings of the texts, but methodological caution is warranted in these cases as well.

It seems in general very unlikely that a translator would have omitted parts of the text for a small or unclear reason. Already more than a century ago, Samuel Holmes addressed the issue and vehemently rejected the proposition that the translator (of Joshua) would have regularly omitted parts of the older text. He wrote:

> The hypothesis of deliberate omission on the part of the translator is difficult to uphold. The only reason for omission in most cases would be a desire to shorten labour; but in the face of all LXX scribes to amplify, this is improbable. Indeed our translator amplifies even where one might expect abbreviation.… Thus the hypothesis of shortening the text to avoid labour falls to the ground.[8]

Holmes discusses several examples in detail, and clearly demonstrates that the assumption of a general shortening in Joshua is very unlikely. Closer examination of the evidence in other books as well shows that

---

5. As an extreme example one could mention Georg Fischer, who notes that he has not found a single convincing case where the LXX preserves the more original reading (Fischer, *Jeremia 1–25*, 46). Fischer evaluates the countless minuses in the LXX in their totality as secondary intentional shortenings.

6. See, e.g., Levin, *Verheißung*, 69–72.

7. This tendency can best be observed in the commentaries and studies of Jeremiah, where the LXX readings have been given less than due weight. The authors of this volume assume that in most cases the shorter LXX of Jeremiah is more original than the longer MT.

8. Holmes, *Joshua*, 3.

the assumption is often on a shaky ground. This does not exclude the possibility of some omissions, but in all cases one needs to establish and demonstrate a clear reason for the suggested omission. If the translator is assumed to be responsible for the shortenings, it is crucial to understand the translation technique. For example, in the book of Jeremiah the parallel sections show that the translation has been extremely literal so that the Greek often follows the Hebrew very closely.[9] In view of this, it would be illogical that in some sections the translator would omit large and important sections without compelling and evident reasons.[10]

To be sure, there are multiple instances where the text was probably slightly shortened in the Greek translation. This is especially the case with some Hebrew expressions that are difficult to render into Greek or untranslatable. Such cases can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible, for example in the book of Genesis.[11]

Genesis MT		Genesis LXX
12:11	הנה נא ידעתי	Γινώσκω ἐγώ
	Behold now, I know	I do know
18:24	האף תספה	ἀπολεῖς αὐτούς;
	will you also sweep away?	will you destroy them?
20:13	זה חסדך אשר תעשי עמדי	Ταύτην τὴν δικαιοσύνην ποιήσεις ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ·
	This is the kindness that you shall do for me	This righteousness you shall do for me

---

9. See, e.g., Hermann-Josef Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches*, OBO 136 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 20, 57.

10. E.g., Fischer, "7.3 Septuagint," §7.3.5., presents an ambivalent picture of the translator's technique. He acknowledges that the translator followed the Hebrew *Vorlage* closely, but when the LXX contains a clearly shorter text, he assumes that the translator omitted and shortened. His view is largely unconvincing; it is more likely that the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* was already essentially shorter than the MT.

11. See, e.g., on הנה in Peter Prestel and Stefan Schorch, "Genesis: Das erste Buch Mose," in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament,* ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 1:169; on נא Peter Juhás, *Die biblisch-hebräische Partikel נא im Lichte der antiken Bibelübersetzungen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer vermuteten Höflichkeitsform,* SSN 67 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 60–67.

27:19	קום נָא שבה	ἀναστὰς κάθισον
	rise <u>now</u>, sit	rise, sit
31:32	וקח לָךְ	καὶ λαβέ
	and take it <u>for you</u>	and take it
33:10	אל נָא	—
	<u>no, please</u>	—
37:32	הכר נָא	ἐπίγνωθι
	know <u>now</u>	know

Faithful translations usually try to render even such expressions with Greek equivalents (e.g., נא as δή in Judg 4:19; 7:3; 8:5; 9:2; הנה as ἰδοὺ in Jer 1:6, 9, 18; 3:5; 4:13).[12]

There are also related stylistic omissions where a unit in the Hebrew sentence was unnecessary in the Greek translation and was therefore left out. An example can be found in Gen 23:13, where the Hebrew נתתי כסף השדה קח ממני, "I will give the price of the field; take it from me" is rendered τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ ἀγροῦ λαβὲ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ, "take the price of the field from me" in the LXX. Two sentences were effectively combined by omitting one verb (נתתי) in the translation, for the main idea is already contained in the second verb (קח). The somewhat unnecessary repetition (give-take) functions better in Hebrew than in Greek. Further examples where unnecessary sentence constituents were omitted in the translation can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible, for example, Gen 24:10 (וילד); 26:29 (רק); 27:6 (לאמר); 38:21 (לאמר), but in more literal translations they are rare. The rendering of ארץ מצרים, "the land of Egypt" with merely Αἰγύπτου "Egypt" in Gen 45:18 may also go back to the translation.[13] These and related cases are not the main focus in this chapter. Nevertheless, they highlight the necessity of understanding closely each case interpreted as an intentional omission in one textual tradition. A general presupposition toward a witness should be rejected, and one should always ask how and why a variant reading emerged. Without a theory about the reasons for a secondary reading, a theory is essentially weakened.[14]

---

12. See Juhás, *Die biblisch-hebräische Partikel* נא, 91–98.

13. Probably as an assimilation to 45:23, see Prestel and Schorch, "Genesis," 245.

14. As noted by Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know," 106, one should always consider all variant readings, weigh them "against one another," and understand each variant.

An example of a clarifying omission that probably happened in the translation process can be found in Gen 33:20. According to the MT, Jacob erected an altar at Shechem and "called it El-Elohe-Israel" (ויצב שם מזבח ויקרא לו אל אלהי ישראל). The name of the altar can be either understood as "God is the God of Israel" or "El is the God of Israel," thus identifying the ancient North-West Semitic deity El with Israel's God. In the LXX this peculiar passage is slightly shortened and substantially simplified; according to the Greek version, Jacob "invokes the God of Israel" (καὶ ἔστησεν ἐκεῖ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν θεὸν Ισραηλ). The Greek translation thus lacks an equivalent of the Hebrew לו אל, which effectively changes the meaning. The altar is no longer given a name, but Jacob addresses the God of Israel. This is in all likelihood a secondary interpretation, by which a considerable obstacle for understanding the text was removed. The reason for this interpretive shortening was probably the somewhat perplexing character of the original: The Greek text left out the peculiarly redundant and potentially difficult reference to God contained in the word אל "El/God" and changed the meaning of the sentence by referring to an invocation of the God of Israel, which is a frequent motif in the book of Genesis.

A related, and probably also translational, omission is attested in Gen 35:7. Whereas the MT reads ויקרא למקום אל בית אל, "and he (Jacob) called the place El-Bethel" or "God of Bethel," the Greek renders the sentence καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου Βαιθηλ, "and he called the name of the place Bethel." The Greek again simplifies the text by leaving out the word אל "El/God" (and adding the word τὸ ὄνομα "the name"), possibly as a theological correction of a concept where a place was named as God or, perhaps more probably, as a correction of a perceived mistake. As the place was called Bethel and not an otherwise unknown El-Bethel the translator may have been convinced that אל בית אל as a place-name cannot be correct. A similar interpretive motive can be found in Gen 31:13, where the LXX renders the Hebrew אנכי האל בית אל, "I am the God of Bethel" as ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὀφθείς σοι ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ, "I am the God who appeared to you at the place of God." In this text nothing was left out, but by means of an explanatory translation a problematic conception that the God of Israel called himself "the God of Bethel" was effectively omitted. According to the Greek text God merely appeared in this cult site, but was not so intimately tied with it.

In some books of the Hebrew Bible the Greek translation may have taken more liberties in omitting content. The LXX (as well as the Alpha

text) of Esther is perhaps the clearest example. The translation differs throughout the book from the MT, and although the exact relationship between the three witnesses has not been established, it seems evident that the translator is behind some of the variants where the LXX lacks a notable parallel to the MT. Some examples suffice to demonstrate the process. Esther 8–9 describes how the plot to kill Jews was reversed so that eventually the opponents of the Jews were killed. The details of killing are essentially different in the MT and LXX. Whereas the MT explicitly refers to the Jews killing their opponents, including the women and children, the translator avoids brutal details and thereby thwarts the impression that Jews were actively participating in the killing. The difference is found in several verses, which shows beyond reasonable doubt that the change is intentional. Esther 9:2 describes the actual killing, and according to the MT, the Jews gathered "to lay hands" on their enemies (נקהלו היהודים בעריהם בכל מדינות המלך אחשורוש לשלח יד במבקשי רעתם), while the Greek parallel merely mentions that the enemies of the Jews "perished" (ἀπώλοντο οἱ ἀντικείμενοι τοῖς Ιουδαίοις). The use of the Greek verb ἀπώλοντο avoids any involvement of the Jews. According to the MT of Esth 9:5, "The Jews struck down all their enemies with the sword, slaughtering, and destroying them, and did as they pleased to those who hated them," ויכו היהודים בכל איביהם מכת חרב והרג ואבדן ויעשו בשנאיהם כרצונם. The whole verse is missing in the LXX. Even the king's permission to the Jews to take a revenge on their enemies contains differences. According to the MT of Esther 8:11 the Jews were allowed "to destroy, to kill, and to annihilate" (להשמיד ולהרג ולאבד) those who attacked them, and also kill "their children and women, and to plunder their goods," טף ונשים ושללם לבוז. The LXX leaves out the details and merely notes that the Jews could "deal with their adversaries and their enemies as they wished," (χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀντιδίκοις αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις αὐτῶν ὡς βούλονται). It is very likely that the LXX is the result of intentional omissions in these cases, since they clearly appear as tendentious. A key reason for them was probably the international and multicultural context of translation in Alexandria. The MT contains material that would be unfitting for a wider audience in this context, and it stands to reason that many Jews would also have rejected such conceptions. Although the Esther translator took many more liberties than most other translators of the Hebrew Bible, even in Esther one needs to understand the reasons and argue for each variant that is regarded as a secondary development.

Evidence for Intentional Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Text

Omissions of essential elements of the older text appear all in all to be relatively rare. Their number is dwarfed by the multiple additions attested by documented evidence throughout the Hebrew Bible. It is difficult to find unequivocal cases of omission in the main textual traditions, the MT, the LXX, and the SP. The documented textual transmission suggests that expanding the text by inserting additional elements was by far the prevailing editorial technique. By the same token, however, occasional omissions are attested.

Two main types of omissions stand out from among the surveyed examples. There are omissions where part of the older text was left out in order to clarify the meaning or to reduce stylistic or logical unevenness, which sometimes may have resulted from earlier editing or accidental textual corruption. Such processes of smoothing out stylistic or logical obstacles by deleting certain textual elements can be compared with similar phenomena in the translations, particularly in the LXX: difficult words or word-clusters are not uncommonly skipped in translations, since rendering a text in another language is not possible without at least roughly grasping at its meaning, which leads to a somewhat harmonizing tendency toward the translated text.[15] It needs to be stressed that such deleting of stylistically or logically difficult elements can sometimes also be observed in the transmission of the Hebrew text itself. Not all shortenings of the text attested by the LXX or other versions likely go back to the translators, but instead to the transmission of the Hebrew textual tradition.

The second main cause for omitting certain textual elements seems to have been of a theological or dogmatic nature. The documented textual evidence suggests that under certain circumstances an element in the older text was omitted since it was regarded as theologically problematic or even offensive in relation to an emerging orthodoxy. It seems that in these cases the editors were unable to harmonize the problematic element with the theological conceptions prevailing in their own time and therefore decided to delete it. Such theological censoring of the older text, which is not attested very often, but in some dramatic cases seems mostly related to ancient Israelite conceptions about the divine and the

---

15. Clearly, in some cases a Hebrew word was rendered in Greek without understanding what was meant (e.g., 2 Kgs 12:10: αμμασβη for המצבה or המסבה; for discussion of this reading, see Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 239–41).

cult that became outdated in emerging Judaism. In this field it can also be illuminating to compare the ancient translations, since sometimes they attest similar tendencies of avoiding theologically unacceptable expressions or concepts.

Second Kings 2:14 probably contains two small but significant omissions that took place in the transmission of the proto-MT.[16] The scene describes how Elisha performs a miracle using Elijah's mantle. According to the MT Elisha strikes the Jordan River with the mantle, which causes the waters to part so that Elisha can cross over. The LXX largely follows the account, but some Greek manuscripts (Cambridge sigla: Nbgoprc₂e₂) and other versions (Ethiopic, Syriac, Old Latin) contain pluses that add a twist to the event. According to what is probably the Old Greek version, the waters did not part when Elisha struck the river for the first time. The Antiochene text further underscores that Elisha indeed had to hit twice.

2 Kgs 2:14 MT	2 Kgs 2:14 LXX
ויקח את אדרת אליהו אשר נפלה מעליו ויכה את המים ויאמר איה <u>יהוה</u> אלהי אליהו אף הוא ויכה את המים ויחצו הנה והנה ויעבר אלישע	καὶ ἔλαβεν τὴν μηλωτὴν Ηλιου ἣ ἔπεσεν ἐπάνωθεν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὸ ὕδωρ ~~καὶ οὐ διέστη~~ [L: ~~καὶ οὐ διῃρέθη~~] καὶ εἶπεν ποῦ ὁ θεὸς Ηλιου αφφω καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὰ ὕδατα καὶ διερράγησαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα [L: ~~καὶ ἐπάταξεν Ελισαιε τὰ ὕδατα ἐκ δευτέρου καὶ διῃρέθη τὰ ὕδατα~~] καὶ διέβη Ελισαιε
He took the mantle of Elijah that had fallen from him, and struck the water, saying, "Where is <u>Yahweh</u>, the God of Elijah?" When he had struck the water, the water was parted to the one side and to the other, and Elisha went over.	And he took the sheepskin of Elijah that fell from upon him and struck the water, ~~and it did not part~~, and he said, "Where is the God of Elijah—aphpho?" And he struck the waters, and they burst here and there, [L: ~~and Elisha struck the waters a second time and the waters divided~~], and Elisha went over.

Many manuscripts (e.g., Alexandrinus and Vaticanus) largely harmonize after the MT, but it is probable that the pluses go back to the Old Greek.

---

16. We are thankful to Timo Tekoniemi for drawing our attention to this passage. We are also indebted to his text-critical observations of the passage, which he presented at a workshop in Frauenwörth in May 2018.

The MT and Old Greek portray Elisha in a somewhat different light. In the MT Elisha is a powerful miracle man, who is immediately successful upon taking the mantle of his teacher Elijah. In the Old Greek, however, he is less successful as his first attempt fails and he has to invoke the divinity for a second time. Because of this difference it is probable that the longer Old Greek is more original, while the MT is the result of theological revision. This is suggested by Elisha's question, "Where is the God of Elijah?," which is a logical reaction to the unexpected nonparting of waters. In the MT this sentence is somewhat illogical since it lacks a clear reason. In addition it is unlikely that someone had sought to diminish Elisha by adding such embarrassing details to the account in a late stage of the transmission. Consequently, the MT reading is probably the result of two subsequent theologically motivated omissions that seek to remove any doubt in Elisha's ability to perform miracles.

Several theological omissions can be found in the first two chapters of 1 Samuel. The older text contained theological concepts that increasingly became problematic in Second Temple Judaism. For example, in the LXX of 1 Sam 1:9 Hannah stands before Yahweh in the temple of Shiloh, but the whole reference is missing in the MT:

1 Sam 1:9 MT	1 Sam 1:9 LXX
ותקם חנה אחרי אכלה בשלה ואחרי שתה ועלי הכהן ישב על הכסא על מזוזת היכל יהוה	καὶ ἀνέστη Αννα μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν Σηλω <s>καὶ κατέστη ἐνώπιον κυρίου</s>, καὶ Ηλι ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκάθητο ἐπὶ τοῦ δίφρου ἐπὶ τῶν φλιῶν ναοῦ κυρίου.
After they had eaten <u>and drunk</u> in Shiloh, Hannah rose. Eli the priest was sitting on the seat beside the doorpost of the temple of Yahweh.	After they had eaten in Shiloh, Hannah rose <s>and stood before the Lord</s>. Eli the priest was sitting on the seat beside the doorpost of the temple of the Lord.

That we are not dealing with an accidental omission in the LXX becomes evident in 1:14, which contains a clearly related text-critical variant:

1 Sam 1:14 MT	1 Sam 1:14 LXX
ויאמר אליה עלי עד מתי תשתכרין הסירי את יינך מעליך	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ τὸ παιδάριον Ηλι Ἕως πότε μεθυσθήσῃ περιελοῦ τὸν οἶνόν σου <s>καὶ πορεύου ἐκ προσώπου κυρίου</s>

And Eli said to her, "How long will you be drunken? Put away your wine from you."	And Eli said to her, "How long will you be drunken? Put away your wine from you ~~and go away from the presence of the Lord~~."

The LXX describes Hannah setting herself before the divinity, while in 1:14 Eli orders her to go away. References to Hannah facing or being in the immediate presence of the divinity are missing in 1 Sam 1:9 and 14. A further confirmation for an intentional and at least somewhat broader theological censoring comes from 1 Sam 2:11, where the MT version lacks a parallel to the LXX where Hannah and Samuel are in front of Yahweh worshiping him (Καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐκεὶ καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ κυρίῳ). It is highly unlikely that the LXX pluses could be late additions, because in the late Second Temple period it would have been exceedingly problematic to add the notion that someone, particularly a woman, enters the holy of holies and stands in the immediate presence of Yahweh. The temple increasingly became out of bounds to nonpriests. It is much more likely that the LXX in these cases preserves the more original text containing much more ancient conceptions that had to be purged in the proto-MT transmission. It is notable that these omissions are rather large, consisting of entire sentences in all three verses.

Indeed, omissions larger than one or two sentences are very difficult to find in the Hebrew Bible and seem to be the exception. One of the clearest examples of a slightly larger omission can be found in 2 Kgs 10:23, which is part of the scene where Jehu abolishes Baal's cult in Samaria. Some Greek manuscripts as well as Codex Vindobonensis contain a large plus that is missing in the MT as well as in most Greek manuscripts. According to the plus, Jehu orders the worshipers of Yahweh to be brought out of Baal's temple before he orders the temple to be destroyed.[17] This version seems to imply a syncretistic cult where Baal and Yahweh could be worshiped in the same sanctuary. The MT, by contrast, does not refer to any worshipers

---

17. The plus in Greek manuscripts (Cambridge sigla: *hijnuvxz*): καὶ ἐξαποστείλατε πάντας τοῦς δούλους κυρίου τοῦς εὑρισκομένους ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐγένετο καθ᾽ ὡς ἐλάλησεν Ἰοῦ ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ τῶν δούλων κυρίου, "and bring out all worshipers of Yahweh who have been found in the temple of Baal. And it came to pass as Jehu the king had spoken, and there were no (more) of the worshipers of Yahweh." The plus in Codex Vindobonensis: "*et eicite omnes seruos domini qui inuenti fuerint in templum bahal. Et factum est sicut locutus est ieu rex et cum nemo fuisset ibi de seruis domini.*"

of Yahweh in the temple. Because of the evident theological offense, it is probable that the whole section was secondarily removed in the proto-MT transmission, while the longer Greek reading probably goes back to the Old Greek and its Hebrew *Vorlage* that preserved the more original text.[18]

Most documented omissions are much smaller and a great number of them consist of single words or even single letters, which highlights the caution with which editors related to omissions. Genesis 31:53 is an example of an omission, where the plural in reference to the gods of Abraham and Nahor in the MT was omitted in the SP and LXX in order to avoid the idea that there were two different gods and thus reading the text as if it condones polytheism: אלהי אברהם ואלהי נחור ישפטו בינינו, "May the god of Abraham and the god of Nahor"—the gods of their fathers—"judge between us." > אלהי אברהם ואלהי נחור ישפט בינו, ὁ θεὸς Αβρααμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ναχωρ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν. By omitting one letter in Hebrew, an editor effectively changed a polytheistic conception to a monolatric one.[19]

At the beginning of the book of the covenant, the SP of Exod 20:24 contains a typical example of a single omitted word.

Exod 20:24 MT	Exod 20:24 SP
מזבח אדמה תעשה לי וזבחת עליו את עלתיך ואת שלמיך את צאנך ואת בקרך בכל־המקום אשר אַזכּיר את שמי אבוא אליך וברכתיך	מזבח אדמה תעשה לי וזבחת עליו את עלתיך ואת שלמיך מצאנך ומבקרך במקום אשר אַזכּרתַי את שמי שמַה אבוא אליך וברכתיך
Make an altar of earth for me, and sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your peace offerings, your sheep and your oxen; in ~~every~~ place where I r̲e̲c̲o̲r̲d̲ my name I will come to you and bless you.	Make an altar of earth for me, and sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your peace offerings, your sheep and your oxen; in the place where I h̲a̲v̲e̲ r̲e̲c̲o̲r̲d̲e̲d̲ my name, t̲h̲e̲r̲e̲ I will come to you and bless you.

While the MT seems to allow offerings in various cult sites, the SP implies that there is only one such place. The MT also implies that Yahweh had

---

several cult sites with an operating sacrificial cult. It is very likely that the SP version is the result of a theologically motivated omission that seeks to remove the idea of many legitimate cult sites. The text clearly conflicted with the idea of cult centralization and was thus secondarily brought in line with Deuteronomy. With a very small omission of three letters (במקום > בכל המקום) one could reach a very significant theological change in meaning.

The MT of Samuel contains examples where the omission of one word removed a theological problem concerning Yahweh's temple during the time of King David. The LXX of 2 Sam 5:8 refers to Yahweh's temple (Τυφλοὶ καὶ χωλοὶ οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς οἶκον κυρίου, "The lame and the blind shall not enter into the house of Yahweh"), while the MT parallel merely refers to the house (עור ופסח לא יבוא אל הבית, "The blind and the lame shall not come into the house").[20] It is very likely that the Greek version is more original, as the reference to an otherwise unmentioned house is meaningless here.[21] The reason for the correction is obvious, for according to the book of Kings it is only after David's death that the First Temple is built. The LXX version implies a different concept and is therefore probably more original than the accommodating MT.[22] A related omission in the MT can be found in 2 Sam 15:8, where the Old Greek, as preserved in the Antiochene manuscripts, refers to Absalom vowing to worship Yahweh in Hebron, which implies that Yahweh had a temple in Hebron in David's time.[23] This would not only contradict the idea that Yahweh's temple was supposed to have been built later but it also violates the idea of centralizing the cult to Jerusalem (2 Sam 15:8 will be discussed in more detail below).[24]

Only a limited number of examples will be analyzed in detail, because the issues and challenges pertaining to omissions appear to be similar in

---

20. The whole MT verse reads as follows: ויאמר דוד ביום ההוא כל מכה יבסי ויגע בצנור ואת הפסחים ואת העורים שנאו (שנואי) נפש דוד על כן יאמרו עור ופסח לא יבוא אל הבית "David had said on that day, 'Whoever would strike down the Jebusites, let him get up the water shaft to attack the lame and the blind, those whom David hates.' Therefore it is said, 'The blind and the lame shall not come into the house.'"

21. It would be difficult to see why the lame and blind would not be able to enter a house, whereas the prohibition to prohibit those with physical defects from entering the temple corresponds to ancient Israelite conceptions (cf. Lev 21:17–22).

22. For a detailed discussion of the passage, see Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 213–15.

23. Most Greek manuscripts were secondarily harmonized with the MT.

24. For arguments and discussion, see Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 221–22.

different passages. There are also clearly less omissions than additions, and it is difficult to find unequivocal omissions that clearly impacted the text. Omissions are closely related to replacements, which will be discussed separately. Moreover, the phenomenon has been extensively studied by Pakkala in *God's Word Omitted*.[25]

8.2. Exodus 21:18–21

As part of the laws concerning violence in the Covenant Code, Exod 21:18–19 describes a case where a man fighting with another man causes a nonpermanent injury. The ensuing law in 21:20–21 deals with a related case, where a man mortally strikes his slave. The laws order punishments depending on the resulting injury. In both laws, the SP lacks references to the instruments of violence, while the MT and other witnesses mention them explicitly. Although the basic meaning of the law remains in both variants, the passage is a significant example of a possible omission that has a slight impact on the implementation of the laws in question. All other known witnesses follow the MT.[26] Qumran scroll 2Q2 (2QExod[a]) is quite fragmentary here, but the space seems to imply a shared reading with the MT as well. Exodus 21:20–21 contains a further significant variant. According to the MT the offender should be punished without specifying the manner, while the SP orders the offender to be killed.

MT Exod 21:18–21	SP Exod 21:18–21
ⁱ⁸וכי יריבן אנשים והכה איש את רעהו באבן או באגרף ולא ימות ונפל למשכב	ⁱ⁸וכי יריבון אנשים והכו איש את רעהו ולא ימות ונפל למשכב
ⁱ⁹אם יקום והתהלך בחוץ על משענתו ונקה המכה רק שבתו יתן ורפא ירפא	ⁱ⁹אם יקום והתהלך בחוץ על משענתו ונקה המכה רק שבתו יתן ורפא ירפא
²⁰וכי יכה איש את עבדו או את אמתו בשבט ומת תחת ידו נקם ינקם	²⁰וכי יכה איש את עבדו או את אמתו ומת תחת ידו מות יומת
²¹אך אם יום או יומים יעמד לא יקם כי כספו הוא	²¹אך אם יום או יומים יעמד לא יומת כי כספו הוא

---

25. See Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*.

26. See, e.g., the LXX, which in 21:18 reads ἐὰν δὲ λοιδορῶνται δύο ἄνδρες καὶ πατάξῃ τις τὸν πλησίον λίθῳ ἢ πυγμῇ, καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, κατακλιθῇ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην, and in 21:20 ἐὰν δέ τις πατάξῃ τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἢ τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ ἐν ῥάβδῳ, καὶ ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, δίκῃ ἐκδικηθήτω.

[18]When individuals quarrel and one strikes the other ~~with a stone or fist~~ so that the injured party, though not dead, is confined to bed, [19]but recovers and walks around outside with the help of a staff, then the assailant shall be free of liability, except to pay for the loss of time, and to arrange for full recovery. [20]When a slave owner strikes a male or female slave ~~with a rod~~ and the slave dies immediately, the owner shall <u>be punished</u>. [21]But if the slave survives a day or two, <u>he does not need to be punished</u>, for the slave is the owner's property.	[18]When individuals quarrel and one strikes the other so that the injured party, though not dead, is confined to bed, [19]but recovers and walks around outside with the help of a staff, then the assailant shall be free of liability, except to pay for the loss of time, and to arrange for full recovery. [20]When a slave owner strikes a male or female slave and the slave dies immediately, the owner shall <u>be killed</u>. [21]But if the slave survives a day or two, <u>he does not need to be killed</u>, for the slave is the owner's property.

Although the case is far from self-evident, it is probable that the SP is the result of a secondary omission in both cases. In addition to the somewhat weak textual evidence, the most compelling argument against the SP is its general tendency in Exod 21–22 to generalize the applicability of laws. We have seen other cases that were similarly revised in the SP version of Exod 21:20–21, 28–36. The MT reading restricts the applicability of the laws to physical offenses where one specific instrument of attack was used, which easily leads to the question of whether or not similar offenses with the same result (injury or death) should be included as well. For example, the original law in Exod 21:20 only condemns those slave-owners who killed the slave with a rod, but it remains unclear what should be done if the slave was killed with a knife or fist. To increase the law's applicability, the instrument was deleted in the SP tradition. A further argument in favor of the MT is the originally casuistic character of the laws. They were written on the basis of actual cases that were recorded, and at the background of the laws in question may be a case where the mentioned instruments were used. In a later stage it would have been logical to be more inclusive and thus to widen the applicability to clearly related cases. It is less likely that casuistic laws were originally written to be very generalizing. That the laws in question were originally quite specific is seen in other details, for example, that the victim was "confined to bed, but recovers and walks around outside with the help of a staff." A further reason for the omission may be a harmonization with the other laws of violence that do not specify the instrument of violence in Exod 21:12, 15, 26–27.

Although words are omitted, the case specified in the original law (striking with a stone, fist, or rod) is still included in the law. One could thus see the omission of words as an addition in meaning, for the omission expands the applicability of the law. This may have facilitated the omission in the first place.

Clearly, both versions are syntactically coherent and there appears to be no other text-internal signs that give any hint as to which version is original. Our only means of evaluation is based on the general tendency of the SP in Exod 21–22 and the weight of textual witnesses, and therefore the conclusion can only be made with caution. Most commentators ignore the SP reading and thus imply that the MT is more original.[27]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An alternative to the secondary expansions in the SP would be to assume intentional additions in the MT. Unintentional scribal mistakes can be excluded, because a clearly related difference is found in two laws at exactly the same place. The difference can only be the result of an intentional scribal intervention.

One could argue that an omission is a heavy intervention in a text and requires a compelling reason. Further, the pluses in the MT/LXX do not contain anything offensive or problematic that would give a motive for an intentional scribal omission. The addition of detail, on the other hand, would be a rather typical development of a legal text. The pluses in the MT are also self-contained components that are not essential parts of the laws, and thus addition could easily be done from a technical point of view. One can also refer to similar laws of violence in Exod 21:12, 15, 26–27 that do not specify the instruments (like 21:18–21, they all use the verb נכה); the specification was not necessary for such laws.[28] Taking all these considerations together, one could make a case that the laws of violence in Exod 21:18 and 20 were originally without a specification, thus implying the priority of the SP. Consequently, the case is far from clear, and the scale only slightly tips in favor of the MT.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The omission in the SP seeks to increase the applicability of the laws in question. In this

---

27. See, e.g., Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus*, 231; Baentsch, *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri*, 193–195; Murphy, *Exodus*, 239–240; Holzinger, *Exodus*, 85.

28. One should further note that equivalent laws in the Code of Hammurabi (§§195–214) do not specify the instrument of violence.

sense they are omissions of words mainly, but not of meaning, as the cases originally described are still included. Since there are other editorial interventions in the SP that apparently have a similar tendency, we are dealing with a wider revision that was probably conducted when the entire manuscript was copied. On the other hand, the interventions were not extensive, as the laws still remain rather specific (e.g., the reference to being "confined to bed" and walking "with the help of a staff").

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the longer and more original reading in the MT, it would impossible for all purposes to detect that the instruments of violence were omitted in the SP of Exod 21:18 and 20. The resulting text left no hints that parts of the sentences had been left out. Moreover, the revised laws are more in accordance with other similar laws in Exod 21 that likewise do not specify the instrument, and thus the omission made the laws less conspicuous. The syntax, content and context do not provide any signs to assume an editorial intervention, making conventional methods of literary criticism toothless to identify the omissions.

Results. Exodus 21:18–20 SP is the result of two related omissions, while the MT and other witnesses preserve the more original reading. The omissions are best explained as attempts to expand the law's applicability. Without textual evidence, these omissions could not have been detected.

8.3. Deuteronomy 1:8, 35 and 11:9

The book of Deuteronomy contains three related passages (Deut 1:8, 35; 11:9) where the MT has a plus that is lacking in the SP. It is likely that SP minuses are secondary omissions in the transmission of the proto-Samaritan textual tradition.

Deut 1:8 MT	Deut 1:8 SP
רְאֵה נתתי לפניכם את הארץ	רְאֵו נתתי לפניכם את הארץ
באו ורשו את הארץ	באו ורשו את הארץ
אשר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לאבתיכם	אשר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לאבתיכם
לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב	לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב
לתת לָהֶם וּלזרעם אחריהם	לתת לזרעם אחריהם

See, I have set the land before you; go in and take possession of the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give ~~to them and~~ to their descendants after them.	See, I have set the land before you; go in and take possession of the land that I swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give to their descendants after them.

Deuteronomy 1:8 contains three variants between the MT and SP. There are two differing verbal expressions (SP ראו "see," impv. pl., instead of MT ראה "see," impv. sg.;[29] SP אשר נשבעתי "that I swore" instead of MT אשר נשבע יהוה "that Yahweh swore")[30] that bear witness to typical alterations in Deuteronomy. In the first case, the difficult singular in the MT stands alone against all other witnesses, but it may still be original. In the second variant, the SP reading is supported by the LXX, while the MT reading is shared by 2Q10 and 4Q35.[31]

Our main interest lies in the shorter SP reading in reference to Yahweh's oath to the fathers concerning the gift of the land. Instead of the slightly longer formulation in the MT אשר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לאבתיכם לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לתת להֶם וּלזרעם אחריהם "that Yahweh swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give to them and to their descendants after them," the SP reads אשר נִשְׁבַּעְתִי לאבתיכם לאברהם ליצחק ויעקב לתת לזרעם אחריהם "that I swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give to their descendants after them." In this variant the MT reading is supported by the LXX, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and the targumim, while the SP stands alone. Although three Dead Sea manuscripts (2Q10, 4Q35, and 4Q45 [4QpaleoDeut[f]]) contain parts of Deut 1:8, these words are missing.

The MT plus is probably more original, for its reading is more difficult and less logical than that of the SP. According to the MT, Yahweh gave the land *already to the fathers*, which implies that their descendants were also recipients of the land. In other words, "their descendants after them" were inheriting what was given to the fathers. The SP, by contrast, implies a slightly different but more logical concept; according to the SP Yahweh *swore to the fathers to give the land to their descendants*. In other

---

29. Thus also 2Q10 (2QDeut[a]), LXX, Peshitta, and targumim.

30. Thus also LXX.

31. According to Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 331, and others the other variants in Deut 1:8 are secondary harmonizations in the pre-Samaritan textual tradition.

words, in the SP the fathers were the addressees of Yahweh's oath, while their descendants were the recipients of the divine gift, which is more logical and suggests that the SP is the result of a secondary improvement. The MT and SP versions of Deut 11:9 contain the same variant, which implies an intentional and planned scribal change:

Deut 11:9 MT	Deut 11:9 SP
ולמען תאריכו ימים על האדמה אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתיכם לתת ל̶ה̶ם̶ ולזרעם ארץ זבת חלב ודבש	ולמען תאריכון ימים על האדמה אשר נשבע יהוה לאבותיכם לתת לזרעם ארץ זבת חלב ודבש
and so you may live long in the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers to give ~~to them and~~ to their descendants, a land flowing with milk and honey.	and so you may live long in the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers to give to their descendants, a land flowing with milk and honey.

Instead of the slightly longer phrase in the MT that refers to both the fathers and their descendants as recipients of the land (אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתיכם לתת להם ולזרעם "that Yahweh swore to your fathers to give to them and to their descendants"), the words להם ו "to them and" are lacking in the SP and only the fathers' descendants are mentioned as recipients of the land. The MT reading is supported by the LXX, a group of Qumran manuscripts (1Q13 [1QPhyl]; 4Q38; 4Q138; 8Q3 [8QPhyl]), the Peshitta, and the targumim. A simpler reading similar to the SP is found in the Vulgate (*sub iuramento pollicitus est Dominus patribus vestris et semini eorum* "that the Lord promised under oath to the fathers and their descendants"). A further variant is attested by the LXX and 4Q138, which both read an additional "after them" (μετ᾽ αὐτοὺς; אחרי[המ]ה) following "to their descendants," which corresponds to the phrase in Deut 1:8.[32]

Deut 1:35 MT	Deut 1:35 SP
אם יראה איש באנשים האלה הדור הרע הזה את הארץ הטובה אשר נשבעתי לת̶ת̶ לאבתיכם	אם יראה איש באנשים האלה הדור הרע הזה את הארץ הטובה אשר נשבעתי לאבתיכם

---

32. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 36, who—somewhat misleadingly—combines both variants in the critical apparatus.

Not one of these—not one of this evil generation—shall see the good land that I swore ~~to give~~ to your fathers.	Not one of these—not one of this evil generation—shall see the good land that I swore to your fathers.

A potentially related variation between the MT and the SP can be observed in Deut 1:35. While the MT refers to Yahweh's promise to Israel's fathers *to give the land to them* (הארץ הטובה אשר נשבעתי לתת לאבתיכם "the good land that I swore to give to your fathers"), the infinitive לתת "to give" is lacking in the SP, which creates the less complicated notion that the fathers were simply the addressees of Yahweh's oath; this expression has equivalents in Gen 50:24; Num 11:12; 14:23; 32:11; Deut 6:18; 8:1; 26:15; 31:20, 21; Judg 2:1. The textual attestation of this variant differs from Deut 1:8 since in this case the reading of the SP is also attested by the LXX and the Vulgate, while the MT is supported by the Peshitta and the targumim.

To begin with Deut 1:8 and 11:9, a crucial clue for understanding the more complicated version of these passages in the MT is contained in the book of Genesis, where precise equivalents of the peculiar expression occur in Gen 17:8 and 35:12. Here Yahweh promises Abraham and Jacob that he will give the land *to them and to their descendants after them*.

Gen 17:8

ונתתי לך ולזרעך אחריך את ארץ מגריך

And I will give to you, and to your descendants after you, the land where you are now an alien.

Gen 35:12

ואת הארץ אשר נתתי לאברהם וליצחק לך אתננה ולזרעך אחריך אתן את הארץ

The land that I gave to Abraham and Isaac I will give to you, and I will give the land to your descendants after you.

Deut 1:8 MT

את הארץ אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתיכם לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לתת להם ולזרעם אחריהם

the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give to them and to their descendants after them.

Deut 11:9 MT

על האדמה אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתיכם לתת להם ולזרעם

in the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers to give to them and to their descendants.

Deuteronomy 1:8 and 11:9 MT closely follow the peculiar expressions and logic of Gen 17:8 and 35:12. Similar passages according to which the land was given to *both* the patriarchs *and* their descendants are found in Gen 13:15, 26:3, and 28:4, 13.[33] Equivalents in Deuteronomy are 6:23 LXX (see below) and 19:8 (כאשר נשבע לאבתיך ונתן לך את כל הארץ אשר דבר לתת לאבתיך "as he swore to your fathers, and *he will give you* all the land that he promised *to give to your fathers*"). It can be argued that all these passages were drafted in light of Gen 17:8 and 35:12 and the corresponding expressions in the book of Genesis.

The shorter and simpler expression attested by the SP in Deut 1:8 and 11:9, according to which Yahweh had promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *to give the land to their descendants* has, by contrast, equivalents in other passages of the Pentateuch, in Gen 15:18; Exod 32:13; 33:1; and Deut 34:4.

Gen 15:18

לזרעך נתתי את הארץ הזאת

To your descendants I have given this land.

Exod 32:13

אשר נשבעת להם בך ותדבר אלהם ... וכל הארץ הזאת אשר אמרתי אתן לזרעכם

how you swore to them by your own self, saying to them, "…and all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants."

Exod 33:1

אל הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לאמר לזרעך אתננה

to the land of which I swore to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, saying, "To your descendants I will give it."

Deut 34:4

זאת הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לאמר לזרעך אתננה

This is the land of which I swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, saying, "I will give it to your descendants."

---

33. Notably, in Gen 12:7; 15:18; and 24:7 only Abraham's descendants are mentioned as recipients of the land, in Gen 26:4 the same is said about Isaac's descendants, and Gen 48:4 mentions Jacob's descendants as the recipients of the land.

Furthermore, Deuteronomy contains a sequence of passages (6:10; 6:23; 7:13; 26:3; 28:11) that correspond logically to the shorter and simpler expression of Deut 1:8 and 11:9 SP. According to these passages, the recipients of the land are those Israelites who are the addressees of Moses's speech.[34]

Deut 6:10

אל הארץ אשר נשבע לאבתיך לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לתת לך

into the land that he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give you.

Deut 6:23

לתת לנו את הארץ אשר נשבע לאבתינו

to give us the land that he promised to our fathers.[35]

Deut 7:13

על האדמה אשר נשבע לאבתיך לתת לך

in the land that he swore to your fathers to give you.

---

34. A logically corresponding variant is attested in Deut 30:20 between the MT and the SP. Here the MT refers to Yahweh's oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to give the land to *them* (לתת להם), while the SP addresses the Israelites who are listening to Moses's speech as the recipients of the land (לתת לכם "to give it to you"). The MT is supported by 1Q5 (1QDeut[b]), the OG, the Vulgate, and the targumim, while the SP's reading is also found in two minuscule groups of the LXX. A reading comparable to the SP is attested by the Peshitta, which has a second-person singular suffix ("to you"). Similar phrases like Deut 30:20 MT are found in Deut 10:11; 11:21; 19:8; and 31:7 (see also Josh 1:6; 21:43), but in all these cases no such variant is attested.

35. A singular variant is attested by Deut 6:23 LXX that renders this passage by adding a further δοῦναι "to give" in the context of the reference to the divine oath (δοῦναι ἡμῖν τὴν γῆν ταύτην, ἣν ὤμοσεν δοῦναι τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν "to give us this land that he promised to give to our fathers"). A similar statement is found in Deut 19:8 (ונתן לך את כל הארץ אשר דבר לתת לאבתיך "he will give you all the land that he promised to give to your fathers"), and the position of לתת "to give" before לאבתינו "to our fathers" also corresponds to Deut 1:35 MT and Josh 21:43. It is possible that this expansion is a translational clarification, see Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 125, although in the similar passages Deut 6:18; 8:1; 31:20 no such Greek rendering is attested. Thus it cannot be excluded that Deut 6:23 LXX attests an additional לתת "to give" in its Hebrew *Vorlage* (אשר נשבע לתת לאבתינו), which could even go back to the original reading; a secondary omission of this plus would betray the same editorial tendency as in Deut 1:8, 35; and 11:9 SP, although in this case it would be attested by the textual tradition shared by the MT and the SP.

Deut 26:3

אל הארץ אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתינו לתת לנו

into the land that Yahweh swore to our fathers to give us.

Deut 28:11

על האדמה אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתיך לתת לך

in the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers to give you.

In these cases, the decisive phrase לתת לך "to give you" or לתת לנו "to give us" is attested by all textual witnesses without variation.[36]

In light of the close equivalents of Deut 1:8 and 11:9 SP in Exod 32:13; 33:1; and Deut 34:4, on the one hand, and the formulaic phrases in Deut 6:10; 7:13; 26:3; 28:11, on the other, it stands to reason that the shorter and simpler reading in Deut 1:8 and 11:9 SP is due to an editorial simplification by which these passages were secondarily assimilated to the corresponding ones in Deuteronomy and beyond.[37] In other words, it seems probable that in Deut 1:8 and 11:9 the words להם ו "to them and," according to which the land had already been given to the fathers, were intentionally omitted to harmonize these passages with the frequently attested simpler expression according to which Yahweh had sworn to the fathers to give the land to their descendants.

For the same interpretative reasons the infinitive לתת "to give" attested by Deut 1:35 MT could have been omitted in the textual tradition attested by the SP, the LXX, and the Vulgate; by skipping לתת "to give," the passage could have been simplified and harmonized with the recurrent formulaic references to Yahweh's oath to the fathers that do not specify to whom the land was given (e.g., Deut 6:18; 8:1; 26:15).[38]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Two alternative models are imaginable. The shorter readings of Deut 1:8, 35 and 11:9 SP could be

---

36. See, however, the preceding note.

37. Thomas Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition,* OBO 99 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 199, 213; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 131, 433; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 14, 132; Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 331; Lothar Perlitt, *Deuteronomium 1–6**, BK 5.1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2013), 36.

38. Thus Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 23; cautiously Römer, *Israels Väter*, 203.

due to accidental omissions, or they could represent more original versions secondarily supplemented in the proto-MT. A scribal mistake seems particularly possible in Deut 1:35 (MT: לתת לאבתיכם); in this case an inattentive scribe could have skipped לתת "to give" by jumping to the next ל (homoioarchton). However, in Deut 1:8 and 11:9 (MT: לתת להם ולזרעם) such unintentional skipping of להם ו "to them and" seems less likely because of the intervening ו. Although such mistakes can never be fully excluded, three logically related scribal mistakes in Deut 1:8, 35; and 11:9 would be improbable.

Postulating secondary expansions is a different matter. It is certainly possible to assume that the *lectio brevior* of Deut 1:8 and 11:9 SP represents the more original reading, while in the proto-MT these passages were secondarily expanded by inserting להם ו "to them and."[39] Correspondingly one can assume a secondary addition of לתת "to give" in Deut 1:35.[40] All these additions would have aimed at assimilating these passages to the peculiar expressions in Genesis that refer to both the fathers and their descendants as recipients of the land (13:15; 17:8; 26:3; 28:4, 13; 35:12).

For testing this alternative one could ask why such an addition was not also made in the other passages according to which Yahweh swore to the fathers to give the land to the later Israelites (namely Deut 6:10, 23; 7:13; 26:3; 28:11; see also Deut 34:4; Exod 32:13; 33:1). For example, in Deut 6:10 it would have been easy to add a reference to the fathers as the first recipients of the land by inserting the words להם ו "to them and" between לתת "to give" and לך "you," just as in Deut 1:8, but such an addition is not attested:

Deut 6:10

אל הארץ אשר נשבע לאבתיך לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לתת לך
into the land that he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give you

---

39. Norbert Lohfink, *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium: Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer*, OBO 111 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 28–30; approved by McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 50*.

40. Thus, e.g., Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 373–74; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium 1–6**, 85. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 54, notably leaves the case open; she states that the passage could have been secondarily harmonized either with Josh 21:43 by adding לתת "to give" or with Deut 6:18 by omitting this infinitive.

Similar additions could have also been made in other related passages, but the text of the phrases in question is largely transmitted without further variation; an exception is only found in Deut 6:23 LXX where the reference to the fathers as first recipients of the land is expressed by an additional "to give," but this expansion may be due to an interpretive rendering and seems unrelated to the pluses in Deut 1:8, 35 and 11:9 MT.[41]

To be sure, one could ask why a change corresponding to the supposed omissions in Deut 1:8, 35; and 11:9 was not made in Deut 10:11; 11:21; and 31:7, which refer to the fathers as recipients of the land. Closer examination reveals that these passages do not contain such distinctive causes for an omission or a replacement; in Deut 10:11 and 31:7, the reference to the recipients of the land can also be understood as referring to the Israelite people (העם "the people," mentioned in both passages immediately before), and Deut 11:21 revolves around the eternal gift of the land in the context of which the reference to the fathers as the first recipients of the land is fitting and provides no reason to be removed. Furthermore, it is in general difficult to expect that a certain change was consequently applied to every passage in question, particularly if entire books are taken into consideration. Editorial alterations of the transmitted texts frequently can be observed here and there but are often not attested consistently throughout a certain book.

A potentially decisive consideration concerns the phrase להם ולזרעם אחריהם "to them and to their descendants after them," found in Deut 1:8 MT, and similarly (without אחריהם "after them") also in 11:9 MT (להם ולזרעם "to them and to their descendants").[42] The stylistically conspicuous reference to someone and his/their descendants, introduced by a double use of the preposition ל "to," is so similar to Gen 17:7–8; and 35:5 and the corresponding passages in Genesis (see the discussion above) that a literary dependence on these passages seems very likely.[43] It suffices here to compare Gen 17:8, which contains a close equivalent of the sequence להם ולזרעם "to them and to their descendants" in Deut 1:8 MT:

---

41. See n. 35.

42. Note that the missing "after them" is attested by 4Q138 (4QPhyl[k]) and LXX, probably also by the fragmentary 4Q38 (4QDeut[k1]); see Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 205.

43. Cf. the similar passages Gen 9:9; 17:9–10; Exod 28:43; Num 25:13.

Gen 17:8

<div dir="rtl">ונתתי לך ולזרעך אחריך את ארץ מגריך</div>

And I will give to you, and to your descendants after you, the land where you are now an alien.

The fact that the SP has only לתת לזרעם אחריהם "to give it to their descendants after them" in Deut 1:8 does not undermine the impression that this passage is literarily dependent on Gen 17:8 and the related passages in Genesis since the peculiar combination of זרע "descendants" with a following אחרי "after" also seems influenced by the corresponding expressions in Gen 17 and elsewhere.[44] Thus it is more probable that the phrase was first conceived in the form of Deut 1:8 MT, which clearly betrays literary influence from the similar expressions in Genesis, while the stylistically and logically awkward reference to the fathers as first recipients of the land (להם ולזרעם אחריהם "to them and to their descendants after them"), which is in tension with those passages in Deuteronomy that do not refer to the fathers as the first recipients of the land (Deut 6:10; 7:13; 26:3; 28:11; 34:4), was secondarily omitted in the proto-SP than the other way around.[45]

Finally, a simplifying and harmonizing tendency is frequently attested by the SP, instances of which can be found already in Deut 1:8 itself. The SP attests here two further variants in relation to the MT, by which some stylistic and logic obstacles are removed (i.e., the pl. impv. ראו "see" instead of the not entirely fitting sg. ראה, and the smoother form נשבעתי "I have sworn" instead of the more difficult נשבע יהוה "Yahweh has sworn"). Omitting the awkward להם ו "to them and" fits perfectly with this tendency.

Results. There are good arguments for assuming that the SP secondarily omits the reference to the fathers as first recipients of the land in Deut 1:8 and 11:9. The same is also possible, albeit with a lesser degree of probability, for Deut 1:35. The motivation for slightly shortening the text in

---

44. See also Gen 13:15; 26:3; 28:4, 13.

45. *Pace* Lohfink, *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium*, 29–30, who argues that the shorter and simpler expression לזרעם אחריהם "to their descendants after them" is also found in Deut 4:37; 10:15, and would in light of the similar expression in 2 Sam 7:12 not necessarily be influenced by the (priestly) passages in Genesis; however, Deut 4:37; 10:15 are also very close, particularly to Gen 17:19, while 2 Sam 7 is only very indirectly related to the passages in the Pentateuch.

these instances was not a theological offense (like, e.g., in Deut 32:8) but the stylistically awkward and logically difficult idea that Yahweh gave the land already to the fathers, while he also promised them to give it to their descendants. Removing this obstacle fits the interpretive and harmonizing tendency frequently observed in the SP, although it should not go unnoticed that in Deut 1:35—contrary to Deut 1:8 and 11:9—the textual tradition of the SP is shared by the LXX and the Vulgate.

Given that the shorter version is not in these cases the more original one, it would be next to impossible to detect that something has been omitted if one only had access to the SP. This case shows that under certain circumstances texts could also be shortened for stylistic and logical reasons. This does not seem to have been common but rather an exception, as such cases are not frequently attested by the documented textual evidence, in Deuteronomy and beyond.

8.4. Joshua 5:14

Joshua 5:13–15 describes the encounter between Joshua and the commander of Yahweh's army, who is presented as a semidivine figure. Joshua is told that an unspecified place close to Jericho where the Israelites have arrived is holy. The MT and LXX versions contain several small text-critical variants in this passage. One is particularly interesting, for the MT refers to Joshua paying honors to the commander, while the LXX lacks the reference. The Peshitta and Targum Jonathan follow the MT variant, while the Vulgate lacks all of 5:14b. Many Greek manuscripts (Cambridge: *Fedgknpqt*) and daughter translations (e.g., Armenian and Ethiopic) follow the MT plus, but this is probably due to a later harmonization toward a proto-MT. The verse is not preserved among the Dead Sea manuscripts.

Josh 5:13–14 MT	Josh 5:13–14 LXX
14 ויאמר	¹⁴ὁ δὲ εἶπεν <u>αὐτῷ</u>
לֹא כִּי אני שר צבא יהוה עתה באתי	Ἐγὼ ἀρχιστράτηγος δυνάμεως κυρίου νυνὶ παραγέγονα.
ויפל יהושע אל פניו ארצה וישתחו	καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
ויאמר לו מה אדני מדבר אל עבדו	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Δέσποτα, τί προστάσσεις τῷ σῷ οἰκέτῃ;

¹³When Joshua was by Jericho, he looked up and saw a man standing before him with a drawn sword in his hand. Joshua went to him and said to him, "Are you one of us, or one of our adversaries?" ¹⁴He said, "<u>Neither, but</u> as commander of the army of Yahweh I have now come." And Joshua fell on his face to the earth ~~and worshiped~~, and he said to him, "What do you command your servant, my lord?"

¹³When Joshua was at Jericho, that he looked up with his eyes and saw a person standing before him, and his sword was drawn in his hand. And Joshua approached and said to him, "Are you one of us or on the side of our adversaries?" ¹⁴Then he said <u>to him</u>, "As commander of the army of Yahweh I have now come." And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and he said to him, "Master, what do you order your servant?"

It is quite likely that the LXX is the result of a theologically motivated omission. The MT reading could be read to imply that Joshua worshiped a figure other than God. Although the original text may not have referred to a full-blown worship as such, it could easily be read as such. The original context of the *hishtaphel* חוה was the court, referring to the honors given to a superior, but in the Hebrew Bible it was increasingly connected with the worship of God only.[46] With its reference to the commander of Yahweh's army, Josh 5:14 could easily lead to the idea that Joshua worshiped a semidivine figure, which would violate the increasingly strict monolatry in early Judaism.[47] Furthermore, the preceding sentence, ויפל יהושע אל פניו ארצה, anticipates a reason for Joshua to fall to the ground, and the ensuing honors or worship would be a logical consequence. The same sequence of action with similar expression—a person falls to the ground in order to worship or give honors—is found several times in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., 1 Sam 20:41; 25:23; 2 Sam 1:2; 9:6; 2 Kgs 4:37; Job 1:20; Ruth 2:10). In fact, the LXX reading is somewhat comic, for Joshua falls to the ground in order to speak from there, but this can hardly have been the original intention. Consequently, the MT is probably more original in this variant.[48]

---

46. See Reinhard Müller, "Treue zum rettenden Gott: Erwägungen zu Ursprung und Sinn des Ersten Gebots," *ZTK* 112 (2015): 423.

47. The lack of a parallel to 5:14b in the Vulgate may go back to a similar motive, for even without the verb in question, the half-verse can be read to imply some kind of worship or at least exceptional honors given to him. Joshua falls to the ground and calls the commander "my lord."

48. Thus many, e.g., Holmes, *Joshua*, 31; Steuernagel, *Josua*, 170; Nelson, *Joshua*,

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is unlikely that the MT plus is the result of an intentional addition. Since the verb חוה, *hishtaphel* was used in reference to the worship of divinities and became a very typical verb in the prohibition of worshiping other gods, the likelihood of adding it in a late context is very small. It would be difficult to find any reason for such an addition. In this case one would also have to explain the lame or comical original text, where the falling to the ground leads nowhere or to Joshua speaking from the ground.

A more likely alternative would be the accidental omission of וישתחו in the transmission of the LXX Hebrew *Vorlage.* Indeed it could be argued that its omission was occasioned by a homoioarchton (וישתחו ויאמר). Although this alternative cannot be completely excluded, a typical Hebrew prose is full of words that begin with וי, and it is not very likely that this took place exactly where the word is theologically loaded. In the present short scene of three verses, Josh 5:13–15, there are ten such words (all are consecutive third-person imperfects).

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The omission of one word in the transmission of the LXX (or its Hebrew *Vorlage*) sought to avoid the offense that Joshua worshiped the commander of Yahweh's army. The omission is one of the many very small editorial interventions that gradually purged the Hebrew Bible of its ancient religious conceptions. It is unlikely that we are dealing with a systematic revision, for vestiges of the old religion are still evident in many parts of the Hebrew Bible, including the book of Joshua. Vestiges are found both in the MT and LXX, and censoring revisions were conducted in the transmission of both versions.[49]

Detectability by Literary Criticism. If the MT would not have been preserved, it is possible that some critics would be disturbed by the LXX reading where Joshua falls to the ground and speaks from there. Other passages could give a hint to what is missing here. Nevertheless, this would only remain a conjecture that would be difficult to argue convincingly. The

---

74. Notably, some critics make no mention of the LXX reading; e.g., Holzinger, *Josua*, 12; Knauf, *Josua*, 67.

49. See, e.g., the MT and LXX of Josh 24 (e.g., in 24:1, 26, and 31). For a further analysis of Josh 24, see Mäkipelto, *Uncovering Ancient Editing*.

LXX text is not syntactically or otherwise problematic in a way that could give any support for the conjecture.

Results. Joshua 5:14 provides evidence for a theologically motivated omission. A reference to Joshua paying homage or worshiping the commander of Yahweh's army was removed in the LXX transmission, or in its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Without the MT version the critic would have a slight chance of suspecting what could be missing, but this would only remain an uncertain conjecture.

8.5. 1 Samuel 4:7

With this verse, some Greek manuscripts, such as the Antiochene text, follow the MT, but this is probably due to a later harmonization.

1 Sam 4:7 MT	1 Sam 4:7 LXX[B]
ויראו הפלשתים כי אמרו בַּא אלהִים אל המחנה ויאמרו אוי לנו כי לא היתה כזאת אתמול שלשם	καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι καὶ εἶπον <u>Οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ ἥκασιν <u>πρὸς</u> <u>αὐτοὺς</u> εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν· οὐαὶ ἡμῖν· <u>ἐξελοῦ ἡμᾶς, κύριε, σήμερον,</u> ὅτι οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἐχθὲς καὶ τρίτην.
The Philistines were afraid, <u>for</u> they said, "<u>God</u> <u>has</u> <u>come</u> into the camp." <u>And they said</u>, "Woe to us, for nothing like this has happened before.	The allophyles were afraid <u>and</u> said, "<u>These</u> <u>gods</u> <u>have</u> <u>come</u> <u>to</u> <u>them</u> into the camp; woe to us, <u>O Lord, deliver</u> <u>us</u> <u>today</u>, for nothing like this has happened before.

The MT of 1 Sam 4:7 is probably the result of a theological revision including three small omissions. The problem culminates in the Greek plus ἐξελοῦ ἡμᾶς, κύριε, σήμερον, "O Lord! Deliver us today." The sentence is theologically very problematic, for the Philistines are calling for Yahweh's help, which implies that they also worshiped Yahweh.[50] Other differences between the LXX and MT are related to this variant. The LXX uses the plural verb ἥκασιν, "have come" in reference to the gods of the Israelites, which are also given in the plural form οἱ θεοί. Although the Hebrew אלהים can refer to God in singular, it is hardly a coincidence that the MT lacks

---

50. It is very likely that the Greek κύριε goes back to Hebrew יהוה, for the context implies that the Philistines called a divinity to help them.

a parallel to Οὗτοι "these," for its parallel in Hebrew would make it clear whether the word אלהים was meant in the plural or singular. A further variant is πρὸς αὐτούς, "to them," which makes the connection between the Israelites and the gods even more explicit. The gods came for the Israelites. Since the four variants—three pluses and a change of plural to singular, which would also be a plus in Hebrew (בא versus באו)—are related, it is very likely that we are dealing with an intentional revision. One should also note that 4:8 refers to the gods of the Israelites, and in this case the reading is shared by both the MT and LXX. This corroborates the assumption that the text originally referred to the gods in the plural. The LXX of 4:7 essentially portrays a peculiar picture where the Yahweh worshiping Philistines accuse the Israelites of bringing many gods to their camp. The MT presents the scene very differently: God (Yahweh) has come to the camp, which merely frightens the Philistines but who do not call for help. The LXX version contradicts the Deuteronomistic ideal and picture that the Philistines are idolaters and the Israelites followers of Yahweh. It stands to reason that the LXX is more original, while the MT is the result of a theological revision that corrected the text to accord with a more a Deuteronomistic view. One should also note that 4:8 partly contradicts 4:7. The Philistines ask who will deliver them, although they have already called Yahweh to deliver them. First Samuel 4:8–9 may be a later addition to 4:7, which perhaps seeks to expand the text to give another reason why the Philistines beat the Israelites. First Samuel 4:7 implies that the reason for the Philistine success is their appeal to Yahweh, while 4:9 implies that self-encouragement and pure force were essential. In fact, one could also argue that 4:7 is an essential background for the ensuing victory over the Israelites that leads to the capture of Yahweh's ark. Some scholars have regarded the LXX as more original, although many assume or imply that the MT is more original or that the text must be reconstructed (see below).[51]

The LXX may also contain a small stylistic omission. The MT is somewhat repetitive in the plus ויאמרו, "and they said." Since the text continues with the speech of the Philistines, the repetition is unnecessary and adds no information. Therefore, it may have been removed in the translation, while the alternative, a secondary addition in the MT, would be unmotivated and is thus very unlikely.

---

51. LXX as more original, e.g., Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 63–64. Several scholars make no mention of the LXX variants, thus e.g., Driver, *Samuel*, 37.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Many scholars, especially in early research, reconstructed the text by using LXX[B], LXX[L], and MT. For example, Karl Budde assumed that the original text read as follows: כי אמרו אלה האלהים באו אלהים אל המחנה. Although the Hebrew was reconstructed in the plural, he argued that the meaning must be singular: "Das ist ihr Gott, er ist zu ihnen in das Lager gekommen." Similarly Henry Smith, according to whom the MT preserves the more original text in rendering the gods in the plural, but he also notes that ἐξελοῦ ἡμᾶς, κύριε, σήμερον "is of course impossible in the mouth of the Philistines." He nevertheless leaves open the possibility that the LXX is original, but in this case "it is part of the speech attributed to the Israelites, which it is now impossible to reconstruct." With the exception of πρὸς αὐτούς, "to them," (< אלהם) Julius Wellhausen largely regards the LXX secondary in this verse.[52] The alternative theories provide little explanations for the allegedly secondary LXX reading. One could suggest that a later editor made the Philistines Yahweh worshipers by adding the sentence "O Lord/Yahweh! Deliver us today," possibly already in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. This would be part of a universalization of Yahwism: even the Philistines acknowledge his power. The addition could also function as a justification or explanation for their victory over the Israelites (4:10). After calling Yahweh for help, even the Philistines could overcome the Israelites. The implied positive stand of the Philistines could also function as a background for their capture of Yahweh's ark (4:11). This is a realistic development, yet the argument can be turned around. Already the older text contained the reference and it explained the further course of the plot, as suggested above. Its omission weakened the text, which in the MT version does not fully explain why the Philistines beat the Israelites and could capture the ark. Clearly, both developments—an omission in the MT or addition in the LXX—are feasible, but the scale tips against the MT because the other variants in the verse can be connected to the MT omission of a reference to Philistines worshiping Yahweh. It would be very difficult to argue that the singular verb and the other minuses in the MT (in "these *gods have come* to them") are more original in the MT. The leading principle in the MT seems to be theological censoring and bringing the text in harmony with expected

---

52. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 55. E.g., he notes that the words Οὗτοι οἱ θεοί (< אלה האלהים) have to be incorrect for the unspecified gods, but otherwise he provides very little argument for the rejection of the LXX.

theological concepts. Several other passages in the MT of Samuel were also theologically revised in a very similar vein.[53]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The omissions and changes in the MT are part of the theological censoring of Samuel. Although possible, it is not necessary to assume that a single scribe is responsible for all the editorial changes. The proto-MT may have been transmitted in a theological milieu where unorthodox theological conceptions gradually became more unacceptable. It is very likely that the omissions and other changes are part of an authorized revision that took place when the entire manuscript was recopied. The book of Samuel especially shows several examples where editors could omit theologically problematic parts of the text.

The stylistic omission of the second reference to the Philistines speaking is rather typical, and the most probable stage when this would be done is the translation. In the Hebrew the repetition is more necessary, since the preceding sentence and the speech of the Philistines both contain a כי-sentence, and the ויאמרו seems stylistically necessary in Hebrew. As the Greek renders the first כי with καί the stylistic awkwardness is removed. It is probable that this is also a stylistic change in the translation, for it is unnecessary to translate the first כי with ὅτι.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the longer reading in the LXX it would have been very difficult to detect the editorial changes behind the MT reading. The MT text gives very few signs to suspect censoring. The difference between the plural reference to אלהים, "gods" in 4:8 and the singular reference in 4:7, "God" would certainly be noticed and could lead to the hypothesis that the singular in 4:7 may not be original.[54] Paradoxically the LXX is more contradictory, since the Philistines call for Yahweh to deliver them in 4:7, but in 4:8 they again ask who could deliver them. The reason for this is probably an earlier addition of 4:8–9; the MT slightly removes the tension the addition has caused. Consequently, the critic would have no possibility of reconstructing the older phase of the text where, among the other changes, the Philistines call for Yahweh's help. It is also very unlikely that one could detect the stylistic omission in the

---

53. E.g., 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 24–25; 2:11; 7:6; 2 Sam 5:8, 21, 24; 7:11, 15, 16; 15:25.

54. On the other hand, this difference could also give the critic a further reason to assume that 4:7 and 8 cannot derive from the same hand.

LXX without the MT. The MT is more repetitive, while the LXX reads better. This again shows a case where an editorial intervention resulted in a smoother sentence than the older text.

Results. The MT of 1 Sam 4:7 is probably the result of a theological revision that included three small omissions. The revision removed the idea of Philistines successfully calling for Yahweh's help as well as references to the many gods of the Israelites. Without the longer LXX version it would have been next to impossible to reconstruct what had happened to the MT in its early transmission. The LXX also contains a small stylistic omission, where an unnecessary repetition was removed.

8.6. 2 Samuel 15:8

Second Samuel 15 describes Absalom's attempt to overthrow his father King David. The coup starts in Hebron, where Absalom can act secretly and at a distance from the royal court in Jerusalem. In order to justify his going to Hebron, Absalom tells David that he needs to pay a vow that he had made to Yahweh. It is evident throughout the story that Absalom goes to Hebron, which is also the base for the coup. However, 15:8 contains a significant text-critical variant between the MT and Old Greek. Although most Greek manuscripts follow the MT, it is probable that the longer reading in the Antiochene manuscripts goes back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Old Greek. All other witnesses (including 4Q53 [4QSam^c]) follow the MT.

2 Sam 15:8b MT	2 Sam 15:8b LXX^L
כי נדר נדר עבדך בשבתי בגשור בארם לאמר אם ישיב ישיבני יהוה ירושלם ועבדתי את יהוה	ὅτι εὐχὴν ηὔξατο ὁ δοῦλός σου ὅτε ἐκαθήμην ἐν (εἰς) Γεσσειρ ἐν Συρίᾳ λέγων Ἐὰν ἐπιστρέφων ἐπιστρέψῃ με κύριος εἰς Ιερουσαλημ, καὶ λατρεύσω τῷ κυρίῳ ~~εν χεβρων~~.
For your servant vowed a vow while I dwelt at Geshur in Aram, saying, "If Yahweh brings me back to Jerusalem, I will offer worship to Yahweh."	For your servant vowed a vow while I dwelt at Geshur in Syria, saying, "If Yahweh brings me back to Jerusalem, I will offer worship to Yahweh ~~in Hebron~~."

It is probable that the Antiochene reading is original, while all other readings are the result of a later theological correction by omission in the

proto-MT transmission. The theological motive for the change is evident. This verse implies that Yahweh had a legitimate temple in Hebron, for there is otherwise no reason for Absalom to go from Jerusalem to Hebron merely to worship him. Although the text implies Yahweh's cult site in Hebron in any case, in this verse it becomes evident. For example in 15:12, which refers to Absalom offering sacrifices in Hebron, but there is no explicit reference to sacrifices to Yahweh, and with the omission the text leaves it for the reader to be guided by what would have been acceptable. Yahweh's temple in Hebron and in the time of King David would have been highly problematic, as it violated the idea to centralize the cult (Deut 12) to Jerusalem (Kings) and the conception that Yahweh's first temple was built after King David's death (1 Kgs 8). With the omission, the reader may thus be led to assume that something other than Yahweh's cult site was meant. The theory that the oldest reading can be found in the LXX[L] has been represented by some already since early research (e.g., Budde and Smith) but also by some in more recent research.[55]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Although not completely impossible, it is unlikely that the word for Hebron was accidentally omitted. There are no technical reasons to trigger a haplography, and it would be coincidence that a theologically loaded reference had been accidentally omitted. A more potent alternative is the intentional addition in the Antiochene transmission. One could argue that Hebron was added, since it is clear from the text anyway that Absalom goes to Hebron to make sacrifices. According to 15:7 he wants to go to Hebron and in 15:9 he does so, and therefore an editor could have added Hebron to 15:8 as well (note that 15:7, 9, and 10 all end with the word Hebron). Without the reference to Hebron in 15:8 Absalom's actual vow does not provide any motive why the worship should take place exactly in this city, and this could have motivated the addition. Nevertheless, this consideration also can be turned as an argument against the MT reading, for without the reference to Hebron in 15:8, Absalom does not give any reason to

55. Budde, *Samuel*, 270; Smith, *Samuel*, 341–42. More recently, Philippe Hugo, "The Jerusalem Temple Seen in Second Samuel according to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Ljubljana 2007*, ed. Melvin K. Peters, SCS 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 193–96; Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 502–3; Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 221–22.

David why he should go to Hebron, and therefore the reference is in fact essential for the whole scene. Clearly, one cannot completely exclude the possibility of an addition, but an omission in the proto-MT seems more likely. Some scholars assume the LXX[L] reading to be a secondary addition, while many others merely fail to mention the variant reading and follow the majority one.[56]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The omission in the proto-MT transmission accords with other editorial interventions that seek to purge the book of Samuel of older theological concepts that had become problematic (see esp. 1 Sam 1–2).[57] It is notable that the MT of Samuel contains particularly many omissions (see, e.g., 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 24–25; 2:11; 7:6; 2 Sam 5:8, 21, 24; 6:6–7; 7:11, 15, 16; 15:25). Although they are far less frequent than additions in this book as well, similarly significant theological and meaningful omissions are much more difficult to find in other books of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. It appears that the proto-MT of Samuel went through a particularly strong censoring in its transmission in the late Second Temple period.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is very unlikely that critics would have detected the omission without the longer LXX[L] reading. The missing justification to go to Hebron would puzzle the careful reader, but this would hardly lead to the assumption that the word for Hebron is missing at the end of the verse. According to 15:7 Absalom wants to go to Hebron in any case, and the ensuing text implies that there is a cult site (15:12), so the critic would probably let the context add in the missing detail in Absalom's vow.

---

56. As a secondary edition, see Dominique Barthélemy, *Josue, Juges*, vol. 1 of *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, OBO 50.1 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 272. For those failing to mention the variant, see, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 194; Driver, *Samuel*, 241; Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel*, 336–37.

57. Several cases are discussed in Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 200–223: 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 24–25; 2:11; 7:6; 2 Sam 5:8, 21, 24; 7:11, 15, 16; 15:25. In most cases, the MT is the result of a later editorial intervention, while the more original reading can be found in the Old Greek, as preserved in some LXX manuscripts.

Results. The word "Hebron" was omitted in the proto-MT transmission of 2 Sam 15:8, because it explicitly refers to a sacrificial cult site of Yahweh in this city. The omission sought to avoid the idea of an early Yahweh temple outside Jerusalem. Although the resulting text is slightly puzzling, it would have been difficult to detect that something had been omitted without the longer reading preserved in LXX[L].

8.7. Omissions: Results

Omissions have been far less frequent than additions in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. There are repeated pluses and minuses between the main witnesses, the LXX, the MT, and the SP, but in a vast majority of cases, the plus is clearly a secondary addition, the minus thus representing the more original text.[58] In a number of cases it is not obvious what has happened to the text, but it is difficult to find unambiguous and reasonably certain omissions where some of the information in the older text was intentionally left out. The LXX translations contain occasional translational omissions, but they are not particularly common, and they rarely leave out any information. In most translational omissions some trivial repetitions or Hebrew expressions or words (for example particles) that had no clear equivalent in Greek were left out. If one assumes that the translator left out a significant part of the text, this has to be clearly argued, taking the translation technique of the given book into account.

Meaningful omissions mainly pertain to cases where the older text contained something highly problematic. The vast majority of scribes seem to have been very reluctant to omit parts of the older text, at least during the transmission that is documented in the preserved text-critical evidence.[59] If the same result could be achieved, the editors seem to have been much more prone to expand than to omit. An illustrative example of this can be found in the MT of Josh 7:6, according to which Joshua fell down before the ark of Yahweh in sorrow after the people of Ai had beaten the Israelites in battle (ויפל על פניו ארצה לפני ארון יהוה). The LXX version lacks a parallel word for the "ark" ארון, whereby the text refers to Joshua

---

58. More examples can be found in the Greek manuscripts and various other witnesses and translations.

59. This is underscored by the extreme faithfulness of transmission even in cases when the text had become incomprehensible. E.g., instead of leaving it out, the Greek translators often transcribed into Greek a Hebrew word that they could not understand.

falling down before Yahweh: καὶ ἔπεσεν Ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐναντίον κυρίου. The Greek text thus implies a physical presence of the deity and perhaps it even mirrors the concept of a material representation of Yahweh. It is probable that the MT plus ארון, "ark" is the result of a later addition, which sought to omit a conception that had become theologically problematic. That the potentially offensive words were not simply omitted underscores the preference for additions even in cases where a certain concept of the earlier text could no longer be tolerated.

The Samaritan version of Num 22:20 provides a similar case of adding a section of text in order to omit an offensive idea. Whereas the MT refers to God (אלהים) visiting Balaam in a nightly vision, the SP has changed the subject to the angel of God (מלאך אלהים). Nothing of the text was omitted, but effectively God was omitted from appearing in a human form and was therefore replaced by the angel of God. The reason for the scribal intervention was a theological problem with God himself appearing to Balaam (ויבא אלהים אל בלעם), and perhaps there was also an attempt to harmonize the verse with other verses in the passage that refer to the angel of God/ Yahweh. There are also other similar changes in the Balaam story (e.g., Num 23:5 and 16: MT יהוה > SP מלאך יהוה), which confirm that we are dealing with an intentional change.

The LXX uses the same technique in Exod 24:9–11. Whereas the MT refers to Moses and the elders, who are looking at the God of Israel (ויראו את אלהי ישראל), the LXX contains an additional element inside the sentence: καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον, οὗ εἱστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ισραηλ, "And they saw the place, where the God of Israel stood." With the expansion, the original object, "God," was changed to "the place where God stood." By means of an expansion the offensive idea that God could be seen was thus omitted. Such examples highlight the reluctance of editors in all three of these textual traditions to omit parts of the text, which implies that they took considerable effort to preserve the received text as much as possible. In many cases additions were very effective in substantially altering the meaning and omitting the problematic conceptions of the older text.

Nonetheless, the book of Samuel contains relatively many theologically motivated omissions. Although additions are far more common in Samuel as well, the MT version of this book provides a number of examples where something that had become theologically problematic was censored by omitting part of the text. The first two chapters of 1 Samuel already contain several examples of theological omissions (e.g., 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 24–25; 2:11), a couple of which were discussed above in detail. Similar cases are

more isolated in the rest of the text-critical evidence available for the Hebrew Bible. This may be merely due to a historical accident—particularly early editing of Samuel was accidentally preserved in the text-critical evidence—or the book of Samuel experienced particularly heavy theological revisions. In any case, the difference between Samuel and the rest of the Hebrew Bible should not be exaggerated, and other books, such as Joshua and Kings, may reveal a similar picture as text-critical studies on these books advance.[60] The Greek versions of Esther also contain a number of omissions, although most of them cannot be characterized as particularly theological and they may have taken place in the translation process.

That meaningful omissions took place when the older text contained something theologically problematic is particularly challenging for reconstructing the history of ancient Israelite religion and the development of early Judaism. Remnants of older theological conceptions of ancient Israelite religion seem to have been omitted when these conceptions were in conflict with those of emerging Judaism and could not be reconciled with the new theological ideas. It is thus very probable that older theological conceptions may not be well preserved in the Hebrew Bible or that it gives a highly biased and distorted picture of ancient Israelite religion. This should be taken into consideration much more seriously when using the Hebrew Bible as a historical source for ancient Israelite religion. The Hebrew Bible often seeks to project conceptions of emerging Judaism to Israel's past and remove features that disturb this picture.

Intentional omissions are not completely limited to theologically offensive ideas. We have also discussed cases where a meaningful part of the older text was omitted in order to expand the applicability of a law, namely in Exod 21:18–21 SP. This case is particularly interesting, because the version attested by the SP omits words (legal specification on what kind of instruments were used in physical violations such as murder), but adds applicability. The scribe may not have thought that the omission of words factually omits anything if the resulting text still covers the original case (e.g., in the SP of Exod 21:18–21). This case may thus further illustrate that the scribes tried to preserve everything, even if single words were omitted for interpretative reasons.

---

60. In parts of Kings, the MT and the LXX differ considerably and rather extensive editing seems to have been common in one or both of these textual traditions. The importance of the Old Latin witnesses in particular may provide new perspectives to the Old Greek translation and its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Slightly different cases can be found in the SP of Deut 1:8 and 11:9 (and possibly in Deut 1:35), for the small omissions attested here were apparently motivated by an attempt to improve the logic of the passage and to harmonize theological ideas within the Pentateuch. In these cases, assumed logic and harmonizing tendency seem to have overridden the motive of preserving the older text in full. These omissions are rather minor and clearly appear as exceptions, even within the SP, which many scholars erroneously ascribe to a corrupt scribal tradition.[61]

We have seen in this chapter that it is quite difficult to detect omissions without documented evidence. Even if some cases provide hints that a text has been edited and that a section may be missing (e.g., in Josh 5:14), it is difficult to find convincing arguments for such an assumption. The editor who omitted a section mostly created a new functioning text that is syntactically correct and that is reasonable in content (e.g., Deut 1:8; 11:9; 1 Sam 4:7; 2 Sam 15:8). The omissions that are documented were carefully planned, and sheer omissions without any consideration of how the text functions seem not to have taken place. Therefore, omissions did not disturb the text as much as additions, where the intrusive element was added to an otherwise unedited text, which means that the addition may interrupt the narrative, disturb the syntax, or create other tensions with the older context. Even if an omission is suspected, the critic would possess very few tools to reconstruct what had been omitted. At most one could conjecture about the content of the omission, but only in exceptional cases could one find convincing arguments for reconstructing an omitted text.

---

61. In this book we have repeatedly seen that the same techniques of editing and modes of transmission can be found in the SP, the MT, and the LXX. There is no reason to assume a fundamental difference between them and their transmission.

9

Replacements

Replacements are cases where parts of an older text were omitted and a new textual element was added in its place. Documented replacements range from single letters or words to entire passages, although larger replacements are infrequent in the documented evidence.[1] The new text is typically related or parallel in content, but some features in the older text occasioned its substitution with an altered or entirely new text. The majority of replacements are inconsequential in substance and meaning, such as those where a word was replaced by a synonym or by a related word that does not essentially change the sense of the original text. Cases where a replacement significantly alters the meaning or idea of the text are a clear minority, even a rarity. Because such cases are particularly important for the method, most of the texts analyzed in this chapter contain significant replacements. Less consequential replacements, which are clearly more numerous, are discussed only in the introductory remarks that follow, while the analyses contain more substantial cases.

Replacements by synonyms or closely related words are found throughout the documented evidence and they occasionally took place in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible before the texts froze for changes. For example, in the Sabbath law of the Decalogue in Deut 5:15, the MT and the SP use the verb לעשות "to do," whereas 4Q41 (4QDeut[n]), in a reading supported by the LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate, and targumim, uses the verb שמור "to guard/keep." Both essentially refer to the same, observing the Sabbath: "therefore Yahweh your God commanded you to observe [לשמור or לעשות] the Sabbath day." The reading in 4Q41 and the rest

---

1. Larger replacements are extremely difficult to find in text-critical evidence. However, if we compare a new composition with its source—for example, Chronicles in relation to Kings—it is apparent that large replacements took place and in some contexts they have been significant.

is probably secondary and the result of intentional change in order to improve the style and to accord with the opening commandment in 5:12, which also uses the verb שמר. The MT and the SP in particular contain many passages where synonymous words are found as variant readings. There are many examples where the MT uses the verb אמר, while the SP uses דבר *piel* instead (e.g., Exod 5:10; 7:8, 14, 26; 20:20; Num 27:6).[2] Regardless of which of the readings is more original, it is apparent that a verb was intentionally replaced with its synonym in one of the traditions, possibly for reasons of style, language development, or harmonization with other passages.

There are many examples where the change of a word has slightly altered the meaning. In Exod 21:28–29, the MT uses the verb נגח "to gore" in reference to an ox killing a person, whereas the SP—probably secondarily—uses the more general verb נכה "to hit," which is more common and less specific in meaning. Although both verbs could partly be regarded as synonymous, the MT נגח "to gore" primarily refers to killing caused by a piercing horn. There seems to be a tendency in the SP to alter this and other laws to be more inclusive (for a detailed discussion of this passage, see analysis below). Another example of slightly changed meaning can be found in Ps 119:176, which, in the MT, ends with the words כי מצותיך לא שכחתי "I have not forgotten your commandments." However, 11Q5 reads כי עדוותיכה לוא שכחתי "I have not forgotten your *testimonies*." The semantic difference between מצות "commandments" and עדות "testimonies" is certainly not large; both terms occur frequently throughout Ps 119 and seem to be understood in this context more or less synonymously. However, the use of עדות "testimonies" in the very last verse of the psalm strengthens the connection with its opening, since this term already occurs in 119:2, following the reference to "Yahweh's Torah," תורת יהוה, in 119:1. This implies that the more original reading "your commandments," as attested by the MT,

---

2. Sometimes the opposite is the case. E.g., in Exod 9:1 the SP uses אמר, while the MT uses דבר *piel*. Another example can be found in Num 22:23, 25, 27, 28, 32, where the verb הרג of the MT has apparently been changed to נכה in the SP. Similar variation can also be found in Deut 11:8, cf. עברים and באים in the MT and SP. The LXX and MT may also differ in this respect. E.g., in 2 Sam 7:11 for the MT verb יעשה the LXX has οἰκοδομήσεις, which probably goes back to יבנה with the parallel passage in 1 Chr 17:10. A verb was apparently replaced for stylistic reasons. See also Num 23:1 where the MT and SP contain synonymous verbs, בנה and עשה.

was secondarily replaced with "your testimonies" in the textual tradition witnessed by 11Q5.[3]

A more consequential case can be found in Exod 21:20–21. According to the MT, the slayer of a slave is to be "punished" (נקם *niphal*); according to the SP, the slayer is to be "killed" (מות *hophal*). The SP is more specific in defining the punishment and demands a death penalty, while the MT allows for more legal possibilities. The SP could be understood to increase the legal protection of the slave by excluding the possibility that the only punishment was a financial compensation. Regardless of which one represents the more original reading, it is clear that an intentional replacement occasioned a meaningful change.[4] The precise wording of the Pentateuch was obviously not entirely sacrosanct at this stage of its transmission, although most of the text may already have been fixed in some way. A similar case can be found in Deut 21:20, which is part of the law on the rebellious son (21:18–21). According to Deut 21:20 MT, the son's parents shall accuse the son of his disobedience in front of the city's elders (זקני עירו), while according to the SP the forum of the accusation shall be "the men of his city" (אנשי עירו); the latter is also supported by the LXX (τοῖς ἀνδράσιν τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν). Mentioning "the men" instead of "the elders" is in line with the following verse 21:21, according to which "all the men of his city" (כל אנשי עירו) shall stone him to death. Thus, the textual tradition of the SP and the LXX equates the forum of the process with the city's males who are in their entirety obliged to execute the punishment. The LXX/SP reading may be a harmonization toward Deut 21:21, but it also contains a remarkable shift of meaning since it implies that all men of the city need to be present at the gate. This is a kind of legal interpretation that has been done by means of replacing a single word.

Second Samuel 6:5 is another example of a consequential difference that still generally retains the meaning. The MT refers to כל בית ישראל "all the house of Israel," while the LXX merely refers to οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ, "the Israelites" which may go back to בני ישראל in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The reference to the house of Israel gives a different impression about the group in question; "the house of Israel" may be regarded as a more defined group

---

3. Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs[a] aus Qumran*, STDJ 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 182.

4. Because the difference is found three times in Exod 21:20–21, one can exclude the possibility of an accidental change.

that acts together. Regardless of which one is original, a word must have
been intentionally replaced in the transmission.[5] An even more important
change of a name is found in Gen 35:5. Whereas the MT refers to בני יעקב
"the sons of Jacob," the LXX refers to τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ "the sons of Israel"
instead. Although both "Jacob" and "Israel" refer to the same person in
the general narrative of Genesis, the difference is significant. After Jacob's
renaming in Gen 32:28, this would be the first time where Jacob is actu-
ally called "Israel" by the narrator, and the designation of his sons as "sons
of Israel" explicitly equates them with their later offspring, the Israelite
people.[6] Similar textual variation of the names "Israel" and "Jacob" can be
found in other parts of the Hebrew Bible as well (e.g., Exod 32:13; 1 Kgs
18:31; Isa 2:6; 8:14).

There are also cases of systematic replacement of words that may be
connected to theological reasons. An example of this is the reference to
the prophet Elisha in 2 Kings. Whereas the MT often refers to him as איש
האלהים "the man of God," the LXX calls him by his name Ελισαιε "Elisha."
Since this variant reading is found repeatedly (e.g., 2 Kgs 4:27; 5:14, 15;
6:9, 10, 15; 7:2, 18: 8:2), it is clear that we are dealing with an intentional
change. Although it may not seem obvious which version is more origi-
nal, it would be understandable that Elisha's profile was secondarily raised
and his status as a man of God emphasized. This would speak in favor
of the LXX as preserving the more original text. On the other hand, the
LXX often adds the name "Elisha" to places where his name is missing
in the MT. One could thus argue that the LXX attests a tendency to add
his name (e.g., 2 Kgs 4:7, 16, 33, 36, 37, 41; 5:16), although this does not
fully explain why his prophetic title would have been secondarily omit-
ted. Additionally one should note that the term איש האלהים "the man of

---

5. It seems probable that the MT is secondary here. The concept of בית ישראל is
more likely to derive here from a later hand and it is more difficult to see why it would
have been changed to a more neutral בני ישראל. Note that the parallel passage in 1
Chr 13:8 refers to כל ישראל "all Israel" which is a further development and implies the
religious concept of all Israel. A similar example can be found in Amos 3:1, where the
LXX reads οἶκος Ισραηλ "house of Israel," while the MT has בני ישראל "Israelites"; in
this case, the LXX or its *Vorlage* seems to have assimilated the passage to the parallel
Amos 5:1 which speaks of בית ישראל "house of Israel."

6. A second time, attested by all textual traditions, is Gen 35:10 which contains a
parallel to the renaming scene in Gen 32:28; the variant reading in Gen 35:5 LXX—
regardless of whether it goes back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX or to the Greek
translator—seems to be inspired by the use of the name "Israel" in 35:10.

God" is occasionally found as a plus in the MT (2 Kgs 4:16; 5:8, 20), which indicates that this title was secondarily added in the later textual transmission. In either case, it is apparent that an editor has extensively sought to replace the more original wordings. If the replacements were done in the proto-MT transmission, it attests to an evident tendency of theologically qualifying Elisha's activities in a certain way. If the replacements took place in the LXX, Elisha's role as a man of God would have been secondarily diminished, which would be very difficult to explain. In any case, this replacement is still a rather subtle intervention, since both versions imply that Elisha was a man of God, who performed miracles in Yahweh's name.

A somewhat less subtle case is the rendering of the Hebrew אלהים as εἴδωλα, "idols" or βδελύγματα, "abominations" in the LXX of 1 Kgs 11:2, 5–8. Although this difference may have been occasioned in the translation process, the effect has theological significance, for it explicitly diminishes the gods of other nations to idols and abominations, which implies that they are not divinities at all and that they are detestable. The MT version still uses the same word for the gods of other nations as for Israel's God. The secondary rendering in the LXX interprets the older readings through theological conceptions that can be found in the Pentateuch in particular. The change could easily be justified in the late Second Temple period, because all other gods were assumed to be idols that are not worthy to be worshiped. Such a conception may not have been shared by the original author of the text, who wrote in an earlier period.

There are even clearer examples where parts of the older text were replaced for obvious theological or ideological reasons and where the meaning was changed substantially. This is especially the case when the older text contained something theologically or otherwise problematic and was therefore replaced with a text more in line with the scribe's theological conceptions. In a hermeneutical perspective, such cases seem to be radical interventions in the transmission of the older text, because the editor, at least to a limited extent, challenged its authority and decided to leave out some of it from further transmission. The editor may have assumed to know better than the older textual tradition what the correct wording of the passage in question should be, or the editor was convinced that the older text cannot be correct, since it so obviously contradicts theological conceptions of the editor's own time. Such replacements are thus essentially different from additions that preserve all of the older text and combine it with some new elements, which are often clarifications and interpretations. This is also reflected in the overall infrequency of editorial

replacements that clearly change the meaning of the text. Whereas additions were common in all known literary traditions of the Hebrew Bible before the texts eventually became unchangeable, it is much more difficult to find replacements of substance and meaning in the main textual traditions, the MT, SP, and the LXX. For example, the repeated additions in the SP in relation to the MT far exceed the number of any replacements, and the vast majority of replacements are inconsequential changes in language (such as changes of preposition).[7] The same is true of the transmission of Jeremiah; when the MT and LXX versions of the book are compared, an overwhelming majority of differences can be shown to be additions in one of the versions, whereas replacements (or omissions) are rare, and replacements that clearly changed the meaning are exceptionally rare.[8]

Even in cases where an editor would have been strongly motivated to make a replacement, the actual documented changes are often small. Well-known examples are the personal names with Baal as the theophoric element in the historical books, which, in part, were later changed in order to avoid a reference to Baal (e.g., Beeliada, "Baal knew" in 1 Chr 14:7 to Eliada, "El knew" in 2 Sam 5:16). Gideon's alternative name Jerubbaal (Judg 6:32; 7:1; 8:29; 9:1; 1 Sam 12:11) was later changed to Jerubbesheth (2 Sam 11:21).[9] A comparable replacement can be found in 1 Kgs 18:19, 25, where the MT refers to the prophets of Baal (נביאי הבעל), whereas the LXX has secondarily degraded them to prophets of shame (τοὺς προφήτας τῆς αἰσχύνης).

---

7. E.g., the prepositions ל and אל as well as עם and את seem to have been regarded as interchangeable (see Exod 8:5; 10:17, 24; 2 Sam 2:6, cf. MT and 4Q51), and sometimes also על and אל (cf. MT and SP in Exod 9:14, 21, etc.; and MT, LXX, and 4Q51 in 2 Sam 6:3, 6).

8. For further discussion on this aspect of Jeremiah, see Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 103–16; Stipp, "Semi-Empirical Example," 295–318. Similar smaller examples can be found in various parts of the Hebrew Bible. E.g., extensive revision took place in Josh 6. Nearly all of its editorial interventions are expansions in the MT, while an older stage of the text is attested by the LXX.

9. For other similar cases, see Eshbaal > Yishvi, Ishyahu, Ishbosheth (cf. 2 Sam 2–4 and 1 Chr 8:33 and 9:39); Meribbaal > Meribbosheth (cf. 2 Sam 4; 9; 16; 19:25; 21:7 and 1 Chr 8:34 and 9:40). See discussion in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd ed., 268–69; Reinhard Müller, "Das theophore Element '-Baal' zwischen Samuel und Chronik," in *Rereading the Relecture? The Question of (Post)chronistic Influence in the Latest Redactions of the Books of Samuel*, ed. Uwe Becker and Hannes Bezzel, FAT 2/66 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 107–29.

A further case of replacement that changes the content substantially can be found in 1 Sam 2:32–33, which is part of the oracle announcing the fate of Eli's descendants. Apart from pluses in the MT and possible traces of corruption in the proto-MT, comparison between the MT, the LXX, and 4Q51 indicates that at the proto-MT stage some textual elements were also replaced. Although most of the replacements are merely changes of single letters (i.e., suffixes), they had considerable impact on the meaning of the text. The divine punishment of Eli and his house was secondarily intensified by these changes.

1 Sam 2:32–33 4Q51	1 Sam 2:32–33 MT	1 Sam 2:32–33 LXX
	<u>והבטת צר מעון בכל אשר ייטיב את ישראל</u>	
[ולוא] יהיה לך זקן בביתי כול [הימים]. [ואיש לוא אכרית לך מעם] מזבחי לכלות א[ת] עיניו ו[להדיב] [את נפשו] וכול מרבית ביתך] יפולו <u>בחרב</u> אנשים.	ולא יהיה זקן בביתך כל הימים ואיש לא אכרית לך מעם מזבחי לכלות את עיניך ולאדיב את נפשך וכל מרבית ביתך יָמֻתוּ אנשים	καὶ οὐκ ἔσται σου πρεσβύτης ἐν οἴκῳ <u>μου</u> πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας· καὶ ἄνδρα οὐκ ἐξολεθρεύσω σοι ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου ἐκλιπεῖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς <u>αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ καταρρεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν <u>αὐτοῦ</u>, καὶ πᾶς περισσεύων οἴκου σου <u>πεσοῦνται</u> <u>ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ</u> ἀνδρῶν.
[32]and] there will [not] be an old man in <u>my</u> house all [the days]. [33][And a man I will not cut off for you from] my altar to wear out <u>his</u> eyes and [make <u>his</u> spirit grieve. All the descendants of your house] will <u>fall</u> by <u>the sword of</u> men.	[32]<u>And you will look at the affliction of the refuge, upon anything that makes Israel glad;</u> and there will not be an old man in <u>your</u> house all the days. [33]And a man I will not cut off for you from my altar to wear out <u>your</u> eyes and make <u>your</u> spirit grieve; and all descendants of your house will <u>die</u> as men.	[32]and no elderly of yours will be in <u>my</u> house all the days. [33]And a man I will not destroy for you from my altar so that <u>his</u> eyes may fail and <u>his</u> soul may ebb away, but all remaining of your house will <u>fall</u> by <u>the sword of</u> men.

Second Samuel 7:16 provides a similar case. The replacement of a suffix/ pronoun with another one has affected the meaning of the text significantly. In Yahweh's promise to David, the MT refers to the house, kingdom, and

throne of David, while in the LXX the reference is to Solomon. Moreover, in the MT they are "made sure forever before" David, while in the LXX they are made sure before Yahweh.

2 Sam 7:16 MT	2 Sam 7:16 LXX
ונאמן ביתך וממלכתך עד עולם לפניך כסאך יהיה נכון עד עולם	καὶ πιστωθήσεται ὁ οἶκος <u>αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ ἡ βασιλεία <u>αὐτοῦ</u> ἕως αἰῶνος ἐνώπιον <u>ἐμοῦ</u>, καὶ ὁ θρόνος <u>αὐτοῦ</u> ἔσται ἀνωρθωμένος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
<u>Your</u> house and <u>your</u> kingdom shall be made sure forever before <u>you</u>; <u>your</u> throne shall be established forever.	<u>His</u> house and <u>his</u> kingdom shall be made sure forever before <u>me</u>, <u>his</u> throne shall be restored forever.

Regardless of which one of the versions preserved the original text in 2 Sam 7:16, the differences are so crucial that a failure to recognize them crucially affects our understanding of this theologically central text as well as of many related passages.

In Deut 27:1–8, Moses instructs the Israelites that they shall erect large stones after their crossing of the Jordan, cover them with plaster, write on them the entire torah, build with them an altar and bring upon it the first offerings in the promised land. According to the Deut 27:4 MT, this altar has to be placed "on Mount Ebal" (בהר עיבל), which some verses later is the scene of a peculiar ceremony: six of the twelve tribes are instructed to stand on Mount Gerizim "to bless the people" (27:12), and the other six shall stand on Mount Ebal "for the curse" (27:13). The altar has to be placed on the mountain where "the curse" is proclaimed. The SP, however, gives just the opposite location for the altar: according to Deut 27:4 SP, it shall be placed on Mount Gerizim, which according to 27:12 is the mountain where the blessing takes place. The reading "on Mount Ebal" of Deut 27:4 MT is supported by nearly all LXX manuscripts, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and the targumim, while SP's reading, written in peculiar orthography as one word (בהרגריזים), is supported by one Greek manuscript (papyrus Giessen 19: εν αργαρ[ι]ζιμ), and the Old Latin Codex Ludgunensis (*in monte Garzin*).[10] The Samaritan Targum also follows the SP. It is probable that the

---

10. For Giessen 19, see Paul Glaue and Alfred Rahlfs, eds., *Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des Pentateuchs*, MSU 2 (Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1911), 37. For the Old Latin, see Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 287. For an additional witness presumably from Qumran, see Ursula Schattner-Rieser, "Garizim *versus* Ebal: Ein neues

SP is more original than the MT, for an altar on the mountain of blessing is far more understandable. The reason for the replacement is clear, for it would seem to legitimize the cult site at Gerizim, which was rejected in the later Jewish tradition. Manuscript evidence also suggests that the Old Greek may have read Gerizim, which would further undermine the MT reading. Regardless of which reading is original, the verse bears witness to a replacement concerning a central theological issue: where Yahweh's legitimate cult site is located.[11]

Despite a number of cases discussed in this chapter, our review of large amounts of documented evidence suggests that theologically consequential replacements were rare. They were done mainly for weighty reasons and/or in special circumstances. There seems to be a general tendency to avoid replacements and omissions of older textual elements if a similar result could be reached by interpretative additions.[12] This applies to the documented evidence from the Pentateuch in particular, but this tendency is found in much of the rest of the Hebrew Bible as well. Nevertheless, the textual evidence may suggest that replacements were more common in some books than in others. The most prominent examples are the Greek versions of Daniel, Esther, and 1 Esdras. In all of these works,

---

Qumranfragment samaritanischer Tradition?," *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 277–81; James Hamilton Charlesworth, "הברכה על־הר גרזים—An Unknown Dead Sea Scroll and Speculations Focused on the *Vorlage* of Deuteronomy 27:4," in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran*, ed. Jörg Frey and Enno Edzard Popkes; WUNT 2/390 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 393–414. It was evaluated as authentic by Eugene Ulrich, "The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh^a," in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Andres Piquér Otero and Pablo Torijano Morales, JSJSup 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 364–65; but it is probably a forgery, see Årstein Justnes, "Forfalskninger av dødehavsruller: Om mer enn 70 nye fragmenter—og historien om ett av dem (DSS F.154; 5 Mos 27,4–6)," *Teologisk Tidsskrift* 6 (2017): 70–83. Many of the Qumran fragments that have appeared from the black market in the last two decades seem to be forgeries, see also Kipp Davis et al., "Nine Dubious 'Dead Sea Scroll Fragments' from the 21st Century," *DSD* 24 (2017): 189–228.

11. For a more detailed discussion of Deut 27:4, see Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 99–100, and Reinhard Müller, "The Altar on Mount Gerizim (Deuteronomy 27:1-8): Center or Periphery?," in *Centers and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, FAT 108 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 197–214.

12. Clearly, this does not apply to all scribes and editors. It is apparent that there have been editors who could take much more liberties. However, this is more an exception that took place in special circumstances.

replacements of words, entire sentences, or even passages can be found without difficulty.

For example, the MT and LXX versions of Esth 8:7–11 differ considerably, and it is very likely that the Greek tradition represents a younger version of the passage.[13] In the MT the Jews are allowed to kill their enemies including their women and children. The LXX apparently seeks to soften this by largely replacing detailed references to the brutal killings with a more general idea that Jews were allowed to defend themselves and treat their adversaries as they pleased. This is especially evident in Esth 8:11:

אשר נתן המלך ליהודים אשר בכל עיר ועיר להקהל ולעמד על נפשם להשמיד ולהרג ולאבד את כל חיל עם ומדינה הצרים אתם טף ונשים ושללם לבוז	ὡς ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς χρῆσθαι τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν ἐν πάσῃ πόλει βοηθῆσαί τε αὐτοῖς καὶ χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀντιδίκοις αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις αὐτῶν ὡς βούλονται,
(By these letters) the king gave the Jews who were in every city to assemble and defend their lives, to destroy, to kill, and to annihilate any armed force of any people or province that might attack them, with their children and women, and to plunder their goods.	(by which) he ordered them to use their own laws in every city to help themselves, and to treat their adversaries, and those who attacked them, as they pleased.

The text is quite different, and the main motive for the change seems to be the disconcerting content of the Hebrew text, which would have been poorly received in the heterogeneous and international setting of the Greek translation in Alexandria. Similar examples of wide replacements can be found in other parts of the LXX version of Esther as well, and perhaps to a somewhat lesser degree in Daniel and 1 Esdras.[14] By contrast, examples of such extensive rewritings are difficult to find in most other parts

---

13. Clearly, each variant reading has to be determined separately, as the LXX also preserves more original readings than the MT.

14. In the Alpha text replacements are so widespread that one should, at least in part, characterize the version as a rewritten text. This shows that the editorial technique of replacing older text with something new borders on the technique of entirely rewriting older compositions, as it was most prominently done by Chronicles in relation to its *Vorlage*, represented by the extant books of Samuel and Kings. However, replacements that are documented by the textual transmission of single books are usually of

of the Hebrew Bible. It needs to be noted that all these examples come from Greek translations of rather late books of the Hebrew Bible. This may play a role in the frequency of the radical changes, such as omissions and replacements, but these correlations are not yet fully understood. It is also possible that these books preserve text-critical evidence from the earlier transmission of the books in question more than many other books in the Hebrew Bible. They may not have received such a high standing and normative position when they were translated. This could partly explain the difference with other books, which would also imply that biblical texts could be more freely changed in their earlier transmission. This conclusion is relativized by the fact that the evidence mainly comes from rather free Greek translations.

As for the intention of replacements, a new text that replaced parts of the older text was always intended to be part of the text, for otherwise it would be difficult to explain omissions that accompanied the insertion of the new material. In this respect replacements differ from some additions that could be drafted as marginal notes and may not have been originally intended to be included in the main text. Clearly, there are also cases where a scribal lapse or textual corruption caused a word to change, but such unintentional alteration of the wording is a different phenomenon, and it usually confused the text rather than producing an improved or clearly different meaning that fits the context.

As for the technical aspect of replacements, the recovered ancient palimpsests show that it was possible to wash off an entire manuscript and use the writing material—usually parchment—for an entirely new literary work.[15] In view of the many palimpsests of ancient documents that have been found, this was a well-known technique that was utilized regularly in order to save expensive parchment. Moreover, the Dead Sea Scrolls show that scribes sometimes canceled or erased erroneous words. There is evidence for various methods how this was done. A word or letter could be erased completely by scraping it off or otherwise blurring it (e.g., 1QIsaᵃ XIII, 14, Isa 15:7; 4QJ72 1, Jer 50:4; 11Q5 frag. E ii, 12, Ps 104:33) or by using cancellation dots (e.g., 4Q53 frag. 1 1, 1 Sam 25:30). Alternatively, a

---

very limited scope, which distinguishes them from the process of entirely rewriting a certain literary work.

15. Palimpsests of papyrus are also known, but since papyrus was more fragile, thus easily damaged in the process, and cheaper than parchment, it seems that parchments were more often reused for writing down new texts.

word could be placed in parenthesis (e.g., 4Q70 XII, 11, Jer 18:23; 4Q107 [4QCant^b] frag. 2 ii, 12, Song 4:10) or cancelled by crossing it out (e.g., 4Q30, frag. 33 I, 10, Deut 16:12; 1QIsa^a XVI, 21, Isa 21:1; and XLIX, 17, Isa 60:14). The new word was then written on top of the canceled word or in its place if it was scraped off.[16] Similar methods have been found in many other contexts in the ancient Near East, which shows the need for such a method and their widespread use.[17] The methods of erasing text from an existing manuscript was mostly done by scribes who corrected their own or other scribe's mistakes. Some evidence however suggests that short intentional alterations of the transmitted text could also be applied in this way. A case in point is the attestation of Isa 3:17–18 in Qumran. In 4Q56 frag. 3 1, the word אדוני, 'Lord' in Isa 3:17 is marked with cancellation dots. In 1QIsa^a III, 24, the passage is found in similar fashion; the word אדוני "Lord" is marked with cancellation dots, and it bears the supralinear addition יהוה "Yahweh":

יהוה
·אֲדוֹנִי·

This alteration is not a harmonization toward the textual traditions represented by the MT and the OG, since the MT reads אדני "Lord" and the OG ὁ θεός "God." In the second half of the verse, which also contains אדוני "Lord" in 1QIsa^a, the word was left unchanged.[18] In other words, the original text of 1QIsa^a had in both cola of Isa 3:17 אדוני "Lord," but it was secondarily corrected by replacing the first אדוני "Lord" with יהוה "Yahweh," thus creating a variation between the synonymous terms. Such variation is also found in the MT, but here it is the first colon that has אדני "Lord" and the second that has יהוה "Yahweh." In the next verse (Isa 3:18),

---

16. See Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 175–91, for discussion of different methods and their applicability. See also Tov, "Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 232–63.

17. See Martin Worthington, *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*, SANER 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 41–63, 140–45. Clearly, Akkadian was written on different material and therefore the mechanical techniques were different, but the need and general process is similar.

18. In 4Q56 (4QIsa^b), 3:17b is not extant.

which contains the name יהוה "Yahweh" once, 1QIsaᵃ attests the opposite development, that is, the replacement of יהוה "Yahweh" with אדוני "Lord." In sum, the scribe who made these replacements in 3:17–18 of 1QIsaᵃ changed the original sequence אדוני, אדוני, יהוה "Lord, Lord, Yahweh" into אדוני, אדוני, יהוה "Yahweh, Lord, Lord." The MT, by contrast, has the pattern אדני, יהוה, אדני "Lord, Yahweh, Lord."

Isa 3:17–18 1QIsaᵃ	Isa 3:17–18 MT
יהוה ושפח ·אֲדוֹנָי· קדקד בנות ציון ואדוני פתהן יערה אדוני ביום ההוא יסיר ·יהוה·̣ את תפארת	ושפח אדני קדקד בנות ציון ויהוה פתהן יערה ביום ההוא יסיר אֲדַי את תפארת
Yahweh ¹⁷And the Lord will afflict with scabs the heads of the daughters of Zion, and Yahweh will lay bare their secret parts. the Lord ¹⁸In that day Yahweh will take away the finery	¹⁷And the Lord will afflict with scabs the heads of the daughters of Zion, and Yahweh will lay bare their secret parts. ¹⁸In that day the Lord will take away the finery

The scribe who altered the text of 1QIsaᵃ seems to have been convinced that the original series יהוה, אדוני, אדוני "Lord, Lord, Yahweh" could not be correct, and in this regard it is noteworthy that 4Q56, despite being fragmentary, also seems to have contained the same correction in Isa 3:17a. In other words, both manuscripts attest an extant textual tradition containing these alternative readings. To be sure, the theological consequence of such replacements is not large; both the divine title אדוני "Lord" and the divine name יהוה "Yahweh" unquestionably refer to the same deity in this context. However, the scribe who made these changes took utmost care of the precise wording; to him it was obviously not irrelevant in which sequence the terms אדוני "Lord" and יהוה "Yahweh" occur in this passage, although it remains difficult to understand the precise reasons for the alteration of the wording that led to the existence of at least three different versions of the passage (i.e., the MT, the first version of 1QIsaᵃ, and the corrected version). The phenomenon becomes even more peculiar when the larger context of 1QIsaᵃ is taken into consideration, since the scribal interventions in Isa 3:17–18 are isolated and highly exceptional in the context of this scroll. A corresponding change—in this case from יהוה "Yahweh" into אדוני—is only found once more in Isa 8:7, isolated supra-

linear additions of אדוני "Lord" to the Tetragrammaton are found in Isa 30:15 and 65:13, and a similar variation between ואדוני "and the Lord" and ואלוהי "and my God" occurs in Isa 49:14.[19] On the other hand, the changes in Isa 3:17–18 in 1QIsaᵃ (and probably also in 4Q56) show that the precise wording was not yet entirely fixed at this stage of the textual transmission. In spite of the exceptional character of such changes in the Isaiah Scroll it cannot be excluded that similar processes were more common at earlier stages.

Despite the evidence for replacements in existing manuscripts, it is probable that they were most often done when an entire manuscript was reproduced. It is not only laborious to wash or scrape off ink and write a new text in its place, but there would also be a danger of damaging the manuscript or parts of the text that were not intended to be removed. Moreover, it always leaves a trace of what has been done, which would hinder at least some replacements. A replacement in an existing manuscript may thereby be a more radical intervention that needs a more conscious intent than a replacement in the copying process of an entire manuscript.

Many scholars who investigate the literary history of biblical texts by using literary or redaction criticism do not reckon with replacements, and this editorial technique—like omissions—is generally neglected or even explicitly rejected in conventional literary critical models and in their underlying methodological presuppositions.[20] This contradicts the clear

---

19. The latter case is, however, more uncertain, since the ואדוני in the original text lacks cancellation dots, while the supralinear addition is marked with dots before and after the word: ·ואלוהי·. Does this indicate that the supralinear version was regarded as an alternative reading without the validity to fully replace the more original?

20. Thus, e.g., Odil Hannes Steck, *Exegese des Alten Testaments: Leitfaden der Methodik; Ein Arbeitsbuch für Proseminarie, Seminarie und Vorlesungen*, 12th ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 46; Levin, *Old Testament*, 26–27; Becker, *Exegese des Alten Testaments*, 84. This was different in earlier periods of scholarship, particularly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when scholars proposed large numbers of conjectures which, in part, implied the assumption that an older text was deliberately changed during the textual transmission (apart from conjectures that reckoned with scribal mistakes). Since these conjectures usually had no basis among the extant textual witnesses, following generations of exegetes up to the present became much more skeptical about conjectures and dismissed them more or less entirely as purely speculative. This skepticism, which is certainly warranted in a methodological perspective, was and is however often accompanied by the implicit or explicit assumption that during the textual transmission no replacements happened at all—which is proven wrong by the documented textual transmission.

evidence for replacements of letters and words, rarely also phrases, sentences, and larger passages that took place even during the final stages of the textual transmission before the texts became practically unchangeable. The examples discussed in this chapter show that, although not very frequent, one may not a priori exclude the possibility that some textual elements were replaced in their transmission.

Replacements as an editorial technique should be distinguished from rewriting. The former refers to the technical replacement of parts of the text, while the latter can be seen as a more comprehensive process and position in relation to the older composition. Although rewriting is variably understood in biblical scholarship, the term is often used to denote a genre of literature (for example, "rewritten Bible compositions") rather than an editorial technique as such. Nevertheless, sometimes a sharp division between replacements and rewriting cannot be made. A process of rewriting obviously necessitates replacements. For example, the two Greek versions of Esther would be borderline cases. It would not be completely unjustified to regard the Greek Esther as a rewritten composition that necessitated repeated replacements. Chronicles in relation to its sources in Samuel and Kings could more clearly be characterized as a rewritten composition. Parts of Chronicles follow the sources almost verbatim (e.g., 2 Chr 21:5–10; cf. 2 Kgs 8:17–22), but other sections are entirely rewritten or full of omissions, replacements, and large additions (e.g., 2 Chr 21:11–19; cf. 2 Kgs 8:23). On the other hand, Chronicles can also be termed an entirely new composition that used Kings as a source. Some of the Dead Sea Scrolls can also be characterized as rewritten texts (e.g., 4Q98g [4QPs^x]) and they also contain repeated replacements in relation to their sources. Then again, there are several replacements in the MT/LXX of 1 Kgs 11, but it would be misleading to characterize the textual witnesses as rewritten texts. In any case, it is not the goal of this volume to delve deeper into the clearly complex issue of rewriting and its more appropriate definition.[21] In this volume we refer to replacements as cases where an individual passage was edited by exchanging a textual element while the broader context remained largely untouched by such

---

21. For discussion on the terminology and definition of rewriting, see Molly M. Zahn, "Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology," *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, BZAW 419 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 93–120.

radical interventions.[22] With the possible exception of examples from Esther, the variant versions that are discussed in this chapter cannot be characterized as rewritten versions but are rather variant versions of the same composition.

A further aspect especially relevant for replacements are the so-called memory variants (also oral variants or synonymous readings), which some scholars assume could explain some of the differences in the manuscript.[23] The synonymous variants are often seen as intentional revisions, but David Carr and Raymond Person suggest alternatives. According to Carr, some of them could have been occasioned "when a tradent modifies elements of texts in the process of citing or otherwise reproducing it from memory."[24] Person goes a bit further and argues that "the standard explanations of these variants (such as 'scribal error' or ideologically motivated revisions) simply do not apply."[25] Following Albert Lord's investigations in the transmission of oral traditions, Person suggests that it is misleading to talk about variants at all, since the multiformity of traditions erases the concept of originality. This is not the place to discuss orality in detail. However, our analyses here pertain to this issue in terms of the observable variants in the manuscript. If Person is correct, one would expect a high number of variants and considerable fluctuation especially in the use of synonyms. One central question is whether "ideologically motivated revision" is a misleading interpretation of the variant. If this is the case, the explanations to that effect would have to be somewhat forced, and Person's explanation would then be much more natural. Clearly, some of the variants may well have been caused by a scribe reproducing a different, synonymous word out of memory. This could explain some of the many synonymous variants between the MT and SP. In the end, each case has to be decided on the basis of its own evidence. It is clear that in quite a

---

22. Replacements took place in rewritten texts, but not all texts where replacements took place could be characterized as rewritten texts.

23. For memory variants, see Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 17. The concept and term "synonymous reading" is from Shemaryahu Talmon, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament," in *Studies in the Bible*, ed. Chaim Rabin, ScrHier 8 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), 336.

24. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 17.

25. Raymond F. Person, "Formulas and Scribal Memory: A Case Study of Text-Critical Variants as Examples of Category-Triggering," in *Weathered Words: Formulaic Language and Verbal Art*, ed. Frog and William Lamb (Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2021).

number of cases investigated here an ideologically motivated intentional change is a very plausible explanation. This is especially the case when the replacement has caused a clear change in meaning. It is not obvious how a memory variant caused a clear change in meaning. The memory aspect may certainly explain some of the synonyms, especially if the change appears to be unmotivated.

9.1. Genesis 2:2

After the creation had been concluded, according to Gen 2:2 God rested on the seventh day. The verse contains a significant text-critical variant concerning the day when the creation was finished. According to the MT, God finished his work on the seventh say, whereas in the SP and LXX he is said to have finished it already on the sixth day.

Gen 2:2 MT	Gen 2:2 SP	Gen 2:2 LXX
ויכל אלהים ביום הַשַׁבִיעִי מלאכתו אשר עשה וישבת ביום השביעי מכל מלאכתו אשר עשה	ויכל אלהים ביום הַשִׁשִׁי מלאכתו אשר עשה וישבת ביום השביעי מכל מלאכתו אשר עשה	καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ἃ ἐποίησεν, καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὧν ἐποίησεν.
On the seventh day God finished the work that he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all the work that he had done.	On the sixth day God finished the work that he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all the work that he had done.	On the sixth day God finished his works that he had made, and he left off on the seventh day from all his works that he had made.

The fact that the LXX reading is supported by the SP indicates that the LXX reading is not an interpretive alteration by the Greek translator but was probably found already in the Hebrew *Vorlage*; the LXX *Vorlage* and the SP probably go back to a shared tradition in this reading, and it is also supported by the Peshitta and the parallel verse in Jub. 2.16. The targumim and the Vulgate follow the MT. Both readings thus have wide textual support, and on the weight of the textual witnesses it is difficult to determine which reading is more original.

The key to the textual change lies in the content. The MT reading is more difficult and thereby could represent the original text.[26] The problem lies in the idea that God would have finished his work only on the seventh day, which could be read to imply that some work was still done on the seventh day when he is supposed to have rested already. According to the preceding text, however, the last work he had done happened on the sixth day, and the sixth day had already been concluded according to Gen 1:31. In addition, Gen 2:1 states that "the heavens, the earth and all the host of them were finished" (ויכלו השמים והארץ וכל צבאם). The reference to the conclusion of God's work on the seventh day in Gen 2:2 MT thus seems incorrect, while the LXX/SP reading seems logically consistent. This may indicate that the latter is a secondary attempt of correcting the seemingly incorrect version preserved in the MT (*lectio difficilior potior*).

The reason for the seemingly incorrect counting of the day when God concluded his work may lie in the peculiarly ambivalent semantic range of the verb כלה *piel*. It refers both to "ceasing," "stopping," "not doing," and to "finishing" and "completing."[27] In the MT, the emphasis seems to lie on the "ceasing" or "not doing" aspect of the verb; it is possible that the MT version ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי מלאכתו originally intended to express that God had already ceased his work on the seventh day and thus would not do any work on this day.[28] This may be combined with the grammatical theory that the verb has to be read in the pluperfect tense—on the seventh day *he had* (*already*) *finished* the work—which avoids the problem.[29] Alternatively, according to Gerhard von Rad, the verb could intentionally refer to the seventh day to stress the nexus between completion and peace; von Rad notes that the text does not refer in any way to the cultic institution of the Sabbath but focuses solely on God's completion of his work

---

26. Thus many since early research, e.g., Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *The Pentateuch*, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1885), 68; Dillmann, *Genesis*, 90, Skinner, *Genesis*, 37, von Rad, *Das Erste Buch Mose: Genesis*, ATD 2.4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), 48.

27. See *HALOT*, s.v. "כלה II"; and cf., e.g., Gen 27:30 (ויהי כאשר כלה יצחק לברך את יעקב "As soon as Isaac had stopped/finished blessing Jacob") or Deut 32:45–46 (ויכל משה לדבר את כל הדברים האלה אל כל ישראל ויאמר אלהם "And Moses finished reciting all these words to all Israel and said to them").

28. Thus already Dillmann, *Genesis*, 90.

29. Thus e.g., Driver, *Genesis*, 17–18, and many others. This solution is also criticized by many, e.g., Dillmann, *Genesis*, 90; and Skinner, *Genesis*, 37.

and his rest.[30] Christoph Levin, by contrast, proposes that Gen 2:1–3 was written by three different hands; according to him, 2:1, and secondarily also 2:2a and 3a had from the outset not been connected with the idea of God's own rest. He hypothesizes that this idea was only interpolated by addition of 2:2b and 3b—which would explain the slight tension between the completion of God's work on the seventh day and his rest on this day.[31] This would thus imply that the MT is original, while the SP/LXX reading is an attempt to harmonize the tension caused by earlier editing.

With the meaning of כלה *piel* "to finish" or "to complete" in mind, a later editor naturally would have read Gen 2:2a as referring to the factual completion of God's creational work. Being understood this way, the reference to the seventh day in Gen 2:2 MT openly contradicts the Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:11 which explicitly differentiates between six days of God's work and the seventh day as the day of God's rest (כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ ... וינח ביום השביעי "For in six days Yahweh made heaven and earth … but rested the seventh day"; see also Exod 31:17). With the increasing importance of the Sabbath commandment, readers would have become sensitive to this issue, and thus there would have been incentive to avoid even the slightest hint of God having done any work on the seventh day. This would explain the rather radical editorial intervention in a well-known and central text resulting in the version attested by the LXX and the SP: "And on the *sixth* day God *completed* his work."

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. One could assume that the replacement was done accidentally in either one of the textual traditions. Although the Hebrew words שביעי "seventh" and ששי "sixth" are dissimilar, it cannot be completely excluded that a scribe mistakenly read seventh for sixth. This could have been occasioned by the existence of the word seventh in the same verse, which confused a scribe. According to Karl Budde, the LXX and the SP represent the original text, while the MT is merely the result of an unintentional scribal error.[32] Charles James Ball also argues in favor of the primacy of the LXX/SP reading by stating that the content necessitates the reading "sixth" and the original text contained "an intentional antithesis between ביום הששי and ביום השביעי."[33] In the

---

30. Von Rad, *Genesis*, 48.
31. Levin, "Tatbericht und Wortbericht," 27–28.
32. Karl Budde, *Die Biblische Urgeschichte (Gen 1-12,5)* (Giessen: Ricker, 1883), 490.
33. Ball, *Genesis*, 47, see also the reconstructed text on p. 2.

MT there is a somewhat unnecessary repetition of the word *seven*, which is missing in the SP/LXX. One may also consider that the use of the verbal root כלה in Gen 2:2 (ויכל אלהים ... מלאכתו אשר עשה "And God ceased [doing] … the work that he had done") intentionally differs from its use in Gen 2:1 (ויכלו השמים והארץ וכל צבאם "And the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them"). Explanations of the text that imply the originality of the LXX/SP reading can be defended with the assumption that MT goes back to a mechanical scribal error. Clearly, this theory cannot be completely excluded.

An *intentional* change from an original reading ביום הששי "on the sixth day," as attested by the LXX/SP, to ביום השביעי "on the seventh day," as attested by the MT, is, by contrast, highly unlikely. It would be difficult to explain why the sixth would have been changed to the seventh day, particularly in light of the Sabbath commandment. Such a change would run counter to the increasing tendency of being sensitive for any work conducted on the Sabbath. Consequently, if the textual variation is not due to an unintentional change in one of the traditions, it is very likely that the LXX/SP is the result of a theologically motivated intentional replacement.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Since the secondary reading is well represented among textual witnesses and the reading is shared by the SP and LXX, we are probably dealing with a rather early replacement. There is no evidence for a wider redaction or other related editorial changes in the creation stories, and it thus seems to be an isolated scribal intervention motivated by the hint of the older text that God might have still worked on the seventh day. Because one word was replaced, it would easily have been possible to scrape it off or otherwise cancel it, and write the new word in its place. Clearly, it is also possible that the intervention was done in the process of copying the entire manuscript.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the older text preserved in the MT, it would be very difficult to detect that the numeral had been changed from seven to six in the LXX/SP. Both readings are possible and would not raise suspicions that something could have been replaced. This is especially the case with the apparently secondary numeral "sixth," which is less conspicuous than the numeral "seventh." Paradoxically, the probably original reading would raise more suspicions than the secondary one, and the probable reason for this is earlier editing as discussed above. How-

ever, had the critic for some reason detected the editing, it would have been relatively evident to determine which word was replaced.

Results. Although certainty cannot be reached here, it seems slightly more probable that the LXX/SP of Gen 2:2 is secondary and the result of a replacement of one word. The cause for the theological correction was an assumed contradiction with the Sabbath commandment. Without documented evidence for the original reading in the MT, it would have been nearly impossible to detect that the LXX/SP readings are the result of an editorial intervention.

9.2. Exodus 21:28–29

Exodus 21:28–29 is part of the casuistic law collection of the Covenant Code, and it may derive from or at least preserve vestiges of an ancient law code that was used during the monarchic period. As part of a series of related laws in 21:28–36, verses 28–29 deal with cases where an animal has killed a man or another animal. The passage contains two significant variants between the MT and SP, one concerning the verb with which the animal hits the victim and one concerning the animal itself.

The MT specifies that the animal in question is שור, which primarily refers to a bull, ox, or bovine, whereas the SP mainly (but not only) uses a more general term הבהמה, which may refer to cattle but which is wider in scope and can refer to animals in general. Using the word ταῦρος, "bull," the Greek is like the MT more specific in meaning, and it is thus very likely that the LXX goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* שור. The Vulgate (*bos*), the targumim (תור/תורא) and the Peshitta (ܬܘܪܐ) also follow the MT. The passage in question is not preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is also a difference in a central verb of the passage. For describing the offense the MT uses the verb נגח, "to gore" whereas the SP uses the more general and inclusive verb נכה, which can mean "to hit," "to beat," "to strike dead," or "to injure." The LXX (κερατίζω), the Vulgate (*cornu petierit*), the targumim (יגח and יגש/ינגש), and the Peshitta (ܢܕܩܪ) follow the MT. The variant readings are also found in the following 21:30–36, but it suffices to discuss them in 21:28–29. The number of variants clearly indicates that we are dealing with a systematic revision where words in the original text were replaced with new ones.

Exod 21:28–29 MT	Exod 21:28–29 SP
²⁸וּכִי יִגַּח שׁוֹר אֶת אִישׁ אוֹ אֶת אִשָּׁה וָמֵת סָקוֹל יִסָּקֵל הַשּׁוֹר וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל אֶת בְּשָׂרוֹ וּבַעַל הַשּׁוֹר נָקִי ²⁹וְאִם שׁוֹר נַגָּח הוּא מִתְּמֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם וְהוּעַד בִּבְעָלָיו וְלֹא יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ וְהֵמִית אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה הַשּׁוֹר יִסָּקֵל וְגַם בְּעָלָיו יוּמָת	²⁸וּכִי יַכֶּה שׁוֹר אוֹ כָל בְּהֵמָה אֶת אִישׁ אוֹ אֶת אִשָּׁה וָמֵת סָקוֹל יִסָּקֵל הַבְּהֵמָה וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל אֶת בְּשָׂרוֹ וּבַעַל הַבְּהֵמָה נָקִיא ²⁹וְאִם הַבְּהֵמָה מַכֶּה הִיא מִתְּמוֹל שִׁלְשׁוֹם וְהוּעַד בִּבְעָלָיו וְלֹא יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ וְהֵמִית אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה הַבְּהֵמָה תִּסָּקֵל וְגַם בְּעָלָיו יוּמָת
²⁸When an ox gores a man or a woman to death, the ox shall be stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall not be liable. ²⁹If the ox has been accustomed to gore in the past, and its owner has been warned but has not restrained it, and it kills a man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned, and its owner also shall be put to death.	²⁸When an ox or any beast hits a man or a woman to death, the beast shall be stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the beast shall not be liable. ²⁹If the beast has been accustomed to hit in the past, and its owner has been warned but has not restrained it, and it kills a man or a woman, the beast shall be stoned, and its owner also shall be put to death.

It is quite likely that the MT preserves the original readings in both variants, the SP being a secondary development that by generalizing sought to expand the applicability of the law.[34] Both changes have the same tendency to be more inclusive. As for the difference between the בהמה "beast" and the שור "ox," the following considerations suggest that the SP is secondary: First, the SP receives no support from other witnesses, whereas the textual support for the MT is strong as noted above. Second, the SP also refers to the ox at the beginning of the passage in 21:28, but adds "any beast" immediately after it (שור או כל בהמה).[35] This plus is not followed by any other witness. However, the SP mentions the ox only at the beginning, but

---

34. This view is represented by most scholars, e.g., Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus*, 233–34, Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 195, Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie*, BZAW 188 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 150–51; John I. Durham, *Exodus*, WBC 3 (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 312; Christoph Dohmen, *Exodus 19–40*, 2nd ed., HThKAT (Basel: Herder, 2012), 140, 146; Thomas B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, ECC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 516, 521; Houtman, *Exodus*, 178–79. Many scholars take no note of the SP reading, e.g., Murphy, *Exodus*, 241–43; and Holzinger, *Exodus*, 86–87, and merely imply that the MT is original.

35. A similar addition of או כל בהמה after a reference to the ox is also found in Exod 21:33, 35.

it has no function in the rest of the law (it is mentioned in 21:33 and 35). In all other cases when the MT refers to an ox, the SP refers to the beast. It would be unnecessary to refer to the ox at all if the same law already covers all cattle and animals as well. The ox in the SP is redundant. It is thus very likely that the plus (או כל בהמה) in the SP at the beginning of 21:28 is an expansion that sought to include other animals to the law as well. The same motive seems to be behind those cases where the beast has replaced the ox altogether. It would be difficult to explain the reference to the ox at the beginning of the law in the SP if the beast is the original reading, for there would be no reason to add it after a more general word is already used. Third, the motive for the change in the SP is understandable: The MT reading is rather specific, which limits the applicability of the law. The reader easily asks, does the law not apply to other animals in cases where the animal kills a man. As the word שור may even have denoted a male bovine, one could ask whether the case applies to a female. This would tempt a later editor to add "or any other beast," which extends the same law to analogous cases. Subsequently it would have been logical to replace the more specific word throughout the law with a more inclusive one.[36] In contrast, the opposite direction from a more general and inclusive applicability to a specific one would be difficult to explain.

A similar reason and motive seems to be behind the difference between the words נגח "to gore" of the MT and נכה "to hit" of the SP. The latter has a much more general scope than the former. In reference to an ox, נגח primarily refers to the piercing or wounding with the horn(s), which in this law would easily raise the question of its applicability to cases where the animal has killed or wounded in another way, for example, by kicking or crushing by trampling. This would have been expanded by replacing the word with the verb נכה, which has the meaning "to pierce" but which also refers to striking, smiting, beating, or injuring in a general sense. Moreover, the SP stands alone with its reading against all other witnesses. It is therefore very likely that the SP represents a secondary development.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is clear that we are dealing with intentional changes, as the words are so different that they could hardly be confused and the same differences are found repeatedly in these

---

36. Thus also Houtman, *Exodus*, 178–79.

and the following 21:30–36. Accidental changes—in either direction—can thus be completely excluded.

An intentional change from beast to ox is a theoretical possibility, but it would be difficult to find any motive to change a general term to a much more specific one that excludes cases where other animals have killed. It would also necessitate that the first reference to the beast in the SP had been intentionally omitted in the textual tradition behind the MT/LXX reading. This seems very unlikely and accordingly this theory is not represented in scholarship. The same is probable for the difference between נגח and נכה. It would be difficult to find any motive to specify the case and thus exclude cases where an animal has killed by other means than goring.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The systematic replacement of the ox with beast and goring (נגח) with hitting (נכה) bear witness to an intentional redaction in the SP that sought to widen the applicability of the law. Since words were repeatedly replaced, it is unlikely that this would have been done without copying the entire manuscript. This also implies intentional authorization for the revision. The replacements are not fundamental revisions and therefore we are dealing with minor redactional activity that nonetheless altered the text in a meaningful way. It is notable that Exod 21:18–19 also contains cases where the SP similarly increases the applicability of laws by omitting.[37] It thus appears that we are dealing with a wider redactional inclination to develop the laws of the Covenant Code to be more applicable and inclusive.

Both changes are skillful editorial procedures, for the new words do not factually remove any meaning, they only expand it. The meaning of the original word נגח "to gore" is covered by the new word נכה, although it can also mean something else as well. The same is true of the word בהמה, which can and often mainly refers to bovines, thus including שור, "ox," but which can also include other animals. The use of more inclusive words may have been a justification to alter the text. The new words could thus have been regarded as synonyms to the replaced words, although with an augmented meaning. In some sense the replacements may have been understood as additions that did not really remove anything from the older text, although technically a word was removed. This shows the subtleties of how new meanings could have been sneaked into the text without

---

37. See analysis of these verses in ch. 8, "Omissions."

rejecting the old one. The use of such a technique clearly implies that it was not possible to change the text very freely and that perceptive methods had to be developed to alter the text and attain new meanings.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the MT it would have been difficult to detect the systematic changes in the SP. The changed words בהמה, "beast" and נכה "to hit" fit very well to all of the laws in 21:28–36, and the content would not easily disclose that these words may not be original. The only feature that would raise a suspicion of an editorial intervention is the peculiar reference to an ox at the beginning of 21:28, which is redundant in this verse and does not have any function in the actual laws either. A critic would also be surprised to find references to the ox and donkey in Exod 21:33 and 35, which are unnecessary, since the more general term "beast" (בהמה) includes them in any case. Nevertheless, it is very unlikely that the critic would be able to reconstruct that the text had been edited by nearly systematically replacing the word "ox" with "beast" throughout the laws in 21:28–36. It is very possible that a critic would suspect the term "ox" to be a secondary disturbance and addition in 21:28. Paradoxically, the critic could thus be misled to assume that the original word is a later addition. The critic would have been even more toothless to detect the change of נגח to נכה.

Results. The SP of Exod 21:28–29 (and 21:30–36) contains repeated editorial interventions where the word שור "ox" was replaced with the more general term בהמה "beast" and where the verb נגח "to gore" was changed to the verb נכה "to hit." We are dealing with a systematic revision that altered the text by expanding the applicability of the law to include not only the ox but also other animals and to include not only goring but also other types of killing or wounding the victim. Without the older text preserved in the MT/LXX a literary critic might suspect that something was edited in the SP, but it seems unlikely that the critic would have recognized what exactly happened to the text, and it would have been nearly impossible to reconstruct the original text on the basis the SP version.

9.3. Exodus 24:4

Exodus 24:1–11 describes the making of a covenant between Yahweh and the Israelites after the theophany on Mount Sinai. As part of the scene, in 24:4 Moses builds an altar at the foot of the mountain and sets up twelve

stones for the tribes of Israel. The word for the stones is different in the witnesses. Using the Hebrew word מצבה (sg.), the MT refers to them as standing stones or masseboth, which are usually regarded as having a cultic function, whereas the SP and LXX use a more neutral term for stones, אבנים and λίθους (pl.), respectively. The Vulgate (*titulos*), targumim (קמא, קמן), and the Peshitta (ܡܢܨܒܬܐ) follow the MT.

Exod 24:4 MT	Exod 24:4 SP	Exod 24:4 LXX
ויכתב משה את כל דברי יהוה וישכם בבקר ויבן מזבח תחת ההר ושתים עשרה מַצֵבָה לשנים עשר שבטי ישראל	ויכתב משה את כל דברי יהוה וישכם בבקר ויבן מזבח תחת ההר ושתים עשרה אַבְנִים לשנים עשר שבטי ישראל	καὶ ἔγραψεν Μωυσῆς πάντα τὰ ῥήματα κυρίου. ὀρθρίσας δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ πρωὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος καὶ δώδεκα λίθους εἰς τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ισραηλ
Moses wrote down all the words of Yahweh. Early in the morning he built an altar at the foot of the mountain and twelve masseboth for the twelve tribes of Israel.	Moses wrote down all the words of Yahweh. Early in the morning he built an altar at the foot of the mountain and twelve stones for the twelve tribes of Israel.	Moses wrote down all the words of Yahweh. Early in the morning Moses built an altar at the foot of the mountain and twelve stones for the twelve tribes of Israel.

It is likely that the SP/LXX readings are the result of a theological correction, while the MT represents the original text.[38] Although the variant reading is well represented, a consideration of the motive for changing the text strongly suggests that the MT is original. The word מצבה has an evident cultic connotation, and, accordingly, in some passages the Israelites are prohibited from erecting them (e.g., Lev 26:1; Deut 16:22) and told to destroy them (e.g., Deut 7:5; 12:3). For example, in Exod 23:24 God explicitly orders the Israelites to crush the masseboth of the people of the land:

---

38. Thus many scholars, e.g., Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 1:362; Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri,* 215, Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 498; Dozeman, *Exodus,* 561; Houtman, *Exodus,* 288–89. As noted already by Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus,* 256, "nur aus Aengstlichkeit, vgl. 23, 24. Lev. 26, 1, haben *Sam.* und LXX אבנים." Some scholars, such as Durham, *Exodus,* 339, merely note the SP/LXX reading, and imply that it is a secondary development.

שבר תשבר מצבתיהם. It is thus embarrassing that in the following chapter, in Exod 24:4, Moses himself erects masseboth and thus contradicts the law he is mediating. There would thus be a great incentive to avoid the contradiction and desacralize the stones that he erected. By replacing the word with another one that similarly refers to erected stones but that does not have an obvious cultic aspect would have avoided the problem. The more neutral word for stone could be understood to refer to a memorial without an evident cultic connotation. It is probable that this caused the change in the SP/LXX.[39] The reason for originally using the more cultic word, massebah, may be that in the early development of the Hebrew Bible the masseboth were still a normal and accepted as part of Israelite religion. This is suggested by the apparent other vestiges in the Pentateuch and elsewhere. For example, the patriarchs in particular erect masseboth without any condemnation of the practice in the text.[40] Their prohibition is probably a late phenomenon and connected with developments within the legal corpora. The prohibition was gradually adopted as the norm, which then secondarily influenced most parts of the Hebrew Bible. Many texts were secondarily revised according to this norm, Exod 24:4 being among them.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Because the words אבנים and מצבה differ almost completely, an accidental mistake is unlikely. Slightly more possible would be the intentional change of אבנים to מצבה. One could argue that the setting is obviously cultic, and because the stones are set up with an altar, cultic stones must have been meant in any case. An editor could have been tempted to use a more technical and specific word for cultic stones. Although this theory is not completely impossible, it would run counter to the typical tendency in the Hebrew Bible to purge the texts of ancient religious items and practices that had become prohibited. Such a change would thus imply increased interest in the cultic stones in a late context, which is unlikely. Moreover, it would fail to explain why the original author used the neutral word for stones if cultic stones were meant. That the stones were erected beside an altar clearly indicates a cultic purpose. With the lack of convincing alternative theories, scholars generally accept that the MT represents the original text, while the SP/LXX is the result of a theologically motivated change.

---

39. Similarly, Childs, *Exodus*, 498; Houtman, *Exodus*, 288–89.
40. Thus in Gen 28:18, 22; 31:13, 45, 51–52; 35:14, 20.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Since the editorial intervention concerns one word only, it would have been possible to replace it without copying the entire manuscript, although a replacement in the process of copying is also quite possible. The replacement is part of a wider tendency to purge the Hebrew Bible of older religious conceptions that did not accord with the religious ideals and norms that emerged after 587 BCE. However, there is no evidence of a systematic redaction to this effect, since ancient conceptions that contradicted later ideals can still be found in parts of the book, including Exod 24 (e.g., vv. 10–11), and in other parts of the Pentateuch. Much of the purging seems to have taken place as isolated revisions where a scribe instinctively altered the text to accord with theological conceptions of his own time. One could also refer to a milieu of transmission where certain kind of older conceptions became increasingly difficult to accept.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the MT reading it would have been difficult to detect the replacement in the SP and LXX versions. The intervention left no obvious signs of editing in the text, as only one word was replaced and the new one was placed in the same grammatical position. On the basis of many other texts where the word מצבה is used in reference to cultic stones, one could have speculated about the possibility that this is also the case in Exod 24:4. The erection of stones for cultic purposes usually means masseboth. In some passages a stone is erected as a massebah (Gen 28:18, 22; 31:45), which implies a ritual where a stone becomes a massebah. Nevertheless, without textual evidence this possibility would only be a conjecture. Joshua 4:3, 9 contains a similar case but without textual evidence. In what is a very comparable setting to Exod 24:4, Josh 4:3, 9 refers to the erection of twelve stones, אבנים for the twelve tribes of Israel. The suspicion that the original word could be מצבה is suggested by the reference to the place from which the stones are taken (4:3): ממצב רגלי הכהנים, "from the standing place of the feet of the priests," and where they were eventually returned to (4:9): ושתים עשרה אבנים הקים יהושע בתוך הירדן תחת מצב רגלי הכהנים, "Joshua set up twelve stones in the middle of the Jordan, in the place where the feet of the priests stood." There may have been a play of words between מצב and מצבה, which could be used as an argument that the original word in Josh 4:3 and 9 was מצבה and not אבנים. In other words, a very similar theological correction could be identified in Josh 4:3 and 9 without documented evidence. The passage in Joshua gives support to assume that similar theological corrections took

place in other parts of the Hebrew Bible as well, and thereby one could assume an editorial intervention in Exod 24:4 even without documented evidence.

Results. The variant readings in SP/LXX of Exod 24:4 are the result of a theologically motivated correction where a massebah, a word for an erected cultic stone, was replaced with a more neutral term for stone, אבן. Without the older version preserved in the MT it would have been difficult to detect the replacement, although one could have conjectured that the original word was indeed מצבה "massebah."

9.4. Numbers 1:47 and 2:33

The inclusion of the Levites among the Israelites is ambiguous in the book of Numbers. Some passages clearly specify them as Israelites (Num 3:9, 12, 41, 45, 46; 8:6, 14, 19), while others implicitly (Num 8:6, 20) or explicitly (Num 1:47, 49; 2:33) exclude them from the other Israelites by regarding them as a separate group. That there was some controversy over this issue is seen in the very similar terminology used in the passages where they are included or excluded. For example, according to Num 3:12, the Levites from among the Israelites are regarded as substitutes for the firstborn: את הלוים מתוך בני ישראל. On the other hand, according to Num 2:33, the Levites should not be counted among the Israelites when Moses took the census of the Israelites: והלוים לא התפקדו בתוך בני ישראל. The reason for this ambiguity probably lies in the complicated redaction history of the book. It appears that the Levites are completely missing in some sections, such as in the census taken of the Israelites in Num 1:1–46, whereas they have a central role in many other parts of the book. Our focus lies on the editorial changes that the incongruity has occasioned. Later editors sought to accommodate the inconsistencies concerning the position of the Levites. Two examples of documented evidence illustrate that sometimes the accommodation necessitated replacements. Numbers 1–2 describes the census Yahweh ordered Moses to take of the Israelites. There are interesting text-critical variants on the exclusion of the Levites from the census in Num 1:47 and 2:33.

According to the MT of Num 1:47, the Levites are not counted among "them." The formulation in the MT is unspecific, and the reader can be led to assume that it refers to the number of people presented in 1:46. In other words, the number of people does not include the Levites. However,

according to the LXX, the Levites are not counted among the Israelites. Although this reference to the census is the same, the formulation in Greek clearly excludes the Levites from the Israelites.

Num 1:45–47 MT	Num 1:45–47 LXX
[45]ויהיו כל פקודי בני ישראל לבית אבתם מבן עשרים שנה ומעלה כל יצא צבא בישראל [46]ויהיו כל הפקדים שש מאות אלף ושלשת אלפים וחמש מאות וחמשים [47]והלוים למטה אבתם לא התפקדו בתוכם	[45]καὶ ἐγένετο πᾶσα ἡ ἐπίσκεψις υἱῶν Ισραηλ σὺν δυνάμει αὐτῶν ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετοῦς καὶ ἐπάνω, πᾶς ὁ ἐκπορευόμενος παρατάξασθαι ἐν Ισραηλ, [46]ἑξακόσιαι χιλιάδες καὶ τρισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι καὶ πεντήκοντα. [47]Οἱ δὲ Λευῖται ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς πατριᾶς αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπεσκέπησαν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ.
[45]The whole number of the Israelites by their ancestral houses from twenty years and above, everyone able to go to war in Israel, [46]their whole number was six hundred three thousand five hundred fifty. [47]But the Levites from their paternal tribe were not numbered among them.	[45]The whole number of the Israelites with their force from twenty years and above, everyone able to go to war in Israel was [46]six hundred three thousand five hundred fifty. [47]But the Levites from their paternal tribe were not numbered among the Israelites.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, targumim (ביניהון), Peshitta (ܒܝܢܬܗܘܢ), and the Vulgate (*cum eis*) follow the MT, which thus has a rather wide textual support. Since the LXX reading is unanimously supported in the Greek manuscripts, it seems probable that it goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* בתוך בני ישראל. The passage is not attested among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Despite the strong textual support for the MT reading, the Old Greek represents a very strong candidate for the original reading. The Greek can be regarded as the more difficult reading as it runs counter to the more prevalent conception that the Levites should be regarded as Israelites. The MT reading is more ambiguous as it can be interpreted in different ways. It avoids the problem but does not really change the meaning. The MT can still be interpreted to exclude the Levites from among the Israelites but it is not the first interpretation the reader is led to. It subtly changes the meaning so that the reader easily understands it as a reference to the result of the census: the Levites were excluded from the census.

If one would assume that the OG is secondary, one would have to assume that a later editor explicitly wanted to sharpen the exclusion of the

Levites. Although this is theoretically possible, one would then suspect that the exclusion was made systematically, but there is no evidence for this. In fact, the Old Greek of Num 2:33 seems to attest to an opposite development (see below). This suggests that the MT reading is the result of a spontaneous reaction to the apparently problematic idea that the Levites should not be counted among the Israelites.[41]

A very similar case is found in Num 2:33, which like 1:47 is also located at the end of a census and of its result. Peculiarly, in Num 2:33 the witnesses go exactly the opposite direction from Num 1:47. According to the MT of Num 2:33 the Levites should not be counted among the Israelites, whereas the LXX blurs the explicit exclusion by referring to "them." Some Greek manuscripts (bquw) follow the MT, but this is probably due to a later harmonization.[42]

Num 2:33 MT	Num 2:33 LXX
[32]אלה פקודי בני ישראל לבית אבתם כל פקודי המחנת לצבאתם שש מאות אלף ושלשת אלפים וחמש מאות וחמשים	[32]Αὕτη ἡ ἐπίσκεψις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ κατ᾽ οἴκους πατριῶν αὐτῶν· πᾶσα ἡ ἐπίσκεψις τῶν παρεμβολῶν σὺν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν αὐτῶν ἑξακόσιαι χιλιάδες καὶ τρισχίλιοι πεντακόσιοι πεντήκοντα.
[33]והלוים לא התפקדו בתוך בני ישראל כאשר צוה יהוה את משה	[33]οἱ δὲ Λευῖται οὐ συνεπεσκέπησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καθὰ ἐνετείλατο κύριος τῷ Μωυσῇ.

---

41. Notably, most commentators pay no attention to the variants; thus, e.g., August Wilhelm Knobel, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, KEH 13 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1861), 7–8; Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, 2:110; Dillmann, *Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 11; James Paterson, *The Book of Numbers: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text*, Sacred Books of the Old Testament 4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900), 41; Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 450, 453; George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903), 10; Martin Noth, *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri*, 4th ed., ATD 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 17–19; Baruch Levine, *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 4A (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 140; Horst Seebass, *Numeri*, BK 4.1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007), 12. Heinrich Holzinger, *Numeri*, KHC 4 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1903), 2, notes the existence of the variant, but does not evaluate its relationship with the MT.

42. Note that in some manuscripts (Cambridge: *svz*) τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ is written in the margins, which is probably an indication of a harmonization toward the MT.

³²This was the whole number of the Israelites by their ancestral houses; the total enrollment of the camps with their forces: six hundred three thousand five hundred fifty. ³³The Levites were not numbered among <u>the Israelites</u>, just as Yahweh had commanded Moses.	³²This was the whole number of the Israelites by their ancestral houses; the total enrollment of the camps with their forces: six hundred and three thousand five hundred fifty. ³³The Levites were not numbered among <u>them</u>, just as Yahweh had commanded Moses.

Just as in Num 1:47, the MT is followed by the Samaritan Pentateuch, targumim, Peshitta, and the Vulgate. The reasons for regarding the MT as more original are similar to those in Num 1:47 where the OG is more probably original. The secondary development to exclude the Levites would be more difficult to explain than their secondary inclusion.[43]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. As the same difference is found in two different verses and the variant readings are not reminiscent words or letters, an accidental mistake can be excluded. In both cases we must be dealing with an intentional change. An alternative to the above-argued theory would be the intentional exclusion of the Levites from among the Israelites. One could argue that the OG reading of 1:47 was influenced by and harmonized with 1:49, which (in both MT and LXX) excludes the Levites from among the Israelites.[44] This theory would assume that the almost adjacent verses were originally contradictory. This is not impossible, as 1:47 could be a later addition. Numbers 1:48 reads like a new beginning, while 1:47 is unnecessary in its immediate context. Numbers 1:47 could thus be an isolated expansion to explain that the Levites were missing from the preceding census. The main weakness of this theory is that it implies a rather late intervention that would run counter to the prevalent view in the book of Numbers to include the Levites among the Israelites. It is more typical that late interventions seek to harmonize concepts within the whole book and not vice versa. Nevertheless, one cannot completely exclude this alternative theory that would similarly have necessitated a secondary intervention by replacement in the LXX of 1:47.

---

43. Most scholars make no note of the variants in Num 2:33, e.g., Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, 2:112–13; Paterson, *Numbers*, 42–43; Gray, *Numbers*, 30; Levine, *Numbers*, 150; Seebass, *Numeri*, 44.

44. לא תפקד ואת ראשם לא תשא בתוך בני ישראל.

As for Num 2:33 one could likewise suggest that the MT is a secondary development that sought to exclude the Levites from among the Israelites. This could then be a harmonization toward Num 1:49 (and 1:47), where the Levites are excluded. Both following the description of a census and being also otherwise similar, Num 1:49 and 2:33 could thus easily have influenced each other.[45] On the other hand, it is emphasized several times in Num 3 that the Levites are Israelites (vv. 9, 12, 41, 45, 46), which could also have influenced 2:33 in the other direction. It is clear that a definite conclusion cannot be made, and in both verses the alternative theory is a reasonable possibility. The evidence only slightly tips the balance toward assuming that in Num 1:47 the OG and in Num 2:33 the MT represent the more original readings. For the purposes of the present investigation the alternative theories would similarly imply that a replacement was made, in Num 1:47 in the OG tradition and in Num 2:33 in the MT.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The replacement of the word "Israelites" with the word "them" was a skillful editorial intervention, as it subtly introduced a new meaning without fully omitting the old one. The edited text can still be understood in the same way as the old text, a potential reference still being the Israelites, but after the replacement the reader can understand—and perhaps more probably does—the text as referring to the number of people that has been mentioned in the preceding verse (in Num 1:46 and 2:32). The change thus delicately avoids the problem but ostensibly retains the original meaning. The technique also shows the inhibitions of the scribes to make radical changes, for without any restrictions the scribes could have easily solved all of the tensions concerning the inclusion of the Levites among the Israelites. That even clear contradictions are left in Num 1–3 implies that only a limited number of profound editorial interventions were made in the time that is witnessed by the available text-critical evidence. Nevertheless, Num 1:47 and 2:33 show that radical techniques, such as replacements could be made in a rather late stage of the development of the Pentateuch.

Although exactly the same change was made in two different verses, it is probable that they are isolated, as they took place in different textual traditions. This also implies that the text was considered problematic by

---

45. Note that Num 1:46 and 2:33 are very similar in idea and language, and therefore it is quite possible that there was reciprocated influence.

different readers. That the scribal solution to the problem was identical in different scribal contexts highlights the similarity of techniques used by different early Jewish scribal schools.

The replacements in Num 1:47 or 2:33 also show how later editing sought to remove or reduce some of the tensions in the older text that were probably caused by earlier editing. It is probable that the original tension concerning the position of the Levites derives from different conceptions of different authors and editors. This further corroborates the observation made in many other example texts that the harmonization of passages was a very common motive in the *Fortschreibung* of the Hebrew Bible.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the preservation of the older versions it is highly unlikely that the critic could have detected the editorial interventions in Num 1:47 or 2:33. Nonetheless, the reader is in any case puzzled by the somewhat contradictory position of the Levites in the text. As the replacements removed the most blatant contradictions, the edited text would be even less conspicuous to the critic than the older one. Paradoxically, the original texts would have disturbed the critic more than the edited text and perhaps led him to assume editing.[46] There is very little in the edited text to suggest that an editorial intervention had taken place.

Results. Numbers 1:47 and 2:33 were both edited to avoid the idea that the Levites would not be considered Israelites. The result was attained by replacing "the Israelites" with a pronoun "them," which blurred the sharpest contradiction in the text and led the reader to interpret the sentence differently. Without textual evidence for the original readings, it would have been nearly impossible to detect the editorial interventions.

9.5. Deuteronomy 32:8–9

Deuteronomy 32:8–9 contains well-known text-critical variants between the MT, LXX, SP, and 4Q37 (4QDeut[j]). Before the discovery of 4Q37, it was debated whether the MT or the Old Greek provides the original reading, but the discovery of the Qumran manuscript changed the discussion. The main issue is about the final words of 32:8. The MT refers to the number

---

46. Indeed the original texts are also the result of some editing, for which there is not documented evidence. The replacements in Num 1:47 and 2:33 partly concealed this editing by harmonizing the texts with the prevalent view in the book of Numbers.

of the sons of Israel, whereas most Greek manuscripts read ἀγγέλων θεοῦ/ ἀγγέλον θεοῦ or υἱῶν Ισραηλ. Many Greek variants contain the words υἱός and θεός, but the reading υἱῶν θεοῦ is attested only by MS 85, which reads υἱῶν θεοῦ υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ, possibly going back to Aquila. The Armenian daughter translation supports the reading υἱῶν θεοῦ. Accordingly, the Göttingen LXX assumes that υἱῶν θεοῦ is the Old Greek reading, which would imply a Hebrew *Vorlage* בני אלהים (or בני אל). In view of the 4Q37 reading בני אלוהים (see below), it is probable that the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek was also בני אלוהים, while the majority of the Greek manuscripts probably contain later developments. The targumim, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate follow the MT (בני ישראל, ܒܢܝ ܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ, and *filiorum Israel*, respectively), while the Old Latin witnesses read either *filiorum Israel* or *angelorum Dei*, thus following either the MT or being dependent on the Greek.

Deut 32:8–9 MT	Deut 32:8–9 LXX
⁸בהנחל עליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבלת עמים למספר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ⁹כי חלק יהוה עמו יעקב חבל נחלתו	⁸ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Αδαμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν υἱῶν θεοῦ, ⁹καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ιακωβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ισραηλ.
⁸When the Most High gave nations their lot, when he separated the sons of man, he set up the boundaries of peoples according to the number of the sons of Israel. ⁹For Yahweh's portion is his people Jacob, the lot of his inheritance.	⁸When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of peoples according to the number of the sons of God. ⁹Yahweh's portion is his people Jacob, Israel was the line of his inheritance.

Despite the poor preservation of 4Q37 in these verses, it is generally accepted that the manuscript contains a fragment of Deut 32:7–8:

12	⸢בינ⸣[°
13	בהנחי]ל
14	בני אלוהים]

Essential for the text-critical issue between the MT and Old Greek are the words בני אלוהים "sons of God(s)," which are clearly visible on line 14. These words correspond to υἱῶν θεοῦ, "sons of God," which is probably the

Old Greek reading.[47] The original reading was disputed until the discovery of the Qumran manuscript 4Q37, after which many have assumed that the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek also read בני אלוהים.[48] With the Qumran reading, Greek MS 85, and the Armenian translation, the textual support for בני אלוהים is strong.[49]

In addition to strong textual support, the primacy of the Old Greek/4Q37 reading is suggested by the content. The MT reading can be seen as an attempt to avoid polytheistic conceptions. The oldest text implies a setting where the main god, El Elyon, divides up the peoples according to the number of the sons of God, thus each people having its own divinity. The passage implies that Yahweh was one of the sons of god and also subservient to the main god, El Elyon, because Yahweh is given Jacob or Israel as his lot (32:9). Such a text would have been theologically problematic in late Second Temple times, when Yahweh had become the unquestioned only divinity. In other words, there would have been a strong motive to alter the text. That many Greek manuscripts—clearly independent of the MT—read ἀγγέλων θεοῦ or ἀγγέλον θεοῦ, "angel(s) of God" corroborates the assumption that the original reading was problematic. There were thus at least two independent attempts to avoid the apparent theological offense of the oldest text.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An alternative explanation for the text-critical variants is to assume that the MT preserves the original reading and the other readings are the result of an accidental textual corruption. One would then have to assume that ישראל was later misread or corrupted to אלהים, but this is not very likely, since the words are very dissimilar. Another alternative is to assume an intentional change, but this is even more unlikely, because it implies that a later scribe intentionally inserted polytheistic conceptions in a rather late stage. Such an

---

47. Most scholars assume that 4Q37 bears witness to the same reading as the LXX; thus, e.g., Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 384; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 367. For the assumed Old Greek reading υἱῶν θεοῦ, see John William Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*, MSU 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 85; and Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 1:320.

48. Since early research, it was generally assumed that the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek was בני אל but in reference to angels. Thus, e.g., Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 96; and Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 356.

49. Cf. the shared reading of Codex Vindobonensis and 4Q51 in 2 Sam 5:4–5, discussed at §5.6, above.

editorial intervention would go against the typical direction to harmonize the Hebrew Bible toward monolatric or early monotheistic conceptions.

Jan Joosten proposed an alternative theory.[50] He argues that the MT reading בני ישראל makes no sense in this context, so it is unlikely that the text was intentionally corrected to read in this way. Moreover, the Greek readings would be separate and secondary developments that do not preserve the original text. In his view the original text read בני שר אל, "sons of Bull El," which by dittography was later confused or intentionally made to have read בני ישראל. As a reference to Bull El is offensive, it would have created various attempts to avoid it, such as the readings in the Greek manuscripts. It is certainly true that בני שר אל and בני ישראל could easily be confused, as there is only one letter of difference, and a later scribe could also be tempted to add the letter י to avoid the offense. However, his suggestion finds no textual support and is thus purely conjectural. Although the Ugaritic texts are familiar with an equivalent term, the Hebrew Bible never refers to שור אל, "Bull El."[51] Joosten's interpretation also implies a more complicated textual development, as the LXX and 4Q37 would have to be explained as independent secondary developments. Joosten suggests that the original text was edited so that the word שר was dropped out of בני שר אל, which would have resulted in בני אל. This was then further changed to בני אלוהים in the tradition behind 4Q37. The Old Greek would have been translated from a similar tradition that read בני אל or בני אלהים. Although Joosten's suggestion is intriguing, one should not follow a purely conjectural reconstruction if a satisfactory interpretation based on extant manuscripts can be offered. One should also note that his theory implies a more complicated development. For these reasons, it is more likely that the Old Greek/4Q37 reading is more original than the MT.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. In what seems like a makeshift solution, the word אלהים was secondarily changed to ישראל in the proto-MT tradition. In this intentional intervention a word in the

---

50. Jan Joosten, "A Note on the Text of Deuteronomy xxxii 8*," *VT* 57 (2007): 548–55.

51. Joosten refers to a similar conjecture in Hos 8:6 by Naftali Herz Tur-Sinai, "אביר," *Encyclopedia Mikra'it*, ed. Eleazar Sukenik and Umberto Cassuto (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955), 1:31, who argues that the text should similarly be reconstructed to refer to the bull El, שר אל.

older text was replaced with a new one. Although similar theological corrections of polytheistic conceptions have been detected in different parts of the Hebrew Bible, there is no evidence of a wider redaction to this effect in Deuteronomy. Some theological corrections seem to have taken place in Deut 32:43 as well, but these are more isolated interventions than part of a systematic revision. Because we are dealing with one word only, it is technically possible that the correction was done by erasing the original word and replacing it with the new one. The content of the correction supports this theory: the space only allowed for a makeshift correction the meaning of which was not fully thought out: It is difficult to see the logic between the number of the sons of Israel and the boundaries of the nations. On the other hand, since the intervention in Deut 32:43 could have been made by the same scribe, the correction in Deut 32:8 may also have taken place when the entire manuscript was reproduced.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the older text preserved in the LXX/4Q37 it would have been possible to detect that something is not correct in the MT of Deut 32:8. Although fully comprehensible as a sentence, the idea that the boundaries of the nations are set up according to the number of the Israelites makes little sense. Deuteronomy 32:9 is also peculiar after the MT of 32:8, because it implies that each divinity has been given its own people. Yahweh is given Israel. One would also note the polytheistic conceptions implied by the reference to El Elyon and Yahweh. These observations would easily lead to the conclusion that the older text could have referred to the division of nations according to different divinities. Nevertheless, without the LXX or 4Q37, it would have been regarded as highly conjectural to reconstruct the original text as referring to the "sons of God" (למספר בני אלהים) on the basis of the MT reference to the "sons of Israel."

Results. The MT of Deut 32:8 contains a theological correction where a polytheistic vestige was polished in order to be in harmony with monolatric or early monotheistic concepts that increased in the Second Temple period. This was done by replacing בני אלהים, "sons of God(s)" with בני ישראל, "sons of Israel." Similar attempts to avoid polytheistic conceptions were made in Greek manuscripts that contain other secondary readings. A literary critic would probably suspect that an editorial intervention took place, but it would have been highly conjectural to reconstruct the original text without the Old Greek/4Q37 readings.

9.6. Joshua 24:1 and 25

Joshua 24 describes the gathering of the Israelites to renew the covenant after the land had been conquered, but the location of the renewal differs in different textual witnesses. According to the MT, it took place at Shechem (שכם), and the MT reading is shared by a small group of Greek minuscules (Cambridge: *abcxz*) that read συχεμ, Targum Jonathan, the Peshitta, some Old Latin witnesses as well as the Vulgate (*Sychem*). However, the majority of Greek manuscripts read Shiloh (Σηλω; also Σηλωμ), and this reading is shared by the Ethiopic and some Old Latin witnesses (Codex Lugdunensis) as well as Pseudo-Philo. It is very likely that that the majority Greek witnesses go back to the Old Greek and that the minority Greek readings are later harmonizations toward a proto-MT.[52] The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Josh 24:1, 25 MT	Josh 24:1, 25 LXX
¹ויאסף יהושע את כל שבטי ישראל שְׁכֶמָה ויקרא לזקני יִשְׂרָאֵל ולראשיו ולשפטיו וְלְשֹׁטְרָיו ויתיצבו לפני האלהים	¹Καὶ συνήγαγεν Ἰησοῦς πάσας φυλὰς Ἰσραηλ εἰς Σηλω καὶ συνεκάλεσεν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς δικαστὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς ἀπέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ.
²⁵ויכרת יהושע ברית לעם ביום ההוא וישם לו חק ומשפט בִּשְׁכֶם	²⁵Καὶ διέθετο Ἰησοῦς διαθήκην πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ νόμον καὶ κρίσιν ἐν Σηλω ἐνώπιον τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ θεοῦ Ισραηλ.
¹Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shechem, and summoned the elders, the heads, the judges, and the officers of Israel; and they presented themselves before God. … ²⁵Joshua made a covenant with the people that day, and made statutes and ordinances for them at Shechem.	¹Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shiloh and summoned their elders and their scribes and their judges and they set them before God. … ²⁵Joshua made a covenant with the people that day and gave them law and judgment at Shiloh before the tent of the God of Israel.

It is probable that the MT is original here and that the Greek reading is a later correction by replacement. The motive for the change is apparent, since the location of an important event in Shechem would seem to

---

52. Other text-critical variants between the witnesses will not be discussed here.

legitimize the importance of the Samaritan heartland. The relationship between the Jerusalemite and Samaritan communities deteriorated in the Second Temple period, and therefore a theological motive to question the legitimacy of the Samaritan cult would have been increasingly present. A replacement of Shechem with Shiloh in Josh 24:1 and 25 could be seen as an attempt to deprive any legitimacy of the areas close to Mount Gerizim.[53] A similarly motivated replacement—in this case in the MT—seems to have taken place in Deut 27:4 where Mount Gerizim was replaced with Mount Ebal (see the introduction to this chapter). It is not accidental that in the Samaritan book of Joshua the connection between the ceremony of Josh 24 and Mount Gerizim is further emphasized by noting that the location was at (the foot of) Mount Gerizim. Both traditions understood that the legitimacy of the Samaritan cult site was at stake.

One should note that in Josh 24:32 the bones of Joseph are buried in Shechem, and this reading is shared by all manuscripts of the LXX (Σικιμοις). In this case the LXX has not changed the location, because the connection with the renewal ceremony is missing, but it would have been logical that the bones were taken to the location of the renewal. In other words, the inconsistency of the LXX may reveal that it is secondary in 24:1 and 25.

Ville Mäkipelto has convincingly shown that the oak mentioned in Josh 24:26 strongly suggests that Shechem was the original location of the ceremony. Several biblical passages refer to a (holy) oak at Shechem (Gen 12:6; 35:4; Judg 9:6), while an oak at Shiloh in never mentioned. It would be logical that the ceremony took place where Yahweh appeared to Abraham. Clearly, one could argue that the connection with the oak and the patriarchal stories where it is first mentioned could have occasioned a later change to this effect, but since the oak plays an important role in Josh 24, it is more likely that the oak of Shechem was originally selected as the loca-

---

53. This has been assumed by many scholars, e.g., Holmes, *Joshua*, 78; Graeme A. Auld, "Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts," in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, ed. John A. Emerton, VTSup 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 14; Leonard J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, HSM 28 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 80; Nelson, *Joshua*, 262; Emanuel Tov, "Midrash-Type Exegesis in Joshua in the Septuagint of Joshua," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 161; Knauf, *Josua*, 195; and many others, most recently, Mäkipelto, *Uncovering Ancient Editing*, 51, 56, 67–71, 95, 99, who discusses the case in detail.

tion of the ceremony. An otherwise unknown oak of Shiloh would hang in the air, while the oak of Shechem would connect the ceremony with Abraham (Gen 12:6) and Jacob (Gen 35:4). Mäkipelto has also shown that the addition of "before the tent of the God of Israel," ἐνώπιον τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ θεοῦ Ισραηλ in the LXX is probably related to the Shiloh-Shechem difference.[54] The LXX plus is probably a later addition that seeks to justify the ceremony at Shiloh. Since many biblical texts portray the tent as a predecessor of the temple in Jerusalem, the implication of this addition and change to Shiloh would have been to underline the Jerusalemite connection and discredit the Samaritan one.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Since the variant between Shechem and Shiloh is found in two different verses, one can exclude the possibility of an accidental mistake. In any case, the names are not reminiscent apart from the shared initial letter. The possibility of an intentional alteration in the MT cannot be completely excluded, and indeed Kurt Möhlenbrinck has suggested that this is the case.[55] According to him, Shiloh was a central location for the amphictyony (cf. Josh 22), but the E editor (which he assumed in Joshua) would have changed this to Shechem. It is apparent that his theory is largely dependent on a wider redaction historical reconstruction that has become outdated. Although Shiloh was an important site in many early stories in the Hebrew Bible, the same can be said of Shechem, and therefore arguments based on the importance of one or the other can be used to defend both. Moreover, one could easily argue that Josh 22 later influenced Josh 24 in secondarily changing the location.[56] By approaching the issue from another angle, Ernst Axel Knauf has also suggested that Shiloh is original. According to him, Shiloh would be a logical setting for a story that is prior to the separation of the kingdoms, whereas Shechem would already take a position in favor of the Samaritan community after the text was read in combination with 1 Kgs 12, where the communities are separated and where Jeroboam begins the sin. The change to Shechem in Josh 24 would then be an anti-Samaritan alteration that is pointing at the destruction of the

---

54. Mäkipelto, *Uncovering Ancient Editing*, 56–57, 67–71, 95.

55. Kurt Möhlenbrinck, "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," *ZAW* 56 (1938): 250–54.

56. See also Mäkipelto, *Uncovering Ancient Editing*, 69–71, for criticism of Möhlenbrinck's theory.

Northern Kingdom.[57] Although Knauf's argumentation is logical as such, the construction is rather speculative and it is difficult to see why it would have been necessary to replace the location of an important ceremony in order to create such a murky connection with an upcoming destruction of the Northern Kingdom. In comparison with the rather weighty arguments in favor of the priority of Shechem, Knauf's theory rests on vague speculation and should be rejected.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It is theoretically possible that the change of Shechem to Shiloh took place in the translation, but it is more probable that already the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX differed from the proto-MT.[58] The tensions between the Samaritan and Jerusalemite communities would have been acute in the Palestinian context, while the Alexandrian community—assuming that the Greek translation was made there—would have been more detached from the conflict. Although ideological changes in the translation should not be rejected, in this case it is more probable already in the Hebrew transmission.

The replacements in Josh 24:1 and 25 again show that severe theological conflicts could occasion a radical intervention in the text. To delegitimize the Samaritan cult an important cultic event was moved to a location that was closer to Jerusalem. Since Jerusalem was not an option before the Israelites had conquered it, Shiloh (probably Khirbet Seilun), an important early cult site in many biblical stories and only about 30 kilometers north of Jerusalem, would have been an excellent substitute.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. On the basis of the Old Greek reading, it would have been difficult to detect an editorial intervention and a replacement in Josh 24:1 and 25. Since only a place-name was changed, no syntactical incongruity was caused in the text. The reference to Shechem in 24:26 in connection with Joseph's bones would remain undetected, for one would probably assume a separate tradition that merely preserved a memory of the bones being in Shechem. One would certainly notice that the holy oak is otherwise located in Shechem, but since we are dealing with fragmentary traditions, on the basis of Josh 24 one would probably assume that there was a tradition of a holy oak in Shiloh as well. Neverthe-

---

57. Knauf, *Josua*, 195.
58. Holmes, *Joshua*, 8–9, favors at the time of translation.

less, if the critic would suspect that Shiloh in the Old Greek of Josh 24:1, 25 is not original, Shechem would be the obvious candidate.

Results. The Old Greek reading Σηλω "Shiloh" probably derives from a later editorial intervention that replaced the original שכם "Shechem" in Josh 25:1, 25, which is preserved in the MT. The main reason for replacing Shechem with Shiloh was to deprive any legitimacy from the Samaritan heartland and especially of the cult site at Mount Gerizim, which overlooked the town of Shechem. Without the original reading it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to detect the replacement.

9.7. Judges 20:2

Judges 20 describes the punishment of Gibeah and war against Benjamin after bad men of Gibeah had raped the concubine of a visiting Levite (Judg 19). There is a notable variant between the MT and the LXX at the beginning of Judg 20:2. According to the MT, the chiefs (פנות כל העם) of all the people (of all tribes of Israel) stood in the assembly, whereas some Greek manuscripts (e.g., Codex Vaticanus) refer to the standing of all tribes before (the face of) Yahweh (B: κατὰ πρόσωπον Κυρίου; *glnoptvw*: ἐναντίον πρόσωπου Κυρίου). Several Greek manuscripts, such as Codex Alexandrinus, follow the MT (καὶ ἔστη τὸ κλίμα παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ), but this is probably due to a later harmonization toward the proto-MT text.[59] It seems likely that the Old Greek goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that read על פני יהוה or לפני יהוה (cf. Josh 24:1). The Vulgate (*anguli populorum*) and Targum Jonathan (רישי העם) follow the MT. The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Judges 20:1–2 MT	Judges 20:1–2 LXX[B]
¹ויצאו כל בני ישראל ותקהל העדה כאיש אחד למדן ועד באר שבע וארץ הגלעד אל יהוה המצפה	¹Καὶ ἐξῆλθον πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐξεκκλησιάσθη ἡ συναγωγὴ ὡς ἀνὴρ εἷς ἀπὸ Δὰν καὶ ἕως Βηρσαβεὲ καὶ γῇ τοῦ Γαλαὰδ πρὸς Κύριον εἰς Μασσηφά.

---

59. Note that the word κλίμα is otherwise never met in the LXX.

²ויתיצבו פַנוֹת כָל הָעָם כל שבטי ישראל בקהל עם האלהים ארבע מאות אלף איש רגלי שלף חרב	²καὶ ἐστάθησαν κατὰ πρόσωπον Κυρίου πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τετρακόσιαι χιλιάδες ἀνδρῶν πεζῶν ἕλκοντες ρομφαίαν.
¹All the children of Israel went out, and all the congregation was assembled as one man, from Dan to Beersheba, and the land of Gilead, to Yahweh, to Mizpah. ²The chiefs of all the people of all the tribes of Israel stood in the assembly of the people of God, four hundred thousand footmen who drew the sword.	¹All the children of Israel went out, and all the congregation was assembled as one man, from Dan to Beersheba, and the land of Gilead, to Yahweh at Mizpah. ²All the tribes of Israel stood before Yahweh in the assembly of the people of God, four hundred thousand footmen who drew sword.

It is probable that the Greek reading that differs from the MT preserves the original reading, while the MT is the result of a theological correction that included a replacement of an offensive detail in the older texts. This is suggested by the following considerations. The MT reading is congested with its reference to all the people of all the tribes of Israel (כל העם כל שבטי ישראל), which effectively duplicates the same idea with two expressions. The redundancy is highlighted by the double use of the word כל, "all." It is very unlikely that the original author would have formulated the text in this way. Second, outside this verse the word פנה is never met in Judges, and it is also otherwise rare. It primarily denotes a "corner," whereas the metaphorical meaning in reference to chiefs as "corner-stones" is only met a couple of times in the Hebrew Bible.[60] Third, the MT is contradictory as to who was present. The MT of 20:2a implies that only the chiefs of the people stood in the assembly, while 20:2b mentions that there were four hundred thousand footmen. Judges 20:1 also refers to all Israelites (כל בני ישראל) being present. Fourth, the ויתיצבו verb anticipates that the following text tells the reader where they stood, but the MT leads nowhere. Although the verb may be used without the location being mentioned (see e.g., 1 Sam 3:10; 17:18), in the current passage it has already been told in 20:1 that the people were gathered, after which the verb ויתיצבו would have no additional function, unless it describes the location. Fifth, the LXX contains an offensive theological conception that would easily have given the motive to change the text. It implies the physical presence of the divin-

---

60. In 1 Sam 14:38 and Isa 19:13.

ity, perhaps being a vestige of the time when Yahweh's image was still part of the Israelite religion or when it was assumed normal that the people would be able to be in front of the divinity especially on important occasions. In fact, very similar variants can be found in other passages, and there also the MT often seeks to avoid the idea of people standing in front of the divinity. Such examples can be found in Josh 24:26; 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 25; 2:11. Sixth, the idea of all the tribes of Israel gathering in front of the divinity is found with very similar words in Josh 24:1: ויאסף יהושע את כל שבטי ישראל ... ויתיצבו לפני האלהים, "Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel … and they set themselves before God." This shows that the LXX reading makes perfect sense. Consequently, it is very likely that the MT variant is the result of an editorial intervention, while the LXX manuscripts preserve the more original reading.[61]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is unlikely that the variant readings could be the result of an accidental corruption or misreading. Although the beginnings of the variants are distantly similar by sharing two letters (cf. לפני יהוה and פנות כל העם), it is not very probable that a scribe would have accidentally confused the divine name Yahweh and "all the people."

Another alternative is to assume that the Greek variant is the result of an intentional intervention and an attempt to correct the problems of the congested Hebrew. Although the LXX translations may certainly correct confusing or problematic Hebrew, this theory would not explain the addition of the idea of Yahweh's presence. If one assumes a secondary development in the LXX or in its Hebrew *Vorlage*, one would then have to assume that a scribe secondarily introduced a theological idea that would have been regarded as problematic in a rather late stage in the Second Temple period, and the likelihood for this is very low. The congestion of the Hebrew could have been easily corrected by omitting the unnecessary duplications, while the introduction of an entirely new idea is a separate issue, and unnecessary for improving the sentence. Moreover, one would still have to explain how the congested MT reading came about. Trent Butler briefly discusses the different Greek readings and notes that LXX[B], which probably best represents the Old Greek here, took "פנות in

---

61. Thus also Vincenz Zapletal, *Das Buch der Richter*, EHAT 7.1 (Munich: Aschendorff, 1923), 285–87.

the familiar expression 'face of Yahweh' and (omitted) 'all of the people' … as an unnecessary doublet … not seeing the emphasis on the complete, unified Israel."[62] Although it is certainly possible that one could have omitted what was seen as a doublet in the Greek transmission, it is difficult to see why the Greek translator would introduce "the face of Yahweh" in this text if it did not play any role in the original text. This would be very untypical of the LXX transmission. Butler also fails to give an adequate explanation for the peculiar MT reading. An emphasis on the "complete, unified Israel" is more probably a later insertion in the MT than an omission in the LXX. For example, in 1 Kgs 11:42 the MT adds, probably as a later expansion, a reference to Solomon ruling the "whole Israel" (כל על ישראל), while the LXX lacks this reference. It would be difficult to explain why such a theologically important emphasis had been omitted. Notably, many commentators ignore the variant reading in the LXX of Judg 20:2 altogether or merely make a note of its existence without discussing it further.[63] It is usually only implied that the MT represents the original text, but this seems unlikely.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT of Judg 20:2 bears witness to an editorial intervention where two words in the older text were replaced with a new text. This essentially changed the meaning of the sentence. While in the older text the people are gathered in front of the divinity in what seems like a cultic setting, the new text of the MT does not specify the place. The reason for the change was the theological problem contained in the older text. The idea of Yahweh's physical presence would have prompted censoring by many different late scribes. Although similar

---

62. Trent Butler, *Judges* WBC 8 (Nashville: Nelson, 2009), 432.

63. Those who ignore it are, e.g., Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, 3:151; Budde, *Richter,* 133; George F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Judges*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895), 423, 425; Robert G. Boling, *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 6A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 283; Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth*, ATD 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), 244; J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary*, trans. John Bowden, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 290; Manfred Görg, *Richter*, NEchtB 3 (Würzburg: Echter, 1993), 100; Walter Gross, *Richter*, HThKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2009), 801, 807. Those simply noting it are Wilhelm Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, HKAT 4 (Göttingen; Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 1902), 166; Susan Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 199.

theological corrections can be found in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Josh 24:26; 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 25; 2:11), the conception is preserved in some passages (e.g., Josh 24:1), which implies that there was no systematic redaction to purge the texts of such conceptions. It is more likely that the general milieu of later transmission increasingly regarded such ancient conceptions as problematic and therefore such theological corrections took place in various contexts over a longer period before the texts became nearly unchangeable sometime in the first centuries BCE.

As we are dealing with a very small replacement, it would have been technically possible to erase the offensive words and replace them with new ones without reproducing the entire manuscript. Since the corrected text in the MT is somewhat confusing, it is possible that the space did not allow for more than a makeshift solution. If the entire manuscript had been reproduced, there would have been more space and thus the possibility of creating a more meaningful theologically corrected text. This would suggest that we are indeed dealing with an intervention where words were scraped off or washed from the manuscript in order to be replaced with new ones in the same small space.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is probable that a literary critic would have noted the problems in the MT of Judg 20:2 without the older version in the LXX. The sentence is so congested and the verse is partly contradictory so that one would have to assume an editorial intervention or manuscript corruption. Indeed, an accidental mistake or other corruption would easily be the first conclusion, since the MT contains no hints to assume that the problems were caused by an intentional intervention to avoid a theological problem. It is thus unlikely that the critic would have been able to suspect what was replaced, let alone reconstruct the original text without the LXX.

Results. The MT of Judg 20:2 contains an example of an editorial intervention where two words, which implied an offensive theological idea of Yahweh's physical presence, were replaced with an improvised and confusing correction. Without the older text preserved in the LXX one would suspect that something happened to the text in its transmission, but it would have been nearly impossible to reconstruct the original text or suspect what kind of ideas had been left out.

<center>9.8. 1 Samuel 1:23</center>

As part of the story of Samuel's birth, 1 Sam 1:21–28 describes how his mother Hannah brought him to Yahweh's temple in Shiloh in accordance with her vow (1:10–11). In 1:23 Elkanah, her husband, replies to her concerning how long the child should stay home before he is brought to the temple. There is a significant textual variant between the MT and the LXX.

1 Sam 1:23 MT	1 Sam 1:23 LXX
ויאמר לה אלקנה אישה עשי הטוב בעיניך שבי עד גמלך אתו אך יקם יהוה אֶת דְּבָרוֹ ותשב האשה ותינק את בנה עד גמלה אתו	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἐλκανὰ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ποίει τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, κάθου ἕως ἂν ἀπογαλακτίσῃς αὐτό· ἀλλὰ στήσαι Κύριος τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου. καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἐθήλασε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς, ἕως ἂν ἀπογαλακτίσῃ αὐτόν.
Her husband Elkanah said to her, "Do what is good in your sight, stay until you have weaned him; only may Yahweh establish his word." The woman remained and nursed her son until she weaned him.	Her husband Elkanah said to her, "Do what is good in your sight, stay until you have weaned him; only may Yahweh establish what comes out of your mouth." The woman remained and nursed her son until she weaned him.

The MT variant is followed by the Vulgate (*verbum suum*) and Targum Jonathan (פתגמוהי), while the LXX reading receives support from 4Q51 and the Peshitta. Although 4Q51 is fragmentary in other parts of the verse, the parallel to the text-critical variant in question is preserved and unequivocally supports the LXX: ...יהו[ה היוצא מפיך ותשב האשה [... ("what has come out of your mouth"). Notably, the reading in the Peshitta ܡܠܬܟܝ, "your word," with the feminine suffix referring to Hannah, does not fully correspond to LXX and 4Q51 but would seem to imply an original reading את דברך. In fact, many early scholars suggested that this is the original Hebrew reading, but the discovery of 4Q51 has tipped the scales in favor of the LXX reading.[64]

It is likely that the LXX and 4Q51 preserve the original reading and that the MT is the result of a theological correction that necessitated a

---

64. Those favoring the Peshitta are, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 41; Driver, *Samuel,* 15; and Smith, *Samuel*, 14.

replacement.[65] This is suggested by the following considerations: Since the LXX and 4Q51 share a reading, it is very probable that the reading is ancient. Otherwise their shared reading would be very difficult to explain. This also implies that the Greek reading goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* and was not made in the Greek transmission. As for the content of the variants, the reference to Hannah's saying in LXX/4Q51 is fully logical in this context, while the text does not refer to any word of God that could apply to this. The reader of the MT is puzzled as to which word of Yahweh is being referred to.[66] Moreover, one can see a clear motive for the change to Yahweh's word. The LXX/4Q51 reading implies that Hannah has a decisive role in the events and that her saying is central, while in the MT Yahweh is fully in charge. It is probable that Hannah's role was later regarded as too independent and prominent, which would have motivated the editorial intervention. This notion is corroborated by other editorial changes to the same effect, which can be found in many parts of the passage (cf. MT and LXX esp. in 1 Sam 1:9, 14, 25).[67] The opposite direction of development would imply that Hannah's importance was elevated at the expense of Yahweh, but this is highly improbable.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is unlikely that one of the variant readings could be the result of an accidental mistake. The words differ so much from each other that a confusion of letters could not explain the readings. An intentional correction to increase Hannah's importance is a potent but still merely a theoretical possibility. One could argue that Hannah, as the mother of Samuel, had become a notable figure, whose actions would have been secondarily increased. Nevertheless, this would have been done at the expense of Yahweh, which makes such an explanation unlikely. One could also argue that the reference to Yahweh's word was omitted, because the text does not contain any such word. However, one would still have to explain why it was changed to what Hannah

---

65. Thus many since early research, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 41; Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 7; Budde, *Samuel*, 12; Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 32–33.

66. For this argument, e.g., Jürg Hutzli, *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: Textkritische- und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes*, ATANT 89 (Zurich: TVZ, 2007), 79. As noted by Budde, *Samuel*, 12, the MT reading makes no sense.

67. Thus also, Hutzli, *Die Erzählung*, 145–47.

said and how such a reference emerged in the first place. The original author would hardly add a reference to a word of Yahweh, unless such is mentioned, whereas a later editor could more easily do so to avoid an embarrassing idea, perhaps as an improvised correction. Some scholars have suggested that 1:17 contains Yahweh's word that 1:23 could refer to.[68] In 1:17 Eli tells Hannah: "the God of Israel will grant your request which you have asked of him." However, even in this verse, the ultimate actor is Hannah, whose request Yahweh only fulfills and there is no actual word of Yahweh, but only Eli's promise that Yahweh will act. This theory may be seen as an attempt to maintain the primacy of the MT. Any explanation that assumes that the reference to Yahweh's word is original runs into difficulties and remains more complex than the assumption that the MT is the result of a secondary alteration. In early scholarship it was suggested that the LXX reading derives from the translator, but with the Qumran reading this view has become outdated.[69]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT reading may be the result of an intentional theological redaction of the passage. Similar and theologically related changes in other parts of Samuel's birth story corroborate the notion that we are dealing with a wider redaction that sought to reduce Hannah's role and importance: It had become theologically problematic to portray women who had prominent and independent roles in the society. In part, the redaction can be characterized as ideological censoring, because offensive or problematic details were altered to be more appropriate or they were dropped out altogether. As the redaction included the replacement of parts of the text, it is less probable that the changes were the result of scraping off parts of the text. In the case of a single intervention this is a possibility, but in 1 Sam 1–2 we can observe several similarly motivated changes, which suggests a redaction that was probably done when a new version of the text was produced.

---

68. Barthélemy, *Josué, Juges*, 141.

69. Those suggesting the translator are, e.g., Carl Friedrich Keil, *Die Bücher Samuelis*, 2nd ed., Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament 2.2 (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1864), 21–22. Some commentators, such as Alexander Francis Kirkpatrick, *First Book of Samuel*, CBSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1880), 50, neglect the LXX reading.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the LXX and 4Q51, one would suspect that the MT was edited in some way. The verse refers to a word of Yahweh that is missing. Perhaps the critic would be misled to assume that the word of Yahweh had (accidentally) dropped out. On the other hand, together with other suspected editorial interventions concerning Hannah's role one could possibly be able to suspect that something is not correct with the reference to the word of Yahweh in 1:23. However, it would have been very difficult or impossible to reconstruct the replaced words. They can only be ascertained with the help of the LXX and 4Q51.

Results. The MT variant in 1 Sam 1:23 is in all likelihood the result of a theologically motivated editorial intervention that included a replacement of words in the original text. It may be part of a wider revision of the book of Samuel where theologically offensive conceptions were purged. A careful critic could conjecture that something was edited in the MT, but without the LXX and 4Q51 it would be impossible to reconstruct the words that were dropped out in the proto-MT editing.

9.9. 1 Samuel 2:21

First Samuel 2:21 refers to Hannah's further children and contains a brief note about Samuel. The LXX and MT contain small variants. Notably, 4Q51 always follows the LXX when the MT and LXX differ. There is a small but highly significant variant concerning the preposition עם of the MT and its parallels in 4Q51 and LXX. The variant readings imply that a word was replaced in one of the textual traditions.

1 Sam 2:21 MT	1 Sam 2:21 LXX
כִּי פקד יהוה את חנה וַתהַר ותלד שלשה בנים ושתי בנות ויגדל הנער שמואל עַם יהוה	καὶ ἐπεσκέψατο Κύριος τὴν Ἅνναν, καὶ ἔτεκεν ἔτι τρεῖς υἱοὺς καὶ δύο θυγατέρας. καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουὴλ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου.
For Yahweh remembered Hannah, and she became pregnant and bore three sons and two daughters. And the child Samuel grew up with Yahweh.	And Yahweh remembered Anna, and she bore yet three sons and two daughters. And the child Samuel grew before Yahweh.

4Q51 reads: ויפקד יה[וה את] חנה ותלד עוד של[ו]שה בנים ושתי בנות ויגדל שם [שמואל] לפני י[הוה, "Ya[hweh] remembered Hannah, and she bore yet

three sons and two daughters. [Samuel] grew <u>there</u> before Yahweh." For the MT/LXX words הנער/τὸ παιδάριον, 4Q51 has the word שם, which is not followed by any other witness and may be a secondary addition.

Our focus is on the variant between the MT עם and 4Q51 and LXX לפני/ἐνώπιον. The Peshitta (ܡܕܡ), Targum Jonathan (קדם), and the Vulgate (*apud*) support the reading in the LXX and 4Q51. The following considerations suggest that the MT is the result of a later correction. First, textual support for the variant reading לפני is wide, which implies that it is an ancient reading. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain the shared reading between the Qumran manuscript, LXX, Peshitta, and Targum Jonathan. It is probable that the LXX goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* לפני. Second, the reading לפני implies a more physical presence of Samuel in proximity of the divinity. The implication seems to be that the divinity was physically present and that he would have an image or other representation in the temple. Many texts in the Hebrew Bible strictly prohibit physical representations of the divinity (e.g., the Decalogue in Exod 20:4/Deut 5:8) as well as the presence of nonpriests inside the holy place of the temple.[70] Third, the variant reading implies that other people than the high priest could enter the holy of holies of Yahweh's sanctuaries. Such a conception would have been highly problematic and partly offensive in late times in the Second Temple period when not even all priests could enter the holy of holies. Consequently, there would have been two theological reasons to censor the text that contradicted the pentateuchal legislation and conceptions of the Second Temple period.

Fourth, related text-critical differences can be found in other passages in 1 Sam 1–2, and the same pattern seems to repeat that the MT variants avoid the idea that someone could be in front of the divinity, while a variant reading that contradicts this is often found in the LXX, sometimes supported by other witnesses. In particular, the expression לפני יהוה is avoided. For example, in 1 Sam 1:25 Hannah brings Samuel to the temple, but the LXX reading "and she brought him before Yahweh," καὶ προσήγαγεν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, is missing in the MT. First Samuel 2:11 also refers to Samuel's presence and service in the temple; the LXX reads "the child served in the presence [or "the face"] of Yahweh," τὸ παιδάριον ἦν λειτουργῶν τῷ προσώπῳ Κυρίου, whereas the MT lacks the crucial reference to the face of

---

70. At the end of the development only the high priest was allowed in the holy of holies, and some passages suggest only three times a year (Lev 16:2).

Yahweh and reads "the child served Yahweh," הנער היה משרת את יהוה. In a related scene in 1 Sam 1:9 the LXX refers to Hannah going to the temple and standing before Yahweh (καὶ κατέστη ἐνώπιον Κυρίου), and 1:14 is even more specific and refers to Yahweh's face from which she went away when leaving the temple (καὶ πορεύου ἐκ προσώπου Κυρίου). These references are all missing in the MT. It is thus very likely that the MT variant in 1 Sam 2:21 is the result of an intentional omission and part of a wider censoring that sought to avoid the idea that a nonpriest and especially a woman could go to the holy of holies of Yahweh's temple and stand before the divinity. The LXX, which still contains these ideas, preserves the more original text.[71] In view of so many passages that contain related variants between the MT and the LXX, it is probable that there has been a planned tendency to avoid the expression לפני יהוה and any reference to people being in front of the divinity in the holy of holies.

Fifth, the emergence of the variant readings in the LXX and 4Q51—to secondarily add the expression לפני יהוה or the tendency to add references to Yahweh's physical presence—would be very difficult to explain. In view of the existence of several such variants, one would have to assume a systematic redaction to this effect. Since replacements of words are rare in the text-critical evidence, an obvious and strong motive would have to be found for changing עם to לפני. For these reasons, it is very probable that the MT reading in 1 Sam 2:21 is the result of an intentional editorial intervention where the word לפני was replaced with עם.[72]

---

71. See Hutzli, *Die Erzählung*, 61, 68; Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 201–4; Walter Dietrich, *Samuel: 1Sam 1–12*, BKAT 8.1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 113. Notably, P. Kyle McCarter, *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*, AB 8 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 80, has come to the same conclusion that the MT is secondary, but he assumes that the reason for this is the influence of 2:26.

72. Thus also Hutzli, *Die Erzählung*, 61, 68; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 80; Many scholars make no note of the LXX reading, e.g., Keil, *Die Bücher Samuelis*, 29; Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 46; Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 13; Budde, *Samuel*, 20; Driver, *Samuel*, 25; Smith, *Samuel*, 19; Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, KAT 8.1 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1973), 109; Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel*, 33; Fritz Stolz, *Das Erste und zweite Buch Samuel*, ZBKAT 9 (Zurich: TVZ, 1981), 32–33. Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 41, 49, notes the variant but makes no verdict as to which one might be more original.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Because topically related text-critical variants can be found in other passages (1 Sam 1:9, 14, 25: 2:11), one can exclude an accidental corruption. Another possibility is to assume that the LXX/4Q51 is a secondary development. In this case an editor would have wanted to increase the divinity's physical aspect and presence in the temple. Although such a tendency is theoretically possible, it would go against general developments in the Second Temple period and contradict many texts in the Pentateuch. This development is thus far less likely than the opposite development where 1 Samuel was censored to accord with pentateuchal conceptions. One could also suggest that the phrase ויגדל … לפני יהוה is peculiar and cannot be original, but this is, in fact, an argument for its originality, for it militates against the common conceptions of the Hebrew Bible.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Since editorial changes related in content are found in other passages of 1 Sam 1–2 (e.g., 1:9, 14, 25), we may be dealing with an intentional redaction in the proto-MT where certain concepts were secondarily censored. Although it would have been technically possible to scrape off the word לפני and replace it with the word עם in the same manuscript, the related changes in the other passages are so extensive that this is unlikely, especially if they derive from the same redaction. It is more probable that the changes were made when the entire manuscript was reproduced. Since the textual support for the original reading is very strong, it is probable that the redaction took place relatively late in the transmission of the proto-MT of Samuel. This is significant, since the editorial intervention was radical and part of a wider redaction.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the older text, it would have been difficult to detect that the MT עם is not original. The sentence ויגדל הנער שמואל עם יהוה makes perfect sense and fits the context. In view of the other editorial changes in 1 Sam 1–2, one could perhaps suspect that some editing had taken place, but it is very unlikely that a literary critic would have the tools to determine the nature of changes where offensive or theologically difficult parts were replaced with a different text. It would have been next to impossible to apprehend the original reading on the basis of the MT.

Results. The MT reading עם "with" in 1 Sam 2:21 is probably the result of an intentional editorial intervention where the original לפני "before" was replaced for theological reasons. The original text implies Yahweh's physical presence. The correction may be part of a wider redaction that purged parts of 1 Sam 1–2 of concepts that contradicted the Pentateuch and emerging Judaism. It is unlikely that literary critics would be able to detect the replacement in the MT of 1 Sam 2:21 without the LXX, let alone reconstruct what had been replaced.

9.10. 1 Samuel 22:6

First Samuel 22 is part of the narrative that describes David's flight from King Saul. In 1 Sam 22:6 Saul is said to have been at Gibeah waiting for news of David's whereabouts. The MT and LXX contain small variants that nevertheless are theologically significant. We will mainly focus on the difference between the height (רמה) in the MT and the cultic height (Βαμά) in the LXX.

1 Sam 22:6 MT	1 Sam 22:6 LXX
וישמע שאול כי נודע דוד ואנשים אשר אתו ושאול יושב בגבעה תחת האשל ברמה וחניתו בידו וכל עבדיו נצבים עליו	Καὶ ἤκουσεν Σαουλ ὅτι ἔγνωσται Δαυιδ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ· καὶ Σαουλ ἐκάθητο ἐν τῷ βουνῷ ὑπὸ τὴν ἄρουραν τὴν ἐν Ραμα, καὶ τὸ δόρυ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάντες οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ.
Saul heard that David and the men who were with him had been located, and Saul was sitting at Gibeah under the tamarisk tree on a height, and his spear was in his hand, and all his servants stood around him.	Saul heard that David and the men who were with him had been located, and Saul was sitting on the hill under the field, which is in Rama/Bama, and his spear was in his hand, and all his servants stood around him.

The Dead Sea Scrolls do not preserve 1 Sam 22:6; Targum Jonathan (בגבעתא ברמתא אשלא תחות) and the Vulgate (*in Gabaa et esset in nemore quod est in Rama*) follow the MT. The textual variants are concentrated on the location of Saul, and it appears that there was a problem in the original text in this respect. The variants can be explained as attempts to avoid theological problems, and the original text can only be reconstructed by using both the MT and LXX. The MT may preserve the original text except for one

letter. It is likely that for ברמה "on a height" or "at Ramah" the original text read בבמה "on a high place."[73] This is suggested by the Greek manuscripts (e.g., Vaticanus and the Lucianic group) that preserve the reading Βαμά, a word which is meaningless in Greek, and which thus very likely goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* במה. The readings in other Greek manuscripts, Ραμά (Nacgilqtvxb₂) and Ραμμά (Codex Alexandrinus), should be seen as the result of a harmonization toward רמה of the MT.[74] The secondary development from במה to רמה can be explained as an attempt to avoid the impression that King Saul convened at an illegitimate place of worship.

Unless one assumes an accidental mistake (see below), the opposite direction of development from רמה to במה would be much more difficult to explain. Another change in the Greek manuscripts also supports the notion that the original text contained problematic religious concepts. The tamarisk tree (האשל), which was at the Bama, was changed in the Greek to ἄρουρα "field," although it resulted in the peculiar idea that Saul was on a hill below or under (ὑπό) a field. Here the MT reading תחת האשל "under the tamarisk tree" makes perfect sense and is probably original. The problem in the original text was that King Saul convened at a high place under a (holy) tree, which explicitly corresponds to the sinful practices of the Canaanites condemned in many parts of the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Deut 12:2; 2 Kgs 17:10; Jer 2:20; Ezek 6:13). The combination of both "a cultic height" and a tree located there makes the cultic association explicit, and therefore one attempted to avoid it in both traditions.[75] In the MT the cultic association of the tree disappears when the location is not a high place. It stands to reason that the cult height, במה had not been problematic in the

---

73. Thus many, e.g., Budde, *Samuel*, 152; and Smith, *Samuel*, 205–6. Notably, many commentators make no reference to the variants, e.g., Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 249, 258; and Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 114.

74. In part, the Greek reading Ραμά was facilitated by interpreting גבעה as a height (βουνός) instead of a place-name Gibeah. If גבעה had been read as a place-name, it would have been difficult to add another place-name where Saul would also be sitting. The vocalization with the article implies that at least the MT tradition assumed that a place was meant. That Gibeah is mentioned as the "city of Saul" corroborates the assumption that Gibeah was meant in 1 Sam 22:6 as well. The next scene in 1 Sam 23:19 also implies that Saul was in Gibeah. On the other hand, 1 Sam 19 also refers to Ramah as a location where Saul had gone to seek for David. This may have contributed to the confusion of the place-names in 1 Sam 22:6.

75. Thus also Smith, *Samuel*, 206; and Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 113–14.

early transmission of Samuel. This is suggested by other vestiges, where cult heights are not condemned (e.g., 1 Sam 9:12–14, 19, 25; 10:5, 13). The problem emerged when the book of Samuel was interpreted through Deuteronomistic ideals.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Since ancient Hebrew *beth* and *resh* are similar, one can easily imagine an accidental change from רמה to במה. Although this possibility cannot be excluded, it would be quite a coincidence that an accidental mistake would have secondarily created a meaningful new text and led to the embarrassing idea that Saul convened at an illegitimate place of worship, especially when the verse also contains other cultic connections that were separately censored in the LXX version, as we have seen.

One could also suggest that רמה was intentionally changed to במה. The reason for this could be the intentional discrediting of Saul. The editor would have made him stay at an illegitimate cult place, because he had fallen out of Yahweh's favor. This is theoretically possible, but this seems less probable, since the religious connotation remains very subtle, and there would have been many possibilities to make Saul an idolater. There is no evidence of such a tendency in the book of Samuel. Although the case is not fully conclusive, the most likely alternative is an intentional intervention by replacing one letter with another, *beth* with *resh*. The proximity of the letters would have facilitated the temptation to change the text.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT is the result of replacing one letter with another one. Although the change is technically small, it changes the setting by avoiding all religious connotations. If the change goes back to a time of ancient Hebrew letters, the difference between the letters was so small that it could have been easily done by any scribe with a pen. Reshaping one letter was technically uncomplicated in later stages as well, since *beth* and *resh* remained similar in various stages in the development of Hebrew letters.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Since רמה, meaning "height" or Ramah, makes sense in this context, a literary critic would probably not suspect a corruption or an intentional change. Nevertheless, the close resemblance of the words רמה and במה could lead a critic to suspect an original reference to a high place. That the text also refers to a (holy) tree would perhaps give a further hint that a cult site could have been meant.

Nevertheless, the critic would, at most, only be able to conjecture about this possibility.

Results. The MT of 1 Sam 22:6 contains a small editorial change. Although the change was of one letter only, it avoided the theological problem that King Saul regarded a cult height as an important place where he had convened. Since we are dealing with the difference of one letter only, the possibility of an accidental corruption cannot be excluded. It is unlikely that a critic could have been able to detect the editorial intervention without the variant reading preserved in some Greek manuscripts.

9.11. 2 Samuel 5:21

Second Samuel 5:17–25 describes David's two victories over the Philistines at the Valley of Rephaim. After David's first victory the Philistines fled and left their divine objects at Baal-Perazim, the place of the battle. According to 5:21, David and his men took the objects, but the MT and LXX differ in their reference to the objects: The Hebrew text uses the derogatory word עצב "idol," whereas the Greek text uses the word θεος "god."[76] Targum Jonathan (טעותהון), the Vulgate (*sculptilia*), and the Peshitta (ܦܬܟܖ̈ܝܗܘܢ) follow the MT. The verse is not preserved among the Qumran fragments of Samuel. A parallel to the passage in 1 Chr 14:12 partly follows the LXX in referring to the objects as gods, but it contains a further difference.

1 Chr 14:12	2 Sam 5:21 MT	2 Sam 5:21 LXX
ויעזבו שם את אֱלֹהֵיהֶם ויאמר דוד וַיִּשָּׂרְפוּ בָאֵשׁ	ויעזבו שם את עֲצַבֵּיהֶם וישאם דוד ואנשיו	καὶ καταλιμπάνουσιν ἐκεῖ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐλάβοσαν αὐτοὺς Δαυιδ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ.
They left their go͟ds there, and David commanded them t͟o b͟e b͟urned.	They left their i͟do͟ls there, and David and his men took them.	They left their go͟ds there, and David and the men with him took them.

Despite the wide textual support for the MT of 2 Sam 5:21, it is likely that it represents a later development, whereas the LXX probably preserves the

---

76. That the word עצב is derogatory is suggested by the contexts it is otherwise used; see also *HALOT*, s.v. "*עֶצֶב I."

original reading.[77] On the basis of the reading in Chronicles, it is possible to deduce that the LXX reading τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* אלהיהם. Otherwise the shared reading of 1 Chr 14:12 and 2 Sam 5:21 LXX would be difficult to explain. The Chronicles parallel may preserve the original reading as far as the word in question is concerned, because the problem in the original reading has been solved in a different way in Chronicles, and the Chronicler's reading also reveals the problem. Whereas 2 Sam 5:21 refers to David and his soldiers taking the divine objects with them, the Chronicler has David burn them. It was an embarrassing detail that David took foreign gods (θεούς) with him, because so many passages in the Pentateuch prohibit foreign gods and command the Israelites to destroy their cult objects (e.g., Deut 7:5; 12:3). The Chronicler replaced and rewrote part of the source text so that David acted according to the law, and in fact, David's action is described with the same expression as Deut 7:5 commands: תשרפון באש (cf. 1 Chr 14:12: וישרפו באש). Notably, some Greek manuscripts (Cambridge: Mabegiovwzc₂e₂) and daughter translations contain a plus where the objects are burned. Although this may be a later influence from Chronicles, it highlights the problem in the original text.

The MT of 2 Sam 5:21 does not go as far as Chronicles, but it has made a crucial change that degrades the divine images to illegitimate idols. The word עצב is mainly used to refer to false gods and idols that one should not worship. With the small change the MT thus implies that although David took them, they were idols that would surely not be used in the Israelite cult. In contrast, the LXX reading gives the impression that the objects will continue to be used. This accords with the common practice in the ancient Near East that the conqueror or champion seizes the divine statues of the conquered, and carries them to his temple as prestigious objects. This practice can also be seen in 1 Sam 4–5, for example, and the original text of 2 Sam 5:21 appears to imply this practice. The change of one word in the MT has, in part, deprived the foreign gods of their power,

---

77. This has been suggested by many since early research, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 166; Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 170–71; Budde, *Samuel*, 225; Driver, *Samuel*, 264; Smith, *Samuel*, 290–91; Jürg Hutzli, "Theologische Textänderungen im Masoretischen Text und in der Septuaginta von 1–2 Sam," in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*, ed. Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker, VTSup 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 223–24.

significance, and thus future cultic use. Besides considerations based on the content, it would be very difficult to explain the shared reading "gods" in 1 Chr 14:12 and 2 Sam 5:21 LXX unless they go back to an original reading. Consequently, it is probable that the LXX preserves the original reading, while the MT is a secondary development.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An accidental corruption can be excluded, because the words contain no resemblance in the differing letters. Another alternative is an intentional change of an idol to gods in the LXX (and Chronicles), but it would be very difficult to find any motive for such a change. It would mean that foreign idols had been secondarily legitimized and subsequently used by David, but considering the development of the Hebrew Bible away from polytheistic conceptions this is very unlikely. This theory could also not explain why 1 Chr 14:12 shares the reading with the LXX of 2 Sam 5:21, unless one would assume that it was also secondarily changed (to the opposite direction).

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The editorial intervention in 2 Sam 5:21 is small but significant. It thwarts an embarrassing reading of the text, which implies that David accepted the legitimacy of foreign gods. The intervention was thus an intentional theological correction of the text. A similar degrading of foreign gods can be found in 1 Kgs 11, where the LXX translates the Hebrew אלהים with the derogatory words εἰδώλα (11:2, 5, 7) and βδελύγματα (11:6). This may have taken place in the translation process. These changes accord with the increasing tendency to reject the gods of other nations, and can be attributed to the general milieu of transmission. Because the change in 2 Sam 5:21 is of three letters only, it would have been technically feasible to scrape off or cancel the letters, but it could also have been made by an editor who was copying the entire text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the LXX version or the reading in 1 Chr 14:12 it would have been next to impossible to detect that a word had been replaced in the MT of 2 Sam 5:21. In view of many passages in the Hebrew Bible, one would even expect that biblical authors generally called the statues of the Philistines idols. Because of its brevity, the change did not leave any technical signs indicating that the word in the MT is not original. This case is thus a prime example of the difficulties in identifying replacements of one word that had evident impact on the meaning of the text.

Results. The MT of 2 Sam 5:21 is the result of a small replacement where foreign gods were degraded to idols. The original reading is preserved in the LXX as well as in the Chronicles parallel in 1 Chr 14:12. On the basis of the MT alone literary critics would not have any possibilities of detecting the editorial intervention, let alone reconstructing the replaced word.

9.12. 2 Samuel 6:6–7

In 2 Sam 6 we read of the transfer of the ark of the covenant from Baale-Judah to Jerusalem. The ark was carried on a cart driven by Uzzah and Ahio sons of Abinabad. When the oxen stumbled causing the cart to shake, Uzzah accidentally touched the ark, causing Yahweh's anger and Uzzah's death. The reference to Uzzah's death contains a significant text-critical variant that goes back to a theologically motivated replacement. Although the passage contains a number of text-critical variants, our focus will be on the one that may have implied a physical presence of Yahweh in the original text in 6:7.

2 Sam 6:6–7 MT	2 Sam 6:6–7 4Q51
⁶ויבאו עד גרן נכון וישלח עזא אל ארון האלהים ויאחז בו כי שמטו הבקר ⁷ויחר אף יהוה בעזה ויכהו שם האלהים על הַשַׁל וימת שָׁם עַם אֲרון האלהים	⁶ויבאו עד ג[רן] נדון וישלח עזא [אֶת] יָדוֹ אל ארון האל[וה]ים[ויאחז בו] כ[י ש]מטו הבקר ⁷ויחר אף יהוה בע[זא ו]יכהו שם האלהי[ם על] אֲשֶׁ[ר שלח ידו] על [הָ]ארון וימת ל[פְּנֵי הא[לֹ]הים]
⁶ When they came to the threshing floor of N̲a̲c̲on, Uzzah reached out to the ark of God and took hold of it, for the oxen shook it. ⁷The anger of Yahweh was kindled against Uzzah; and God struck him there because o̲f̲ h̲i̲s̲ m̲i̲s̲t̲a̲k̲e̲ (?), and he died t̲h̲e̲r̲e̲ b̲e̲s̲i̲d̲e̲ t̲h̲e̲ a̲r̲k̲ o̲f̲ God.	⁶When they came to the thre[shing floor] of N̲a̲d̲on, Uzzah reached out h̲i̲s̲ h̲a̲n̲d̲ to the ark of G[o]d [and took hold of it], fo[r] the oxen [sh]ook it. ⁷The anger of Yahweh was kindled against U[zzah; and] God struck him there be[cause h̲e̲ r̲e̲a̲c̲h̲e̲d̲ o̲u̲t̲ h̲i̲s̲ hand] to [the] a̲r̲k̲, and he died b[efore G]o[d].

The passage has a parallel in 1 Chr 13:9–10 that corroborates that the 4Q51 variant ל[… at the end of 6:7 is indeed ל[פני "before" and that it goes back to an ancient reading.

2 Sam 6:7–MT	1 Chr 13:9–10
⁶ויבאו עד גרן נכון וישלח עזא אֶל ארון האלהים וַיֹּאחֶז בו כי שמטו הבקר ⁷ויחר אף יהוה בעזה ויכהו שָׁם הָאֱלֹהִים עַל הַשַּׁל וימת שם עַם אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים	⁹ויבאו עד גרן כִּידָן וישלח עזא אֶת יָדוֹ לֶאֱחֹז אֶת הארון כי שמטו הבקר ¹⁰ויחר אף יהוה בעזה ויכהו עַל אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח יָדוֹ עַל הָאָרוֹן וימת שם לִפְנֵי אלהים

| ⁶When they came to the threshing floor of Nacon, Uzzah reached out to the ark of God and took hold of it, for the oxen shook it. ⁷The anger of Yahweh was kindled against Uzzah; and God struck him there because of his mistake (?), and he died there beside the ark of God. | ⁹When they came to the threshing floor of Chidon, Uzzah reached out his hand to hold the ark, for the oxen shook it. ¹⁰The anger of Yahweh was kindled against Uzzah; he struck him because he put out his hand to the ark, and he died there before God. |

At the end of 2 Sam 6:7 most Greek manuscripts read παρὰ τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, "beside the ark of Yahweh, before God." This reading seems to imply familiarity with both the MT reading and 4Q51/1 Chr 13:10. It is probable that the reading is the result of a harmonization where an original reading has been combined with a secondary reading. The Vulgate (*mortuus est ibi iuxta arcam Dei*), Targum Jonathan (ומית תמן עם ארונא דיי) and the Peshitta (ܘܡܝܬ ܬܡܢ ܠܘܬ ܐܪܘܢܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ) follow the MT reading in 2 Sam 6:7b.

It is probable the original text of 2 Sam 6:7b referred to the death of Uzzah in front of God.[78] This is suggested by the following considerations. The variant tradition is widely represented and it would be difficult to explain the shared reading in 4Q51, 1 Chr 13:10, and in LXX (partly: ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ) unless the reading is ancient. The LXX reading also implies that the original text indeed differed from the MT, because the LXX has typically been harmonized toward the proto-Masoretic Text. If the MT reading were original, it would be difficult to explain why the LXX also contains the secondary reading represented by 4Q51. Consequently, the LXX also bears witness to the shared reading of 4Q51 and 1 Chr 13:10. It is thus probable that the Old Greek only read ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ "before

---

78. Thus many scholars since early research, e.g., Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 168; Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 173; Driver, *Samuel*, 206; Budde, *Samuel*, 229; Smith, *Samuel*, 294; thus before the discovery of the Qumran manuscript.

God" and that the text was later expanded toward the proto-MT with παρὰ τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ κυρίου, "beside the ark of Yahweh."[79]

The motive for the change in the MT is evident. The original text seems to imply the physical presence of God and a physical connection of God with the ark. Changing the reference to the death of Uzzah "before God" to "beside the ark of God" avoided the theological problem. That this was indeed a theological problem is shown by several other very similar editorial changes in the Hebrew Bible. For example, in 1 Sam 2:21, which refers to the place where Samuel grew up, the original לפני יהוה "before Yahweh" was replaced by עם יהוה "with Yahweh." Similar changes can be found in Josh 24:26 and Judg 20:2 (cf. LXX and MT; for Judg 20:2 see analysis in this chapter). The idea that Yahweh/God was physically present (perhaps in or in connection with an idol) or bound to a physical object, such as the ark, increasingly became problematic in the Second Temple period. It is therefore probable that passages, apparently vestiges of earlier conceptions, were prone to be altered to correspond to later theological conceptions.

It is possible that the idea of putting a hand to the ark was also problematic, since the MT seems to have removed this twice. Although it could theoretically be a mistake due to a homoioarchton in 6:6, the reference is also missing in 6:7, which suggests that it is no accident. If this were the case, the passages would contain two replacements/omissions in the MT.[80] The idea of removing the reference to the hand could be to avoid the impression that the ark was a magical object, the touching of which would occasion Yahweh's outburst. This censoring would be in line with the change of a reference to Yahweh's presence. Ancient sacred objects are gradually and subtly desacralized, and conceptions are brought more in line with those of emerging Judaism.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. One can exclude the possibility that the difference between the MT and 4Q51 is the result of an accidental mistake. The variants לפני and עם ארון are not reminiscent, and the addition of the word for the ark clearly implies an intentional editorial

---

79. Similarly also Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 409, who assumes that the reading in LXX[B] is conflated.

80. Many scholars also assume that parts of the MT may have been corrupted; e.g., Smith, *Samuel*, 294. This is especially the case for the word השל, which is otherwise unknown in the Hebrew Bible.

intervention. Another alternative is to assume an intentional change in the Qumran manuscript and 1 Chr 13:10, but it would be difficult to find any motive for this. It would mean that an editor had deliberately sought to emphasize the physical presence of God and his dependence on the ark. This would go against the broader trend in the Hebrew Bible to decrease or completely omit references and implications that God had a physical presence and was closely connected with the ark. The opposite direction of development is far more likely. Some passages, which were apparently left uncensored, still retain the idea that the presence of the ark is somehow equated with the presence of Yahweh (e.g., in 1 Sam 6:20 the people want to take away the ark, because "Who is able to stand before Yahweh, this holy God?" מי יוכל לעמד לפני יהוה האלהים הקדוש הזה; cf. also Josh 24:1), but these are probably vestiges of earlier conceptions that escaped later censoring. Notably, many scholars make no mention of the variants and merely assume the MT text.[81]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It is noteworthy that a similar replacement, original לפני being replaced by עם, was made in 1 Sam 2:21 and that the theological problem was the same: the original text referred to God's physical presence (and a connection with the ark), which the editorial intervention sought to avoid. First Samuel 1:9, 14 also seem to imply that the older text of Samuel implies a physical presence of Yahweh. It is possible that these changes are the result of an intentional censoring or a redaction that sought to bring the book more in line with later theological conceptions. In most cases the changes are technically small (only one or two words), which implies a rather subtle intervention in the older text, but the theological effect is significant, as many unorthodox conceptions are left out.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is unlikely that, without the Qumran manuscript or 1 Chr 13:10, critics would notice that something was replaced in 2 Sam 6:7b. The text is fully consistent in content and there

---

81. Thus, e.g., Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel*, 276; Georg Hentschel, *2 Samuel*, NEchtB 34 (Würtzburg: Echter, 1994), 24; Stolz, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel*, 212. Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das zweite Buch Samuelis*, KAT 8.2 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994), 190, who notes the LXX and Chronicles variant without discussing the case, follows the MT. Alfons Schulz, *Die Bücher Samuel* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1919), 70, also note the variant, but does not discuss it any further.

is no syntactical problem that would have occasioned the critic to suspect an editorial intervention. The critic would certainly be puzzled about the word השל, which may be a scribal mistake possibly connected to another scribal intervention in 6:7a, but this does not pertain to the replacement in 6:7b. Nevertheless, already before the discovery of 4Q51 many scholars assumed on the basis of 1 Chr 13:10 and the LXX manuscripts that the MT is the result of an editorial intervention and a textual corruption.

Results. The MT reading in 2 Sam 6:7b is probably the result of a theological correction that necessitated the replacement of one word that implied the physical presence of Yahweh and a physical connection with the ark. Without the older version preserved in 4Q51 and 1 Chr 13:10 it would have been impossible to detect the editorial intervention, let alone reconstruct what was replaced.

9.13. 1 Kings 11:11

According to 1 Kgs 11, Solomon took foreign wives who lured him to worship other gods and to build foreign cult sites in Jerusalem. The description of his sins is followed by Yahweh's announcement of punishment in 11:11–13: Solomon's kingdom will be divided. There are repeated differences between the MT and LXX versions of this chapter, and it is apparent that one or both of the versions are the result of heavy editing after the textual traditions diverged.[82] First Kings 11:11 reveals one theologically significant replacement. According to the MT, in following the other gods Solomon violated Yahweh's covenant *and* statutes, whereas the LXX only refers to the violation of the commandments and statutes, which both effectively refer to the same. The MT reading is followed by Targum Jonathan (ולא נטרתא פקודי וקימי דפקידית עלך). The Peshitta reads ܡܢܚ ܗܪܒܘ ܘܦܘܩܕܢܘ "covenant, statutes, and commandments," which is probably a harmonization between the MT and LXX traditions. The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

82. For an attempt to solve the text-critical problems in this chapter, see Percy van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11*, VTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

1 Kgs 11:11 MT	1 Kgs 11:11 LXX
ויאמר יהוה לשלמה יען אשר היתה זאת עמך ולא שמרת <u>בריתי</u> וחקתי אשר צויתי עליך קרע אקרע את הממלכה <u>מעליך</u> ונתתיה לעבדך	καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Σαλωμων Ἀνθ' ὧν ἐγένετο ταῦτα μετὰ σοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλαξας <u>τὰς ἐντολάς</u> μου καὶ τὰ προστάγματά μου, ἃ ἐνετειλάμην σοι, διαρρήσσων διαρρήξω τὴν βασιλείαν <u>σου</u> <u>ἐκ χειρός σου</u> καὶ δώσω αὐτὴν τῷ δούλῳ σου.
Yahweh said to Solomon, "Since these things were with you and you did not keep my <u>covenant</u> and my statutes that I commanded you, I will surely tear the kingdom <u>from you</u> and give it to your servant.	Yahweh said to Solomon, "Since these things were with you and you did not keep my <u>commandments</u> and my statutes that I commanded you, I will surely tear <u>your</u> kingdom <u>from your hand</u> and give it to your servant.

The following considerations suggest that the LXX preserves the more original reading. The ensuing text refers to what Yahweh has commanded (צויתי), but this verb would be unusual, if not illogical, in reference to the covenant, while it is perfectly logical in reference to the commandments (ἐντολάς) of the LXX version. Accordingly, the preceding verse also refers to the violation of what Yahweh has commanded (ולא שמר את אשר צוה יהוה), while a reference to the covenant is missing. One should also note that the covenant and the statutes are issues of a different class that are unlikely to be paralleled in this way.[83] One would expect a reference to the violation of the commandments that will entail the breach of the covenant, but the text only refers to the violation of both as parallel phenomena. This leads to a further argument in favor of the LXX. The LXX contains only one theological idea, the breaking of the commandments—although expressed with two different words that refer to the commandments— while the MT contains two ideas, the violation of the commandments and of the covenant. It is more logical that the theologically more differentiated reading is younger, because the opposite direction of development would imply a reduction of the differentiation.

Moreover, the book of Kings contains other cases where the idea of a covenant between Yahweh and Israel has been secondarily added to the MT, the LXX preserving an older stage of the text. In 1 Kgs 19:10 and 14

---

83. Thus already Julius Friedrich Böttcher, *Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testament* (Leipzig: Barth, 1863), 96.

the older text, as preserved in Greek witnesses, only refers to the Israelites forsaking Yahweh, while this has been secondarily changed in the MT to the idea that the Israelites forsook his covenant.[84] An even more extensive addition to this effect is found in 2 Kgs 13:23 MT, which is missing in some Greek manuscripts and probably reveals an older stage of the text. In other words, there is wide text-critical support in the LXX to assume that the idea of a covenant between Israel and Yahweh was secondarily added to many passages in Kings. Taking these passages together, there is a clear pattern and it is hardly by accident that there are several pluses in the MT that contain the covenant, which the LXX is lacking. This suggests that we are also dealing with an intentional addition in 1 Kgs 11:11 MT and not with an accidental misreading or a secondary change in the LXX.[85]

One should further note that the word חקה in reference to God's commandments is otherwise never met without other members of the list, either מצוה or משפט.[86] The word is used alone in Kings only in reference to the ways of David (1 Kgs 3:3) and the customs of other nations (2 Kgs 17:8) or Israel (2 Kgs 17:19). In Deuteronomy חקה is used only as part of a list of the other references to the commandments. Consequently, it is probable that חקה was originally accompanied by another word for commandments in 1 Kgs 11:11 as well, the word ברית thus being a later addition that replaced either מצוה or משפט.[87]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The differences between the MT and the LXX were probably not caused by an accidental mistake. The Greek τὰς ἐντολάς μου likely goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* מצותי or משפטי, neither of which has a beginning that resembles ברית. Although the endings are similar, a copyist's misreading a word would only be expected if the beginnings and the core word are similar. A more plausible

---

84. For discussion of these verses, see analyses in §3.8, above.

85. Thus a small minority of scholars, especially in the nineteenth century, e.g., Böttcher, *Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testament*, 96; Thenius, *Könige*, 170 (but only as a possibility); DeVries, *1 Kings*, 141–42.

86. Thus in 1 Kgs 2:3; 6:12; 9:6; 11:33, 34, 38; 2 Kings 17:13, 34; 23:3. In 2 Kings 23:3 the word עדות is also used.

87. Some scholars merely note the LXX variant, but do not consider its text-critical value, e.g., Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 122. Other completely ignore the variant, e.g., Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 305.

alternative is to assume that the LXX was intentionally changed—and this has been suggested by many scholars.

For example, John William Wevers has argued that the LXX seeks to avoid the idea that Yahweh's covenant could be broken by humans.[88] This is a possibility, but it is difficult to determine, since the idea of humans not keeping or breaking the covenant is not met elsewhere in Kings. First Kings 8:23–24 refers to Yahweh keeping his covenant with Israel. In other books of the Hebrew Bible human beings can break the covenant (e.g., Gen 17:14; Lev 26:15; Deut 31:20; Jer 31:32; Ezek 16:59), but the idea is rendered more or less faithfully in the LXX. Wevers's argument can also be reversed. The idea of breaking the covenant itself is exceptional in Kings in any case, while breaking the commandments is very common. One can therefore ask where this idea came from in the first place. Wevers's argument thus only transposes the problem to another textual tradition, namely the LXX. This can only be used as an argument if an earlier transmission of Kings would have been more open to the possibility that a covenant could be broken, but with the lack of related passages, this remains hypothetical. Nevertheless, many texts in Kings and other books of the Hebrew Bible consider it as a real danger that the Israelites violate the commandments and thereby cause the covenant to be broken, but this is a consequence that is emphasized in later texts (see below). It is difficult to see that in some part of the transmission one would have intentionally excluded the possibility that the covenant could be violated if the text describes deeds that would lead to the breach of the covenant. Moreover, the text does not explicitly say that the covenant was broken. It only says that Solomon did not keep (שמר) the covenant or the terms of the covenant, which are the commandments, but it does not yet mean that he canceled the covenant. The implication is that his deeds caused the covenant to be canceled.

Percy van Keulen argues that the LXX is a later attempt to harmonize the text to accord with standard expressions. This is certainly a possible motive that can also be substantiated in other passages, as Van Keulen has shown.[89] However, this does not account for the sheer omission of a

---

88. John William Wevers, "Exegetical Principles underlying the Septuagint Text of I Kings ii 12–xxi 43," *OtSt* 8 (1950), 300–322; his suggestion is followed by some scholars, e.g., Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11*, 560.

89. See Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 149–50. He writes: "it is well conceivable that the readings of 3 Reg. 8: 58, 9:4 and 11:11 reflect modifications in accordance with the standard expression."

central theological concept in the LXX. If the LXX reading is the result of a later harmonization, it would not necessitate the omission of the word for covenant. It would have been very possible to add the standard expression and retain the covenant. The Peshitta reading, which may be a harmonization of LXX and MT types of readings, is a case in point. A harmonization with the context would have been easily attained by changing the sentence in another way, for example, by placing the word "covenant" after the verb "to command."[90] A similar argument was already made in early research. According to Charles Fox Burney, "these variations in order seem to indicate that מצותי is a later addition made first upon the margin as being a word often coupled with חקתי."[91] It is certainly true that מצוה and חקה would easily be coupled, and some later scribes could be tempted to add one of them (or משפט).[92] Like other theories that argue for the priority of the LXX, it does not explain the *lack* of the word *covenant* in the LXX. The priority of the MT would imply the omission of an important theological concept in the LXX, and this remains a strong argument against the priority of the MT reading. Notably, many scholars make no mention of the variant in the LXX.[93]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT reading contains a secondary introduction of the idea of Solomon breaking the covenant. Not only did he break the commandments, but he also violated the covenant. As many passages suggest, the worship of the other gods was the gravest danger to the covenant (e.g., Deut 31:16, 20; Josh 23:16; 2 Kgs 17:15, 35, 38), and thus the sins described in 1 Kgs 11 would logically mean that Solomon had violated the covenant as well. The older text

---

90. Peculiarly, Targum Jonathan has reversed the order of the words thus highlighting the problem even more: ולא נטרתא פקודי וקימי דפקידית עלך, "you did not keep my statutes and my covenant that I commanded you."

91. Burney, *Notes*, 157.

92. Similarly many others, e.g., Martin Noth, *Könige*, BKAT 9.1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), 242 ("absichtliche Änderung" in LXX); Gray, *I and II Kings*, 279.

93. Thus, e.g., Kittel, *Könige*, 96; Martin Rehm, *Das erste Buch der Könige: Ein Kommentar* (Würzberg: Echter, 1979), 120–22; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 305; Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 10 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 328; Jürgen Werlitz, *Die Bücher der Könige*, NSKAT (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002), 113–15; Ernst Axel Knauf, *1 Könige 1–14*, HThKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2016), 316, 319.

did not yet refer to the violation of the covenant, but in view of many other passages, it would have been a logical consequence. It is typical of the Hebrew Bible that important theological ideas are gradually adopted from other parts of the collection.

The replacement in the MT of 1 Kgs 11:11 is part of the increasing emphasis on the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. Israel's conduct was seen in connection with the covenant, which they are in danger of violating or even breaking if they violate Yahweh's commandments. There is no evidence of a wider redaction to this effect in Kings, for the additions with documented evidence are rather isolated and relatively rare (e.g., 1 Kgs 19:10, 14; 2 Kgs 13:23).[94] It is more probable that the additions were made as part of a transmitting milieu where the covenant had become a more important concept in perceiving the relationship between Israel and Yahweh, and thus many copyists and editors would have been prone to add the idea to 1 Kgs 11:11.

Since the replacement consists of one word only, it is possible that it was made by scraping off the older word and putting the new one in its place. If the whole manuscript had been copied, there would have been less reason to leave out the word for commandment. The lack of space could explain why the word was left out. As for the omitted word, it did not have much impact, since the word statutes (חקות) was left in the text. In many texts the words for statutes, commandments, and stipulations (מצות, חקות, and משפטים) are interchangeable, and thus the idea that Solomon violated the commandments was retained.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is very possible that a careful critic would have noticed the problem in the text without the LXX version. The idea of a covenant that Yahweh commanded is peculiar and it is also unexpected that the commandments and the covenant are paralleled. That the idea of a covenant is only found in some passages in Kings—many of which are missing in the LXX—would have increased the suspicion that something is amiss in this verse. Although it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to determine what was replaced or that something was replaced in the first place, it is likely that some critics would come to the conclusion that the covenant is a late intrusion in 1 Kgs 11:11. In this

---

94. Some scholars have assumed that Deuteronomy was heavily edited by the so-called *Bundestheologische Redaktor*; thus esp. Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 4–5.

case, it would not have been crucial to know what word was left out, for the most significant theological alteration is the addition of the idea of the covenant. The critic might have concluded that no word was omitted and that only the word "covenant" was added.

Results. It is probable that the MT of 1 Kgs 11:11 is the result of a later intervention in which מצות "commandments" was replaced with ברית "covenant," while the LXX preserves the more original reading. The purpose of the intervention was to show that Solomon not only broke the commandments but also violated Yahweh's covenant. Without the LXX reading, one would be able to suspect that the word *covenant* may not be original, although it would have been difficult to determine which word was replaced.

9.14. 2 Kings 12:10

Second Kings 12 describes the reign of King Jehoash of Judah, and much of the chapter deals with the repair of Yahweh's temple in Jerusalem. In order to finance the repairs, a collection chest was placed at the entrance to the temple, as described in 12:10. However, there are notable variants concerning the location of the chest. According to the MT, the priest Jehoiada placed the chest "beside the altar on the right side as one entered the house of Yahweh." Most Greek manuscripts contain a reading that is meaningless in Greek but which also clearly differs from the MT. However, some Greek manuscripts (especially the Lucianic group borc$_2$e$_2$), Vulgate (*et posuit illud iuxta altare ad dexteram ingredientium domum Domini)*, Peshitta (ܡܕܒܚܐ ܡ̇ ܡܝܢܐ), and Targum Jonathan (מדבחא מימינא/בימינא) follow the MT. The parallel text in 2 Chr 24:8 skips over the reference altogether.[95]

2 Kgs 12:10abα MT	2 Kgs 12:10abα LXX^B
ויקח יהוידע הכהן ארון אחד ויקב חר בדלתו ויתן אתו אצל המזבח בימין/מימין בבוא איש בית יהוה	καὶ ἔλαβεν Ιωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς κιβωτὸν μίαν καὶ ἔτρησεν τρώγλην ἐπὶ τῆς σανίδος αὐτῆς καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν παρὰ ιαμειβειν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἀνδρὸς οἴκου κυρίου

---

95. 2 Chr 24:8: ויתנהו בשער בית יהוה חוצה/καὶ τεθήτω ἐν πύλῃ οἴκου κυρίου ἔξω.

Jehoiada the priest took a chest and bored a hole in its lid, and placed it beside <u>the altar on the right when one enters</u> the temple of Yahweh.	Jehoiada the priest took a chest and bored a hole in its lid, and placed it by <u>ιαμειβειν in the house</u> of a man of the house of the Lord.

Those Greek manuscripts that were not obviously harmonized toward the MT contain several variants in the parallel to the Hebrew אצל המזבח בימין/מימין. Since their readings are meaningless in Greek, it is necessary to determine whether behind them is a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is transcribed in Greek:

Manuscript	Greek reading	Conjectural Hebrew *Vorlage*
A	αμμασβη	אצל המצבה/המסבה
B	ιαμειβειν	ימיבין
V/N	αμμαζειβη	המזיבה
MS 71	μαζιβι	מזיבה
e	αμαζειβι	המזיבה
borc₂e₂	τό θυσιαστήριον ἐν δείξια	המזבח בימין/מימין
f	αμμαζεηβι	המזיבה
i	ιαμειβει	ימיבין
j	αμμαζεειβη	המזיבה
x	αμμαζιβιν	המזיבין
zᵃᶠ	αμμαζεειβι	המזיבה

Notably, with the exception of Lucianic manuscripts, which are most likely harmonizations toward a proto-MT, not one witness can be read as a reference to an altar (cf. borc₂e₂ τό θυσιαστήριον), as found in the MT.[96] This is peculiar, for there is no apparent reason to avoid translating this word and the possibility of misunderstanding the passage is also unlikely. None of the variants are transcriptions of the Hebrew word for altar, המזבח. The final letter of המזבח has no counterpart in the Greek variants, and in its

---

96. Most scholars, e.g., Benzinger, *Könige*, 160, consider the Lucianic manuscripts as harmonizations.

place are letters ι or η that typically in names go back to the Hebrew letter
ה.[97] Moreover, if the Hebrew *Vorlage* had been המזבח, there would have
been no reason not to translate the word. It thus seems probable that the
Old Greek did not contain the word המזבח. Nevertheless, the unusually
large number of Greek variants implies a problem in the Hebrew *Vorlage*
and/or some misunderstanding of the transmitted text. While most of
the Greek manuscripts seems to reflect a Hebrew המזיבה or similar, some
could have a parallel to בימין/מימין: ιαμειβειν (B) and ιαμειβει (i), although
this is also uncertain as the letter β finds no counterpart. It is very pos-
sible that the translator did not understand what exactly was meant by the
Hebrew *Vorlage*, and this could have caused a great number of variants in
the later Greek transmission.[98]

The variant in Codex Alexandrinus, αμμασβη, may provide the key to
the variant readings. Although meaningless in Greek, the transliteration is
very close to the Hebrew המסבה or המצבה.[99] Only the latter has a mean-
ing in Hebrew, namely, a massebah or standing stone.[100] It would also fit
very well in the present context as standing stones are known to have been
placed at entrances to important places such as temples or at other lim-
inal spaces. For example, in Bethsaida/et-Tell and Tell Dan standing stones
were found at the right side of the entrance to the city. Importantly, this
reading would explain the variants in Greek as well as in the MT, since
standing stones were prohibited in the Pentateuch as illegitimate (Deut
7:5) and pious kings are said to have removed them (2 Kgs 18:4; 23:14).
There is thus an obvious contradiction between Jehoash's piousness (2 Kgs
12:3) and the existence of an illegitimate cult object at the temple entrance.
Looking from a late biblical perspective, it would be puzzling why the
pious king leaves the idolatrous stone untouched, although he restores
the temple. His action could be read as legitimizing the standing stone. In

---

97. Typically the letter ח is rendered in names, etc. with the Greek χ (e.g., אחז as
Αχαζ).

98. Thus many, e.g., Benzinger, *Könige*, 160.

99. The Greek letter ς is mostly a rendering of Hebrew letter צ or ס.

100. According to William A. McKane, "Note on 2 Kings 12 10 (Evv 12 9)," *ZAW*
71 (1959): 260–61, "the Greek does not give positive support to the emendation of
המזבח to המצבה. An examination of the larger Cambridge Septuagint will show that
it is impossible to decide whether the Greek transcriptions point to המזבח or המצבה."
It is certainly true that the Greek is not unequivocally clear. However, it seems quite
certain that Codex Alexandrinus would correspond to המצבה, while none of the tran-
scriptions correspond to המזבח.

accidentally omitted, or perhaps its omission was an attempt to solve the theological problem in the text. The word בוא seems to have been misread as בית by the Greek translator, or it was corrupted already in the *Vorlage*. These differences may imply that some additional technical corruption could have taken place in the *Vorlage* of the Greek text.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An accidental confusion between המזבח and המצבה is a possibility.[105] ח and ה are written similarly in much of the history of Hebrew letters. The same cannot be said of ז and צ, but as sibilants they could have been confused, especially in oral transmission. The idea of a corruption in the transmission of the Greek or its *Vorlage* would gain support from the missing parallel to מימין/בימין and the misreading of בוא for בית. One could argue that a section of the text had become unreadable or partly lost. This theory should be regarded as a possibility that cannot be completely excluded. Although this is quite possible for some of the differences, it cannot explain the difference between המזבח and המצבה. This corruption would have coincidentally resulted in a meaning that is theologically problematic but that also corresponds to our understanding of the development of the text in Kings that gradually became stricter toward cultic practices. This is less likely than to assume an intentional attempt to avoid a theological problem in the assumed original text.

   Some scholars, such as Marvin Sweeney, have suggested that the Codex Alexandrinus reading may be the result of a harmonization with the parallel account in 2 Chr 24, where Jehoash is described as an idolater (24:18).[106] The king would have remained pious only until the death of the priest Jehoiada, after which he practiced idolatry and tolerated cultic stones. Although intriguing, this theory would only explain the reading in Codex Alexandrinus, but would provide no explanation for the variant readings in other Greek witnesses. Moreover, his theory does not explain why the Hebrew is not translated but is transcribed as meaningless Greek.

---

   105. Some scholars, such as Montgomery, *Kings*, 429, have suggested that the words may have been just confused. He points to another similar confusion in 2 Kings 10:27, which refers to the massebah of Baal. It is certainly possible that the original text here read altar of Baal, but it may have been an intentional change to avoid the impression that sacrifices were made to Baal in a temple in Samaria.

   106. Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 348. According to him, Codex Alexandrinus reads αμμαζειβι, but this seems to be incorrect; it reads αμμασβη.

In other words, the reading in Codex Alexandrinus does not, in fact, make Jehoash an idolater, since the word is not understood except by a very small group of scribes who could see through the Greek transcription. If there had been an intention to make Jehoash an idolater, one would rather translate the word properly in order to highlight the sin. Moreover, one would then have to assume that the altar was intentionally omitted in a rather late stage of the transmission of the Greek text, but this seems highly unlikely.[107]

Another theory proposed by August Klostermann and others assumes that the original text read מזוזה "doorpost."[108] This would match with the idea that the priests are guarding the threshold (12:12bβ). Although this would render the text comprehensible, it is not supported by any witness; none of the Greek variants gives support to the second ז, and therefore the theory would remain a purely conjectural emendation of the original text. Moreover, it would not explain why the Greek translator and later transmitters had not attempted to make any sense out of the text. This is especially problematic in explaining the Codex Alexandrinus reading, as it clearly refers to a massebah but leaves it without translation. It would also give a poor explanation of the MT reading.

William McKane has proposed that the key to the problem lies in the words בבוא איש בית יהוה. By assuming various changes that were undertaken in the temple, he argues that the reference to the altar by the entrance in 2 Kgs 12:10 is anachronistic and the reason for the changes. According to him, the altar to which the collection box was fixed could only have been placed in such a position after Ahaz's reign, that is, after Jehoash.[109] This theory is dependent on several assumptions concerning the history of architectural elements in the temple. Moreover, it also offers a poor solution to the various Greek readings. It is difficult to see why the location of the altar would occasion a change that renders the text incomprehensible.

---

107. Notably, many commentators neglect the Greek readings and merely imply that the MT represents the original text. Thus, e.g., Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 353, 355–56; Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 302–3.

108. Thus, e.g., August Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, KKAT 3 (Nördlingen: Beck, 1887), 434; and Gray, *I and II Kings*, 528.

109. McKane, "Note on 2 Kings 12," 263. He writes: "The writer of the verse fixed the position of the collection-box with reference to an altar which was on the right as one entered the temple-building, but the altar in question was only moved to that position consequent to the installation of Ahaz's new altar."

If the location were offensive, one would rather expect that the location of the altar had been changed.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT of 2 Kgs 12:10 is the result of an intentional theological correction that necessitated the replacement of a word. By scraping off two letters, it would have been technically possible to change the word without copying the entire manuscript, but the change could also have taken place when the entire manuscript was copied. Although interventions that purged older conceptions have been found in many historical books of the Hebrew Bible, there is no evidence to assume a systematic censoring or a comprehensive redaction to this effect. It is more probable that the milieu of transmission gradually became disposed to reject offensive theological conceptions. We may thus be dealing with an isolated intervention that sought to bring the text to be more in line with acceptable theological conceptions of the transmission milieu.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the variant Greek readings, it would have been very difficult to detect the editorial intervention in the MT. The MT reading is in principle logical and does not give any hint that a word was replaced. Although the idea that there had been an altar at the right side of the entrance to the temple is otherwise unknown in the Hebrew Bible and is somewhat peculiar in the present context, our information on the temple and its utensils is too vague to conclude on that basis alone that we are dealing with a secondarily introduced idea. Even if one would have suspected an editorial intervention, it would not have been possible to recognize what exactly happened to the text.

Results. The MT of 2 Kgs 12:10 contains an editorial intervention in which the word for standing stone, המצבה, was replaced with the word for altar, המזבח. Although meaningless in Greek, the Old Greek αμμασβη (as preserved in Codex Alexandrinus) goes back to the original Hebrew המצבה. Without the variant reading it would not have been possible to detect the editorial intervention on the basis of the MT alone, let alone reconstruct the original text.

9.15. Psalm 72:1, 5, 7

Psalm 72 is counted among the so-called royal psalms. It revolves around the king, his relationship to God, and his assignment to rule in righteousness. The psalm depicts the rule of the king in cosmic dimensions, relating him to the heavenly entities sun and moon (72:5, 7, 17). At the same time, the psalm stresses the king's responsibility toward the poor and the righteous (72:2, 4, 7, 12–14). The origins of the psalm are in the monarchic age where it may have played a crucial role in the coronation ritual.[110] Accordingly, several motifs in the psalm have parallels in other ancient Near Eastern royal texts, particularly in Northwest Semitic traditions.[111] However, there are also traces of postmonarchic editing.[112] In this context, three instances of the textual transmission of Ps 72 need to be considered, as they seem to bear witness to deliberate changes of single words. In 72:1, 5, and 7 conspicuous divergences between the MT and the LXX should be noted.[113]

Ps 72:1–2, 5–7 MT	Ps 71:1–2, 5–7 LXX
אלהים משפטיך למלך תן¹ וצדקתך לבן מלך	¹Ὁ θεός, τὸ κρίμα σου τῷ βασιλεῖ δὸς καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ βασιλέως
ידין עמך בצדק² ועניך במשפט	²κρίνειν τὸν λαόν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς πτωχούς σου ἐν κρίσει.
ייראוך עם שמש⁵ ולפני ירח דור דורים	⁵καὶ συμπαραμενεῖ τῷ ἡλίῳ καὶ πρὸ τῆς σελήνης γενεὰς γενεῶν
ירד כמטר על גז⁶	⁶καὶ καταβήσεται ὡς ὑετὸς ἐπὶ πόκον

110. See Christoph Levin, "Das Königsritual in Israel und Juda," in *Herrschaftslegitimation in vorderorientalischen Reichen der Eisenzeit*, ed. Christoph Levin and Reinhard Müller, ORA 21 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 248–49.

111. See Reettakaisa Sofia Salo, *Die judäische Königsideologie im Kontext der Nachbarkulturen: Untersuchungen zu den Königspsalmen 2, 18, 20, 21, 45 und 72*, ORA 25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 229–68.

112. See Christoph Levin, "The Poor in the Old Testament: Some Observations," in *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, BZAW 316 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 336; Salo, *Die judäische Königsideologie im Kontext der Nachbarkulturen*, 215–28.

113. The ESV follows the MT. Other translations, such as the NRSV, have corrected the text according to the LXX. The superscription לשלמה "Of Solomon" is left aside.

כרביבים זרזיף ארץ	καὶ ὡσεὶ σταγόνες στάζουσαι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.
⁷יפרח בימיו צַדִּיק	⁷ἀνατελεῖ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ <u>δικαιοσύνη</u>
ורב שלום עד בלי ירח	καὶ πλῆθος εἰρήνης ἕως οὗ ἀνταναιρεθῇ ἡ σελήνη.

¹O God, give the king <u>your ordinances</u>, and your righteousness to the king's son! ²May he judge your people with righteousness, and your poor with justice. … ⁵ <u>May they fear you</u> while the sun endures, and as long as the moon, throughout the generations! ⁶May he be like rain that falls on the mown grass, like showers that water the earth! ⁷In his days may <u>the righteous</u> flourish, and abundance of peace, until the moon be no more!	¹O God, give the king <u>your judgment</u>, and your righteousness to the son of the king, ²to judge your people with righteousness and your poor with justice. … ⁵<u>And he will endure</u> along with the sun and longer than the moon, generations of generations. ⁶And he will descend like rain on a fleece, and like drops dripping on the earth. ⁷In his days <u>righteousness</u> will sprout, and an abundance of peace, until the moon vanishes.

There is a slight divergence between the MT and the LXX at the beginning of the psalm (72:1*). While the MT contains the plural משפטיך "your judgments" or, perhaps more precisely, "your ordinances," the LXX has in its place τὸ κρίμα σου "your judgment" in the singular. The singular is also attested by the Vulgate (*iustitiam tuam*) and the Peshitta, while the plural is also found in the targum. It can be argued that the LXX reading, which fits the context of the psalm much better, is the more original one. Two considerations suggest this conclusion: First, 72:1* is a bicolon with synonymous parallelism; compared with the plural משפטיך "your ordinances," an object in the singular (i.e., "your judgment" or "your justice") fits the singular object צדקתך "your righteousness" in the second colon better. Second, the singular form משפט "judgment/justice" is also found in the following 72:2 (cf. also צדקתך "your righteousness" in 72:3). The notion of divine justice transferred to the king and his son is one of the psalm's main topics, while a reference to the divine "ordinances" (משפטים) is in this context somewhat surprising, since this term mostly refers to the laws of the Torah. In the Psalms, this meaning for משפט is prevalent.[114] It would be understandable that the common interpretation of משפט would

---

114. Cf. Pss 18:23; 19:10; 48:12; 89:31; 97:8; 119:7, 13, etc.; 147:19–20; see also the slightly more ambivalent attestations in Pss 10:5; 103:6; 105:5, 7.

have secondarily influenced the verse, whereas the opposite direction of development would be difficult to explain. One can also see in many text-critical variants discussed in this volume (e.g., 1 Kgs 18:18; 19:10, 14; Ezra 10:3) a general torahization of the Hebrew Bible where older conceptions have been understood through the Torah and devotion to its commandments.

Although not completely impossible, it is unlikely that the variant in the LXX reading was occasioned by the Greek translator (see the discussion of potential counterarguments below). The Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the translation would thus be אלהים משפטך למלך תן וצדקתיך לבן מלך "O God, give the king your justice, / and your righteousness to the king's son!"[115] This reading would have been secondarily changed in the textual tradition attested by the MT, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta into אלהים משפטיך למלך תן "O God, give the king your *ordinances*!" Orthographically this is a tiny alteration diverging from the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX by the single additional letter י, but semantically this change leads the resulting text to suggest that God is called to give his "ordinances," which are found in the pentateuchal law, to the king. This notion is conspicuously similar to the law of the king in Deut 17:14–20 according to which the king is obliged to study the torah all days of his life (17:19).

In the opening of 72:5, the MT reads ייראוך "may they fear you," which implies as subject "the poor" and "the needy" mentioned in 72:4, while the addressee is God, as in 72:1–2. The LXX, in contrast, reads καὶ συμπαραμενεῖ "and he will endure,"[116] which refers to the king who is the subject in 72:2 and 4. The reading of the MT is also attested by the Vulgate, the Psalm targum, and the Peshitta, while the LXX version is not supported by other textual traditions.

Although the Greek verb συμπαραμένω "to continue as long as"[117] does not appear elsewhere in the LXX, it is clear that it cannot be explained as a translation of the MT ייראוך "may they fear you." The probable Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX reading is יאריך[ו], a *hiphil* of the root ארך that precisely

---

115. Thus, e.g., Friedrich Baethgen, *Die Psalmen,* 3rd ed., HKAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1904), 223; Charles Augustus Briggs and Emily Grace Briggs, *The Book of Psalms*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909), 2:137; Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100,* WBC 20 (Nashville: Nelson, 2000), 220.

116. The preliminary edition by Rahlfs and Hanhart, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 200, does not note any textual divergence concerning this word.

117. According to LEH, s.v. "συμπαραμένω."

would mean "he will/may he live long/endure." The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX therefore seems to have read ‏[ו]יראיך עם שמש ולפני ירח דור דורים‎ "[And] may he live long with the sun / and before the moon through-out the generations!"[118] Many have noted the visual similarity of the MT and probable LXX *Vorlage*.[119] Notably, the conjectured LXX *Vorlage* forms a synonymous parallelism, which also syntactically fits the sequence of 72:4–6, since here the king is subject in all three verses. Moreover, the motif of the king's living "throughout the generations" fits the reference to sun and moon much better than the MT reading, since these heavenly bodies symbolize the stability of the cosmic order. Furthermore, the motif of a permanent endurance of the king with sun and moon is smoothly continued with the images in 72:6, which compare the king with the heavenly gift of rain. Contrary to this cosmic imagery, the masoretic version of 72:5 gives the verse a completely different direction; the poor and the needy, who are mentioned in 72:4 as being delivered by the king, shall fear God throughout the generations. This is certainly a theologically weighty motif but it remains unclear how this fear is related to the sun and the moon; particularly puzzling is that the poor and the needy are called to fear God in the presence of the two astral bodies.[120] Furthermore, 72:6 MT resumes the king as subject ("may *he* be like rain") from 72:4, while 72:5 interrupts this sequence with the form ‏ייראוך‎ "may *they* fear you." While the version attested by the LXX is a coherent sequence of images revolving around the king, the MT of 72:5 "May they fear you with the sun/and before the moon throughout the generations!" contains the conspicuous and theologically weighty motif of the fear of God which is not very smoothly integrated into the passage and remains somewhat puzzling. It is therefore probable that the masoretic reading is the result of a deliberate change of the origi-

---

118. Whether the ‏ו‎ was part of the *Vorlage* cannot be established with certainty; while it is always possible that an original ‏ו‎ was misread (or deliberately changed) into a ‏י‎ (or vice versa), it needs to be noted that in 71:4–6, the LXX has a sequence of six cola beginning with καὶ "and," only two of which have an equivalent in the MT.

119. E.g., Baethgen, *Die Psalmen*, 223; Briggs and Briggs, *Book of Psalms* 2.138; Tate, *Psalms 51–100*. Salo, *Die judäische Königsideologie im Kontext der Nachbarkulturen*, 208–9, proposes in light of Prov 28:2 the slightly different meaning "er schaffe Stabilität," which would be indirectly attested by the LXX.

120. It seems that in this context fearing God is understood as a form of pious veneration, cf. Pss 15:4; 22:24, 26; 25:12, 14; 31:20, etc. The form and meaning of ‏ייראוך‎ "may they fear you" in Ps 72:5a is particularly similar to Ps 52:8 where ‏וייראו‎ "and may they fear" is related to ‏צדיקים‎ "the righteous."

nal יאריך[ו] "[and] may he live long" into ייראוך "may they fear you"—a change in the course of which the original consonants were put in different sequence in order to create the new verbal form.

A similar textual alteration is attested in 72:7a. Here the MT reads יפרח בימיו צדיק "in his days may *the righteous* flourish," while the LXX has ἀνατελεῖ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ δικαιοσύνη "in his days *righteousness* will sprout." The LXX reading is supported by the Peshitta, the Vulgate (*iustitia*), and even some medieval Hebrew manuscripts (צדק), while the MT is supported by the targum of the Psalms.[121] The textual transmission thus shows that the Greek reading cannot be a translational variant but goes back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* צדק "righteousness."

The term צדק "righteousness" is also found in Ps 72:2 and seems closely related to the main topic of the psalm. In the opening (72:1), God is called to give the king and the king's son his justice (משפטיך) and his righteousness (צדקתך) so that the king's rule will have these qualities. According to 72:3, mountains and hills are bearing "peace" (שלום) and "righteousness" (צדקה) for the people. The version attested by the LXX in 72:5 fits this context: יפרח בימיו צדק ורב שלום עד בלי ירח "In his days may righteousness flourish/and abundance of peace, till the moon be no more!" The parallelism of צדק "righteousness" and שלום "peace" is similar to the parallelism of שלום "peace" and צדקה "righteousness" in 72:3. The metaphor that uses a verb for flourishing to describe "righteousness" צדק is in line with the similar style of using nature and cosmos in 72:3, 5–7: note the references to mountains, hills, sun, moon, rain, and earth. MT's reference to צדיק "the righteous" is, by contrast, in this place unusual and does not fit the immediate context of 72:7. Syntactically, the king is subject in the preceding 72:6 (ירד כמטר על גז "may *he* be like rain that falls on the mown grass"), and the content of the following 72:8 requires the king as subject as well (וירד מים עד ים "may *he* have dominion from sea to sea"); this sequence is interrupted by the reference to צדיק "the righteous" in 72:7. Furthermore, the parallelism of צדיק "the righteous" in 72:7a and רב שלום "abundance of peace" seems peculiar. References to צדיק or צדיקים "the righteous" are found in many psalms but they seem particularly connected with theological concepts probably postdating the monarchic age,

121. For the medieval manuscripts, see *BHS*; i.e., three manuscripts according to Johannis Bernardo de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (Parma: Regio, 1788), 4:50.

such as orientation toward the Torah (see especially Ps 1).[122] An expression similar to the MT's version of Ps 72:7a (יפרח בימיו צדיק "in his days may the righteous flourish") is found in Ps 92:13 (צדיק כתמר יפרח "the righteous shall flourish like the palm tree"), a motif that seems fitting to the context of Ps 92. In light of all this it can be concluded that the readings in the LXX, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and some medieval Hebrew manuscripts probably represent a more original text of Ps 72:7a, while the reading found in the MT and the targum goes back to a secondary change of the word צדק "righteousness" into צדיק "the righteous."[123] This change was probably inspired by the expression in Ps 92:13a.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The opposite development is theoretically possible in all three cases. In 72:1, the plural reading משפטיך "your ordinances" could have been changed into the singular, either in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX (in the form משפטך "your justice") or by the Greek translator (with τὸ κρίμα σου "your judgment" as translation of משפטיך "your ordinances"). A motivation for such a change could have been an attempt to assimilate the plural form to the singular synonym צדקתך "your righteousness" in the second colon and the mention of משפט "judgment/justice" in the singular in 72:2. If the translator would have been responsible for this change, one could also imagine that rendering the plural משפטיך "your ordinances" with τὸ κρίμα σου "your judgment" was motivated by strengthening a potential connection to concepts of eschatological judgment that may have had an impact on the Greek translation of the Psalms.[124] However, this would have severed the possible connection of משפטיך "your ordinances" with the laws of the torah, and in light of the prevalence of torah theology in the final collection of the Psalms, which was also clearly shared by the Greek translator, it would be an unlikely direction of development.

A similar line of argument is theoretically possible for assuming the priority of the MT variants in 72:5 and 7. In 72:5 the more original ייראוך

122. I.e., Pss 1:5–6; 5:13; 7:10; 11:3, 5; 14:5; 31:19; 32:11; 33:1; 34:16, 20, 22; 37:12, 16–17, 21, 25, 29–30, 32, 39; 52:8; 55:23; 58:11–12; 64:11; 68:4; 69:29; 72:7; 75:11; 92:13; 94:21; 97:11–12; 112:4, 6; 118:15, 20; 125:3; 140:14; 141:5; 142:8; 146:8.

123. E.g., Baethgen, *Die Psalmen*, 223; Briggs and Briggs, *Book of Psalms* 2:138; Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 221.

124. See esp. Holger Gzella, *Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalters,* BBB 134 (Berlin: Philo, 2002).

"may they fear you" could have been changed into יאריך "may he endure," either mistakenly by a confusion of the consonants or deliberately. However, an accidental confusion of consonants resulting in a form יאריך "may he endure" that fits the context perfectly would be a great coincidence and thus unlikely. A deliberate change in this direction would have implied omitting the fear of God by the poor and needy. Since this is a theologically important motif, it is difficult to see its complete omission for the sake of creating a better parallelism. This would not accord with the typical direction of development in the Psalms. It has been noted in many studies that the oldest parts of psalms correspond to the rules of ancient Northwest Semitic poetry, whereas the poetry gradually falls apart when more and more theological motifs are added without regard of the older poetry. Consequently, the priority of the MT in 72:5 is unlikely.

As for 72:7, the alternative explanation would assume that the more original צדיק "the righteous" was changed to צדק "righteousness." Although an accidental omission of the letter י and the consequential change into צדק cannot be completely excluded, it would again be a great coincidence to have a mistake produce superior parallelism, so this alternative is unlikely. On the other hand, a deliberate change from צדיק "the righteous" into צדק "righteousness" would imply the omission of a theologically central motif in the final forms of the Psalter (cf. Ps 1). Moreover, the similarity between Ps 72:7 MT and Ps 92:13 strongly suggests that the change of צדק "righteousness" into צדיק "the righteous" was inspired by Ps 92:13; that the reference to the righteous does not fit very well to the content of Ps 72 shows that theological motives preceded other considerations. In sum, in all three cases the LXX reading is more probably original than alternative theories.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. All three discussed scribal changes are minimal modifications of the consonantal text. In 72:1 and 7, the change was achieved by adding the single letter י, while in 72:5 mainly the consonants were put in different order (יראוך[ו] ← יאריך). This already shows considerable respect for the older text, for the intended theological changes would have been more easily attained by wider revisions. Now, many inconsistencies and tensions were left in the text. Technically speaking the editorial changes are not even replacements. Those in 72:1 and 7 are tiny additions and those in 72:5 are transpositions of letters. Nevertheless, since the meanings are changed, the result is effectively a replacement of meaning in all three cases.

It stands to reason that the editor(s) responsible for these changes was (were) convinced that the original or "true" text of 72:1, 5, and 7 must have read משפטיך "your ordinances" instead of משפטך "your justice," ייראוך "may they fear you" instead of [ו]יאריך "[and] may he live long," and צדיק "the righteous," instead of צדק "righteousness." This is suggested by the similarity between 72:7 MT and Ps 92:13 ("The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree"). The editor was probably convinced that Ps 72 must have meant the same thing. Many later scribes had a theological perspective and thereby shaped the texts in view of the whole Hebrew Bible and its central theological motifs. The modifications in Ps 72 may thus be interpreted as an editorial attempt to clarify the assumed original meaning of the text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. As in most replacements, the textual changes in 72:1, 5, and 7 would be very difficult to detect if only the resulting text, witnessed primarily by the MT, was preserved. Perhaps the most notable phenomenon would be the peculiar sequence of subjects in 72:6–8: While 72:6 refers to the king, 72:7 has the righteous as subject, but 72:8 seems to refer again to the king. Similar observations could be made regarding 72:4–6: The king must be subject in 72:4 and 6, but in 72:5 the poor and the needy of 72:4 are subject of ייראוך "may they fear you," after which the king is not explicitly mentioned in 72:5–6. Observations like these would perhaps suggest that the text is not in the original order. However, it would be next to impossible to determine what exactly happened to the text. In 72:1, the change from משפטך "your justice" to משפטיך "your ordinances" would remain even more undetectable; this is highlighted by the fact that in many critical investigations the variant witnessed by the LXX and the Peshitta is still neglected.[125]

Results. The textual changes in Ps 72:1, 5, 7 are minimal modifications of the consonantal text but they had substantial consequences for the inter-

---

125. E.g., Martin Arneth, *"Sonne der Gerechtigkeit": Studien zur Solarisierung der Jahwe-Religion im Lichte von Psalm 72*, BZAR 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 20; Bernd Janowski, "Die Frucht der Gerechtigkeit: Psalm 72 und die judäische Königsideologie," in *Der Gott des Lebens: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, ed. Bernd Janowski (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003), 3:165; Markus Saur, *Die Königspsalmen: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie*, BZAW 340 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 132.

pretation of the psalm. They would probably remain undetected without the variant readings in the LXX and Peshitta. The cases demonstrate that the precise wording of a certain text can always be the result of minimal but consequential alterations of individual consonants, which must be kept in mind in any critical investigation of a biblical passage. To be sure, attempts to reconstruct an original text without textual evidence remain highly speculative, and the conjectural criticism of late nineteenth-century scholarship, which extensively reconstructed missing texts, has been rightly criticized for its arbitrary results.[126] On the other hand, one now often encounters the opposite extreme: the implied position that the MT always attests the most original version. This is methodologically hazardous as well and should be rejected, since it prevents scholars from seeing textual irregularities. Instead, a discussion of various possibilities should always be based on arguments and a fair evaluation of different witnesses.

The cases from Ps 72 discussed here demonstrate that the rule of *lectio difficilior potior* "the more difficult reading is the better one" can sometimes be misleading. In all three verses, 72:1, 5, 7, the reading of the MT can be perceived as the *lectio difficilior*, since it does not fit the immediate context as well as the readings in the LXX. משפטך "your justice" and צדקתך "your righteousness" in 72:1 is a more balanced parallelism than משפטי "your ordinances" and צדקתך "your righteousness." ייראוך "may they fear you" in 72:5 fits the following reference to sun and moon much less than [ו]יאריך "[and] may he endure," and צדק "righteousness" and שלום "peace" is a much better parallelism than צדיק "the righteous" and שלום "peace." Mechanically following the principle *lectio difficilior potior* would produce a distorted picture here. In any case, designating these readings cases of *lectio difficilior* is a modern interpretation based on notions of poetical balance and semantic coherence. The transmitting scribes were first and foremost interested in the theological message of the texts, and this interest prevailed over other considerations, such as poetic consistency. This explains why they could secondarily create readings that are more difficult (*lectio difficilior*) from many perspectives. This highlights the importance of always discussing each text on its own and weighing different considerations in relation to each other.

---

126. Cf., e.g., the multiple free conjectures in the famous commentary by Hermann Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*, 4th ed., HKAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926).

9.16. Replacements: Results

Most replacements detected in text-critical evidence are small. In a typi-
cal case merely one word or just one letter was replaced by a new one. The
vast majority of replacements are inconsequential changes of prepositions
or words changed to synonymous words or expressions, and such can be
found in many parts of the Hebrew Bible. For example, the MT and SP
contain repeated variants that result from a replacement with a stylistic or
semantic motive. Translational replacements are common in free transla-
tions, but it is apparent that even more faithful LXX translations utilized a
variety of synonyms for one and the same word in Hebrew. Whether these
are replacements at all is a matter of definition. In any case, replacements
of a synonym, stylistic replacement, and translational variety were only
discussed in the introduction of this chapter, while the detailed analyses
concentrated on cases that more probably took place in the Hebrew trans-
mission where more consequential replacements essentially changed the
meaning of the text.

It has become apparent that consequential replacements are signifi-
cantly more infrequent than consequential additions. While the former
are rather difficult to find in the documented evidence, the latter can easily
be found throughout the Hebrew Bible in notable numbers. The book
of Jeremiah is a case in point. Several additions (mainly to the MT) can
be found in almost every passage, whereas clear replacements—whether
in the MT or the LXX—have proved exceedingly difficult to find in this
book (the same is true of omissions). Clearly, the preserved text-critical
variants in Jeremiah may only bear witness to a limited period of trans-
mission, but the difference is nonetheless significant. In the historical
books, from which many of the detailed examples were taken, it is easier
to find replacements than in Jeremiah, but they are still outnumbered by
the repeated additions.

In much of the documented transmission, replacements that clearly
altered the meaning mainly took place where a scribe found weighty rea-
sons to replace something in the older text. In most of the analyzed cases
theological or related reasons were assumed to be the main motive for
the intervention. In this respect, replacements resemble omissions closely.
Part of the older text typically contained something theologically offensive
or problematic, which therefore needed to be omitted by replacement or
omitted completely. At the background are changed theological concep-
tions that became increasingly stricter and intolerant of ancient Israelite

conceptions that contradicted parts of the emerging Judaism and thus conflicted with more recent parts of the Hebrew Bible. For example, references to Yahweh's physical presence (e.g., Judg 20:21; 1 Sam 2:21; 2 Sam 6:7), illegitimate cult objects (e.g., Exod 24:4; 2 Kgs 12:10), and polytheistic conceptions (e.g., Deut 32:8) were censored by replacing critical words with more acceptable ones. The conflict between the Samaritan and Jerusalemite communities occasioned replacements that sought to delegitimize the cult site at Mount Gerizim (e.g., Deut 27:4; Josh 24:1, 25). Genesis 2:2 shows a correction by replacement of a text that seems to contradict the Sabbath commandment. Although the reason for theological replacements was not always something offensive in the older text (this is not the case in 1 Kgs 11:11, for example), the prevalence of such cases in replacements that clearly altered the meaning highlights that the later editors did not resort to this editorial technique for very light reasons. Most scribes clearly preferred additions over all other techniques if the same result could be thus achieved. The review of replacements thus further corroborates the notion that in much of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible scribes had considerable interest and motive to preserve the transmitted text in full.

The respect of the older text is also seen in some of the replacements that still preserve the older meaning in some sense but that also expand or alter its meaning. A good example of this technique is found in Exod 21:28–29 where more specific words were replaced by more inclusive ones in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The intention of the word that was left out was included in the new word: When the word "ox" was replaced with the word "beast," the latter still includes the ox, since it is also a beast. One could thus still assume that the ox was not taken out of the text, although technically the word was. At the same time the meaning was changed and expanded to include other beasts as well. The change of the verb "to gore" to the verb "to hit" in the same passage was very similar. Apart from the replacements where something offensive was left out, in most other cases the meaning of the older text was in some way retained in the new text. Clearly, it may be a matter of perspective how much of the meaning was changed. For example, in Exod 21:20–21 the original word used for resolving the case was "to punish," as preserved in the MT, but this was specified in the SP by using the word "to kill." Although killing is obviously a punishment as well, in this case it practically excludes some other types of punishment (such as a monetary compensation).

Since replacements necessitate the erasure of the older text, most of them probably took place when the entire manuscript was copied or edited.

Technically it would have been possible to make small replacements rather easily by crossing out or otherwise erasing an unwanted letter or word and replacing it with a new one. Manuscripts from Qumran show that some replacements were done in this way, although a number of these examples may have been corrections of copying mistakes by the same scribe who wrote the copy or by another person checking the copy for mistakes. However, if the replacement was made in a previously completed manuscript, it would imply a somewhat more resolute intervention than one done in the process of copying or editing the entire manuscript. It would also leave traces of the intervention as can be seen in the Qumran manuscripts, and such interventions would be visible to anyone later reading the manuscript. Therefore, it is probable that the majority of replacements that sought to change the meaning of the text were done when a new copy of the manuscript was prepared.

Replacements pose a challenge for traditional literary criticism. It has become clear that replacements are very difficult to detect without textual or other documented evidence where the critic can compare variant readings. Since a replacement substitutes something new for something in the older text and often takes its grammatical and contextual place, the substituted textual elements are much more difficult to detect than additions. Adding an element to an already existing text may confuse the grammar and/or content of the context, and in many cases added elements discernibly stick out from their surroundings, as can be seen in many examples of additions discussed in this volume. Most replacements, however, did not leave any syntactical or other traces, such as inconsistencies of meaning in the edited text, which would disclose an editorial intervention. This is highlighted by the fact that even in cases where we do have variants for comparison, it is still difficult to determine which reading is more original. The difficulty of detecting a replacement is especially evident when the replacement consisted of one letter or word only.

Genesis 7:2 is illustrative of the difficulties. The mention of the pairs of animals consisting of a male and a female is formulated in the MT with איש ואשתו, which literally means "a man and his wife," while the SP reads זכר ונקבה "male and female" (supported by the LXX reading ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ). Since the difference is found twice in the same verse, we are evidently dealing with an intentional change. It is probable that the textual tradition represented by the SP and the LXX replaced the more original reading of the proto-MT tradition, which is somewhat peculiar—speaking of animal pairs as "a man and his wife"—with the more appropriate terms

"male and female."[127] Here the critic has a good chance of determining which one is more original, but only because two versions are available. If we only possessed the SP/LXX reading, it would be next to impossible to detect that something had been replaced here. Similarly, if one place-name was substituted for another, the syntactical structure would not be affected, and thus there would be no grammatical evidence of an editorial intervention. For example, without the MT, it would be difficult to detect that the name Shechem in Josh 24:1, 25 was replaced with Shiloh in the LXX or its *Vorlage*.[128] In this case, the replacement is also theologically and historically very important.

In some cases, the divine name יהוה "Yahweh" was replaced with the more general term for divinity אלהים "God," possibly in order to avoid using the divine name too often.[129] Sometimes the change had considerable impact on the interpretation and historical reconstruction of a passage. This is the case in Gen 22:14 MT where the name יהוה "Yahweh" is used in conjunction with the naming of the place as יהוה יראה "Yahweh sees"; this seems to be an intentionally composed theological climax of the narrative. However, instead of the tetragrammaton, the fragmentarily preserved manuscript 4Q1 reads here אלהים "God", which may be the result of a secondary replacement of the divine name in the context of this theo-

---

127. Note that the preceding text in Gen 6:19 refers to זכר ונקבה in both witnesses. The SP/LXX may be harmonizing the language to be consistent throughout the passage. The original difference in terminology may be due to the use of different sources for the flood story.

128. The MT in both Josh 24:1 and 25 reads Shechem, while many Greek witnesses read Shiloh instead. It is probable that Shechem is original, since Shiloh connects Joshua's last address to Israel and his covenant with the people (24:25) with the place where the tent of meeting was erected in these days (see Josh 18:1; 19:51); in addition, the change may have sought to avoid the impression that the Samaritan holy site had any legitimacy.

129. See, e.g., Gen 4:4; Exod 24:2, 3, 5, 16; Lev 2:13; Num 9:19; Josh 17:14; 1 Sam 6:5; 10:26; 19:9; 22:10; 23:14, 16; 26:8; 2 Sam 2:27; 6:3; cf. LXX and MT; Exod 22:8, cf. MT and SP; Judg 6:13, cf. LXX/MT and 4Q49. In some of these cases, the opposite direction of change is possible as well. The phenomenon is important for the theory of a comprehensive Elohistic redaction in the so-called Elohistic Psalter of Pss 42–83; the comparison between Pss 14 and 53 and Pss 40 and 70 indicates that in the collection of Pss 42–83 the divine name יהוה "Yahweh" was in most passages secondarily replaced with אלהים "God," although direct evidence for these replacements documented in the textual transmission of Pss 42–83 seems largely missing.

logically crucial passage, although the reasons for this replacement are not entirely clear.[130]

In other cases a seemingly small replacement could have been made in order to avoid polytheistic conceptions. Such a change seems to have taken place in the SP version of Exod 22:8, for example: the MT uses the plural יַרְשִׁיעֻן "they condemn as guilty" in reference to gods, while the SP must be interpreted as singular ירשיענו "he (i.e., God) condemns him as guilty." The sequence האלהים … אלהים, attested by the MT, which in the original understanding seems to have referred to a plurality of gods, is in the SP replaced by יהוה … האלהים "Yahweh … (the) God," which excludes a polytheistic notion completely. In such cases, any arguments for postulating an editorial intervention would have to be based on the content alone, which is essentially more uncertain than if other criteria—such as grammatical problems, tensions, or disturbing repetitions—are also available.

In the case of some replacements, an incongruence or other problem was occasioned with the wider context. For example, in 1 Sam 1:23 MT the new text that replaced parts of the original text referred to a word of Yahweh, which cannot be found in the preceding narration. Without the older version preserved in the OG, the critic would certainly be able to notice that something may not be correct in the MT, and probably one would be led to assume that the text was somehow edited, but it would be difficult to know what precisely happened. First Kings 11:11 contains another example where the problems of the MT would suggest an editorial intervention. The MT reading refers to the covenant *commanded* by Yahweh, but in view of many other passages, this is an uncharacteristic idea in the Hebrew Bible.

Without documented evidence for the older version, the literary critic's possibilities of detecting and reconstructing replacements are limited. Even if one suspects that the preserved reading may not be original and that something is missing, reconstructions of the replaced text would remain highly hypothetical at best. Despite some exceptions that could indicate what was replaced (e.g., Deut 32:8; Jos 4:3, 9; 1 Kgs 16:32), replace-

---

130. According to the edition by Augustino Ciasca, *Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica* (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fidei, 1885), 1:22, the Sahidic text has "God" instead of "Lord" in both instances in 22:14. For a similar phenomenon where Yahweh may have been secondarily replaced by אלהים "God" in Gen 14:22, see the analysis of this verse in §3.1, above.

ments thus clearly pose a challenge to the literary-critical method.[131] Like omissions, they are usually not assumed as a possible editorial technique and their existence partly contradicts some of the method's basic assumptions. Future studies must take replacements into consideration when investigating the prehistory of the transmitted texts. Any reconstruction of the literary history of a passage in the Hebrew Bible must consider the possibility that crucial words or letters could have been replaced by new ones. Second Samuel 7:16, discussed briefly in the introduction, is a case in point, as the replacement of suffixes has fundamentally altered the meaning of the passage, which counts among the most central and influential texts of the Hebrew Bible. We have also seen that replacements (like omissions) potentially took place in cases where the older text preserves ancient religious conceptions. This means that the literary-critical method may have its greatest challenges in reconstructing conceptions of ancient Israelite religion.

Despite the evident challenges of dealing with replacements, the apparent infrequency of consequential replacements in much of the documented evidence implies that the critic's endeavor is not fundamentally endangered by this phenomenon. The occasional replacements of some textual elements certainly complicate literary-critical analyses, and they may especially mislead the critic in reconstructing older religious conceptions, but they do not make the method as such unviable. The consequences of these observations will be discussed in the final conclusions of this volume.

A further aspect that needs to be taken into account is the probability that text-critical evidence from the Hebrew Bible only provides a partial picture of the literary development. Although most of the documented evidence shows only a limited number of replacements, cases of much more comprehensive replacements, which could be defined as rewriting, have also taken place in some parts of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. The book of Esther is a clear example of an authoritative text that was adopted in the Hebrew Bible but that was also transmitted in a radically revised version in Greek. Extensive replacements can be found in all parts of the book, and in some cases the underlying texts are quite different. Although these changes seem to have mostly taken place in the

---

131. A further exception to this would be cases where the text is highly repetitive and a lost section may be reconstructed on the basis of parallels.

book's Greek transmission, similar techniques in other books and also in their Hebrew transmission cannot be excluded. It is quite possible that, particularly in the early transmission of some texts, as well as in some threads of transmission, replacements were much more common than what the text-critical evidence of the Pentateuch or Jeremiah, for example, suggests. In the early transmission a text may not have been regarded as untouchable as in its later transmission. This possibility also needs to be taken into account in the use of the literary-critical method, especially if it seeks to reconstruct the initial phases of transmission. It would be necessary to detect when a text has indeed undergone a comprehensive editing that entailed extensive replacements. Nevertheless, the documented evidence from the Hebrew Bible does not suggest that extensive rewriting took place during those phases of the transmission that are conventionally investigated by historical criticism.

10

Transpositions

Transposition is an editorial technique in which parts of the text—single words, clauses, sections, or even larger passages—are relocated within the same book. The technique was used during the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. When the MT and LXX or the MT and SP are compared, some variants clearly imply an intentional rearrangement in the order of words, sentences, sections, and passages. Perhaps the best-known examples are in 1 Kgs 3–12 and 20–21, where the MT and LXX contain a number of differences in their text arrangement. Another famous case is Josh 8:30–35, which is found in three different locations in the MT, LXX/OG, and 4Q47.[1] On the basis of these and other documented cases, transpositions in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible have been recognized since the nineteenth century. They received attention in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when scholars discussed which order or sequence was more original and which was the result of a later transposition. Such discussions can be found in older commentaries on Kings in particular, while more recent ones discuss them less frequently.[2]

Apart from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, transpositions have been widely neglected in historical criticism. Despite unambiguous text-critical evidence, they have not played more than a marginal role in literary- and redaction-critical reconstructions of the

---

1. The MT locates the scene in Josh 8, the OG at the beginning of Josh 9, and 4Q47 in Josh 5. For a recent discussion on this passage and arguments for regarding the OG as the most original location, see Ville Mäkipelto, Timo Tekoniemi, Miika Tucker, "Large-Scale Transposition as an Editorial Technique in the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 22 (2017): 3–5; https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101a.

2. Older commentaries are, e.g., Burney, *Notes*; Keil, *Kings*; Montgomery, *Kings*; Benzinger, *Könige*.

undocumented earlier development of the texts. Although transpositions are not explicitly rejected as an editorial technique, many implicitly assume that this phenomenon was exceptional and need not be taken into consideration in literary criticism. Beyond that, there may have been an implicit hesitation to assume transpositions, since literary criticism offers few tools to deal with them. Our interest in this chapter is to understand the phenomenon in more depth and thereby discuss its methodological repercussions for literary criticism. We will ask whether transpositions could be detected and their original location determined without text-critical or other evidence. What is the impact of this phenomenon for the practice of historical criticism? Does their existence challenge or even fundamentally undermine the method? How frequently were parts of the text relocated? To what extent should a literary critic take them into consideration?

Transpositions are also important for the question about the nature of transmission. Julio Trebolle Barrera has characterized some passages found in different locations as "movable units."[3] Before their location was fixed in a particular textual tradition, such movable units would have been transmitted alongside the more fixed text without a specific location themselves, or they were units that could be moved for certain purposes. One may think of units that appear loose or without a clear connection with their contexts, which could have facilitated their relocation. The relocation would not have disrupted the older text. Malachi 3:22–24 (4:4–6 ET) is a typical case. In the MT version an instruction to remember the law of Moses (3:22 MT) is met before the promise to send Elijah (3:23–24), while in the LXX the instruction is met after the promise. The position of the unit does not essentially disturb the contextual logic, but its position at the very end of the book in the LXX version grants it a somewhat more prominent position. The existence of such movable units would thus imply that the location of some passages or the order of texts was not entirely rigid.

Frank Ueberschaer takes a further step and suggests that some passages found in different locations may bear witness to the oral aspect or dimension of transmission. Before the transmitted traditions were textually fixed in a specific sequence—at least as far as all of its components are concerned—the traditions would have been fluid (*in der Schwebe*) and at

---

3. Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Criticism and the Composition History of Samuel: Connections between Pericopes in 1 Samuel 1–4," in Hugo and Schenker, *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel*, 261–64.

least partly transmitted orally alongside the text. In a later stage when their textual location became or had to be fixed, different transmitting traditions would have placed parts of the traditions in different locations.[4] This would explain the variant location of some units in the LXX and MT. If Ueberschaer is correct, it would be futile to try to determine which order is more original and which is the result of a transposition, because there was no transposition of textual nature. Such units would have had various "original" locations, and the idea of a more original location and the chronological relationship between two such textual variants could not be determined. Because of the methodological importance of Ueberschaer's theory for an aspect of the transmission, we will discuss in detail some of the central examples he has used in favor of his theory, namely 1 Kgs 11:1–3 and 11:43–12:3.

Minor transpositions are rather common, especially in lists. Although some variants in sequence may be due to a scribal mistake, most of the differences probably go back to an intentional rearrangement for stylistic, hierarchical, or other reasons.[5] For example, the MT and LXX of Gen 8:18 present members of Noah's family in different order. According to the MT "Noah went out (of the ark) with his sons and his wife and his sons' wives" (ויצא נח ובניו ואשתו ונשי בניו אתו), while the LXX lists his wife before the sons (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Νωε καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ). It is probable that the transposition was intentional and that the order was changed to accord with a certain conception of hierarchy in family.[6] A similar case can be found in Deut 3:19, where the MT refers to נשיכם וטפכם ומקנכם "your wives, your children, and your livestock," while the SP has טפכם ונשיכם ומקנכם "your children, your wives, and your livestock."

A further example of a changed order can be found between the SP and MT versions of Lev 12:8. The MT version presents the burnt offerings first and the sin offerings second (אחד לעלה ואחד לחטאת), while the SP has

---

4. Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 251–52.

5. Especially in a long list a scribe may have accidentally skipped over one member of the list, but while still copying the text and noticing the mistake, the skipped member could have been easily placed in a posterior position.

6. The MT may be the result of a secondary transposition where Noah's sons, who became important ancestors of nations, were placed before his wife, who is never mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. It would be unlikely that an unnamed wife is secondarily placed before the named ancestors of nations, while the opposite direction of development is understandable.

the opposite order (אחד לחטאת ואחד לעלה).[7] Although it may be difficult to determine which one is more original, the changed order is probably intentional with the purpose of harmonizing the text with a certain classification of sacrifices. Clearly, there are many cases where it is difficult to determine whether the change was intentional or accidental. Such an example is found in Exod 9:34, where the MT and SP refer to the rain and hail in different order: וירא פרעה כי חדל המטר והברד והקלת "The Pharaoh saw that the rain and the hail and the thunder had ceased" (MT); "The Pharaoh saw that the hail and the rain and the thunder had ceased" וירא פרעה כי חדל הברד והמטר והקולות (SP). The copyist may have accidentally changed the order to accord with the order in which these were typically mentioned in the copyist's social and linguistic context, or they may have been intentionally changed to correspond to the order in which they are presented in the preceding verse (in the latter case the SP would be the result of a secondary transposition).[8]

Some text-critical variants between the SP and MT imply a rearrangement for clarity. Leviticus 21:21 is a typical case:

Lev 21:21–22 MT	Lev 21:21–22 SP
²¹כל איש אשר בו מום מזרע אהרן הכהן לא יגש להקריב את אשי יהוה מום בו את לחם אלהיו לא יגש להקריב ²²לחם אלהיו מקדשי הקדשים ומן הקדשים יאכל	²¹כל איש אשר בו מום מזרע אהרן הכהן לא יגש את אשי יהוה מום בו לא יגש להקריב את לחם אלהיו ²²מקדשי הקדשים ומן הקדשים יאכל
²¹No descendant of Aaron the priest who has a blemish shall come near to offer Yahweh's offerings by fire. Having a blemish, the food of his God he shall not come near to offer. ²²He may eat the food of his God, of the most holy as well as of the holy.	²¹No descendant of Aaron the priest who has a blemish shall come near Yahweh's offerings by fire. Having a blemish he shall not come near to offer the food of his God. ²²He may eat of the most holy as well as of the holy.

---

7. MT: ולקחה שתי תרים או שני בני יונה אחד לעלה ואחד לחטאת "she shall take two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a burnt offering and the other for a sin offering"; cf. SP ולקחה שתי תרים או שני בני יונה אחד לחטאת ואחד לעלה "she shall take two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering."

8. Exod 9:22–30 refers only to hail and thunder, which may indicate that the rain in 9:33–34 is a latecomer. This could also be the original reason for the variants.

Although it is not fully clear what all has happened here, it is probable the SP word order in 21:21 is the result of a secondary transposition in which parts of the sentences were relocated for clarity and to accord with a more typical word order. It is possible that the unusual word order in the MT is the result of an earlier editorial intervention that caused a congested sentence. Note that the MT refers to "the food of his God," לחם אלהיו, twice and the SP only once. This may indicate that the transposition took place in the SP as part of a larger clarifying intervention of the text, where the unnecessary repetition of לחם אלהיו "the food of his God" was also omitted.[9]

Transpositions with a possibly stylistic motive are also documented throughout the Hebrew Bible. For example, in Num 1:20 the MT refers to all males (of the sons of Reuben) לגלגלתם כל זכר, "individually, every male," while the SP has the opposite order כל זכר לגלגלתם, "every male individually." In the MT the reference to "all males" is an apposition and thus grammatically correct, but the phrase is somewhat awkward. The SP reads better and corresponds to the word order in 1:22, which suggests that it is the result of a later stylistic correction and harmonization, while the MT, as the *lectio difficilior*, probably preserves the more original reading.

In the MT and LXX of Zech 3:5 the putting on of Joshua's clothing is presented in different order. In the MT the clothes are put on after his turban is placed, while in the LXX this is done before the turban.[10] Perception of what would be the logical order of putting on clothes may have influenced one of the versions. Similar minor transpositions for stylistic and other preferred purposes can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible, but most of them had only limited impact on the text's meaning. Further examples can be found in Gen 26:28; 30:43; 31:17; 32:8; 33:7; Deut 13:3. In some cases the exact reason for the transposition is not immediately

---

9. There are several cases where a section of the text is found in different places in the MT and SP, which implies a transposition. An example of an entire verse is found in Exod 29, where the MT 29:21 is located after 29:29 in the SP.

10. MT: ואמר ישימו צניף טהור על ראשו וישימו הצניף הטהור על ראשו וילבשהו בגדים ומלאך יהוה עמד "And I said, 'Let them put a clean turban on his head.' So they put a clean turban on his head and clothed him with the apparel; and the angel of Yahweh was standing by." LXX: καὶ ἐπίθετε κίδαριν καθαρὰν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. καὶ περιέβαλον αὐτὸν ἱμάτια καὶ ἐπέθηκαν κίδαριν καθαρὰν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου εἱστήκει "'and put a clean turban on his head.' And they clothed him with garments and put a clean turban on his head, and the angel of the Lord stood by." Note that the NETS translation follows the MT order.

evident, but in the majority of these cases the reasons for the transposition can be found in the immediate context or the content gives an impression of what might have happened.

The text-critical variants in Isa 5:3 bear witness to a rather typical transposition that impacted the text. In what appears to be Yahweh's speech to Judah and Jerusalem, the MT and LXX versions present the addresses in different order.

Isa 5:3 MT	Isa 5:3 LXX
ועתה יושב ירושלם ואיש יהודה שפטו נא ביני ובין כרמי	καὶ νῦν, ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ιουδα καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν Ιερουσαλημ, κρίνατε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀμπελῶνός μου.
And now, inhabitants of Jerusalem and people of Judah, judge between me and my vineyard.	And now, people of Judah and who dwell in Jerusalem, judge between me and my vineyard.

It is possible that the LXX reading is the result of a secondary transposition, as Judah is more often presented first (e.g., Isa 1:1; 2:1), and it would be understandable that an editor tried to harmonize the order with the usual order. Although such a transposition changes the meaning only slightly, it nevertheless gives an impression of which one is more important. A similar text-critical variant in the order of Jerusalem and Judah can be found between the MT and LXX versions of Isa 3:1, which implies that the transpositions are not accidental.

In 1 Sam 17:36 the MT refers to the lion ("killed by your servant") first and the bear second, while the LXX has the opposite order: הכה עבדך גם את הארי גם הדוב ("Your servant has killed both the lion and the bear") versus καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου καὶ τὸν λέοντα ("and it was the bear that your servant killed, and the lion"). The LXX is somewhat awkward with the lion hanging at the end of the sentence, and therefore the MT may be the result of a secondary improvement of the sentence structure and harmonization with the order found in 17:34. Transpositions occasioned by harmonizations with other passages and similar stylistic reasons can be found throughout the Hebrew Bible. In most cases they have little or no bearing on the text's meaning.

Larger transpositions are much less frequent than smaller ones. The heaviest concentration of larger transpositions—from sentences to pas-

sages—can be found in 1 Kings. The largest transposition in Kings concerns chapters 20 and 21, which are met in different order in the MT and LXX. Regardless of which version is more original, it is apparent that a later editor rearranged the material and made a large transposition. This is obviously a major intervention in the text, and it is probably connected to other revisions and to differing conceptions of Israel's history. Perhaps related to this is another large section found in two different locations: 1 Kgs 22:41–50 MT (the account of Jehoshaphat's reign) is located after 1 Kgs 16:28 in the LXX.

Large transpositions are witnessed outside Kings as well. Perhaps the largest known transposed block in the Hebrew Bible is the oracles against the nations in Jer 46–51 MT, which is found in Jer 25:14–31:44 in the LXX version. It is probable that the LXX version is more original, and it stands to reason that even without the LXX one would suspect that the section is secondary in its current location in the MT.[11] A further clear example of a large transposition is the passage about the opposition to the temple in Ezra 4:7–24, which in 1 Esdras is found in 1 Esd 2:16–30, thus between the corresponding chapters 1 and 2 of the MT version. Most scholars assume that 1 Esdras is generally more secondary and thus the transposition also may have taken place in the transmission of this version.[12] Since the LXX translation of 1 Esdras is not very literal, one cannot exclude that the translator is behind the transposition. This rearrangement of the text-blocks may be connected to other changes in the composition. The same is probably the case for the larger transpositions in Daniel as well, where the Greek version is probably secondary in this respect (cf. Old Greek and MT in Dan 4, for example). The large variants in 1 Kings are more controversial and so far there is no consensus among scholars as to which one of the versions is the result of a later intervention. Since the question of priority is unclear even when documented evidence is available, it stands to

---

11. For a recent discussion of the transposition in the oracles against the nations, see Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi, and Tucker, "Large-Scale Transposition," 9–12. See also Emanuel Tov, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in *Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu; les oracles et leur transmission*, ed. Pierre Maurice Bogaert, BETL 54 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 152; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 758; and William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 313.

12. For discussion of this issue, see contributions and arguments in favor of both versions in Fried, *Was 1 Esdras First?*

reason that with only one of the versions preserved it would be even more challenging to detect the large transpositions in Kings, let alone determine what was the original location of the transposed units. In smaller transpositions the problems for historical criticism may be even more apparent. Moreover, some transpositions are very complicated and intertwined with other editorial changes (see, e.g., the analysis of Gen 31:45–52).

Some of the minor differences in sequence between the MT and the LXX may have been occasioned by the translation into Greek. For example, in Gen 29:24 the MT reads ויתן לבן לה את זלפה שפחתו ללאה בתו שפחה "Laban gave to her Zilpah his maid, to Leah his daughter a maid." The Hebrew sentence is clearly awkward as Leah is mentioned with the suffix and separately with her personal name, and this was probably occasioned by an earlier scribal intervention, which is undocumented in the witnesses. The Greek translation preserves all the sentence elements but due to their rearrangement it reads much smoother: ἔδωκεν δὲ Λαβὰν Λείᾳ τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ Ζέλφαν τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ αὐτῇ παιδίσκην "Laban gave to Leah his daughter Zilpah his maid as a maid for her." Although it cannot be completely excluded, there is no reason to assume a different Hebrew *Vorlage*; a translational adjustment and improvement of the sentence is the best explanation. Similar translational and stylistic adjustments by transposition can be found, for example, in Gen 9:22–23; 19:20; 26:2–3; Exod 20:20; 25:39; Num 15:4; 24:1–2; 1 Sam 15:4; 20:1; 24:20; 2 Sam 14:2; Ezek 1:4.

On the other hand, it is improbable that most translators made substantial transpositions that distinctly changed the structure and meaning of the text. This can be largely excluded when the translation technique is rather literal, such as in the Old Greek of Kings and Jeremiah. It is difficult to imagine that a translator followed the Hebrew faithfully by preserving even the Hebrew word order in Greek, accepting that such a translation is rather awkward to read, and in some passages suddenly rearranged the textual sequence to improve its readability. If such rearrangements occur, in all likelihood they go back to an editorial process in the *Vorlage* of the Greek and not to the Greek translation. In books with a very literal translation, a transposition by the translator may only be assumed when the Hebrew *Vorlage* is clearly awkward or seems corrupted, and the transposition still faithfully retains all elements of the awkward Hebrew version.[13]

_____

13. In some cases, it may be theoretically possible that transpositions also took

The issue is not entirely different in books where the Greek translators seem to have been more inclined to formulate good and readable Greek, such as in Genesis or Exodus. Aiming at writing agreeable Greek certainly requires adapting the Hebrew word order continuously to the Greek syntax and to certain stylistic figures. Syntactical adaptation of Hebrew sentences in Greek always necessitates some transpositions (concerning, e.g., the place of the verb in the sentence) and may have been accompanied by further relocations of certain elements for stylistic and/or logical reasons, as shown above. However, such adaptation does not account for the following cases where all of a sudden the sequence of entire sentences and textual units diverges between the MT and the LXX—a phenomenon that remains conspicuously isolated and limited only to certain passages of the books in question. Cases where a passage was apparently thus deliberately restructured probably go back to secondary relocations that took place either in the proto-MT or in the *Vorlage* of the OG. Only if a translation is rather free and deals creatively with its *Vorlage*, such as in the OG of Esther, 1 Esdras, or Daniel, is the issue substantially different. If a translator took the freedom to frequently omit and rewrite, it seems certainly very probable that transpositions were in his toolbox as well.

10.1. Genesis 31:44–52

Genesis 31:44–52 provides evidence for several transposed sentences within a short passage, which can be seen in units found in different locations in the MT and the LXX. It appears that the text was extensively rearranged for narrative purposes in either one of these versions. The SP, the Peshitta, the targumim, and the Vulgate follow the MT. The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea manuscripts. Apart from transpositions and adjustments connected to them, there are a number of minor variants that may have emerged as secondary changes in one of the versions, but they will not be discussed here (note that the MT verse numbers are used in the LXX).

---

place in the later Greek transmission, but this is mostly not very probable. An exception to this are recensions where a differing order in Greek was later harmonized with a proto-MT order, but this is a different phenomenon, as the Old Greek would then contain a different order from the proto-MT.

Gen 31:44–52 MT	Gen 31:44–52 LXX
⁴⁴ועתה לכה נכרתה ברית אני ואתה והיה לעד ביני ובינך	⁴⁴νῦν οὖν δεῦρο διαθώμεθα διαθήκην ἐγὼ καὶ σύ, καὶ ἔσται εἰς μαρτύριον ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ.
	εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Ἰδοὺ οὐθεὶς μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστιν,
	^{50b}ἴδε ὁ θεὸς μάρτυς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ.
⁴⁵ויקח יעקב אבן וירימה מצבה	⁴⁵λαβὼν δὲ Ιακωβ λίθον ἔστησεν αὐτὸν στήλην.
⁴⁶ויאמר יעקב לאחיו לקטו אבנים ויקחו אבנים ויעשו גל ויאכלו שם על הגל	⁴⁶εἶπεν δὲ Ιακωβ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ Συλλέγετε λίθους. καὶ συνέλεξαν λίθους καὶ ἐποίησαν βουνόν, καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον ἐκεῖ ἐπὶ τοῦ βουνοῦ.
	^{48a}καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Λαβαν Ὁ βουνὸς οὗτος μαρτυρεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ σήμερον.
⁴⁷ויקרא לו לבן יגר שהדותא ויעקב קרא לו גלעד	⁴⁷καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν Λαβαν Βουνὸς τῆς μαρτυρίας, Ιακωβ δὲ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν Βουνὸς μάρτυς.
^{48a}ויאמר לבן הגל הזה עד ביני ובינך היום ^{48b}על כן קרא שמו גלעד	
	⁵¹εἶπεν δὲ Λαβαν τῷ Ιακωβ Ἰδοὺ ὁ βουνὸς οὗτος καὶ ἡ στήλη αὕτη, ἣν ἔστησα ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ,
	^{52a}μαρτυρεῖ ὁ βουνὸς οὗτος καὶ μαρτυρεῖ ἡ στήλη αὕτη·
	^{48b}διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Βουνὸς μαρτυρεῖ
⁴⁹והמצפה אשר אמר יצף יהוה ביני ובינך כי נסתר איש מרעהו	⁴⁹καὶ Ἡ ὅρασις, ἣν εἶπεν Ἐπίδοι ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστησόμεθα ἕτερος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου.
^{50a}אם תענה את בנתי ואם תקח נשים על בנתי אין איש עמנו	^{50a}εἰ ταπεινώσεις τὰς θυγατέρας μου, εἰ λήμψῃ γυναῖκας ἐπὶ ταῖς θυγατράσιν μου, ὅρα οὐθεὶς μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστιν·
^{50b}ראה אלהים עד ביני ובינך	
⁵¹ויאמר לבן ליעקב הנה הגל הזה והנה המצבה אשר יריתי ביני ובינך ^{52a}עד הגל הזה ועדה המצבה	

^{52b}אם אני לא אעבר אליך <u>את הגל הזה</u> ואם אתה לא תעבר אלי את הגל הזה ואת המצבה הזאת לרעה	^{52b}ἐάν τε γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ διαβῶ πρὸς σὲ μηδὲ σὺ διαβῇς πρός με τὸν βουνὸν τοῦτον καὶ τὴν στήλην ταύτην ἐπὶ κακίᾳ,

⁴⁴Come now, let us make a covenant, you and I; and let it be a witness between you and me."	⁴⁴Come now, let us make a covenant, you and I, and let it be a witness between you and me."
	<u>And he said to him, "Look, no one is with us;</u> ^{50b}see, God is a witness between you and me."
⁴⁵So Jacob took a stone and set it up as a pillar.	⁴⁵Then Jacob, taking a stone, set it up as a stela.
⁴⁶And Jacob said to his kinsfolk, "Gather stones," and they t<u>oo</u>k stones, and made a heap; and they ate there by the heap.	⁴⁶And Jacob said to his kinsfolk, "Gather stones." And they g<u>ather</u>ed stones and made a mound, and they ate <u>and drank</u> there by the mound.
	^{48a}And Laban said <u>to him</u>, "This mound bears witness between you and me today."
⁴⁷Laban called it Jegar-sahadutha, but Jacob called it Galeed.	⁴⁷And Laban called it Mound-of-the-witness, but Jacob called it Mound-witness.
^{48a}Laban said, "This heap is a witness between you and me today." ^{48b}Therefore he called it Galeed,	
	⁵¹Then Laban said to Jacob, "Here is this mound and the stela that I have set up between you and me; ^{52a}this mound bears witness, and this stela bears witness." ^{48b}Therefore its name was called Mound-bears-witness,
⁴⁹and the pillar Mizpah, for he said, "Yahweh watch between you and me, when we are absent one from the other.	⁴⁹and The-act-of-seeing, about which he said, "May God oversee between you and me, that we shall withdraw one from the other.
^{50a}If you ill-treat my daughters, or if you take wives in addition to my daughters, though no one else is with us,	^{50a}If you shall humiliate my daughters, if you shall take wives in addition to my daughters, <u>look</u>, no one is with us.

⁵⁰ᵇlook, God is witness between you
and me."
⁵¹Then Laban said to Jacob, "See this
heap and see the pillar, which I have set
between you and me.
⁵²ᵃThis heap is a witness, and the pillar
is a witness,

⁵²ᵇthat I will not pass beyond this heap   ⁵²ᵇFor whether I do not cross over
to you, and you will not pass beyond   to you, or you do not cross over this
this heap and this pillar to me, for   mound and this stela to me for harm,
harm.

The sequence of verses and half-verses illustrates the differences between
the two versions:

MT	LXX
44	44
—	50aβb MT
45	45
46	46
—	48a MT
47	47
48a	—
48b	—
—	51 MT
—	52a MT
—	48b MT
49	49
50a	50a
50b	—
51	—
52a	—
52b	52b

For several reasons it seems likely that the secondary rearrangement took
place in the transmission of the LXX and probably already in its Hebrew
Vorlage. This is suggested by the peculiar new beginning in 31:51 of the
MT version, which is missing in the LXX. In 31:51–52a MT Laban refers
to the heap as being a witness, although he has already said almost the
same in 31:48. One may explain this peculiar redundancy by assuming

that 31:51–52 originally derive from a different author than the preceding text. Furthermore, several peculiarities, repetitions, and tensions can only be noted in the MT version. For example, in 31:45–46 Jacob sets up the pillar and the people (literally, Jacob's brothers, אחיו) make the heap, while in 31:51–52 Laban claims to have set up both. According to 31:50 the covenant purports to protect Laban's daughters, while according to 31:52 its purpose was to mark the boundary between Jacob and Laban.[14] Although the exact division to pentateuchal sources and authors is controversial and cannot be discussed here, it is evident and generally acknowledged that the text is repetitive and contains internal tensions that can only derive from several authors.[15]

The repetitions and tensions are partly—albeit not completely—missing in the textual tradition attested by the LXX, which suggests that it preserves a more developed and revised version of the passage. It stands to reason that this version emerged from secondary smoothing of the passage that sought to remove some of the tensions and repetitions caused by earlier editing. Genesis 31:50b–52a, which read conspicuously repetitive in the MT, have been transposed to various earlier parts of Laban's speech, which effectively improves the narrative sequence and removes the second beginning. The transposition of 31:50b to 31:44 worked to this effect by making a reference to God being a witness at the beginning of the scene. The arrangement attested by the LXX also brings together the rationale of the heap and pillar: Jacob may not violate Laban's daughters and neither may cross over the pillar and heap to harm the other. The less coherent narrative attested by the MT is thus likely to be more original (*lectio difficilior potior*), which is also assumed by several commentators.[16] This conclusion may imply that the more original

---

14. The tensions have been noted since early research, for example Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 42–44; Skinner, *Genesis*, 399–400; von Rad, *Genesis*, 311–12; Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 237–44.

15. This is assumed by most scholars, e.g., Dillmann, *Genesis*, 263–68; Otto Procksch, *Die Genesis: Übersetzt und erklärt*, KAT 1 (Erlangen: Deichert, 1924), 188–90; Holzinger, *Genesis*, 206–8; Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung*, 143; Driver, *Genesis*, 287–89; Skinner, *Genesis*, 399–400; von Rad, *Genesis*, 312; Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 237–44. In early research one sought to divide the text between the J and E sources; thus, e.g., Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 42–44; or to other sources, e.g., Dillmann, *Genesis*, 263–64. Ball, *Genesis*, 90, notes the LXX variants but does not give a clear evaluation.

16. Thus, e.g., Dillmann, *Genesis*, 263–64; Holzinger, *Genesis*, 206–8; Skinner,

version resulted from intense earlier editing, which is largely not documented by the textual transmission.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Because the variants are many and evidently purposeful, accidental transpositions can be excluded. The only conceivable alternative to the primacy of the text attested by the MT and the related witnesses is an intentional rearrangement in the MT version. Such a theory, which to our knowledge has not been suggested in scholarship, would be very unlikely since it would imply that the text had been secondarily made more repetitive in the proto-MT transmission for no apparent reason. This would also mean the secondary introduction of ambivalence as to who set up the heap and the pillar, which is difficult to imagine. It is far more likely that one would have sought to remove such tensions than introduce them without any apparent motive. Consequently, there seems no viable alternative to regarding the MT version as more original than the LXX. It needs to be stressed that this only pertains to the transpositions and does not exclude the possibility that in some details the LXX preserves more original readings in this passage. The complexities of the passage imply extensive editing that probably took place in several stages.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The version of Gen 31:44–52 attested by the LXX is the result of a later harmonization that sought to remove some of the tensions and repetitions caused by earlier editing. The main editorial technique used to smooth the narrative was to rearrange parts of the text, and this first and foremost removed the peculiar new beginning in 31:51. Nevertheless, the editor seems to have been reluctant to omit or replace parts of the older text, because many of the tensions (e.g., who erected the pillar and heaps) remain in the LXX version. This implies considerable respect for the older text and a motive to preserve it as much as possible, but it also implies that transpositions were regarded as a less serious intervention of the older text than omissions or replacements.

It is likely that the rearrangement already took place in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and not in the translation. The translation of Genesis

---

Genesis, 399–403. However, several commentators make no note of the LXX reading, e.g., Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 42–44; Driver, *Genesis*, 287–89; von Rad, *Genesis*, 311–13.

seems all in all rather faithful, which also applies to the current passage. The parallel sections, although sometimes transposed, mostly correspond to the word. It needs to be stressed that such a substantial rearrangement of text only occurs in this passage in all of Genesis, and (except for the much smaller transposition in Gen 47, see below) the phenomenon is thus extraordinary in the textual transmission of this book. That a Greek translator rearranged the text so thoroughly in only one place of the book and left other similarly confusing passages mostly unchanged is difficult to imagine. Furthermore, transposing the sentences in this passage for improving readability without freer rendering of the wording and content of the transposed sentences would imply a very inconsistent approach to the text and its translation.[17] The rearrangement is thus better explained by deducing it from editorial processes that took place during the transmission of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek.

To be sure, such a comprehensive rearrangement of the text also remains exceptional in the documented Hebrew transmission of the book of Genesis. However, this can be explained with the widespread phenomenon—often noted in this book—that editorial interventions affected only isolated passages or limited parts of a book, and usually are not documented throughout entire books. In this case it is conceivable that a scribe who copied Genesis stumbled over the extremely confusing final passage of Gen 31 and decided to ameliorate the text by rearranging its sentences and carefully retaining their content. It needs to be stressed that nothing of the earlier text seems to have been left out in the process of rearranging, and the text was even slightly expanded by doubling 31:50aβ MT (> 31:44 LXX) and adding another speech introduction in 31:44 LXX (εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ "And he said to him," probably translated from ויאמר לו, implying Jacob as subject). These expansions, which apparently seek to clarify the text, also indicate the secondary nature of the version attested by the LXX.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Both the MT and LXX easily catch the critic's attention by being repetitive and containing tensions. This is

---

17. Alternatively one may assume that the rearrangement happened in the later transmission of the Greek text. This cannot completely be excluded, but the Greek text of Genesis otherwise does not clearly attest to such substantial interventions within the transmission of the Greek. One would then also have to assume that a later editor of the Greek version had taken more liberties in shaping the narrative's structure, although the expressions largely retain a Hebrew character.

much more so for the MT version, and accordingly many scholars since early research have assumed different sources and redactors at work in these verses. However, without knowledge of the MT version, it would have been very difficult to detect that the version attested by the LXX resulted from several transpositions, and it would have been next to impossible to reconstruct the original location of the transposed units. On the basis of the tensions that remain in the LXX version, one would perhaps suspect that parts of the transposed units were secondarily added to their current place in the Greek text.

Results. The different sequence of sentences in Gen 31:44–52 MT and LXX is best explained by assuming that the LXX version is the result of rearrangements that sought to improve narrative consistency and remove tensions. The rearrangement probably took place in the transmission of the Hebrew *Vorlage* and was not made by the Greek translator. The version attested by the MT, which is conspicuously more contradictory and repetitive, is older than the LXX in this respect, but the MT version is in all likelihood also the result of earlier editing. Although the critic would easily notice that the passage can hardly derive from one author, on the basis of the LXX alone it would have been nearly impossible to detect what exactly was transposed and to reconstruct the older version as preserved in the MT.

10.2. Genesis 47:5–6

Genesis 47:1–12 describes how Joseph introduces his brothers and father to Pharaoh after they had arrived in Egypt. Joseph first introduces five of his brothers (47:2–4), then his father Jacob (47:7–10). They are subsequently settled in the best part of the land (47:11–12). In 47:5–6 the MT and LXX versions differ considerably. The LXX contains pluses and its order of sentences differs from the MT. The SP, the targumim, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta follow the MT in the main variants. Some Greek manuscripts and daughter translations (e.g., the Armenian and the Ethiopian) follow the MT, but this is probably due to a later recension. That the LXX variants go back to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* than the MT is suggested by the word ἰδού, "see" in 47:6, which appears to be a rendering of Hebrew הנה. The passage is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Gen 47:4–6 MT	Gen 47:4–6 LXX
⁴ויאמרו אל פרעה לגור בארץ באנו כי אין מרעה לצאן אשר לעבדיך כי כבד הרעב בארץ כנען ועתה ישבו נא עבדיך בארץ גשן	⁴εἶπαν δὲ τῷ Φαραω Παροικεῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ ἥκαμεν· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν νομὴ τοῖς κτήνεσιν τῶν παίδων σου, ἐνίσχυσεν γὰρ ὁ λιμὸς ἐν γῇ Χανααν· νῦν οὖν κατοικήσομεν οἱ παῖδές σου ἐν γῇ Γεσεμ.
⁵ויאמר פרעה אל יוסף לאמר	⁵εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ Κατοικείτωσαν ἐν γῇ Γέσεμ· εἰ δὲ ἐπίστη ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄνδρες δυνατοί, κατάστησον αὐτοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν ἐμῶν κτηνῶν. ⁷Ἦλθον δὲ εἰς Αἴγυπτον πρὸς Ἰωσὴφ Ἰακὼβ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤκουσεν Φαραὼ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου. καὶ εἶπεν Φαραὼ πρὸς Ἰωσὴφ λέγων
אביך ואחיך באו אליך ⁶ארץ מצרים לפניך הוא במיטב הארץ הושב את אביך ואת אחיך	Ὁ πατήρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἥκασιν πρός σέ· ⁶ἰδοὺ ἡ γῆ Αἰγύπτου ἐναντίον σού ἐστιν· ἐν τῇ βελτίστῃ γῇ κατοίκισον τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.
ישבו בארץ גשן ואם ידעת ויש בם אנשי חיל ושמתם שרי מקנה על אשר לי	

⁴They said to Pharaoh, "We have come to reside as aliens in the land, for there is no pasture for your servants' flocks because the famine is severe in the land of Canaan. Now, let your servants settle in the land of Goshen."

⁵Then Pharaoh said to Joseph,

"Your father and your brothers have come to you. ⁶The land of Egypt is before you; settle your father and your brothers in the best part of the land; let them live in the land of Goshen; and if you know that there are capable men

⁴They said to Pharaoh, "We have come to reside as aliens in the land, for there is no pasture for your servants' livestock of because the famine has prevailed in the land of Canaan. Now, let your servants settle in the land of Gesem."

⁵Then Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Let them live in the land of Gesem, and if you know that there are capable men among them, appoint them as rulers of my livestock." And Jacob and his sons came into Egypt to Joseph, and Pharaoh king of Egypt heard. Pharaoh spoke to Joseph, saying,

"Your father and your brothers have come to you. ⁶See, the land of Egypt is before you; settle your father and your brothers in the best land."

among them, put them in charge of my
livestock."

It is probable that the MT version is the result of a revision that sought to remove narrative inconsistency, while the LXX version preserves an earlier stage of the text, which had been rendered illogical by earlier editing. The priority of the LXX is suggested by the following considerations. In both versions, the father and brothers of Joseph have already arrived in Egypt, Joseph introduces five of his brothers to Pharaoh (Gen 47:2–4). In 47:5 the versions diverge. In the LXX Pharaoh addresses Joseph and allows his brothers to live in Goshen/Gesem, but then the text continues with the unexpected note that Jacob and his sons have arrived in Egypt, which Pharaoh hears about. In a short speech to Joseph, Pharaoh then refers to their arrival and tells Joseph that he allows them to settle in the best part of the land. This makes little sense after Joseph had already introduced his brothers to Pharaoh (47:2–4), and after Pharaoh had already allowed them to live in the land of Goshen/Gesem (47:5a LXX). One receives the impression that 47:5b of the LXX starts to tell the arrival of Joseph's brothers anew, as if the episode of their arrival had not been told just before. According to the version of 47:5b–6 LXX, Pharaoh, when hearing about the arrival of Joseph's brothers, without further ado allows them to live "in the best part of the land." In the account of 47:1–5a LXX, by contrast, the brothers themselves first ask Pharaoh to live in the land of Goshen/Gesem (47:4), a request that Pharaoh permits and even offers Joseph to appoint some among them as rulers over the Egyptian livestock.

A basic difference between the two versions is related to the question of where the brothers should settle. Genesis 47:1–4 in both versions refers to the land of Goshen/Gesem (ארץ גשן/γῇ Γέσεμ), while 47:6 of the LXX and 47:11 of both versions refer to the best part of the land (מיטב הארץ). The MT of 47:6 merges these, which results in a peculiarly repetitive reference: במיטב הארץ הושב את אביך ואת אחיך ישבו בארץ גשן, "settle your father and your brothers in the best part of the land; let them live in the land of Goshen." This must be a secondary harmonization of the two references. If the LXX is secondary, one would have to assume that the references to Goshen and to the best part of the land had been taken apart, but this is improbable, since in the whole narrative as it now stands the final text of both versions refers to the same place where Joseph's brothers will eventually settle.

If the LXX version is assumed to be secondary, one needs to explain why the text was made more inconsistent and illogical. Accordingly, most scholars, especially in earlier research, assumed that the LXX preserves a more original version than the MT.[18] Based on the version attested by the LXX, classic source criticism ascribed the passage to the merger of two parallel sources.[19] As an alternative and perhaps more probable model, one may postulate that the crucial encounter of Joseph's brothers with Pharaoh attested by 47:1–5a LXX, focusing on the land of Goshen and culminating in Pharaoh's permission to appoint Hebrew shepherds as rulers of the Egyptian livestock (47:5a LXX), was placed in front of an earlier version attested by 47:5b–6 LXX according to which Pharaoh immediately allowed Joseph to settle his father and his brothers "in the best part of the land." The first scene can be understood as interpreting the second and may have been added in the course of earlier editorial activity. Placing the version of 47:1–5a LXX in front of the one of 47:5b–6 LXX however caused a substantial tension within 47:5 since in the final text of the LXX the note in 47:5b ("and Jacob and his sons came into Egypt") is rather puzzling after the preceding narration of the arrival of Jacob's family in Egypt, and Pharaoh's permission to settle there is also narrated twice. This tension was, in part, removed in the protomasoretic version, namely by *omitting* the first part of 47:5b LXX and by *transposing* 47:5a LXX to the latter part of 47:6.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The nature of the differences clearly excludes a scribal mistake, and therefore the only alternative is to assume that the LXX attests a version that results from an intentional revision of the version attested by the MT.[20] For example, Christoph Levin assumes that a post-Yahwistic editor added 47:4 and 6bα, which contrib-

---

18. Thus, e.g., Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 61; Dillmann, *Genesis*, 423; Ball, *Genesis*, 41, 104–5; Driver, *Genesis*, 370; Skinner, *Genesis*, 497–98; Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., HKAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 420; Holzinger, *Genesis*, 248.

19. E.g., Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 61; Dillmann, *Genesis*, 423; Ball, *Genesis*, 41, 104–5; Gunkel, *Genesis*, 420; Holzinger, *Genesis*, 248. According to Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 304–5, Goshen was emphasized in order to (physically) separate the Israelites from the Egyptians. He also argues that 47:4 and 6bα, with a new introduction (or "Redeeinleitung") in 47:4, are later additions.

20. Wilhelm Rudolph, *Der Elohist als Erzähler: ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik? An der Genesis erläutert*, BZAW 63 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1933), 165–66.

uted to the confusion in the passage: Because in the earlier text Pharaoh answered Joseph, the addition of 47:4, according to which Joseph's brothers ask Pharaoh to live in the land of Goshen, blurred the text. The MT would preserve the more original confusion, while the LXX, where 47:6b MT seems to have been transposed in front of 47:5 (= 47:5a LXX) and the speech introduction of 47:5a MT seems to have been doubled (= 47:5b LXX), would be the result of a secondary correction.[21] This suggestion is questionable, because the version attested by the LXX contains a much more massive tension by telling the arrival of Joseph's family in Egypt and Pharaoh's permission to stay there twice. Compared to this puzzling sequence, MT's tension that *the brothers* ask Pharaoh to allow them to stay in Goshen (47:4 MT), while Pharaoh permits this request in a speech addressed *to Joseph* (47:5–6) seems marginal, particularly since Joseph seems to be present at this scene all the time and it is not altogether problematic that Pharaoh addresses Joseph, his vice-regent, and not his brothers when giving this crucial permission. Levin fails to explain why the LXX version accepted this irritating narrative sequence in order to remove the slight tension that Pharaoh does not reply directly to the brothers. If a correction of the confusion is assumed to be the motive for a major intervention in the text, as must be the case here since a transposition undoubtedly took place, it is unlikely that it would have resulted only in a slight improvement accompanied by a much stronger narrative inconsistency. It seems that Levin's reconstruction, which includes various further detailed literary and redaction critical arguments, is primarily based on the MT, while the evaluation of the text-critical variants between the MT and the LXX is subordinated to the literary-critical analysis.[22] This is methodologically problematic, and a model that is developed in this way is essentially flawed. The differences between the versions need to be explained first, and one should attempt to reconstruct how the narrative developed only on the basis of the development that is attested in the textual transmission.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT version is the result of an editorial intervention where an apparent inconsistency

---

21. Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 304–5.

22. Levin's detailed literary and redaction critical arguments include Genesis 47:1a and 5a from the Yahwist, 47:2–3, 7 as well as 47:1b, 4 and 6bα as non-Yahwistic additions (apparently by two different editors).

caused by earlier editing was removed. This is a very typical motive that we have seen in quite a few other example texts in this volume, including those that contain a transposition. The passage is thus a significant witness to later polishing that complicates literary critical approaches. It is probable that the editing was conducted when the entire manuscript was copied. Since similar inconsistencies can still be found in many parts of the Pentateuch, it is probable that such polishing was not very systematic. In the present passage, however, the inconsistency of the LXX version is so disturbing that it seems to have occasioned an exceptional intervention in the transmission of the proto-MT tradition.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is easy to discern that this passage has been edited, and critics since early research have tried to reconstruct its literary growth. However, the MT is the result of an editorial intervention that removed some of the traces of earlier editing thus making them harder to detect. In the LXX version it is much more apparent that two different versions of the episode were placed after each other, the first of which was possibly created as interpreting the second. However, the transposition (and the omission) that took place in the proto-MT transmission would remain undetected without the LXX version, because the purpose of the interventions attested by the MT was precisely to smooth out the passage. The critic would certainly notice the double reference to the land where Joseph's brothers will settle, and the critic would probably come to the conclusion that the passage was somehow substantially edited, but this could not disclose the nature of the editorial interventions with accuracy. Models of literary history that are built on the MT alone may be able to grasp correctly some tendencies of the development, but if they put too much weight on the details of the MT version, the picture they draw of the development will be distorted.

Results. It seems most likely that Genesis 47:5–6 MT is the result of a revision that sought to even out a substantial inconsistency in the earlier version attested by the LXX. This inconsistency was probably caused by earlier editing. The MT version is the result of an omission and a transposition. Without knowledge of the LXX version it would have been apparent that the passage was edited in some ways, but it would have been exceedingly difficult to detect what exactly happened. The omission and transposition would have remained undetected or, at most, speculative conjectures. Notably, the younger MT version is less conspicuous to the

critic than the older LXX version. This text shows that not all literary seams, caused by earlier editing, are necessarily preserved in one of the final versions of the text. Editorial polishing of difficult and disturbing passages by reducing redundancy and transposing textual elements, as is probably attested here, may have been rather exceptional, but Gen 47:5–6 (where the LXX is older) and Gen 31:44–52 (where the MT is older) clearly show that this editorial technique was occasionally applied here and there. Such cases suggest that the final forms of the respective textual traditions, such as the MT, the LXX, the SP, and so on, contain further passages resulting from similar editorial polishing, although there is only occasional textual evidence for them.

10.3. Exodus 1:5

Exodus 1:5 preserves an example of a transposed sentence in the context of a crucial transitional passage in the pentateuchal narrative. The preceding verses 1:1–4, which open the book of Exodus, contain a list of Jacob's sons who went with him to Egypt, followed in the MT/SP version of 1:5 by a reference to the number of Jacob's sons (1:5a) and a note that Joseph was already in Egypt (1:5b). In the LXX, the two sentences of 1:5 occur in different order. Qumran scrolls 4Q1 and 4Q11 (4QpaleoGen-Exod[1]), the SP, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and the targumim follow the MT.[23] The Hexaplaric Greek tradition and one daughter translation of the LXX (the Armenian) also follow the MT, but this is probably due to a later harmonization after a proto-MT text type, while the Old Greek most likely differed from the MT. Dead Sea scroll 4Q15 (4QExod[b]) presents a further complication, for it seems to be lacking the reference to Joseph being in Egypt.[24]

---

23. Note that the targumim contain further additions in 1:5b, but in the transposed section they follow the MT.

24. See the documentation by Christoph Berner, "The Attestation of the Book-Seam in the Early Textual Witnesses and Its Literary-Historical Implications," in *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges,* ed. Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, FAT 120 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 1:5–19.

Exod 1:1–6 MT	Exod 1:1–6 LXX
¹וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַבָּאִים מִצְרַיְמָה אֵת יַעֲקֹב אִישׁ וּבֵיתוֹ בָּאוּ ²רְאוּבֵן שִׁמְעוֹן לֵוִי וִיהוּדָה ³יִשָּׂשכָר זְבוּלֻן וּבִנְיָמִן ⁴דָּן וְנַפְתָּלִי גָּד וְאָשֵׁר ⁵וַיְהִי כָּל נֶפֶשׁ יֹצְאֵי יֶרֶךְ יַעֲקֹב שִׁבְעִים נָפֶשׁ וְיוֹסֵף הָיָה בְמִצְרָיִם ⁶וַיָּמָת יוֹסֵף וְכָל אֶחָיו וְכֹל הַדּוֹר הַהוּא	¹Ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ τῶν εἰσπεπορευμένων εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἅμα Ιακωβ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῶν – ἕκαστος πανοικίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσήλθοσαν. ²Ρουβην, Συμεων, Λευι, Ιουδας, ³Ισσαχαρ, Ζαβουλων καὶ Βενιαμιν, ⁴Δαν καὶ Νεφθαλι, Γαδ καὶ Ασηρ. ⁵Ιωσηφ δὲ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ. ἦσαν δὲ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ ἐξ Ιακωβ πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα. ⁶ἐτελεύτησεν δὲ Ιωσηφ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη.
¹These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt, with Jacob, each with his house they came. ²Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, ³Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, ⁴Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. ⁵The number of all people born to Jacob was seventy. Joseph was already in Egypt. ⁶And Joseph died, and all his brothers, and all that generation.	¹These are the names of the sons of Israel who came into Egypt with Jacob their father; they came each with their whole family. ²Ruben, Simeon, Levi, Judas, ³Issachar, Zebulun, Benjamin, ⁴Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. ⁵But Joseph was in Egypt. And all the souls born of Jacob were seventy-five. ⁶And Joseph died, and all his brothers, and all that generation.

The MT version seems more original, because from the narrative per‑
spective it is less consistent and somewhat illogical. One would expect a
reference to Joseph's whereabouts right after all other sons of Jacob have
been mentioned in 1:2–4. Similarly, since Joseph was also Jacob's son, a
reference to the number of Jacob's sons would fit much better after all his
sons are listed and not before Joseph is mentioned. The reference to Jacob's
seventy (LXX: seventy‑five) descendants in 1:5a MT digresses from the
text that focuses on the location of his sons (Joseph already in Egypt, while
the others are now entering Egypt). It would be difficult to explain why the
sentence וְיוֹסֵף הָיָה בְמִצְרָיִם "Joseph was in Egypt" had been intentionally
relocated into such an awkward position as it now stands in the MT. By
comparison, the LXX reading of 1:5 can be seen as the result of a second‑
ary transposition, either in the *Vorlage* of the LXX, or perhaps less likely
by the Greek translator, to correct this inconsistency and to make a more
logical narrative; the total number of Jacob's sons is thus only mentioned
after the list of all his sons. One may also argue with the broad textual sup‑

port for the MT reading, although it can never be excluded that a single witness attests a more original reading without further textual support.[25]

It is possible that the seemingly unfitting place of the sentence in 1:5b ויוסף היה במצרים "Joseph was in Egypt" results from an earlier expansion. Notably, this sentence seems to be altogether lacking in manuscript 4Q15. Although the manuscript is very fragmentary here and the beginning of 1:5 is completely missing, there is not enough space for the sentence.[26] That the sentence is indeed lacking in this manuscript is further suggested by the fact that in the extant text of the fragment Joseph is mentioned in the preceding list in 1:3 (... ויהודה [וישׁשׂכר זבולן יוסף ובני]מין ... "... Judah] and Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph, and Benja[min ..."). It would be illogical to list him here with those who came to Egypt and shortly afterward make a separate note about him being in Egypt already. One model explaining the reading of 4Q15 in relation to the other versions would be that this manuscript bears witness to an earlier stage of the passage's transmission, where Joseph was still mentioned in the list in 1:3.[27] Joseph may have been later removed from the list, because according to 1:1 the list should only mention those who came to Egypt with Jacob; the removal of Joseph in 1:3 would thus be related to the insertion of the note about Joseph being already in Egypt in 1:5b.

However, the harmonistic tendency that can be observed in several places of the manuscript speaks against this theory. This tendency suggests that the disturbingly located sentence in 1:5b MT was secondarily skipped in the version attested by 4Q15, and perhaps in the same act, Joseph was

---

25. Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 2–3, argues for the MT on the basis of the broad support. In most commentaries, the MT reading is implicitly regarded as the more original, for the LXX reading is not mentioned at all; see Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus*, 3; Murphy, *Exodus*, 7–9; Holzinger, *Exodus*, 1–2; Martin Noth, *Das zweite Buch Mose: Exodus*, ATD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 9–10; Cassuto, *Exodus*, 8; Childs, *Exodus*, 1–3. Although Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 129, notes the text-critical variant between seventy and seventy-five, he fails to discuss the different order of the sentences.

26. See Berner, "Attestation of the Book-Seam," 14–15, with n. 18.

27. Thus Cross, *Qumran Cave 4.XII*, 85; according to Rainer Albertz, *Exodus 1–18*, ZBKAT 2.1 (Zurich: TVZ, 2012), 43 with n. 10, the correction in 4Q15 is secondary but nevertheless corresponds to an earlier version in which Joseph was mentioned before Benjamin in 1:3. See also Erhard Blum, "Zwischen Literarkritik und Stilkritik," *ZAW* 124 (2012): 511 n. 70, who, without reference to 4Q15, takes 1:5b as a late addition preparing the transition to the (also secondary) 1:6.

secondarily inserted into 1:3.[28] That 1:5b seems somewhat out of place in the MT version could also be due to a secondary insertion of 1:5a, which is closely related with Gen 46:26–27 and was possibly borrowed from there.[29] The fact that 1:5a interrupts the more original connection of the reference to Joseph in 1:5b with the list of Jacob's other sons in 1:2–4 may have caused the rearrangement of 1:5a and 5b in the *Vorlage* of the LXX.[30]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. It is always necessary to consider the possibility of an unintentional change, and a copying mistake can rarely be completely excluded. However, in this case an accidental transposition in either tradition seems very unlikely, for accidental mistakes mostly confuse the text. For shorter transpositions, an accidental alteration of the text is a potential explanation, but it is difficult to imagine that an entire sentence was accidentally relocated without severely disturbing the syntax of the passage. It would also be a coincidence that an accidental relocation would pertain to Joseph and his position in the family, which is also otherwise a major topic of the narrative. The variants in 4Q15 also show that Joseph's position among the references to Jacob's sons had been a matter of discussion in the transmission of Exod 1.

An alternative to the theory proposed here is to assume the priority of the LXX and thus assume that the transposition took place in the transmission of the proto-MT. In this case one could argue that the sentence "Joseph was in Egypt" ויוסף היה במצרים was secondarily relocated in order to prepare for the ensuing reference to Joseph's death (1:6). An editor would have focused on Joseph and thus brought together sentences mentioning him. Although this is not completely impossible, it is still less likely than a secondary transposition in the LXX *Vorlage*, because this direction of the transposition would have created an even rougher sequence in 1:2–5. Furthermore, the transposition may have been indirectly related to the differing numbers of Joseph's sons; while the version attested by the MT, the SP, and 4Q11 speaks of seventy sons, the version attested by the

---

28. See Berner, "Attestation of the Book-Seam," 17.

29. Cf. Houtman, *Exodus*, 228: "it is best to regard 1:5 to 'and Joseph' as a parenthetic remark."

30. Most scholars merely imply that the LXX is secondary, but some have also argued for this position, such as Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 2–3; Houtman, *Exodus*, 228; Gurtner, *Exodus*, 172.

LXX, 4Q1, and 4Q15 mentions seventy-five sons instead.[31] The increase of the number from seventy to seventy-five (which seems to have happened independently from the transposition, as indicated by 4Q1 which has seventy-five but attests the same sequence as in the MT) may have initiated the transposition of the reference to Joseph in 1:5b MT since the sequence attested by the LXX suggests more clearly that Joseph and his offspring were counted among the seventy-five descendants of Jacob.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The divergent readings between Exod 1:5 MT and LXX most probably resulted from a transposition for narrative consistency in the transmission of the LXX *Vorlage* or, less likely, in the course of the Greek translation. The transposition created a more logical text where the number of Jacob's descendants is only referred to after Joseph is also mentioned. The editorial intervention did not change the meaning of the text, for the older text was preserved in full. Probably the inconsistency in the more original text resulted from earlier editing. The transposition is thus a further example of editing where an uneven and not entirely logical sequence created by earlier editing was later polished.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is probable that a critic would have noticed the problems in both versions of 1:4–6. Paradoxically, the MT, which probably attests a more original version, is more conspicuous to the critic, who would be led to assume earlier editing. The revised version attested by the LXX, on the other hand, conceals some of the earlier unevenness, and based on the LXX alone, it would be more difficult to determine what precisely happened to the text. It would be nearly impossible to detect the transposition, let alone conclude the original location of the transposed sentence.

Results. In order to create narrative consistency, the sentence Ιωσηφ δὲ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ויוסף היה במצרים, "and Joseph was in Egypt," in Exod 1:5b was relocated in the LXX transmission, the MT preserving the more original text. Both are the result of earlier editing, but the LXX reading here seems younger. On the basis of the LXX version alone, one would not be able to detect the transposition and its original location.

---

31. See Berner, "Attestation of the Book-Seam," 13.

10.4. Leviticus 8:10–12

Leviticus 8:1–14 describes the anointing of Aaron to his office and various instructions to him and his sons for sacrificing. Before anointing and consecrating Aaron, Moses anoints and consecrates the tabernacle, the altar, its utensils, the basin, and its base. The MT and the LXX locate the anointing of the tabernacle in different places. Whereas in the MT the tabernacle is anointed *before* the altar and the basin, in the LXX it is anointed *last*, just before the anointing of Aaron. The SP, the targumim, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate follow the MT. The passage is not preserved among the Dead Sea biblical manuscripts.[32]

Lev 8:10–12 MT	Lev 8:10–12 LXX
¹⁰ויקח משה את שמן המשחה וימשח את המשכן ואת כל אשר בו ויקדש אתם	¹⁰ καὶ ἔλαβεν Μωυσῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλαίου τῆς χρίσεως
¹¹ויז ממנו על המזבח שבע פעמים וימשח את המזבח ואת כל כליו ואת הכיר ואת כנו לקדשם	¹¹ καὶ ἔρρανεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἑπτάκις, καὶ ἔχρισεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτό, καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν λουτῆρα καὶ τὴν βάσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτά· καὶ ἔχρισεν τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν.
¹²ויצק משמן המשחה על ראש אהרן וימשח אתו לקדשו	¹² καὶ ἐπέχεεν Μωυσῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλαίου τῆς χρίσεως ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἀαρών, καὶ ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτόν.
¹⁰Then Moses took the anointing oil and anointed the tabernacle and all that was in it and consecrated them. ¹¹He sprinkled some of it on the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all its utensils, and the basin and its base, to consecrate them. ¹²He poured some of the anointing oil on Aaron's head and anointed him, in order to consecrate him.	¹⁰Then Moses took some of the anointing oil ¹¹and sprinkled some of it on the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and consecrated it and all its utensils, and the basin and its base, and consecrated them. And he anointed the tabernacle and all that was in it and consecrated it. ¹²Moses poured out some of the anointing oil on Aaron's head and anointed him and consecrated him.

_____

32. 6Q2 (6QpaleoLev) preserves some letters of 8:12, but they have no bearing on the transposition discussed here.

It is probable that the LXX attests a more original version and that the version attested by the MT and the related witnesses is the result of a later transposition. This is suggested by the ambiguous reference of the suffix in ממנו ("from it") in the MT 8:11. Although the singular masculine suffix can reasonably only refer to the sprinkled oil (שמן) of 8:10, in the current text of the MT the preceding singular masculine is the tabernacle (משכן), which obviously cannot have been the object of sprinkling. The problem is underlined by the use of בו "in it" in 8:10, which refers to the tabernacle. It would be very unlikely that the same author would, after referring to the tabernacle with the masculine singular suffix in 8:10, later refer to an earlier singular masculine. Leviticus 8:11 thus implies that the preceding singular masculine is the oil. The confusion was clearly caused by the secondary transposition in the proto-MT transmission.

The motive for this transmission was the apparent inconsistency of the older text. The anointing of the tabernacle "and all that was in it" (כל אשר בו) can be understood to include the altar and the basin. It would be illogical that the main constituent is mentioned last, when its parts and utensils have already been consecrated. It is thus more logical to mention the tabernacle first, and then continue by detailing some of its most important parts. This order of anointing is also met in Exod 40:9–11, and since Exod 40:12–15 continues with the anointing of Aaron, it is possible that the order of Exod has influenced Lev 8:10–12.[33]

The reason for the somewhat illogical older order, as preserved in the LXX, may be the later insertion of the altar and the basin, or of the tabernacle. Since the tabernacle can be seen to include them already, their insertion could be an addition that sought to increase detail, which would be a very typical tendency in the transmission of the priestly texts of the Pentateuch. Another, and perhaps a more probable possibility is the insertion of the tabernacle itself, for it is very rarely mentioned in Leviticus.[34] That the latter is the case is suggested by the slightly different use and understanding in consecrating the tabernacle. Whereas the altar, the basin, and Aaron are anointed *in order to be consecrated* (לקדש), the tabernacle

---

33. Clearly, the MT and LXX of 40 (and much of the rest of text in the final chapter of Exodus) differ considerably, and this applies to Exod 40:8–15 as well. Nevertheless, the order of anointing is shared by both versions.

34. Besides the current passage, it is only mentioned in Lev 15:31; 17:4; 26:11, while it is very common in Exodus, appearing fifty-six times, and in Numbers, appearing thirty-five times.

is anointed *and consecrated.* The latter procedure thus implies that anointing and consecrating are more separate rituals and that the pouring of the oil consecrated the object, while the former procedure implies that the anointing consecrated the object. Notably, Exod 40:9–11 seems to imply that pouring of oil anoints and consecrates, and in this passage this applies to all: tabernacle, altar, basin, its base, and Aaron. For example: ולקחת את שמן המשחה ומשחת את המשכן ואת כל אשר בו וקדשת אתו ואת כל כליו והיה קדש "Then you shall take the anointing oil, and anoint the tabernacle and all that is in it, and consecrate it and all its furniture, so that it shall become holy." It thus seems more likely that the tabernacle is a latecomer in Lev 8. Given that the text developed thus, the insertion of the tabernacle introduced a slightly different conception of how anointing and consecration are connected, and more importantly, it caused an inconsistency in the passage. In other words, if the tabernacle was secondarily inserted, it was inserted in a slightly odd place, as the version attested by the LXX indicates. The fact that in this version the anointing of the tabernacle is mentioned only after the anointing of the altar and the basin prompted a later editor of the proto-MT tradition to relocate it to a more logical place.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. An accidental transposition is not very likely since it is difficult to imagine how such a confusion could have happened without causing larger syntactical irregularities. Furthermore, the theological implications of the new location of the passage are rather evident. Against this background it is remarkable that most commentaries make no note of the variant order in the LXX, and thus imply the priority of the MT version.[35] However, it would be very difficult to find arguments for the priority of the MT version, because such a model would imply that in the LXX version mention of the tabernacle was secondarily transposed after the mention of its utensils.

---

35. See, e.g., Alfred Bertholet, *Leviticus*, KHAT 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901), 25; James Murphy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Leviticus* (Andover: Draper, 1874), 111–13; Martin Noth, *Das dritte Buch Mose: Leviticus*, ATD 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 54, 57; Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, trans. Douglas W. Stott, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 96–100. Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 344, has noted that 8:10b is missing in the LXX, but he seems to have failed to notice that it is found in 8:11.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The transposition that in all likelihood took place in the proto-MT transmission was an attempt to correct an inconsistency created by earlier editing. Although the content and presentation became more logical in the MT, the transposition created a grammatical problem with the masculine suffix in 8:11, which the editor either failed to notice or decided to accept. After transposing the unit in question the editor merely copied the older text as it had been. It is probable that the transposition was made when the entire manuscript was copied. It is possible that both the addition of the unit and its transposition were influenced by Exod 40:9–11. Inner-pentateuchal influences are very typical motives in the transmission and later editing of the Pentateuch. The transposition is methodologically significant since it again shows a case where a problem that was probably caused by an earlier editorial intervention occasioned further editing in a later stage in the transmission of the text.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the older version preserved in the LXX, the problem with the suffix could easily be detected, and one could thus come to the conclusion that the transposed unit is a latecomer in its current location in the MT. This would lead to the suspicion that it is a later addition, but it would be very difficult to disclose that it had, in fact, been transposed from another part of the passage. There is nothing to indicate that an older location of the tabernacle was after the altar and the basin, since the MT is more logical in this respect. However, the critic would not go completely astray, since the unit in question is probably a later addition in any case. In other words, although it would be very difficult to detect the transposition, the critic would have a very good chance of determining what is probably not part of the older text.

Results. The MT of Lev 8:10–11 is probably the result of a transposition, while the LXX preserves an older textual stage. The transposition seeks to correct an inconsistency caused by an earlier addition. The critic would not be able to detect the transposition, but would easily suspect that the anointing and consecration of the tabernacle in the MT version is a later addition.

10.5. Numbers 1 and 26

The Pentateuch contains several passages that list the tribes of Israel or their ancestral fathers. The lists contain some significant differences, especially the presence and absence of Levi (mostly missing) and Joseph's relation to his sons Manasseh and Ephraim (see Num 13:4–15; in the lists of Genesis Joseph's sons are missing, while in Numbers they are mostly mentioned). The order in which the tribes are presented also played an important role for some editors, since they differ and appear to have been intentionally changed in the transmission. Some of the changed orders can be seen in text-critical variants, two of which will be discussed.

Numbers 1:17–47 describes a census of the Israelites that lists the number of males over twenty in each tribe. In the MT the Gadites are listed third, after Simeon and before Judah (1:24–25), while in the LXX the Gadites are found after the Benjaminites and before the Danites in the latter part of the list (1:36–37). A similar variant in the placement of Gad is found in Num 26, which lists Israelite divisions according to their tribes. In the MT version Gad appears in 26:15–18, after Simeon and before Judah, while in the LXX the same section is found in 26:24–27 after Zebulun. Numbers 26 also contains another apparently related variant in the order of the tribes. Asher is found in different locations: in 26:28–31 MT and in 26:44–47 LXX. The SP, the targumim, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate follow the MT variants in both chapters. The Qumran fragments are indecisive in Num 1, but 4Q27 (4QNum^b) follows the MT order in Num 26.

1:17–51 MT	1:17–51 LXX	26:5–51 MT	26:5–51 LXX
Reuben	Reuben	Reuben	Reuben
Simeon	Simeon	Simeon	Simeon
Gad		**Gad**	
Judah	Judah	Judah	Judah
Issachar	Issachar	Issachar	Issachar
Zebulun	Zebulun	Zebulun	Zebulun
			Gad
			Asher
Ephraim	Ephraim	Manasseh	Manasseh
Manasseh	Manasseh	Ephraim	Ephraim
Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin
	Gad		
Dan	Dan	Dan	Dan
Asher	Asher	**Asher**	

The transpositions are illustrated in this chart (verse numbers according to the MT).

Num 1 MT	Num 1 LXX
17–23	17–23
24–25 (Gad)	
26–35	26–35
	24–25 (Gad)
36–47	36–47

Num 26 MT	Num 26 LXX
12–14	12–14
15–18 (Gad)	
19–23	19–23
24–27	15–18 (Gad)
28–31	44–47 (Asher)
32–43	32–43
44–47 (Asher)	
48–51	48–51

It is probable that the MT is more original than the LXX in both cases. This is suggested by the fact that in the MT Gad is met in an atypically early location of the list, which implies relative priority. It stands to reason that the LXX seeks to harmonize Gad's location in the list to correspond with his later location in other lists of Numbers, as illustrated in the chart of the sequences of tribes on the following page.

Gad's position in the MT of Num 1:17–51 and 26:5–51 clearly differs from others. It would be difficult to explain why the MT secondarily relocates Gad to the beginning of the list in these chapters but leaves his position untouched in other lists of Numbers. In similar lists in the rest of the Pentateuch (see chart on page 498), Gad is also met in a more posterior position than in these two lists of Numbers, which further corroborates the originality of the MT in Num 1 and 26.

1:5-16	1:17-51 MT	1:17-51 LXX	2:10-31	7:12-83	13:4-15	26:5-51 MT	26:5-51 LXX
Reuben	Reuben	Reuben	Judah	Judah	Reuben	Reuben	Reuben
Simeon	Simeon	Simeon	Issachar	Issachar	Simeon	Simeon	Simeon
	Gad		Zebulun	Zebulun		**Gad**	
Judah	Judah	Judah	Reuben	Reuben	Judah	Judah	Judah
Issachar	Issachar	Issachar	Simeon	Simeon	Issachar	Issachar	Issachar
Zebulun	Zebulun	Zebulun	**Gad**	**Gad**		Zebulun	Zebulun
			Levites				**Gad**
							Asher
Ephraim	Ephraim	Ephraim	Ephraim	Ephraim	Ephraim	Manasseh	Manasseh
Manasseh	Manasseh	Manasseh	Manasseh	Manasseh		Ephraim	Ephraim
Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin	Benjamin
		Gad					
Dan	Dan	Dan	Dan	Dan	Zebulun	Dan	Dan
Asher	Asher	Asher	Asher	Asher	Joseph	Asher	Asher
Gad					Dan		
Naphtali	Naphtali	Naphtali	Naphtali	Naphtali	Asher	Naphtali	Naphtali
					Naphtali		
					Gad		

Gen 29–30	Gen 35:23–26	Gen 46:8–25	Gen 49:3–27	Exod 1:2–4
Reuben	Reuben	Reuben	Reuben	Reuben
Simeon	Simeon	Simeon	Simeon	Simeon
	Levi	Levi	Levi	Levi
Judah	Judah	Judah	Judah	Judah
Dan	Issachar	Issachar	Zebulun	Issachar
Naphtali	Zebulun	Zebulun	Issachar	Zebulun
Gad	Joseph	**Gad**		Benjamin
Asher	Benjamin	Asher	Dan	Dan
Issachar	Dan	Joseph		Naphtali
Zebulun	Naphtali	Benjamin	**Gad**	**Gad**
Joseph	**Gad**	Dan	Asher	Asher
	Asher	Naphtali	Naphtali	
			Joseph	

Although there does not appear to be any comprehensive attempt to harmonize the orders throughout the Pentateuch or in Numbers, the particular problem in Num 1:17–51 and 26:5–51 may have been Gad's position before Judah. Gad was the son of Zilpah, Leah's handmaiden (Gen 30:10–11), which may have disturbed the editor to relocate him to a more posterior position. That Judah is the key here is suggested by the sequences in Num 2 and 7, where Judah has been placed at the beginning of the list, although he was only the fourth son of Jacob by Leah, which does not warrant a place at the top of the list. There was no need to change Gad's position in these chapters, because Judah was at the top of the list and Gad was thus after Judah in any case.[36]

The new locations in the LXX of Num 1:17–51 and 26:5–51 reveal further motives of the editor. In Num 1 Gad was placed after all of Jacob's sons by both of his wives Leah and Rachel, while in Num 26 he was placed after all of Jacob's sons by Leah. The editor thus implied that Jacob's sons by his wives were more important than his sons by the handmaids Zilpah and Bilhah. It is thus evident that the transpositions in the LXX were conducted on the basis of a hierarchical conception of Jacob's sons that depends on

---

36. This development is apparently assumed by Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*, 448–49, and his main argument is Num 2:14, which would have influenced Num 1; he also assumes that a similar change was made in Num 26 (p. 631). Gray, *Numbers*, 10, notes that the position of Gad in Num 2 may have influenced his position in Num 1, but apparently he does not assume that the LXX is text-critically more original than the MT in this respect.

Gen 29–30, which describes who gave birth to which son. Although some of the other lists may in fact have been drafted in contexts that were not directly linked with Gen 29–30, they could have been secondarily brought more in line with Gen 29–30.[37] The MT versions of Num 1 and 26 seem to be less affected from these chapters. It is probable that Asher was relocated in the same process and placed with Gad, because in several lists these two are met in adjacent positions.[38]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. The variant locations of Gad are clearly due to an intentional and purposeful transposition. Because the difference is found in two locations, it would be extremely difficult to explain how the variants could have emerged accidentally. The alternative that Gad had been intentionally elevated in the MT would be very difficult to explain. Gad does not have any special position in the Pentateuch or the rest of the Hebrew Bible that could motivate such an intervention. He is one of the least-mentioned sons of Jacob and he is mainly mentioned in the lists. A theoretical motive could be Num 2:10–31 where Gad is, like in Num 1:17–51, found after Simeon. One could argue that Num 1 and 2 were secondarily brought in line. However, this is unlikely because the order in Num 1:5–16 differs from both, and Num 1 and 2 also differ in many other respects, especially on the position of Judah. There seems to have been no attempt to harmonize the lists more comprehensively and the harmonization of Gad alone would be illogical. It is far more likely that the transposition of Gad was an isolated intervention that sought to correct perhaps the most disturbing issue in the list: a son of a handmaiden had been placed before Judah, who had become the most prominent of Jacob's sons.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. Because the transpositions affected larger parts of the lists in Num 1 and 26, it is very likely that they took place when the entire manuscript was reproduced. Although

---

37. The variants in the LXX are barely or only briefly mentioned in classic commentaries, which thus imply that the MT is assumed to be more original: Knobel, *Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 6–8; Dillmann, *Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 10; Paterson, *Numbers*, 41, 60; Holzinger, *Josua*, 1–3; Gray, *Numbers*, 10, 390–91.

38. This is always the case in the lists of Genesis, although according to Gen 30:10–13 they were of different mothers.

transposition as an editorial technique is not extensively common, we are dealing with a rather common editorial motive. It seeks to harmonize the text with other passages and bring it in line with developing conceptions, in this case with the emerging idea that Judah had a special position among the sons of Jacob. Nevertheless, there was no systematic attempt to harmonize the order of Jacob's sons, and thus, despite the fact that the same transposition took place in two lists, we are probably dealing with rather isolated editorial interventions. According to some scholars, the changes in the LXX were arbitrary, but this is certainly not the case here (if ever).[39]

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the text critical variants it would have been virtually impossible to detect the transpositions. The LXX sequence accords better with the order of Jacob's sons in other lists, and thus, paradoxically, the MT would more easily catch the critic's eye than the revised LXX version. Apart from detecting, however, the critic would be toothless to determine what was Gad's original position in the lists of Num 1 and 26.

Results. Numbers 1:24–25 and 26:15–18 provide evidence for transpositions. In the LXX version Gad was relocated to the latter half of the lists of Jacob's sons, while the MT preserves the more original text in this respect. The editorial intervention sought to reduce Gad's prominent position. Without the MT version it would not have been possible to detect the transpositions in the LXX version.

10.6. 1 Kings 11

First Kings 11 describes Solomon's sins and portrays them as the main reason for the division of the kingdom after his death. The repetitions and inconsistencies in 1 Kgs 11 imply heavy editing, some of which can also be observed in the recurrent variants between the MT and the LXX. The Old Greek of the chapter has not been established and there are several variants between the Greek manuscripts. It stands to reason that many of the inner-Greek variants were caused by later harmonization toward a proto-MT type text, while the Old Greek differed substantially from the

---

39. E.g., Dillmann, *Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 10, characterizes the text-critical variants as "willkürliche Umstellungen" in the LXX.

MT. Although the chapter is notoriously difficult from a text-critical perspective, it provides multiple clear examples of transpositions. Without trying to give a conclusive text-critical evaluation of the obviously difficult problems, some illustrative transpositions found in this chapter will be discussed here.

Since it seems very likely that both versions contain later editorial changes, a general characterization of one of the versions should be rejected; neither of the versions should be the sole text-critical starting point. Although one of the versions may eventually turn out to preserve more original variants, each variant needs to be determined on its own. Our analysis of 1 Kgs 11:11, 33–34, and 38–39 has shown that the LXX is in these cases more probably original, whereas the MT contains later additions.[40] Clearly, these conclusions should not have any bearing on evaluating the transposition variants discussed here, but they do cast a shadow on the assumption, represented by many scholars who have worked with 1 Kgs 11, that the Greek text generally represents a secondary version. Notably, many of these theories are heavily dependent on the allegedly more logical order of the LXX or the higher inconsistency of the MT, which would suggest the priority of the MT.[41]

Regardless of the priority of the versions concerning the variants, it is probable that most of them were already occasioned in the Hebrew transmission. Although some scholars have argued that a number of the differences could have been made by the Greek translator (e.g., Wevers) or by an editor of the transmitted Greek translation (e.g., Gooding), Talshir has convincingly shown that more probably already the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek differed considerably from the MT, which implies two essentially different Hebrew versions.[42]

---

40. See our analyses in §4.12, "1 Kings 11:33–34," and §4.13, "1 Kings 11:38–39."

41. In evaluating variants it is probable that in many cases the more logical or consistent text is the result of later polishing. This principle is used to evaluate variants in this volume also. Nevertheless, in 1 Kgs 3–12 this principle is often used in an ambiguous way, and the principle is also problematical here, since both versions are often inconsistent in some ways. It is important to discuss each case and its possible inconsistency or consistency separately.

42. Wevers, "Exegetical Principles," 300–322; David W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Text* 7 (1969): 1–29; Zipora Talshir, "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms—Origin and Revision: Case Study; The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11)," *Text* 21 (2002): 72–77.

First Kings 11 contains several transpositions. Regardless of which version is in each case assumed to be the more original one, the differences between the MT and LXX in this respect show that there is a particularly heavy concentration of transpositions in this chapter. Only 1 Kgs 11:1–3 and 11:43–12:3 will be discussed here in detail, but in order to illustrate the abundance of the phenomenon in this chapter the following chart summarizes the transpositions in its first ten verses:[43]

MT verses	LXX Sequence
1	1
2	3
3	2
4	4
5	6
6	8
7	5
8	7
9	9
10	10

In addition to these transpositions of entire verses, there are several smaller transpositions where sentences or words were relocated in one of the two versions. One example from 11:4 illustrates a typical case where the locations of two units were interchanged in one of the versions:

1 Kgs 11:4 MT	1 Kgs 11:4 LXX
ויהי לעת זקנת שלמה	καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν καιρῷ γήρους Σαλωμων
נשיו הטו את לבבו אחרי אלהים אֲחֵרִים	καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ αὐτοῦ
ולא היה לבבו שלם עם יהוה אלהיו	καθὼς ἡ καρδία Δαυιδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,
כלבב דויד אביו	καὶ ἐξέκλιναν αἱ γυναῖκες <u>αἱ ἀλλότριαι</u> τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω θεῶν <u>αὐτῶν</u>.

---

43. The verse numbering follows the MT. In other words, the LXX column on the right shows the actual order of verses in the LXX.

4 When Solomon was old, his wives turned away his heart after other gods; (and/for) his heart was not true to Yahweh his God, as was the heart of his father David.	4 When Salomon was old, his heart was not true to Yahweh, his God, as was the heart of his father David, and his foreign wives turned away his heart after their gods.

According to the MT, Solomon's old age led him to be persuaded by his wives, which is then seen as an indication that his heart was not true to Yahweh. This gives the impression that Solomon was more generally a sinner who could be led to serious sins and who did not match David in his piety and relationship with Yahweh. With the sentences in a different order, the LXX version presents Solomon's old age as the reason for not being true to Yahweh and for the worship of his women's gods as a consequence. In other words, in the LXX version Solomon is portrayed as a sinner in his old age, which implies that he had not been so in his youth. The MT thus presents a more coherent view of Solomon's impiety; it only became more apparent and serious in his old age.[44] The difference between the MT and LXX may be connected to the larger transposition in 1 Kgs 11:1–3, which will be discussed in more detail below. Regardless of which version is original in 11:4, the change must have been intentional since it sought to relativize (if the LXX is secondary) or sharpen (if the MT is secondary) Solomon's sin.

10.7. 1 Kings 11:1–3

First Kings 11:1–3 provides the background for Solomon sins that led to Israel's division: He was married to foreign wives who lured him to worship other gods. First Kings 11:3 of the MT, which mentions the number of his wives, is found embedded as part of 11:1 in the LXX[BL] as well as in the Ethiopic translation. Some Greek manuscripts, such as LXX[A], Targum Jonathan, the Peshitta, and the Armenian version follow the MT sequence. There are many other differences throughout these verses but they will not concern us here unless connected to the transposition. It is probable that the location in LXX[BL] goes back to the Old Greek, while LXX[A] and other Greek manuscripts are the result of a later harmonization toward a proto-MT sequence.

---

44. The relative age of the variants is debated, with the priority of both the MT and LXX finding defenders.

1 Kgs 11:1–4 MT	1 Kgs 11:1–4 LXX^B

<table>
<tr>
<td>

¹והמלך שלמה אהב נשים

נכריות רבות
ואת בת פרעה מואביות
עמוניות אדמית
צדנית חתית
²מן הגוים אשר אמר יהוה אל
בני ישראל לא תבאו בהם
והם לא יבאו בכם
אכן יטו את לבבכם
אחרי אלהיהם
בהם דבק שלמה לאהבה
³ויהי לו נשים שרות שבע מאות
ופלגשים שלש מאות
ויטו נשיו את לבו
⁴ויהי לעת זקנת שלמה
נשיו הטו את לבבו
אחרי אלהים אחרים
ולא היה לבבו שלם עם יהוה אלהיו
כלבב דויד אביו

</td>
<td>

¹Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων ἦν φιλογύ-
ναιος. καὶ ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἄρχουσαι
ἑπτακόσιαι καὶ παλλακαὶ τριακόσιαι.
καὶ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκας ἀλλοτρίας καὶ
τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω, Μωαβίτιδας,
Αμμανίτιδας, Σύρας καὶ Ιδουμαίας,
Χετταίας καὶ Αμορραίας,
²ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὧν ἀπεῖπεν κύριος τοῖς
υἱοῖς Ισραηλ Οὐκ εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς
αὐτούς, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς
ὑμᾶς, μὴ ἐκκλίνωσιν τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν
ὀπίσω εἰδώλων αὐτῶν, εἰς αὐτοὺς
ἐκολλήθη Σαλωμων τοῦ ἀγαπῆσαι.

⁴καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν καιρῷ γήρους Σαλωμων
καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία μετὰ
κυρίου θεοῦ αὐτοῦ καθὼς ἡ καρδία
Δαυιδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν
αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ ἀλλότριαι τὴν καρδίαν
αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω θεῶν αὐτῶν.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

¹King Solomon loved <u>many</u> foreign women and the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, <u>Sidonians</u>, Hittites, ²from the nations concerning which Yahweh had said to the Israelites, "You shall not enter into marriage with them, neither shall they with you; for they will surely incline your heart to follow their go<u>ds</u>"; Solomon clung to them in/for love. ³Among his wives were seven hundred princesses and three hundred concubines; <u>and his wives turned away his heart.</u> ⁴When Solomon was old, his wives turned away his heart after <u>other</u> gods; his heart was not true to Yahweh his God, as was the heart of his father David.

</td>
<td>

¹King Salomon was a philogynist. And he had seven hundred ruling women and three hundred concubines. ~~And he took~~ foreign women, and the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, <u>Syrians and</u> Idumeans, Hittites <u>and Amorites</u>, ²from the nations that Yahweh forbade to the sons of Israel: "You shall not go in to them, and they shall not go in to you, lest they turn away your hearts after their i<u>dols</u>"; Salomon clung to them in/for love. ⁴When Salomon was old his heart was not true to Yahweh, his God, as was the heart of his father David, and his <u>for-eign</u> wives turned away his heart after <u>their</u> gods.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

The location of the number of Solomon's wives, which is apparently connected with other text-critical variants, influences the way the king is portrayed. Whereas in the MT version the whole passage is about his illicit marriages to foreigners, the Old Greek distinguishes his many marriages with princesses and concubines from his marriages with foreigners. Placed before the sin, the marriages to princesses seem legitimate, and there is not yet any disapproval.

Several considerations suggest that 11:3 MT was secondarily transposed to its current location and that the Old Greek is more original in this respect.[45] The Greek version is well in line with the preceding chapter, which lists Solomon's mighty achievements. After a list of his great building projects, vast property, huge tax income, exotic objects, and large military, it would be logical to mention the great number of his wives as well. Many marriages to princesses in particular would be a sign of the king's magnificence. Considering the incredible number of wives (seven hundred plus three hundred) and the use of the word for princess (שרות; similarly in Greek ἄρχουσαι), the list was quite probably originally meant to glorify Solomon. This applies to the possible older source from which these passages are quoted as well as to the original author/editor who included the reference to Solomon's harem in Kings. It is thus very likely that its original location in Kings was with the list of Solomon's other achievements. In 11:3 it does not serve this purpose, because it is subordinated to the sin and it is separated from the list in 1 Kgs 10. If one assumes that 11:3 is the original location, one would have to explain why the author-editor even used such a source that glorifies Solomon for having many princesses, who in the narrative sequence (of the MT) only have a negative function for Solomon. This would be a contradictory motive from one author/editor. In contrast, the reference to the princesses fits well in the Old Greek text where it continues the list of Solomon's achievements in 1 Kgs 10, and where the foreignness of some of his wives is introduced as a separate topic. In the MT version the honor implied by the sheer number of princesses seems like a peculiar vestige that disturbs the whole intent of the

---

45. The priority of the Old Greek in this variant was represented by some scholars in early research, e.g., Kittel, *Könige*, 95; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 301; Benzinger, *Könige*, 77; and Gray, *I and II Kings*, 252 (with reservations and partly according to Montgomery's reconstructed text; see below), but more recent research has been prone to regard the Old Greek variant as a secondary development or to neglect it completely.

passage. If the section was original in 11:3, one would expect an emphasis on their foreignness and not on their *noble character* and great number, because in the MT version the whole passage is about foreign and illicit wives. It can thus be deduced that the contradiction in the MT version was occasioned by the transposition. If one assumes that the Old Greek is secondary, one would have to assume that the older version accidentally left an older vestige of Solomon's mighty deeds in an essentially negative portrayal of Solomon's marriage to foreign wives, and that this old vestige was secondarily restored to its more original function in the Old Greek version. This is an unlikely development. It seems more probable that the reference to the great number of wives was originally located in 11:1 and not in 11:3.

One can also see an evident theological reason for relocating the reference to the many wives in the MT version. The later transmission of Kings increasingly focused on the theological explanations of events, and Solomon's sin had a very central role in the theological interpretation of the composition of Kings: There would have to be a motive or a clear reason why the kingdom was divided. The MT version is theologically more coherent and avoids the ambiguity concerning Solomon's many wives. In the Old Greek version one first receives the impression that Solomon's many wives are a great and positive achievement, but then the account takes a surprising turn, as some of the wives lure Solomon to worship other gods. The MT version seems like an attempt to accommodate the ambiguity by portraying Solomon's philogyny as a bad thing from the start. This was thus an essentially theological change that severed Solomon's many wives from the list of his other achievements in 1 Kgs 10. In other words, since Solomon's philogyny eventually became the original cause for the breakup of the kingdom, an editor of the proto-MT transmission sought to harmonize the passage and reduce any ambiguity on Solomon's marriages, which is still apparent in the Old Greek version.

Some more technical considerations may also suggest that the MT version is the result of a secondary revision. The words "many foreigners," נכריות רבות (MT 11:1) read like a title or introduction to the passage that consistently presents Solomon's philogyny as a sin from the start. Its addition in the MT is probably connected to the transposition, for both develop the text in the same direction: they seek to present a more consistent view of Solomon's many wives. In contrast, if the Old Greek version would be the result of a transposition of 11:3 to 11:1, the removal of the word רבות "many" would be unmotivated and go against the tendency to

emphasize the many women that Solomon had. It is much more likely that the word was added to the MT than that it was omitted in the Old Greek or its *Vorlage*. That it is lacking in the Old Greek thus suggests that the location of the list of Solomon's many wives is original in the Greek version.[46]

It is also probable that 11:1 originally contained the verb לקח, "to take" (corresponding to the Greek ἔλαβεν), which is lacking in the MT due to the transposition in question. The use of the preposition מן in 11:2 suggests that the preceding verb was לקח instead of אהב; the verb אהב "to love," in the MT of 11:1 is awkwardly used in conjunction with מן. The sentence in the MT effectively reads אהב נשים נכריות רבות … מן הגוים "he loved many foreign women … *from* the (foreign) nations." Although not entirely impossible, the transposition of the section in question to 11:3 would explain the tautology (נכריות … הגוים) and the uncharacteristic and syntactically awkward expression. In comparison, in the Greek version the use of the preposition מן is more fluent: After a verb "to take" (ἔλαβεν > ויקח/לקח), the מן is logical and corresponds to a typical use: לקח נשים מן הגוים "he took wives from the nations." Moreover, the prohibition against taking foreign wives (לא תבאו בהם והם לא יבאו בכם) in 11:2 suggests that the preceding text referred to *taking* foreign wives and not merely loving them. It is hardly a coincidence that 1 Kgs 3:1 refers to Solomon *taking* Pharaoh's daughter as wife: ויקח את בת פרעה, whereas in 1 Kgs 11:1 MT it is said that he loved her.[47] The difference was caused by the transposition, whereas in the Old Greek both verses refer to Solomon taking Pharaoh's daughter. Consequently, the more original text probably read לקח נשים נכריות or ויקח נשים נכריות. When the number of Solomon's women was transposed to 11:3 in the MT and the title נכריות רבות "many foreigners" was added, the sentence became repetitive: Solomon *loved* foreign women and *took* foreign women, and therefore the latter could be omitted as unnecessary in the MT. To put it differently, the changes in the proto-MT

---

46. It should be noted that the Peshitta, which follows the MT order in having the number of women in 11:3, slightly differs from the MT here: For נשים נכריות רבות it reads ܢܫܐ ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܬܐ, which effectively is a different word order as the word for foreign is placed at the end. This difference could be an indication for the secondary insertion of the word נכריות. According to Uebershaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 30, this is a later interpretive change that has no bearing on the earlier textual history.

47. There may be a literary connection between 1 Kgs 3:1 and the original version of 1 Kgs 11:1 (cf. also 1 Kgs 9:16 according to which Pharaoh *gave* his daughter to Solomon).

508   Editorial Techniques in the Hebrew Bible

occasioned a merger of the more original אהב נשים and לקח נשים נכריות, and this led to the current sentence אהב נשים נכריות רבות. In contrast, the opposite direction of development where the sentence would have been divided into two and displaced in different locations would be much more complicated and seems not very likely.

One should further note that the MT version contains a disturbing repetition in 11:2, 3, and 4: אכן יטו את לבבכם אחרי אלהיהם < ויטו נשיו את נשיו הטו את לבבו < לבו, "they will surely incline your heart to follow their *gods*" > "his wives turned away his heart" > "his wives turned away his heart after other gods." This can hardly be original, and editors often seek to connect later additions with the older text by repeating its elements. This technique can be observed in many additions. The addition of the sentence ויטו נשיו את לבו can thus be evaluated as an accommodating addition that was added with the transposed sentences, and it also discloses the main motive of the editor who revised the proto-MT version: the many wives Solomon had turned his heart away from Yahweh, while in the Old Greek version the existence of many wives as such is not seen as a problem. The disturbing repetition thus implies that 11:3 is intrusive in its present location and hardly original.

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. A majority of scholars since early on have argued that the Old Greek version is generally, although not in every detail, more secondary than the MT in this passage.[48] The main force of this position is the allegedly more logical sequence of the Old Greek version and the more repetitive MT: The Old Greek version would be the result of later smoothing. For example, Talshir (similarly Van Keulen) notes: "In the LXX version … most of the problems characteristic of the MT version have disappeared."[49] The main motive for the change would have been the too negative portrayal of Solomon, which

---

48. Böttcher, *Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testamente*, 2:93; Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings,* 121; Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 132; Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11*, 548–52; Jan Joosten, "Empirical Evidence and Its Limits: The Use of the Septuagint in Retracing the Redaction History of the Hebrew Bible," in Müller and Pakkala, *Insights into Editing*, 252–53. Some scholars, such as Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 153; and Knauf, *1 Könige 1–14*, 318–19, merely note the different order in the LXX, but imply that it must be secondary, while others, such as Cogan, *1 Kings*, 325–27, make no note of the variant and only discuss the MT reading.

49. Talshir, "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms ," 71–105. Similarly Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 202–21, who also refers to Talshir's work.

the Old Greek would seek to lessen. According to Bernhard Stade, the
LXX is the result of removing some of the congestions of the MT and
"placing the general statement before the details."[50] These considerations
are fair and explain why so many scholars have regarded the Old Greek
as secondary. However, they are outweighed by reverse arguments. The
MT is syntactically and from the narrative point of view less coherent, but
theologically it is more coherent, for it portrays Solomon's marriages as a
sin from the start and paints a remarkably consistent picture related to this
topic: והמלך שלמה אהב נשים נכריות רבות "And king Solomon loved many
foreign women" serves as a perfect title for the following description, and
Solomon's large harem is depicted as a consequence of his love of *foreign*
women. The Old Greek, by contrast, does not suggest from the outset that
Solomon's harem consisted of foreigners, and it raises the somewhat pecu-
liar impression that Solomon, in addition to the one thousand women
in his harem, took further women of foreign origin. This is a much less
coherent image than the programmatic description in 1 Kgs 11:1 MT. The
theological coherence of the MT had been reached by creating a somewhat
awkward syntax and redundancy, but the overall description of Solomon's
sin is substantially more consistent. These levels need to be distinguished.
This also shows that arguments related to narrative logic are tricky and
should only be used in conjunction with other considerations.

The more congested MT can be used to argue against its priority, for
the congestions were caused by editing in any case. It is rather evident that
the repetitions in 11:2, 3, and 4, discussed above, cannot derive from one
author and can only be explained as the result of rather heavy editing. The
question is whether this congestion was partly caused by the transposition
or earlier editing. In arguing for the priority of the MT on the basis of its
congestions, one then has to assume that there was an older and smoother
version of the passage that was later edited. In other words, although the
Old Greek version may syntactically be somewhat smoother than the MT
in these verses, one would have to assume that its smoothness was caused
later. It is thus problematic to use the argument of smoothness against
the Old Greek but still imply that there had been an earlier smoother but
unknown version. Moreover, one should not exaggerate the smoothness
of the Old Greek version; the congestions are apparent in both versions,
which undermines that syntactical smoothing and removal of repetitions

---

50. Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings*, 121.

had been a central motive for the changes in one of the versions. There is little evidence that the Old Greek of Kings was a particularly smoothed version, for most of the repetitions and congestions found throughout the book are shared by both versions (see, e.g., 2 Kgs 17; 23).

If the Old Greek seeks to harmonize and smooth repetitions in 1 Kgs 11, it would have been left halfway, since the repetition remains between 11:2 and 4. Similar roughness can also be seen in the Old Greek 11:5–8, and partly the MT is more consistent here. Moreover, smoothness and roughness of a text can be used as an argument for both directions. For example, Immanuel Benzinger argued *against* the priority of the MT because it was, in his view, more repetitive and congested.[51] Both tendencies can be observed in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible: Later additions can cause unnecessary repetition and other peculiarities, but later editors may also smooth a text. A general characterization of a witness to such effect is possible only if there is wide evidence that a particular witness is generally known to smooth the text, but this is not the case with the Old Greek of Kings. It is recognized as a very faithful translation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* and despite many repetitions and inconsistencies in the MT, it mostly stands rather close to the MT. It is methodologically important that the Old Greek, or any other version, is first shown to be a smoothed version before it can be used as a weighty argument to evaluate individual variants.[52] Otherwise we are arguing in circles.

Zipora Talshir has convincingly shown that 11:3 is disturbing in its current place, whereas the Old Greek version, where the same information is found in 11:1, is less disturbing. She assumes that the disturbance was caused by the use of an external source, but she rejects the possibility of a theologically motivated transposition in the MT, which could also cause the narrative disturbance. The theory of using a source when 11:3 of the MT was originally written is less probable, because it is difficult to explain why such a source that contradicts the main theological aim of the passage (as it is portrayed in the MT) was used in the first place. Talshir assumes that 11:3a was taken from the external source and that the source was expanded by 11:3b (ויטו נשיו את לבו) "in the spirit of Deuteronomy" before it was added to 1 Kgs 11. However, it would be a coincidence that 11:3 contained an almost identical sentence as one found in the new loca-

---

51. Benzinger, *Könige*, 77.

52. Clearly, this does not exclude the possibility of smoothing in some passages if the passage provides clear arguments in its favor.

tion where it was placed. If Talshir means a source that was added later in the transmission process—this is not clear—then an obvious candidate for the source would be 11:1! Paradoxically, the arguments that Talshir put forward in favor of the source-theory in fact speak for the priority of the Old Greek version, a theory that she later rejects because she assumed that it is not as congested as the MT. This is illogical because the main congestion in these verses is caused by 11:3, which she assumes is an intruder in its location. By rejecting 11:1 as the original location of MT 11:3, Talshir and others assume that 11:3 was first added to its current location in the MT from an unknown source and later removed in the Old Greek version to a less disturbing location in 11:1.[53] The alternative to this would be to assume that the less disturbing location in 11:1 is original, but it would have been moved to 11:3 for theological purposes: to show a consistent picture of Solomon's philogyny. The priority of the MT thus implies a more complicated development and inconsistent evaluation of smoothness as an indicator for originality.

One further challenge to the theory presented here needs to be discussed in detail. Much depends on the sentence ויקח נשים נכריות, which probably was part of the Old Greek *Vorlage* of 11:1. There are two alternative theories to the here-presented view that the sentence was partly left out when the transposition was made in the proto-MT transmission, as argued above. According to the first suggestion, when 11:3 was transposed to 11:1 in the Old Greek or its *Vorlage*, the sentence had to be created in order to distinguish between the number of Solomon's wives in general and the illicit marriages to foreign wives. This theory seems unlikely, because of the above-discussed problem with the preposition מן and because of the ensuing prohibition to take foreign wives. Moreover, it does not give an adequate explanation for the Old Greek reading. It implies that אהב נשים נכריות רבות would have been secondarily split into two sentences in the Old Greek (on its *Vorlage*), namely, לקח נשים נכריות and אהב נשים רבות (or to their Greek equivalents). In other words, a theory that the Greek is harmonizing or smoothing in the passage would here have to assume an opposite tendency. It is more likely that the MT secondarily merged the sentences in order to do away with the idea that Solomon's general love of women was unconnected with their foreignness.

_____

53. Talshir, "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms," 71–105.

Another alternative, represented by Charles F. Burney, is to assume that ויקח נשים נכריות was *accidentally* omitted in the MT version "through homoioteleuton," whereby the issue of transposition is extinguished from this sentence.[54] In his reconstruction the original text of 11:1 began as follows: והמלך שלמה אהב נשים ויקח נשים נכריות רבות "King Solomon loved women and took many foreign women." Although the reconstruction is possible, the initial sentence והמלך שלמה אהב נשים hangs in the air, as the passage would then be only about the sinful foreign marriages. In the Old Greek the sentence has a clear function: because he loved women so much, he took so many women. Burney's theory also assumes that the reference to the number of wives was originally a marginal note that was secondarily placed in different places in the MT and Old Greek transmissions.[55] The theory implies that the other variants in the passage would be unconnected to this issue, but this seems unlikely. Although such movable units are possible, as shown and discussed by Julio Trebolle Barrera, here the theory would have to assume an accidental omission. Burney's theory offers no advantage to a secondary transposition in the MT as suggested here.

According to Frank Ueberschaer, the passage in question may be in its "original" location in both MT and Old Greek versions, and it may be a wrong approach to determine the genetic relationship between the two versions. To some extent his view is like that of Burney, but at the background of Ueberschaer's position is a partly different model of how biblical traditions were transmitted.[56] Ueberschaer notes that since Solomon is condemned in the Old Greek as well, it is unlikely that LXX tradition would rearrange the text with the motive to reduce his sins. Indeed, Ueberschaer rightly notes that the Old Greek version partly increases the criticism of Solomon, for example, in the changed terminology (gods [אלהים] are in 11:5–6 translated as idols, βδέλυγμα or εἴδωλον) and in rendering the neutral verb אמר "to say" with the stronger ἀπεῖπεν "to forbid" in 11:2.[57] With these changes the Old Greek portrays Solomon in a more negative light

---

54. Burney, *Notes*, 154.

55. Burney, *Notes*, 154 writes: "The mention of the number of wives and concubines v. 3ᵃ is no part of the original account, but is an addition from the margin which has come into MT and LXX in a different position, and thus to some extent accounts for their variation in arrangement."

56. See discussion in ch. 1, "Introduction," in this volume.

57. Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 32–33.

than the MT, which goes against the assumption that the Old Greek version sought to avoid an overtly negative picture of Solomon, as argued by many. Ueberschaer thus concludes that the MT cannot be more original than the Old Greek. However, this does not lead him to assume the priority of the Old Greek version, for he simultaneously adopts Percy van Keulen's arguments against the priority of the Old Greek.[58] Therefore, Ueberschaer concludes that neither version can be more original than the other. We have seen that the position by van Keulen and Talshir is far from certain and that the priority of the Old Greek is more probable.

Methodologically it is significant that the lack of strong evidence for one of the textual witnesses leads Ueberschaer to assume an oral-written transmission where the textual position of the notice in question was not yet fixed.[59] Although an oral transmission of some biblical traditions is certainly possible, in this case the suggestion cannot be substantiated by any evidence. It remains merely a conjecture of a difficult *textual* problem, because what we have are two varying textual witnesses. Assuming an oral transmission as an explanation for a textual problem effectively places the whole issue beyond the possibilities of analysis, because the oral transmission is uncertain. Although there are certainly textual problems in the Hebrew Bible that may be explained with the peculiarities of oral transmission, in the case of 1 Kgs 11:1–3 Ueberschaer rejects a textual solution and the priority of the Old Greek too lightly and because the evidence allegedly points in the opposing direction. His theory also implies that the other editorial changes in the text are unconnected from the issue of transposition, but this is unlikely, for it is evident that either one of the versions has sought to revise the image of Solomon, and the location of the reference to his many wives is central to this question. It should be noted that Ueberschaer uses 1 Kgs 11:1–3 as one of the main examples for the assumed oral-written transmission, but based on our analysis, this assumption cannot be substantiated and there are no clear reasons for assuming such a theory.

Jan Joosten has presented further considerations against the priority of the Old Greek version. According to him, "the psychologizing meaning of the verb 'to love' ('Solomon loved women') in the first clause of the Old Greek edition seems to reflect a later period than the more practical

---

58. See Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 33; and Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 209.

59. Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 34, 43.

meaning in the MT."[60] However, nothing speaks against the assumption that the Greek Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων ἦν φιλογύναιος "King Salomon *was a philogynist*" was translated from והמלך שלמה אהב נשים "King Solomon loved women," and the implications of this Greek translation have to be differentiated from the meaning of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Furthermore, arguments like these are tricky, since we do not know the historical contexts of the texts in question, and the psychology of loving in ancient Israel and early Judaism is poorly known.[61] Joosten further notes that "the presence of a kind of *Wiederaufnahme* in the LXX edition—'and he took women…'—suggests that it was produced on the basis of the proto-Masoretic text. The Septuagint's *Vorlage* is a more balanced text, but this is probably due to secondary smoothing."[62] Joosten's consideration of a possible *Wiederaufnahme* can also be reversed, for the sentence is a necessary element to introduce the turn in the narrative. Its omission can be explained as a result of the transposition in the MT where this turn was not needed anymore (see above).

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. The MT 11:3 was transposed from 11:1 in order to remove the separate idea that Solomon loved women in general, which was originally presented in a positive light to glorify the king. The transposition created a theologically more coherent passage as it portrays Solomon's philogyny as an entirely negative issue from the start, whereas in the older version, as preserved in the OG, the reference to the great number of wives is still separated from their foreignness and therefore from the issue of sin. The transposition was essentially a theologically motivated editorial intervention that sought to sharpen and clarify the theological function of Solomon's many wives. Because of the theologically motivated revision, the MT version became syntactically more congested. It stands to reason that the transposition in 11:4 is also connected to the same revision, for in the MT version Solomon is more coherently presented as a sinner (see above in the general introduction to 1 Kgs 11).

---

60. Joosten, "Empirical Evidence and Its Limits," 253.

61. E.g., some texts in Genesis (e.g., 29:18, 30) also use the verb אהב in a similar way—whether in a "psychologizing" meaning can be debated—but one should be cautious of using this for dating or making any text- or literary critical conclusions about it.

62. Joosten, "Empirical Evidence and Its Limits," 253.

It is probable that the transposition was made when the entire scroll was copied, for it would be difficult—although not completely impossible—to technically transpose a passage in an existing manuscript. Moreover, the transposition is connected with other changes that were needed in order to create the new version, which thus implies a rather comprehensive intervention and revision of the older text. The following changes were also made in the process of the transposition: In 11:1 the phrase ויקח נשים "and he took women" was omitted, the adjective רבות "many" was added, the phrases אהב נשים "he loved women" and נכריות רבות "many foreign-ers" were merged to form the single sentence והמלך שלמה אהב נשים נכריות רבות "And King Solomon loved many foreign women," and in 11:3 the sentence ויטו נשיו את לבו "and his wives turned away his heart" was added.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Without the two clearly different versions it would still be evidently clear that both versions are the result of editing in their earlier transmission. In fact, a critical reader would suspect editorial interventions throughout 1 Kgs 11. The small signs discussed above would suggest that 11:3 was added later to its current location, and especially the threefold repetition in the MT would be a strong indicator that 11:2–4 cannot have been originally written by one author. One could even suspect that 11:3 derives from an external source, since its emphasis on the great number of princesses partly contradicts the negative tone of the MT passage (cf. Talshir's suggestion above). However, on the basis of the MT version it would have been nearly impossible to conclude that 11:3 was transposed from another location in the passage, let alone from 11:1. The reason for this are the other accommodating changes that effectively concealed the original location in 11:1. In other words, although 11:3 may be detectable as an addition in its present location, on the basis of the MT alone it would have been impossible to reconstruct the older text, as preserved in the Old Greek version, and to determine all the different kinds of scribal changes that accompanied the transposition.

Results. The MT of 1 Kgs 11:3 is probably the result of a secondary transposition from 11:1. This version provides a theologically more coherent picture on Solomon's many wives: they were foreigners and a source of sin from the start, because they led to idolatry and thus to the division of Israel. Without the older version, as preserved in the LXX, it would have been possible to detect that 11:3 is not original in its context, but it would have been exceedingly difficult to determine that it was transposed from 11:1.

10.8. 1 Kings 11:43–12:3

Repeated variants and considerable text-critical problems continue in 1 Kgs 12, where the MT and LXX differ even more than in chapter 11. Without trying to solve the many text-critical problems in any comprehension, we will discuss a significant transposition in 1 Kgs 11:43–12:3, which further illustrates the phenomenon and improves our understanding of the technique.[63] As in the previous example, the transposition has essential impact on the way the person in question—in this case Jeroboam—is presented. The transposition is also connected to a plus in the MT (underlined below). According to the MT version, Jeroboam returns from Egypt after Rehoboam went to Shechem where he is to be made king; the Israelites then summon Jeroboam to be their spokesperson in their discussion with Rehoboam. In the LXX, however, Jeroboam returns from Egypt immediately after he hears of Solomon's death, and Jeroboam is not portrayed as a spokesperson for the Israelites.

1 Kgs 11:43–12:3 MT	1 Kgs 11:43–12:3 LXX^B
ⁱⁱ:⁴³וישכב שלמה עם אבתיו <u>ויקבר</u> בעיר דוד אביו	¹¹:⁴³καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Σαλωμων μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, <u>καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν</u> ἐν πόλει Δαυιδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.
	¹²:²καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς ἤκουσεν Ιεροβοαμ υἱὸς Ναβατ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἔτι ὄντος ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ὡς ἔφυγεν ἐκ προσώπου Σαλωμων καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, <u>κατευθύνει καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν Σαριρα τὴν ἐν ὄρει Εφραιμ. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων ἐκοιμήθη μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ</u>, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Ροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ.
¹²:¹וילך רחבעם שכם כי שכם בא כל ישראל להמליך אתו	¹²:¹Καὶ πορεύεται βασιλεὺς Ροβοαμ εἰς Σικιμα, ὅτι εἰς Σικιμα ἤρχοντο πᾶς Ισραηλ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτόν.
²ויהי כשמע ירבעם בן נבט	

---

63. There are many Greek variants, which may be due to later harmonizations toward a proto-MT type text. E.g., the death of Solomon is mentioned twice in most Greek manuscripts, but this is hardly original. In any case, it seems clear that the Old Greek order of events clearly differed from the MT in these verses.

<div dir="rtl">

וְהוּא עוֹדֶנּוּ בְמִצְרָיִם
אֲשֶׁר בָּרַח מִפְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה
<u>וַיֵּשֶׁב יָרָבְעָם בְּמִצְרָיִם</u>
<u>³וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ וַיִּקְרְאוּ לוֹ וַיָּבֹאוּ יָרָבְעָם וְכָל קְהַל</u>
<u>יִשְׂרָאֵל</u> וַיְדַבְּרוּ אֶל רְחַבְעָם לֵאמֹר
⁴אָבִיךָ הִקְשָׁה אֶת עֻלֵּנוּ ...

</div>

³καὶ ἐλάλησεν <u>ὁ λαὸς</u> πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα
Ροβοαμ λέγοντες
⁴Ὁ πατήρ σου ἐβάρυνεν τὸν κλοιὸν ἡμῶν
…

---

¹¹:⁴³Solomon slept with his ancestors and <u>was buried</u> in the city of his father David;	¹¹:⁴³And Salomon slept with his fathers, and <u>they buried him</u> in the city of his father David. ¹²:²When Jeroboam son of Nebat heard of it—and he was still in Egypt, since he fled from before Salomon and settled in Egypt—<u>he went straight and came to his city in the land of Sarira which is in the hill country of Ephraim</u>. And King Salomon slept with his fathers,
and his son Rehoboam succeeded him. ¹²:¹Rehoboam went to Shechem, for all Israel had come to Shechem to make him king. ²When Jeroboam son of Nebat heard of it—for he was still in Egypt, where he had fled from King Solomon—<u>then Jeroboam returned from Egypt.</u>	¹¹:⁴³and his son Rehoboam ruled in his stead. ¹²:¹King Rehoboam went to Shechem, for all Israel was coming to Shechem to make him king.
³And they sent and called him; and Jeroboam and all the assembly of Israel came and said to Rehoboam, ⁴"Your father made our yoke heavy.…"	³The people spoke to Rehoboam the king, saying, ⁴"Your father made our yoke heavy.…"

The following considerations suggest that the MT version is the result of a secondary revision that included a transposition. In the Greek version Jeroboam logically returns to his homeland after Solomon, who had tried to kill him, dies. Jeroboam is presented as someone who is afraid for his life, and there appears to be no value judgment on his return home. In the MT version, however, he only returns when the people start looking for a new king, which implies his interest in the kingship. That he is also presented as the spokesperson for the Israelites in their negotiations with Rehoboam further strengthens this impression. To increase the evilness of certain kings in the later transmission is a logical and commonly known development in the Hebrew Bible. It is also understandable that the initiator of the great sin of the Northern King-

dom (1 Kgs 12:26–33) would be portrayed in a darker light in the later
transmission, while the opposite direction of development—the reduc-
tion of Jeroboam's malicious intent, which would have to be implied if
the LXX is regarded as secondary—is difficult to imagine. That the MT
version is the result of a sharpened criticism of the north is also seen
in the plus in 12:3, according to which "all the assembly of Israel" (כל
קהל ישראל) summons Jeroboam and asks him to become Israel's repre-
sentative. This plus implies positive disposition of the Israelites toward
Jeroboam and their endeavor to promote him. In other words, the MT
version highlights not only Jeroboam's sin but also that of the Israelites.
That we are dealing with a later addition in the MT is implied by a simi-
lar reference in 1 Kgs 12:20, according to which the Israelites only now
hear about Jeroboam's return:

1 Kgs 12:20	1 Kgs 12:3aαβ
ויהי כשמע כל ישראל כי שב ירבעם וישלחו ויקראו אתו אל העדה	וישלחו ויקראו לו ויבאו ירבעם וכל קהל ישראל
When all Israel heard that Jeroboam had returned, they sent and called him to the assembly	They sent and called him, and Jeroboam and all the assembly of Israel came.

After 12:3aαβ MT the reference in 12:20 is illogical, which implies that
12:3aαβ is a latecomer in the passage and was not present when 12:20 was
written. On the basis of a literary correspondence (וישלחו ויקראו) between
the verses, 12:20 may even have influenced the plus in 12:3. It is under-
standable that a later editor would have increased the active role of the
Israelites to separate from Judah and to stand behind Jeroboam, while
the opposite direction of development would be much more difficult to
explain. One should also note that in the MT the community of Israel (כל
קהל ישראל) and Jeroboam are explicitly mentioned as the subjects, while
the LXX version is more neutral and only the people address Rehoboam.
The version attested by the LXX generally implies a more neutral portrayal
of the north, while the MT is more tendentious and gives the impression
that Jeroboam and the Israelites plan to revolt against the Davidic dynasty
from the start. The more neutral account is more logical in view of what
follows: It is Rehoboam's harsh attitude toward the people that causes the
Israelites to abandon him, and ultimately at the background lies the deci-

sion of Yahweh to divide the kingdom.[64] The changes in the MT, which were probably caused by a theological motive to increase the guilt of Jeroboam and of the north, confuse this narrative logic. Consequently, it is probable that the LXX is, in this variant, more original than the MT, and this position has also been assumed by many scholars since early research and by others in more recent research.[65]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. Some scholars assume that the MT version of 1 Kgs 11:43–12:3 is generally more original than the LXX. David Gooding has presented arguments that the LXX version is the result of a secondary change.[66] It is important to highlight his basic assumption in evaluating the passage, for according to him, the LXX shows "special interest in matters of timetable" so that it "is quite prepared to alter the order of its subject matter so as to make its details follow one another in a pedantically logical time-sequence." For this reason, he would accept the order of the LXX "only if it can stand up to the most rigorous scrutiny."[67] This is methodologically problematic. LXX's special interest in timetable is not commonly acknowledged and it would be difficult to take it as the main criterion to evaluate text-critical variants. With this starting point in mind, David Gooding then assumes that the LXX version pedantically seeks to present Jeroboam returning "immediately upon the death of Solomon." This motive would have occasioned changes in the passage, and the ultimate goal would have been to "whitewash" Jeroboam.[68] It

---

64. Similarly, Matthieu Richelle, "The Relevance of the Septuagint for the Reconstruction of the History of Ancient Israel," in *Die Septuaginta: Geschichte—Wirkung—Relevanz; 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.–24. Juli 2016*, ed. M. Meiser et al., WUNT 405 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), ch. 2.2. He also provides some additional arguments in favor of the priority of the LXX version.

65. For early research, see Stade and Schwally, *Books of Kings,* 127; Gray, *I and II Kings*, 278–279; Burney, *Notes*, 173; Kittel, *Könige*, 102. Thus also Montgomery, *Kings*, 248, but his position is somewhat unclear, since he does not seem to comment on the transposition, but only notes that the LXX is more original in 1 Kgs 12:3. For more recent research, see Würthwein, *1. Könige 1–16*, 150; and Richelle, "Relevance of the Septuagint," ch. 2.2.

66. David W. Gooding, "The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *VT* 17 (1967): 180–81.

67. Gooding, "Septuagint's Rival Versions," 173.

68. Gooding, "Septuagint's Rival Versions," 186–89.

nevertheless remains unclear what would have been the reason for white-washing a person who introduced the main sin of the Northern Kingdom. Gooding presents a possible explanation for the LXX changes, if it would indeed be secondary in relation to the MT. Perhaps the clearest argument against the priority of the LXX version is his suggestion that 1 Kgs 11:27 ("Jeroboam lifted his hands against the king") "indicates treasonable act of rebellion." On this basis Gooding argues that the allegedly whitewashed portrayal of 11:43–12:3 LXX contradicts the generally negative position of the text concerning Jeroboam; the story is about a planned rebellion. This argument is problematic and to some extent also exemplary of how Gooding evaluates the text-critical variants. The most common argument *against* the primacy of the LXX in 1 Kgs 11–12 is exactly its alleged more consistent presentation of the events, and the same argument is also used by Gooding, although he stresses the chronological consistency. This high-lights the problems of using consistency as an argument. Other than this, his article presents very few arguments in favor of the assumption that the MT is more original in 1 Kgs 11:43–12:3.

Some scholars merely assume that the reference to Jeroboam's return is a late intrusion, while others imply that despite the problems of the MT the LXX is not to be preferred.[69] The text in question regardless of its loca-tion may well be a later addition, but it still probably is more original in one of the locations.

Frank Ueberschaer has argued, not unlike in 1 Kgs 11:1–3, that the passage is a movable unit, the priority of which cannot be determined, but here he takes even more strongly the oral aspect of transmission as the starting point of evaluation. He notes that the problem cannot be text-critically evaluated, and that the passage was not transposed but orally transmitted and later placed in different locations in different traditions.[70]

---

69. Thus Montgomery, *Kings*, 248–249, and Benzinger, *Könige*, 87. The latter also notes that the LXX version is not to be preferred here, but he does not provide any arguments for this. Sweeney, *I and II Kings*, 162, 164, 168, notes the variant but he does not evaluate which one could be more original.

70. Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 69–70, writes: "Welche der verschiedenen Überlieferungen ursprünglich ist, ist keine Frage der Textkritik, sondern muss literarkritisch und überlieferungsgeschichtlich geklärt werden; textkritisch ist der mittlere Teil von V 43 LXX mit Ausnahme des Satzes כי מת שלמה jedenfalls gut zu rekonstruieren. So schließt das Kap. 11, wie es begonnen hat: mit einem Beispiel schriftlich-mündlicher Überlieferung. Denn die Sätze gehören zweifellos zwar nicht in ihrer exakten Formulierung, wohl aber ihrem Inhalt nach zu

Although this explanation cannot be excluded, the clear connection with other changes in the MT version (especially the plus in 1 Kgs 12:3) and the obviously intended presentation of Jeroboam strongly suggest an editorial intervention of a literary nature.[71] In effect, Ueberschaer's theory fails to recognize and explain the connection of the transposition with the other changes that were made in the passage. We have seen the same problem with his theory in 1 Kgs 11:1–3. The transposed passage is not identical and regardless of primacy, the texts are essentially dependent on their current contexts. For example, the MT plus in 1 Kgs 12:3 is obviously connected to the transposition.[72]

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. It is clear that the transposition discussed here was intentional and probably part of a revision of the text where an editor in the proto-MT transmission sought to portray Jeroboam in a more negative light. In addition to the transposition, the editor added a note that Jeroboam was the clear leader of the rebellion against Rehoboam. The transposition also necessitated the omission of a reference to Jeroboam going to his hometown Sarira, which was rendered superfluous after the main motive for Jeroboam's return was changed into opposing Rehoboam in Shechem. We are thus not dealing with an isolated editorial intervention but intentional changes, which—in view of other changes in 1 Kgs 11–12—could be characterized as a kind of comprehensive redaction where the text was revised to accommodate certain theological conceptions. Contrary to conventionally assumed redactions, however, the editor who created the revised version had a variety of techniques in the toolbox, including additions, transpositions, and omissions. Considering the size and nature of the changes, it is clear that the revision could not have been conducted without copying the entire manuscript.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. Although editing throughout 1 Kgs 11–12 is evident in both versions, without access to the LXX version it

---

einem alten Überlieferungsbestand, der sich bei der Zusammenstellung der Texte an unterschiedlichen Orten niedergeschlagen hat."

71. Ueberschaer, *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie*, 69–70.

72. Another example: That Jeroboam goes to his hometown Sarira is necessarily connected to the location of the account of his return. If Jeroboam returns upon hearing about the imminent crowning of Rehoboam as king, there is no reason to go to his hometown.

would have been very difficult to detect that 1 Kgs 12:2 was relocated in the transmission. The MT presents a coherent narrative in this respect, and there would have been very little reason to suspect that 12:2 was originally placed before Rehoboam goes to Shechem. As in the previous case in 1 Kgs 11:1–3, our chances of reconstructing the original location of transposed units are clearly limited. The plus in 1 Kgs 12:3 would be easier to detect as an addition, since it contradicts 12:20, which partly contains a very similar reference. First Kings 12:20 implies that the people had not yet heard of Jeroboam's return.

Results. Jeroboam's return from Egypt in the MT of 1 Kgs 12:2 was originally mentioned immediately after the reference to Solomon's death and burial in 1 Kgs 11:34. The MT version is the result of a theological revision and transposition, which seeks to increase Jeroboam's evilness by portraying him as someone who mainly plans to seize royal power. A more original version is found in the LXX, which is more neutral in its portrayal of Jeroboam. Although editing is evident in both versions, without the LXX version it would have been nearly impossible to detect that 1 Kgs 12:2 was transposed, let alone identify its original location.

10.9. Jeremiah 28:5 (Jeremiah 35:5 LXX)

Jeremiah 28 (Jer 35 LXX) describes the confrontation between Jeremiah and the prophet Hananiah. The chapter contains repeated differences between the MT and LXX version, most of which are notable pluses in the MT (for example in vv. 3–4). Our interest focuses on verse 5 where the MT and LXX present the priests and people in different order. Targum Jonathan, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate follow the MT. Some Greek manuscripts also follow the MT order, but probably due to a later harmonization, the Old Greek thus essentially differing from the MT. The verse is not preserved among the Qumran manuscripts.

Jer 28:5(–6) MT	Jer 35:5(–6) LXX
ויאמר ירמיה <u>הנביא</u> אל חניה <u>הנביא</u>	καὶ εἶπεν Ιερεμίας πρὸς Ανανίαν
לעיני הכהנים	κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ
ולעיני כל העם	καὶ κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν ἱερέων
העמדים בבית יהוה	τῶν ἑστηκότων ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου

⁵The <u>prophet</u> Jeremiah spoke to the <u>prophet</u> Hananiah in the presence of the priests and in the presence of all the people who stood in the house of Yahweh; ⁶and <u>the prophet</u> Jeremiah said, "Amen! May Yahweh do so; may Yahweh fulfill the words that you have prophesied."	⁵Jeremiah said to Hananiah in the presence of all the people and in the presence of the priests who stood in the house of Yahweh, ⁶and Jeremiah said, "Amen, thus may Yahweh do; may Yahweh establish the word that you prophesy."

Although certainty is difficult to attain here, the LXX may attest a more original version than the MT in presenting the people before the priests. The MT order corresponds to that of Jer 28:1, which may have occasioned an editor to harmonize the sequence in 28:5. A further motive for the change may have been a hierarchical understanding that priests should precede the people, which is also the order in which the two are often presented in Jeremiah (23:34; 26:7, 11; 29:1; 34:19). Notably, Jer 27:16 (34:13 LXX) is another exception where the MT and the LXX differ in the same way. The MT of Jer 27:16 places the priest before the people, which shows that the differing sequence in Jer 28:5 is improbably due to an accident. In some cases, such as Jer 1:18, the LXX lacks the priests altogether, which implies that the proto-MT has undergone a revision in which the priests were secondarily elevated or outright added when missing.[73]

Alternative Explanations/Counterarguments. In view of a very similar variant in Jer 27:16, an accidental transposition is very unlikely, although not completely impossible. More probable would be an intentional transposition in the LXX, and in fact, Bernhard Duhm has suggested that the LXX changed the sequence in order to connect the priests with the word העמדים, which is given a special cultic meaning in some biblical texts.[74] For example, Ps 134:1 reads: כל עבדי יהוה העמדים בבית יהוה "all you servants of Yahweh, who stand in the house of Yahweh" (similarly 135:2), which may refer to cultic personnel. Duhm's suggestion is thus a possibility. One could further argue that a later editor in the LXX transmission sought to avoid the conception that all the people (including women) could stand in service inside Yahweh's temple. Consequently, an intentional change of

---

73. Some scholars, such as Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 150, make no note of the LXX variant.

74. Duhm, *Jeremia*, 224. This suggestion is also mentioned as a possibility by Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 152; McKane, *Jeremiah*, 711.

order into both directions can be argued, and it is difficult to reach a very certain verdict here.

The Nature and Technique of the Editorial Change. If we assume a transposition in the proto-MT, it seems to have been made for hierarchical reasons. The position of the priests was elevated, and this corresponds to other similar changes in other parts of the MT version. Since their position was not elevated throughout the composition, it seems unlikely that we are dealing with a systematic revision. More probable are changes made in a milieu of transmission where priests had a more significant position in society than according to the older text of Jeremiah, and therefore the text was occasionally changed to correspond to the existing reality in the milieu of transmission. As with other transpositions, it is likely that the transposition was made when the entire manuscript was copied.

Detectability by Literary Criticism. It is unlikely that critics would notice this transposition without a variant edition. Neither version raises any suspicions that an editor changed the order of priests and people. This conclusion is underlined by the fact that, even with two versions preserved, it is still difficult to determine which is more original.

Results. The comparison between the MT and the LXX of Jer 28:5 suggests that the sequence of priests and people was secondarily switched in the proto-Masoretic textual transmission. The reason for the transposition was probably a conception that priests were assumed to precede the people. This conclusion can only be tentative, because the priority of the MT can also be defended. In either case, the text provides evidence for a small intentional transmission. Without the textual variants it would have been exceedingly difficult to detect the transposition.

10.10. Transpositions: Results

Documented evidence reveals that there have been more transpositions than conventionally assumed in historical criticism. Texts that bear witness to the earlier stages of textual transmission of a given book especially suggest that some editors may have used transpositions rather frequently.[75] This

---

75. It is probable that in Ezra-Nehemiah, Daniel, Esther, Samuel, and Kings, the

is particularly evident in 1 Kgs 3–22, which implies extensive intentional rearrangements of the transmitted textual material. Although a general characterization cannot be made, the example texts analyzed here suggest that transpositions may have been frequent in the proto-MT transmission of Kings. This does not mean that all editors would permanently resort to transpositions, and in fact, it is very possible that most of the transpositions in 1 Kgs 3–22 derive from just one or two editors who made extensive revisions to the text in other respects as well. Although 1 Kgs 3–22 is not necessarily representative, these chapters alone show that transpositions have to be regarded as a potential technique utilized in the transmission history of any text in the Hebrew Bible.[76]

The analyses in this chapter have shown that transpositions are difficult to detect without text-critical evidence. This is particularly the case with small and very small transpositions. For example, without the two versions of 1 Kgs 11:4 for comparison, the transposition of sentences would undoubtedly remain unnoticed, because the intervention left no evident signs of editing. In larger transpositions more traces were often left, and in many such cases one would suspect that the transposed text is an addition in its new location. For instance, it is apparent that the transposed text in 1 Kgs 11:3 MT is not original in its current location. By the same token, however, it would have been nearly impossible to determine that it was transposed from another location in the same passage and to pinpoint what the original location was. The critic would easily assume that it is a later addition and perhaps not even suspect that it could have been transposed from elsewhere in the passage. Consequently, it seems probable that literary critics would not be able to reconstruct the more original location of transposed units. This is an evident challenge for the method.

---

text-critical evidence that has been transmitted to us partly preserves an earlier stage in the development of these texts than the text-critical evidence from the Pentateuch. In other words, the Pentateuch may have been transmitted for a longer period before the *preserved* text-critical traditions diverged and thus they may only bear witness to a relatively late stage of the transmission where editorial changes remain limited and occur more rarely.

76. Clearly, it cannot be excluded that 1 Kgs 3–22 is more typical of the early transmission and that it is only by historical accident that not many similar examples have been preserved in the Hebrew Bible. If 1 Kgs 3–22 is a typical case for the early transmission, it is apparent that transpositions would have been a very common editorial technique, and their frequency would complicate historical criticism considerably.

A further methodologically important observation is that transpositions may have been made to even out roughness or remove inconsistency caused by earlier editing. This is particularly evident in Gen 31:45–52 LXX, Gen 47:5–6 MT, Lev 21:21 SP as well as Num 1 and 26 LXX, where the younger version is more logical in some ways or reads better than the more original one. Paradoxically, in these cases later editing and transpositions made it more difficult for critics to detect the changes and reconstruct the older stage of the text. The use of the technique for such a purpose is thus a clear methodological challenge for historical criticism.

Despite these challenges in determining what precisely happened to the text, a majority of transpositions did not have a crucial impact on the meaning of the texts. Some transpositions may change the hierarchical order (e.g., Gen 8:18; Num 1:24–25; Num 26:15–18; and Isa 5:3), and a certain order may influence how priority between members of a list is perceived, while others had only a subtle influence on the text. For example, in Lev 12:8 the MT first refers to the burnt offering and second to the sin offering, while the SP has the opposite order (see introduction to this chapter). Both offerings are required for the ritual, and the text does not specify in which order they should be offered, but a reader may understand the order stated as being meant to be observed in the ritual.

There are other examples where the changed order had more influence on the text. Of the analyzed texts, 1 Kgs 11:43–12:3 may be the clearest example, for here the location of Jeroboam's return from Egypt essentially changed the way Jeroboam is presented. In the probably secondary MT, Jeroboam plans a coup from the start and thus primarily returns for the coronation of Rehoboam, while in the LXX version he returns home after Solomon, who wanted to kill him, is dead because it was not safe to return earlier. Genesis 47:5–6 and 1 Kgs 11:1–3 are similar in this respect, but in these passages the other editorial changes may have been more important in altering the meaning.[77] In order to accommodate the transposition, a number of transpositions were accompanied by other changes in the text.

Our review of evidence from many parts of the Hebrew Bible (of which only some illustrative examples are discussed in this volume) indicated that transpositions are not exceedingly common but still common enough to be an editorial technique that needs to be taken into account

---

77. Solomon's wives were all made foreign in 1 Kgs 11:1–3, or the omission of a reference to the arrival of Jacob and Joseph's brothers in Gen 47:6 had the most impact on the whole narrative because it effectively removed the main inconsistency.

in literary criticism. Minor transpositions, especially in Greek transla-
tions, are more common, but intentional transpositions that substantially
changed the meaning of the text are the exception and are not often doc-
umented in the textual transmission. Such transpositions probably took
place throughout the Hebrew Bible as occasional exceptions, but they are
clearly outnumbered by significant additions in all of the text material in
the Hebrew Bible that has been reviewed for this volume. Text-critical evi-
dence provides countless, perhaps hundreds of additions for one equally
significant transposition.[78] The relative infrequency of transpositions is
thus an important factor that decreases their methodological challenge for
historical criticism. In concrete terms, although some completely unde-
tectable and textually significant transpositions have undoubtedly taken
place, they are not so common that they would essentially undermine his-
torical criticism as a method.

The impact of transpositions on historical criticism is further limited
by their unconnectedness to their contexts. Most larger transpositions
took place for units that stood only loosely in their contexts, and this
enabled a transposition in the first place. It would be difficult to transpose
a section that is closely tied to its context or is an integral part of it, for
its removal would confuse the entire text, while the relocation of a more
independent section may only have little bearing on its context. The fact
that Josh 8:30–35, which is largely an independent account of the altar
building on Mount Ebal, could be placed in three different locations in dif-
ferent witnesses is a case in point. Independent and self-enclosed units are
thus more prone to be transposed. Some of them may be particularly easy
to relocate, so that they can be called movable units, as phrased by Julio
Trebolle Barrera.[79] It is very possible that a number of transposed units are
earlier additions to their contexts and are therefore more disposed to be
transposed than other units that are more inherent parts of their contexts.
That an already loose unit is transposed will thus not essentially weaken
the critic's understanding of the text, even if the critic would not be able to
detect the unit as a transposed one.

In this chapter we have also addressed Frank Ueberschaer's theory
that some passages found in two locations are best explained by assum-

---

78. The main exception is 1 Kgs 3–22 where the number of transpositions is
clearly higher; nevertheless, it still remains much less than the probable additions.

79. See Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Criticism and the Composition History of
Samuel," 261–64.

ing a partly oral dimension of the transmission. The example texts that were analyzed here, 1 Kgs 11:1–3 and 11:43–12:3, failed to substantiate his model. Quite the contrary, it seems more probable that the variants in these passages are transpositions that took place in the transmission of *written material*. To be sure, this does not exclude the possibility of an oral transmission in some stages of some traditions of the Hebrew Bible, and a potential oral background of certain transposed units (especially in Psalms) may seriously be taken into consideration. However, Ueberschaer's hypothesis is an unlikely explanation for the analyzed variants between the MT and LXX in 1 Kgs 11:1–3 and 11:43–12:3. Because the oral aspects of the transmission are still unclear, such models should only be used with caution to explain textual variants. There is a danger that the reference to orality functions as a wild card for complicated textual problems that places the whole discussion beyond evaluation of the available evidence.

1 1

General Conclusions

11.1. Documented Evidence as Key

Documented evidence contained in various ancient textual traditions is key for understanding the Hebrew Bible as an object of historical investigation. The evidence reveals how its texts were transmitted and perceived by the transmitting communities, and what kind of editorial changes were made in their transmission. This information is essential for any use of the Hebrew Bible as a historical source. All scientific methods need to understand the nature of their sources, and therefore this evidence should not be neglected by anyone working with biblical texts on an academic level.

Nevertheless, the importance of documented evidence for biblical studies has been far from self-evident. The MT is still widely regarded as the single starting point, while comparing it with other witnesses is too often bypassed or regarded as a marginal field to be investigated by textual critics. In this and previous studies we have sought to show that the neglect of the documented evidence contained in the various ancient textual traditions is a grave mistake that leads to distorted and delusive results.[1] Despite the laborious and partly painstaking complexities of comparing witnesses in different languages, the issue is of such great methodological importance that it should be core in biblical studies.[2]

A crucial part of documented evidence is provided by the LXX and its daughter translations. There are good reasons to assume that the

---

1. See esp. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*; and Müller and Pakkala, *Insights into Editing*, 1–21.

2. As multiple pieces of documented evidence are provided by divergences in the Greek translation (or its daughter translations) from the MT, an understanding of the respective translation techniques and a linguistic interpretation of the equivalents between the MT and the OG, etc., is necessary.

Old Greek translation of several books frequently attests an earlier tex-
tual stage than the MT, which clearly undermines the primary or even
sole use of the latter. The reason for the OG preserving original readings
may be the relatively early stage of translation when the proto-MT still
continued to be edited. In general, translations appear to have been less
edited than the Hebrew texts because translations were originally meant
to help non-Hebrew speaking Jewish communities understand their nor-
mative and authoritative traditions in Hebrew. The latter became objects
of intensive scribal exegesis, while similar processes were not necessary
for translations, at least not in the same magnitude. To be sure, the Greek
texts were revised as well, but for different reasons. The main motive for
revising a translation was to keep up with the developing Hebrew text. In
fact, the existence of recensions in Greek (*kaige*, Lucianic, etc.) highlights
the assumed primacy of the Hebrew tradition. The recensions updated the
translations to correspond better with the changes that had been made to
the more authoritative Hebrew texts. The Greek translations mostly lagged
behind the developing Hebrew Bible until it became a fixed collection
frozen from meaningful changes.[3] Therefore, many translations preserved
an older textual stage than the MT, although the later recensions partly
confuse the picture.

The majority of significant variants are found between the MT and
the LXX, and thus most documented evidence comes from a relatively
late stage in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible before it became frozen
from changes, from the late Second Temple period.[4] The overall picture
and the evidence preserved for us is also accidental, at least to a certain

---

3. When the recensional changes are detected, we can often reach the OG translation,
which differs from the MT and often preserves an earlier stage of the text. Clearly, the
recensions are a complicating factor for critics since the recensional elements have to be
identified before we can reach the original Greek translation. After recensions, the LXX
texts may not differ much from the MT, but they do not represent the original translation.

4. In the Pentateuch the SP also provides a number of significant individual vari-
ants. The Qumran manuscripts also provide a number of individual variants, although
they often correspond with variants in either the MT, the LXX, or the SP. The three
main witnesses of the Hebrew Bible, the MT, the SP, and the LXX are, at least in part,
the result of haphazard developments and it should not be excluded that other, widely
deviating, textual traditions existed as well. The so-called rewritten Pentateuch texts
may be a witness of such traditions. The psalm collections among the Dead Sea Scrolls
are also witnesses to the existence of divergent textual traditions that were only acci-
dentally preserved at Qumran.

degree, and thus one should not build a general model on the basis of what is taking place in individual passages or even in single books.[5] A wide enough spectrum of variants from different books, times, and witnesses is needed to obtain a representative picture of the transmission and editorial changes in the Second Temple period.[6] We have sought to achieve this in this book. Our discussion of secondary readings in the MT, the LXX, Latin witnesses, Qumran manuscripts, and the SP implies that the character and techniques of editorial intervention were similar in different contexts of transmission. Although there is variation and some witnesses show special developments, the lack of fundamental difference between the changes in the various textual traditions implies scribal environments that shared conceptions on the nature of the texts, how they should be transmitted, and what kind of changes could be made.[7] This further corroborates that the transmission of texts in the Hebrew Bible followed some unspoken rules or shared concepts that remained constant, and thereby the documented evidence as a whole can be taken as representative for the nondocumented transmission and editorial processes in the earlier Second Temple period as well. The transmission postdating the Second Temple period clearly differed, for the texts gradually became unchangeable as part of a canonical collection of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, the transmission of texts before the Second Temple period, and especially in the monarchic period, also differed to some degree from the transmission of the Second Temple period (see below).

11.2. Editorial Processes in the Hebrew Bible

Our review and search for potential cases of documented evidence for this volume clearly indicated that additions are by far the most common type of editorial intervention.[8] Secondarily added texts are documented

---

5. E.g., the book of Samuel was poorly transmitted in the MT tradition, while in the Pentateuch the MT seems to have been transmitted rather faithfully; see Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, 21–25.

6. The very early transmission, before the texts had gained in status and normativity, may have been somewhat different.

7. E.g., the textual tradition witnessed by the SP attests harmonizing tendencies more often than the LXX or the MT, but the technique as such is used in all three.

8. For this volume we reviewed and studied hundreds of additional cases, but we could only include some of them for detailed discussion. There would have been a myriad number of representative additions, but besides the ones that are discussed, it

in great numbers throughout the Hebrew Bible, while the other types of editorial intervention are difficult to find.[9] Omissions and replacements that had notable impact on the text are especially infrequent, and it seems that they were only done for weighty reasons, but transpositions were also much more limited in number than additions. The vast majority of documented editorial changes are thus additions of various lengths. Although documented changes are representative of the Second Temple period in general, in very early stages of the transmission omissions and replacements could have been more common, as the texts had not yet received a widely recognized and normative standing. This is probable for the compositional stage when sources were collected and combined to create new compositions, but in general the foundational or early phases of composition history remain beyond the reach of textually documented evidence, and they may have followed slightly different rules than in the later transmission.[10] On the other hand, toward the end of the Second Temple period a gradual freezing of texts took place, which can be seen in an increasing reluctance or loss of freedom to revise and change the texts. Eventually, sometime after the first centuries of the Common Era, it became nearly impossible to make any meaningful changes, and in some traditions even obvious copying errors were retained.

This study has also shown that the textual development was much more fragmentary and irregular than the majority of redaction-critical and other models conventionally assume. By this we mean that many additions and other interventions are isolated and do not appear as part of a systematic revision where larger sections or compositions were edited by single redactors. The majority of changes are short additions, such as added words, clauses, or sentences that are not connected to other additions, and they

---

was very difficult to find further cases of clear omission and replacement despite years of intensive search and research.

9. There are some exceptions to this, as we have seen. Free translations generated a large number of omissions, rewritings, and transpositions, but this is a slightly different phenomenon and should not be equated with editorial changes. Some passages also contain a higher number of other interventions. E.g., a notable number of transpositions can be found in 1 Kgs 3–21.

10. The sources used for compositions were probably used selectively so that large parts could be omitted and perhaps rewritten. This should not be characterized as the transmission of the same composition. Clearly, one cannot always make a clear-cut division.

appear to be rather unsystematic and solitary.[11] There are many examples where one passage was extensively revised from a certain theological perspective, while others may have been left untouched by the same scribes.[12] The documented material contains little evidence for classical redactions where series of similarly motivated and theologically connected additions were added to different parts of the composition. Instead, there appears to have been a milieu of transmission that occasioned certain concepts to be added here and there but not in a comprehensive way. Some cases may at first raise the impression of belonging to a larger redaction, but on closer examination there is rarely clear evidence that they derive from the same scribe or scribal group.

A rare instance of what is somehow reminiscent of a redaction is found in the MT pluses of Jeremiah that highlight Babylonia, Babylonians, and their king, but even in this case it is difficult to pinpoint any clear ideological or theological motives that would unequivocally connect the additions. In any case, the Babylonian "revision" in MT Jeremiah is an exception in the documented evidence. Some freer translations also contain a number of related changes. For example, the LXX of Esther contains a number of apparently connected variants where the most explicit violence toward the enemies of Jews has been censored, but this may be a different phenomenon and could be occasioned by the heterogeneous Greek-speaking readership in Alexandria. The overall picture contradicts models that assume large and rather clear revisions or redactions that encompass entire books, but it also contradicts models that assume

---

11. Larger additions, such as entire passages consisting of several sentences up to larger blocks of text, are relatively uncommon in the documented textual transmission, although they are still much more common than omissions, replacements, and transpositions.

12. Heavy editing is particularly evident in theologically central passages, and some of the revision is also documented in text-critical witnesses. E.g., the dedication of the temple in 1 Kgs 8 contains repeated divergences between the MT and LXX (e.g., 8:1–3, 12–13, 41–42). Another theologically central passage is 1 Kgs 11, which explains why the kingdom was divided, and the MT and LXX also differ repeatedly. The conclusion of the book of Joshua, which concludes the conquest of the land, also contains considerable text-critical differences throughout Josh 24. On the other hand, there are many passages that contain relatively few text-critical differences, and it seems that they were not revised so heavily in the periods of textual transmission documented by the extant witnesses.

limited revisions or redactions in two or three stages only.[13] Instead, the documented evidence suggests that countless, mostly smallish additions were made in a rather unsystematic fashion throughout the Second Temple period in different textual traditions, but especially in the proto-MT.[14] The picture we obtain is thus of a fragmented development through hundreds and hundreds of small additions that accumulated over a several centuries of constant expansion.

A notable number of additions are harmonizations between passages and inner-biblical developments by exegesis. The older text was reacted to and explained, to a great extent by using other passages in the Hebrew Bible, and in this process contradictory passages were harmonized. Implicit information was made explicit and perceived gaps in the narratives were filled. Such editorial changes, which form the vast majority of all types of editorial interventions, grew out of the older text or were its logical developments. Clearly, they also entailed entirely new elements and conceptions, and here the editor's own context and understanding played a major role. The older text was understood and interpreted through the editor's social and scribal context so that the text gradually developed by accumulation. New conceptions were placed on top of the older text with its conceptions. In the vast majority of additions there appears to be no intentional motive to alter the text by introducing something entirely new or by contradicting it, but instead, the new ideas and

---

13. E.g., the conventional conception of a comprehensive DtrN redaction is thus challenged; such a redaction has been prominently postulated by Rudolf Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 148–61, and the model was taken up, e.g.,by Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 4. Some of the examples in this volume have shown that such nomistic additions were made at such a late stage of development that they are missing in one of the textual witnesses.

14. The evidence thus corroborates models that assume constant small editing. E.g., Christoph Levin's model of *Fortschreibung*, seen in his contributions to various parts of the Hebrew Bible, e.g., Levin, *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, BZAW 316 (Berlin: de Gruyter 2003); and Levin, *Re-reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament*, FAT 87 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), implies editing by successive scribes for centuries. As noted above, it is unlikely that the translations were edited in a similar fashion as the Hebrew texts. The main revisions of the translations were recensions that sought to bring the translations closer to the Hebrew source texts that had been further edited after the translation was made.

conceptions sneaked into the text as part of the additions that were meant to interpret and clarify.

Documented editorial changes also indicate that the transmission was essentially textual. Although orality may have played a role in the early stages of transmission and oral dynamics and memory may explain some phenomena in the texts, all documented variants discussed in this volume likely go back to intentional changes made by scribes to written texts.[15] Most of the additions are better explained as essentially textual in nature. We have analyzed cases where orality allegedly explains textual variants (1 Kgs 11:1‑3; 12:43‑12:1), but an oral dimension could not be substantiated, and a textual or scribal change was deemed to be a far more convincing explanation for the MT and LXX variants. In the psalms, oral transmission may have played a somewhat larger role, and certain vari- ants, such as some synonymous variants, may in fact have been due to processes of memorizing and reciting the transmitted text. However, in most cases of meaningful and intentional change an interpretive charac- ter of the documented change is evident, and such changes are less likely to be the result of oral transmission. In other words, in the transmission processes of the Second Temple period orality certainly played some role, but it seems to have had only a limited effect *as far as meaningful editorial changes are concerned*.[16] This conclusion underscores that orality should clearly be shown if it is used as a preferred explanation for a variant read- ing, and any such theory should be evaluated and compared with a textual explanation as an alternative. Explaining most or even all textual vari- ants with processes of oral transmission is a model that seems difficult to uphold in light of the actually documented cases of textual divergences.

---

15. Some legends and myths as well as parables and songs of the Hebrew Bible certainly have an oral background and were transmitted orally. It is also probable that such traditions were changed during the oral transmission. For oral dynamics and memory, see Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 41‑42; Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 17, 33; see also Niditch, *Oral World and Written World*, 25‑38 (the example texts from Genesis and Ezekiel); and Person, "Formulas and Scribal Memory."

16. A notable exception is synonymous variants, some of which may well be memory variants. Nevertheless, synonymous variants mostly do not have significant impact on the text, and accordingly Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 42, calls them "nonsignificant variants." He is referring to variants in Anglo-Saxon literature; see Alger Doane, "The Ethnography of Scribal Writing and Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Scribe as Performer," *Oral Tradition* 9 (1994): 420–39.

11.3. Protocanonical Processes of Transmission

Editorial interventions always changed the texts to a certain extent, but they also show considerable respect toward the earlier text. Scribes apparently took great pains to preserve the material they received within the edited version. The conservative attitude and respect explains why additions were so much preferred over other editorial techniques. Even in cases where an omission or replacement would have much more easily occasioned an intended change and created a more fluent text, the scribes overwhelmingly preferred additions and accepted that the resulting text would be congested and awkward.[17] They seem not to have been very concerned about narrative flow and consistency, or at least such a motive was clearly secondary to the content that was added and to the principle of avoiding omissions. It is also noteworthy that additions rarely contradict the older texts, at least very clearly, but instead draw from their ideas and develop them further. If the new ideas somehow overrode those in the older text, this was mostly done in a subtle way and in dialogue with the older text. The interpretative approach underlying many additions sought to make explicit what was *understood as being already implicitly said in the older text*. This especially applies to secondary harmonizations between passages and compositions, which is a broadly attested editorial motive. The editorial hermeneutic toward the received textual tradition suggests that it was already regarded as normative and authoritative religious literature. By gradually expanding the texts in such a way, many passages became more and more congested, which eventually created literary forms that find no parallels in world literature. It can be assumed that many parts of the Hebrew Bible, and especially its key texts, consist of repeated small clarifying and interpretive additions in multiple layers from different times.[18]

---

17. E.g., in Josh 1:7 a mere change of the suffix from masculine to feminine would have sufficed to conceal the expansion much better, but this was not done, which left a clear trace of an editorial intervention. This and other examples show that many later editors who inserted something new did not alter the older text.

18. A classic example of this is the parenetic introduction to the laws of Deuteronomy in Deut 4–11. Other key texts, such as Josh 23–24; 2 Kgs 17; 23, probably also attracted repeated revisions that resulted in exceedingly complicated and congested passages. Some of such key texts also contain text-critical evidence for heavy editing, e.g., Josh 24; 1 Kgs 8; 11.

Literary works that eventually became part of the Hebrew Bible were not assumed to be just any literature, and when we seek to understand their transmission and editorial processes, their own special characteristics need to be understood and recognized. The editorial processes are contingent on the special circumstances in which the texts emerged and where they were transmitted. For biblical studies and especially for textual studies and historical criticism one consequence of this is that other literature, such as contemporaneous Mesopotamian, Greek, or Roman texts, are not obvious analogies that would reveal how the Hebrew Bible was transmitted. Some similarities certainly exist, but the Hebrew Bible has all in all special features and therefore it should first and foremost be understood on its own terms. This means that *documented evidence from the Hebrew Bible itself should go before any possible parallels from neighboring or other cultures are used as evidence for how the Hebrew Bible was transmitted and edited*. Besides the New Testament, the Hebrew Bible is the most studied collection of literature in the ancient world, whereas others are clearly less known or studied, and this also relativizes the information of other ancient texts when we seek to understand the details of the Hebrew Bible's transmission. The closest analogies to the Hebrew Bible are certainly the early Jewish writings from the late Second Temple period that did not make their way into the biblical canon. The textual attestation of these writings, which is, unfortunately, much more fragmentary than the textual attestation of the biblical books, suggests that similar editorial processes took place in their transmission. Contrary to this material, analogies from other ancient and premodern literature certainly can help us better understand some of the features of the biblical texts, but one needs to be careful about prematurely equating processes that took place in different kinds of literature and literary genres and under different cultural circumstances.[19] For example, the oral transmission of bardic literature in the European Middle Ages or of A One Thousand and One Nights does not denote similar processes in the Hebrew Bible, unless clear evidence gives reason to assume so; that being said, such comparative traditions can certainly show the characteristic features of the Hebrew Bible and highlight the areas of

---

19. The heavy dependence on other ancient literature is one of the weaknesses of Ziemer's criticism of historical criticism. See Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*, 136–220, 604–9; and Pakkala, review of *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*, by Benjamin Ziemer, *Bib* 102 (2021): 463–68.

similarities and dissimilarities.[20] If we look at the texts with a very wide focus, a number of shared features with other literature can be seen, but the closer we look, the more unique the texts of the Hebrew Bible appear. Biblical scholars look very closely.

By assuming a unique nature of the Hebrew Bible, we by no means assume that these texts were inherently holy and fundamentally different as objects of investigation. The Hebrew Bible is to be seen as part of humanly devised processes, and the scribal processes investigated in this book underscore its human character. We thus do not imply any divine exceptionalism or assume that the texts were unique because they are the result of extraordinary or divine processes. We also do not deny similarities with other literature. Many other texts were also assumed to be authoritative by their transmitting communities and there are also other precanonical collections that may have been revised in a very conservative way. Some individual texts, especially early Jewish literature, may even be very reminiscent of those in the Hebrew Bible. Similar scribal techniques can also be found in Mesopotamian and other ancient literature. The unique character of the Hebrew Bible texts lies in its special genre as particularly multilayered literature that was formed through successive interpretative and extensive exegetical expansions over centuries.[21] For example, many of the editorial techniques that we have identified are typical of the Hebrew Bible.[22] The scribes went to great lengths to meticulously explain details in the older text and harmonize contradictions between passages. A connecting factor between the observable editorial techniques is a conception that the text bears normative authority, cannot be easily altered and its details need to be explained by using other passages in the text.

Despite its unique transmission and multilayered character, the Hebrew Bible was not a canonical collection in the Second Temple period. Some of its books were more authoritative and normative than others, and the process for canonical collections was long and complicated. Concep-

---

20. *Pace* Person, "Text Criticism as a Lens."

21. Other examples of very special genres can also be found in world literature. The apocalyptic literature was contingent on a specific historical and social setting of early Judaism and early Christianity, which does not find close parallels in other cultures (clearly some later authors have imitated the apocalyptic style). The works of William Shakespeare are in many respects unique.

22. For details, see discussion in §2.6 of this volume.

tions of what exactly the authoritative books actually were may also have differed in different contexts (as they still do). Canonicity has not been a focus of this book, but the documented evidence suggests that these books had an elevated status in the transmitting communities and that this had bearing on the way they were edited.[23] Perhaps one could speak of proto-canonicity related to the late Second Temple period—but understood in a broad and pragmatic way—and its characteristic transmission processes. Such protocanonical transmission would pertain to the Second Temple period in general, although in some books, especially in the Pentateuch, the text began to be frozen for changes somewhat earlier than in other books.[24]

11.4. Detecting Undocumented Editorial Changes

At the very core of this study has been the question: Can editorial changes be detected without documented evidence? Although all analyzed cases contain documented evidence, we always made a theoretical experiment and asked whether the same editorial change could have been detected without the variant version that preserves the older textual stage and whether one would have been able to reconstruct how the text was changed.

In the area of omissions and replacements the conclusion was unambiguous. It would be nearly impossible to discern such cases and reconstruct an earlier stage without documented evidence. What has been left out of the text could not be recovered. In some cases, one would suspect that the text was edited in some way (e.g., Josh 5:14; 1 Sam 1:9; 2 Kgs 2:14), but exactly what was done remains highly hypothetical. In the transpositions, the result was more ambivalent. Although it would

---

23. This clearly does not exclude the possibility that some books that were not included in the Hebrew Bible were edited similarly. E.g., the Temple Scroll seems to have been edited similarly to what we can observe in the Hebrew Bible. It is demonstrably a product of the same scribal milieu.

24. The text-critical evidence gives some rough guidelines for this effect. The text-critical variants in the Pentateuch are conspicuously fewer in number than in other literary works. The difference is notable when compared with the historical books from Joshua to Kings, and particularly evident when compared with the youngest compositions of the Hebrew Bible, such as Esther and Daniel. However, this tendency cannot be made into a general rule. The documented evidence from the Pentateuch also contains clear exceptions such as Exod 35–40, and in any event the Pentateuch does contain repeated changes in all known textual traditions.

hardly be possible to determine the original locations of transposed units, many of them, especially the larger ones, left signs in their new contexts to indicate their intrusive nature (e.g., 1 Kgs 11:3). In many cases, a critic would be led to assume that the transposed unit is an addition, which in fact it was in its new context, but it would not be possible to gain the full picture of the intervention and to conclude that a transposition had taken place. Consequently, in the case of omissions, replacements, and transpositions the possibilities of reconstructing how the texts developed are extremely limited. It is perhaps no coincidence that these techniques have been generally neglected or even explicitly rejected in classical historical criticism. As a positive facet to this negative conclusion, the documented evidence clearly shows that these techniques were rarely applied, and it appears that editors sought to avoid them if the same results could be achieved by additions. Historical criticism is thus not essentially impaired even if most of these editorial interventions would remain beyond its reach.

The decisive question for historical criticism is thus whether additions can be detected without documented evidence. The method of reconstructing the historical development of the texts stands or falls on this question. Our result on additions essentially points in two directions. A certain fraction of additions would be challenging to detect and reconstruct without a variant reading for the earlier stage, but other additions could be detected rather easily. This ambivalent nature of the documented evidence may explain why some scholars reject and others defend historical criticism. Evidence and example texts supporting one's own view can easily be found, as we have seen in this investigation. However, it is necessary to consider both types of evidence when a theoretical model is constructed. Historical research on the biblical texts needs to find a fertile middle ground, and look at a large number of cases (quantitative criterion) and inspect them in detail (qualitative criterion) in order to build the model.

What kind of additions could be detected and reconstructed and what could not be? It has become evident that most small additions would go undetected. However, the vast majority of them are inconsequential clarifications of subjects and other sentence constituents or additions of titles and patronyms that appear in other parts of the passage or composition. That they could not be detected is thus not critical for the method as such. More important are the significant changes that develop the text by introducing new ideas because the main rationale of historical criticism is to

detect and distinguish units that represent different times and contexts. Failure to do so would render the method meaningless.

The main result of this study is that a significant number of such additions could be detected and reconstructed with reasonable accuracy. It is clear that some significant additions would go undetected, and in some cases, one could only reconstruct an earlier stage roughly, but there is a clear correlation between the significance of the addition and its detectability. The more an addition is in line with the older text—syntactically and content-wise—the less detectable it is. The more it comprises additional syntactic elements and content, such as motifs, conceptions, practices, and perspectives, that make an impact on the text and develop it in a new direction, the more it sticks out from its context and provides clues for critics to detect.[25]

11.5. Limits and Possibilities of Historical Criticism

Although documented evidence also sets limits for detecting scribal changes, the results gained in this study corroborate the basic approach of literary criticism to look for signs of later editing. This outcome challenges positions that neglect or ignore conventional historical criticism as a fundamental method in investigating the Hebrew Bible as a historical source. Many additions essentially changed the meaning of the texts, especially their theological conceptions and practices, but additions impacted other areas of historical study as well. For example, Kings is a central source for the political history of Israel and Judah, but later additions confused a number of issues. Trying to detect such additions as comprehensively as possible is a necessity that has direct bearing on the Hebrew Bible as a historical source.

An alternative to the attempt at reconstructing how the biblical texts developed would be to abandon the whole Hebrew Bible as a historical source, but if this position is taken, it should also be methodologically justified and consistently applied. Only a few biblical scholars have taken

---

25. Clearly, there are exceptions. An addition may be fully in line with the older text, but a small syntactic problem may disclose the secondary nature of a section. Some significant small additions provide very little to assume an editorial intervention (e.g., 1 Kgs 18:18; 19:10, 14). Although there are no syntactic problems or tensions, the unexpected reference to the commandments in 1 Kgs 18:18, e.g., could raise doubts about the originality of the reference. The same is true of the references to the covenant in 1 Kgs 19:10 and 14.

this path.[26] More common is neglect of the issue. With our previous *Evidence of Editing* and this study we hope to have raised awareness about the importance of this issue, and we call on biblical scholars to have a methodologically deliberate position toward the multilayered Hebrew Bible as a source text and to the question of what should be done about it. To put it differently, the issue is of such importance for biblical studies as a whole that its neglect is methodologically unjustifiable.

Having stated our confidence in the necessity and possibilities of historical criticism, several limitations and factors need to be acknowledged as well. Extreme positions are untenable, and the present study only underscores this. That a number of editorial changes cannot be detected without documented textual evidence questions models that are overly confident in reconstructing the full literary history of certain texts—models that sometimes imply complicated reconstructions of multiple layers. Such models are challenged by the frequently attested small additions that left virtually no traces in the resulting texts. Any reconstruction inevitably contains uncertainties due to undetectable editorial alterations. The more additions on top of older additions are postulated the more uncertain a reconstruction becomes. Conventional redaction-critical reconstructions are further undermined by the nearly complete lack of documented evidence for classic redactions that would have revised entire compositions from a certain theological perspective.[27] Of the documented additions analyzed in this book only a few can be connected with other additions and thus be suspected of deriving from the same editor, but even they can hardly be characterized as being part of redactions in their conventionally assumed sense.

On the other hand, we have seen many examples where historical criticism gains reliable and significant results, and they challenge overly pessimistic positions toward historical criticism. In some cases scribal changes could not be detected or considerable uncertainties remained, but they do not render the method as such useless. Uncertainties are evident

---

26. One may here perhaps think of Niels Peter Lemche, *The Old Testament between Theology and History* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 379–92, esp. 385, who limits the historical use of the Hebrew Bible by taking it only as a source for the Hellenistic and Roman eras.

27. Clearly, the lack of evidence is not evidence of absence and it is therefore necessary to investigate the issue further and review the entire Hebrew Bible in search of possible documented traces for redactions. However, this project remains beyond the scope of the present investigation.

in all human sciences, and this is especially the case regarding theories on ancient realities and history where evidence is scarce and haphazard. It would be unrealistic to expect that historical criticism achieves results as certain as those of natural sciences.[28] If a similar expectation is consistently applied to other areas of biblical studies, one is inevitably led to nihilistic conclusions about the possibilities of understanding and reconstructing any ancient realities, history, and conceptions. Concretely this expectation is seen in Person's and Rezetko's criticism of *Wiederaufnahme*, one of the classic criteria for assuming an addition.[29] They seem to imply that the *Wiederaufnahme* has been used as a rather certain indicator of additions, but this is not the case. If no other criteria than an assumed *Wiederaufnahme* are found, one should be skeptical of any theory that proposes an addition. The classic criteria are all *possible* signs for later editing; they should not be used mechanically and alone but in conjunction with other criteria to build a more convincing case.[30]

––––––––––––––

28. This expectation seems to be implied by Person and Rezetko in their introduction to *Empirical Models*, 1–35. Person and Rezetko refer to lack of proof, certainty, or objectivity in a way that tends to go beyond the scientific possibilities in the humanities. E.g., they write: "even text-critical variants do not provide completely objective evidence, because there is always a certain degree of subjectivity to text-critical conclusions as well" (25). In the end the question is which theory is the most plausible one, and this can only be decided by weighing different options, which remains an open-ended process. Contrary to the sciences, historical research never comes to final and entirely objective conclusions and needs to be expanded, refined, and modified time and again. According to Person and Rezetko the results of historical criticism nearly always remain too speculative to be plausible (see esp. p. 35), but here they fail to recognize that historical uses of the text—which they apparently do not wish to abandon—need to have a text as the source or object of investigation. The final texts in the MT, LXX, or SP, which are clearly composite, should be compared with any possible theory on their literary history. In other words, the use of redaction-critical reconstructions as a basis for historical investigations is per se not less plausible than the use of a final text.

29. See Person and Rezetko, *Empirical Models*, 23–27. Similarly, Silverman in his forthcoming statement paper in "Historical Criticism: Essential or Expendable?," in Edenburg et al.

30. To be sure, this investigation has discussed a number of cases where *Wiederaufnahme* was used by an editor who added a section: Lev 17:4; Josh 4:10; 1 Kgs 6:10–14; 2 Kgs 8:27; Jer 10:6–8; 26:22; 1 Chr 1:17aβ*–24*; see also in the SP Exod 7:18, 29. This confirms that the classic criterion is a good starting point to suspect an addition if other criteria are found as well. It was more often used in larger additions than smaller ones, but even in larger additions only occasionally.

Historical sciences are built on hypotheses that are compared with other hypotheses. The one that has most explanatory power and scope to explain an investigated event, issue, or subject is to be preferred.[31] A hypothesis or theory may also be contradicted by later evidence or a new consideration of the old evidence, and then another explanation becomes more probable. That the proposed hypotheses and theories are constantly exposed to criticism and academic discussion leads to increased knowledge and understanding.[32] This does not mean that we gain certainty, which may not be possible in any study of history. However, it would be unfair to expect certainty and full objectivity from historical criticism, unless one challenges all study of history, but this would be a larger philosophical issue.[33]

Accepting the uncertainties of historical criticism as a prerequisite of historical studies, there are many edited texts where a careful critic has a good chance of reconstructing what happened and thereby gaining significant information about the development of ancient conceptions and practices. For example, editors secondarily added a reference to the commandments and the Torah in many places.[34] A substantial number of such additions could be detected even without documented evidence. The rather widespread phenomenon gives scholars significant information about the late appearance of the Torah as being central in Israel's relationship with its deity.[35] It would be difficult if not impossible to study the reasons for and background of this development without historical criticism. In fact, without this method one would not even be able to determine that it is a rather late conception. This information would be lost to scholarship if the results of historical criticism are deemed as too uncertain to be scientifically important. To use only a final text, such as the

---

31. Cf. Behan McCullagh, *Justifying Historical Descriptions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 19–26.

32. Richard J. Evans, *In Defense of History* (New York: Norton, 1999), 89–110.

33. Evans, *In Defense of History*, 193–220.

34. See the seminal article by Alexander Rofé, "The Scribal Concern for the Torah as Evidenced by the Textual Witnesses of the Hebrew Bible," in Fox, *Mishneh Todah*, 229–42.

35. See, e.g., the illuminating remarks by Reinhard G. Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel: The History, Tradition, and Archives of Israel and Judah*, trans. Paul Michael Kurtz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 95–104, on the late emergence of the Pentateuch as torah and its impact on other biblical books; for crucial historical perspectives related to this literary phenomenon see pp. 137–96 and elsewhere.

MT, is a poor alternative, because concepts from different times are mixed together here and any result is bound to be only very rough and general at best, or, in worse cases, completely blurred and deceptive. Many other examples could be given to illustrate what is at stake.

The neglect of historical criticism is usually predicated on a preference for the MT, which necessarily leads to limited and distorted results. We have seen in this book that the MT, LXX, SP, and Qumran manuscript traditions frequently contain substantial differences, and it is not rare that the MT preserves a secondary reading. It is certainly time-consuming to go through all the various text materials and witnesses before even beginning to reconstruct the earlier development of the texts by literary criticism, but there is no viable alternative. Unless only one witness such as the MT is a priori preferred—a decision which is scientifically impossible to justify— the variants necessitate a text-critical investigation, but, as we have seen, a sharp division between textual criticism and literary criticism (or lower and higher criticisms, respectively) cannot be made. It is merely a practical division to differentiate the two, while many texts clearly show that they are inseparable and both essentially investigate the same processes. In other words, it would be methodologically untenable merely to look at what is preserved in witnesses by happenstance and neglect the older developments not preserved in textual evidence.[36] Text- and literary criticism thus need to go hand in hand, as many text-critical problems and variants were occasioned by earlier but now undocumented older scribal changes. Many text-critical issues cannot be solved without a proper understanding of the older development that can only be reached by historical criticism.[37]

11.6. Toward Refined Literary Criticism

Future literary criticism needs to be firmly based on documented evidence. Additional research is needed on individual editorial techniques. In the conclusions to the chapter on additions we listed common types of

---

36. Especially the emergence of Judaism, and many of the reasons that led to it can only be discovered and understood by historical criticism.

37. Illustrative of this are two recent studies which fruitfully combine text- and literary critical arguments and considerations: Mäkipelto, *Uncovering Ancient Editing*; and Timo Tapani Tekoniemi, *The Textual History of 2 Kings 17*, BZAW 536 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021). A clear-cut division of these disciplines, as implied by many scholars, e.g., Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text*, 127–40, should thus be abandoned.

additions found in this study. The rough division of common types already helps us detect similar additions when documented evidence is not available, but each one of the types requires further study on its own. For example, statistics on how common they are in the documented evidence and how they are technically applied would be important information for literary criticism. This will help scholarship detect similar additions that are undocumented in text-critical evidence.[38]

Instead of largely focusing on redactions that overarch entire compositions, future literary criticism should expect a more fragmentary picture of the literary history of biblical texts than conventionally assumed. Although classic redactions cannot be excluded, the almost complete lack of documented evidence for them means that they cannot be assumed as given. At least in the periods of documented textual development, no comprehensive redactional activity seems to have taken place. Rather, in these periods the emerging biblical books were massively and repeatedly expanded in an unsystematic way. Although the scribal changes betray similarities in their exegetical approach and are often theologically related, it is difficult to posit shared authorship for different additions. In other words, the conventionally assumed redactional layers may in fact consist of a series of isolated additions that derive from a similar theological milieu but which may not derive from individual redactors. Large-scale redactions clearly cannot be excluded and may have taken place in the initial phases of drafting literary compositions and books, but for an evidence-based approach they remain beyond reach and conjectural. If they did take place, they must have been exceptional undertakings that have not left traces in the documented evidence. Most clearly this result casts a shadow over conventional redaction criticism.

Instead of large redactions, the documented evidence suggests constant expansion and growth of texts as the rule rather than the exception. The documented evidence for this mostly comes from the late Second Temple period and thus does not cover earlier centuries, but this is accidental and due to the contingencies of manuscript preservation.[39] Similar

---

38. Each type of addition would easily be worth a separate monograph.

39. In some cases, the later variants go back to earlier scribal changes. E.g., a variant between the MT and a postulated third century BCE LXX translation may have been occasioned by a scribal change in the fourth century or earlier, for we do not know exactly when the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the LXX and the proto-MT diverged as separate textual traditions, and they may differ in each book.

processes can be assumed for the earlier transmission as well, and therefore any text in the Hebrew Bible may derive from the pen of dozens if not hundreds of scribes. Growth by mostly small isolated expansions seems to have been a constant process from the beginning of compositions until they froze for changes sometime in the second to first centuries BCE or the first century CE. Future literary critical reconstructions should thus expect a more fragmented picture of how the texts developed than conventionally assumed. The documented evidence analyzed here thus challenges models that assume only slight editing in two or three stages.

We have emphasized the uncertainties involved in the results of literary criticism. Any results and reconstructions should be seen as abstractions of a complicated development and as approximations toward still poorly known ancient realities. That omissions, replacements, and transpositions occasionally took place highlights the unfeasibility of fully reconstructing what happened to the texts. When we acknowledge its limitations, literary criticism has a better chance of convincing biblical scholarship at large. To put it differently, an uncompromising focus on exact redactional reconstructions may do harm to the method and obstruct its reception by other scholars. Die-hard redaction-critical reconstructions based on single sentences or even words can hardly convince. Allowing the hypothetical and abstract nature of reconstructions, literary criticism has the potential to regain its central role in biblical studies, for it provides significant information about various aspects of early Judaism, such as general development of concepts, practices, and societal circumstances, which would otherwise be lost.

Because of the complex and controversial transmission, the methodological starting points of diachronic approaches to the Hebrew Bible need to be particularly solid. This study has highlighted the importance of documented evidence as the basis for understanding how the texts were transmitted and how scribes changed the texts. Instead of preconceived and conventional models of transmission, future literary criticism needs to start from a methodologically justified position that builds on the available documented text-critical evidence, because the text-critical evidence represents the final stages of the same continuum as the undocumented history. It is thus evident that literary critics need to be much more familiar with the text-critical evidence and vice versa.

Instead of the MT as the preconceived preferred text, textual variety should be the starting point of any literary critical analysis. As many of the sample texts analyzed in this book show, the Old Greek in particular

often contains readings that predate those of the MT. The variant readings should be used not only to establish a base text that will be analyzed further, but they can also reveal how a particular book was changed in the documented textual traditions, which shows how the scribes related to the text they were transmitting. For example, if one pursues a literary-critical analysis of Kings, the variant readings in the MT, the LXX (the main witnesses including L), the Old Latin, and the Qumran manuscripts should be analyzed first, and after formulating a theory on the development observable in these witnesses, one gains an understanding of how Kings was transmitted and edited. This information will then be an essential guide in trying to go further or deeper into the earlier, undocumented literary history of Kings.

It cannot be stressed enough that all these limitations and complications do not undermine the importance of literary and more broadly historical criticism as such. Quite the opposite, the documented evidence shows that the later growth is of such importance that any of the final texts, such as the MT, cannot be used as a historical source for scientific purposes, and that there needs to be a methodologically argued position to deal with such multilayered composite texts. We the authors are convinced that any alternative is methodologically more problematic than a refined and improved literary criticism.[40]

What the field direly needs is a synopsis and its commentary for the main textual traditions of the Hebrew Bible.[41] Part of the text-critical evidence is difficult to access, and this is especially the case where the evidence would be of particular importance. With this we refer to books such as Joshua, Samuel, Kings, and Psalms, where the Old Greek has not yet been established, or books such as Ezekiel or Job, where the relationship between the MT and LXX is controversial and understudied. The Old Latin witnesses of some books, such as Kings, may also provide crucial information that has the potential to become a game-changer in the

---

40. Some of these alternatives were discussed in the introductory chapter to this book.

41. The synopsis by Hermann-Josef Stipp, published online in a preliminary and frequently updated version, is a welcome and extremely useful tool: https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101c. However, this form of presenting the divergent textual transmissions can only be the beginning, and it needs to be expanded in many ways; particularly the plurality of the LXX transmission needs to be made visible.

research of these books.[42] Part of this problem would be remedied by an online synopsis of the main textual witnesses.

---

42. Here we are particularly referring to studies such as those by Tekoniemi, *A Textual History of 2 Kings 17*, who has suggested that Codex Vindobonensis (La[115]) may preserve several original readings in 2 Kgs 17 that are lost in all other witnesses.

Bibliography

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Jeremiah at the Turning-point of History: The Function of Jer. XXV 1-14 in the Book of Jeremiah." *VT* 52 (2002): 459–82.

———. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

———. "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" Pages 71–115 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Albertz, Rainer. *Exodus 1–18*. ZBKAT 2.1. Zurich: TVZ, 2012.

———. *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*. GAT 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

Alfrink, Bernardus. "Het 'still staan' van zone n maan in Jos 10:12-15." *StC* 24 (1949): 238-68.

Allen, Leslie C. *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of 1 and 2 Chronicles to the Massoretic Text*. 2 vols. VTSup 25, 27. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Arneth, Martin. *"Sonne der Gerechtigkeit": Studien zur Solarisierung der Jahwe-Religion im Lichte von Psalm 72*. BZABR 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.

Auld, A. Graeme. *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

———. *Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus*. BSCS. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. "Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts." Pages 1–14 in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*. Edited by John A. Emerton. VTSup 30. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Baentsch, Bruno. *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*. HKAT 1.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.

Baethgen, Friedrich. *Die Psalmen*. 3rd ed. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1904.

Ball, Charles James. *The Book of Genesis: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text Printed in Colors Exhibiting the Composite Structure of the Book.* Sacred Books of the Old Testament 1. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896.

Barton, John. *The Nature of Biblical Criticism.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations.* Vol. 2 of *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament.* OBO 50.2. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

———. *Josue, Juges.* Vol. 1 of *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament.* OBO 50.1. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

———. "La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel." Pages 1–44 in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna.* Edited by Emanuel Tov. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

Barthélemy, Dominique, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism; Papers of a Joint Research Venture.* OBO 73. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Batten, Loring W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah.* ICC 9. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913.

Becker, Uwe. *Exegese des Alten Testaments.* 3rd ed. UTB 2664. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The Concept of Prophetic Books and Its Historical Setting." Pages 73–95 in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman. Bible World. London: Equinox, 2009.

———. *Hosea.* FOTL 21A.1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. "Memories of Kings of Israel and Judah within the Mnemonic Landscape of the Literati of the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Period: Exploratory Considerations." *SJOT* 33 (2019): 1–15.

Benzinger, Immanuel. *Die Bücher der Könige.* KHC 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1899.

Berner, Christoph. "The Attestation of the Book-Seam in the Early Textual Witnesses and Its Literary-Historical Implications." Pages 5–19 in vol. 1 of *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges.* Edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel. FAT 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Bertholet, Alfred. *Deuteronomium.* KHAT 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1899.

———. *Leviticus*. KHAT 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.

Blum, Erhard. "Die Stimme des Autors in den Geschichtsüberlieferungen des Alten Testaments." Pages 107–29 in *Historiographie in der Antike*. Edited by Klaus-Peter Adam. BZAW 373. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

———. "Zwischen Literarkritik und Stilkritik." *ZAW* 124 (2012): 492–515.

Böhler, Dieter. *Die Heilige Stadt in Esdras α und Esra-Nehemia: Zwei Konzeptionen zur Wiederherstellung Israels*. OBO 158. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.

Böttcher, Julius Friedrich. *Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testamente*. Leipzig: Barth, 1863.

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. "Urtext, texte court et relecture: Jérémie XXXIII 14‑26 TM et ses préparations." Pages 237–47 in *Congress Volume: Leuven, 1989*. Edited by John A. Emerton. VTSup 43. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Boling, Robert G. *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. AB 6. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982.

———. *Judges*: *A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 6A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.

Braulik, Georg. *Deuteronomium II: 16:18‑34:12*. NEchtB 28. Würzburg: Echter, 1992.

Briggs, Charles Augustus, and Emily Grace Briggs. *The Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909.

Brooke, Alan England, and Norman McLean, eds. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. Vol. 4.1 of *The Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917.

Bruning, Brandon E. "The Making of the Mishkan: The Old Greek Text of Exodus 35‑40 and the Literary History of the Pentateuch." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2014.

Budde, Karl. *Die Biblische Urgeschichte (Gen 1–12,5)*. Giessen: Ricker, 1883.

———. *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel: Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*. Giessen: Ricker, 1890.

———. *Die Bücher Samuel*. KHC 8. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1902.

Burney, Charles Fox. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings: With Introduction and Appendix*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903.

Butler, Trent. *Judges*. WBC 8. Nashville: Nelson, 2009.

Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Carroll, Robert P. *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Cassuto, Umberto. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967.

Charlesworth, James H. "הבכרה על-הר גרזים—An Unknown Dead Sea Scroll and Speculations Focused on the *Vorlage* of Deuteronomy 27:4." Pages 393–414 in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Enno Edzard Popkes. WUNT 2/390. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.

Ciasca, Augustino. *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*. 4 vols. Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fidei, 1885–1904.

Cogan, Mordechai. *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 10. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Cogan, Mordechai, and Hayim Tadmor. *2 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 11. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Crawford, Sidnie White. "Interpreting the Pentateuch through Scribal Processes: The Evidence from the Qumran Manuscripts." Pages 59–80 in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* Edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala. CBET 84. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

Cross, Frank Moore. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint." *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15‒26.

Cross, Frank Moore, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel*. DJD XVII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2008.

Curtis, Edward L. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910.

Dahmen, Ulrich. *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPsa aus Qumran*. STDJ 49. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Davis, Kipp, Ira Rabin, Ines Feldman, Myriam Krutzsch, Hasia Rimon, Årstein Justnes, Torleif Elgvin, and Michael Langlois. "Nine Dubious

'Dead Sea Scroll Fragments' from the 21th Century." *DSD* 24 (2017): 189–228.

De Rossi, Johannis Bernardo. *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti*. 4 vols. Parma: Regio, 1784–1788.

De Troyer, Kristin. "The History of the Biblical Text: The Case of the Book of Joshua." Pages 223-46 in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* Edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala. CBET 84. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

———. "'Is This Not Written in the Book of Jashar?' (Josh 10:13c): References to Extra-Biblical Books in the Bible." Pages 45-50 in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*. Edited by J. van Ruiten and Jacobus Cornelis de Vos. VTSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

DeVries, Simon J. *1 Kings*. WBC 12. Waco, TX: Word, 1985.

Dietrich, Walter. *Samuel 1: 1Sam 1–12*. BKAT 8.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010.

Dillmann, August. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880.

———. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*. 2nd ed. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886.

———. *Genesis, Critically and Exegetically Expounded*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897.

Doane, Alger. "The Ethnography of Scribal Writing and Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Scribe as Performer." *Oral Tradition* 9 (1994): 420–39.

Dohmen, Christoph. *Exodus 19-40*. 2nd ed. HThKAT. Basel: Herder, 2012.

Dozeman, Thomas B. *Exodus*. ECC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Driver, Samuel R. *The Book of Genesis: With Introduction and Notes*. London: Methuen, 1904.

———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. 3rd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.

———. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jeremia*. KHC. Tübingen: Mohr, 1901.

Duncan, Julie Ann. "4QDeutʰ (Pls. XVII-XVIII)." Pages 61-70 in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD XIV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Durham, John I. *Exodus*. WBC 3. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

Edenburg, Cynthia. "2 Sam 21-24: Haphazard Miscellany or Deliberate Revision?" Pages 189–222 in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* Edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala. CBET 84. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

Edenburg, Cynthia, Francis Borchardt, Jason M. Silverman, and Juha Pakkala. "Historical Criticism: Essential or Expendable?" In *Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions: Methodological Encounters and Debates.* Edited by Jutta Jokiranta and Martti Nissinen. Atlanta: SBL Press, forthcoming.

Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches.* 3 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908–1910.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Elnes, E. E., and P. D. Miller. "ELYON עליון." *DDD*, 293–99.

Erbt, Wilhelm. *Jeremia und seine Zeit: Die Geschichte der letzten fünfzig Jahre des vorexilischen Juda.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.

Evans, Richard J. *In Defense of History.* New York: Norton, 1999.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio, ed. *Judges.* BHQ 7. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

———. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible.* Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt.* 2 vols. Oxford Clarendon, 1875.

Fischer, Georg. "7.3 Jeremiah: Septuagint." *Textual History of the Bible.* Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0007030000.

———. *Jeremia 1–25.* HThKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005.

———. *Jeremia 26–52.* HThKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005.

Floss, Johannes. *Kunden oder Kundschafter? Literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung zu Jos 2.* ATSAT 16. Saint Ottilien: EOS, 1982.

Fried, Lisbeth S., ed. *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras.* AIL 7. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Fritz, Volkmar. *1 and 2 Kings.* CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Fulton, Deirdre N. *Reconsidering Nehemiah's Judah: The Case of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12.* FAT 2/80. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Gesundheit, Shimon. "The Question of LXX Jeremiah as a Tool for Literary-Critical Analysis." *VT* 62 (2012): 29–57.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Translated by Douglas W. Stott. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Giesebrecht, Friedrich. *Das Buch Jeremia*. HKAT 3.2.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907.

Glaue, Paul, and Alfred Rahlfs, eds. *Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des Pentateuchs*. MSU 2. Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1911.

Görg, Manfred. *Richter*. NEchtB 3. Würzburg: Echter, 1993.

Gooding, David W. "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns." *Text* 7 (1969): 1–29.

———. "The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power." *VT* 17 (1967): 173–89.

Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903.

Gray, John. *I and II Kings: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Greenspoon, Leonard J. *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*. HSM 28. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Gressmann, Hugo. *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels (von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea)*. SAT 1 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.

Gross, Walter. *Richter*. HThKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2009.

Grothe, Jonathan F. "An Argument for the Textual Genuineness of Jeremiah 33:14–26 (Masoretic Text)." *ConJ* 7 (1981): 188–91.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. 3rd ed. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

———. *Die Psalmen*. 4th ed. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.

Gunneweg, Antonius H. J. *Nehemia*. KAT 19.2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1987.

Gurtner, Daniel M. *Exodus: A Commentary on the Greek Text of Codex Vaticanus*. BSCS. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Gzella, Holger. *Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalters*. BBB 134. Berlin: Philo, 2002.

Habel, Norman C. *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament*. GBS. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Hentschel, Georg *1. Könige*. NEchtB 10. Würtzburg: Echter, 1984.

———. *2. Könige*. NEchtB 11. Würtzburg: Echter, 1985.

———. *2 Samuel*. NEchtB 34. Würtzburg: Echter, 1994.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth*. ATD 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.

———. *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1964.

Hirsch, Samson Raphael. *Die Genesis*. Der Pentateuch. 4th ed. Frankfurt am Main: Kauffmann, 1903.

Hölscher, Gustav. *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia*. HAT 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1923.

Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

———. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Holmes, Samuel. *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Holzinger, Heinrich. *Das Buch Josua*. KHC 6.Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901.

———. *Exodus*. KHC 2. Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr Siebeck, 1900.

———. *Genesis*. KHC 1. Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr Siebeck, 1898.

———. *Numeri*. KHC 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1903.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen*. OBO 45. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Houtman, Cornelis. *Exodus: Chapters 7:14–19:25*. HCOT. Kampen: Kok, 1996.

Hugo, Philippe. "The Jerusalem Temple Seen in Second Samuel according to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint." Pages 183–96 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by Melvin K. Peters. SCS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Hutzli, Jürg. *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: Textkritische- und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes*. ATANT 89. Zurich: TVZ, 2007.

———. "Theologische Textänderungen im Massoretischen Text und in der Septuaginta von 1–2 Sam." Pages 213–36 in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*. Edited by Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker. VTSup 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Ilgen, Karl David. *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt*. Halle: Hemmerde & Schwerschke, 1798.

Janowski, Bernd. "Die Frucht der Gerechtigkeit: Psalm 72 und die judäische Königsideologie." Pages 157–97 in vol. 3 of *Der Gott des Lebens: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Edited by Bernd Janowski. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003.

Janzen, J. Gerald. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. HSM 6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Japhet, Sara. *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Jones, Gwilym H. *1 and 2 Kings*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

Joosten, Jan. "Empirical Evidence and Its Limits: The Use of the Septuagint in Retracing the Redaction History of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 247–66 in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* Edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala. CBET 84. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.

———. "A Note on the Text of Deuteronomy xxxii 8*." *VT* 57 (2007): 548–55.

Juhás, Peter. *Die biblisch-hebräische Partikel* נא *im Lichte der antiken Bibelübersetzungen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer vermuteten Höflichkeitsform*. SSN 67. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Justnes, Årstein. "Forfalskninger av dødehavsruller: Om mer enn 70 nye fragmenter—og historien om ett av dem (DSS F.154: 5 Mos 27,4–6)." *Teologisk Tidsskrift* 6 (2017): 70–83.

Kaufman, Stephen A. "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism." *HUCA* 53 (1982): 29–43.

Kauhanen, Tuukka. *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1–2 Kings*. SCS 68. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.

Keil, Carl Friedrich. *The Books of Kings*. Clark's Foreign Theological Library NS 15. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1857.

———. *Die Bücher Samuels*. 2nd ed. Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament 2.2. Leipzig: Dörfling & Franke, 1864.

Keil, Carl Friedrich, and Franz Delitzsch. *The Pentateuch*. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1885.

Kennicott, Benjamin. *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus*. 2 vols.Oxford: Clarendon, 1780.

Keulen, Percy van. *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11*. VTSup 104. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Kirkpatrick, Alexander Francis. *First Book of Samuel*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1880.

Kittel, Rudolf. *Die Bücher der Könige*. HKAT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900.

Klein, Ralph W. *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Klostermann, August. *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*. KKAT 3. Nördlingen: Beck, 1887.

Knauf, Ernst Axel. *1 Könige 1–14*. HThKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2016.

———. *Josua*. ZBKAT 6. Zurich: TVZ, 2008.

Knobel, August Wilhelm. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*. KEH 13. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1861.

Knobel, August Wilhelm, and August Dillmann. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. 2nd ed. KEH 12. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880.

Knoppers, Gary. *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 12A. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

———. "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9." *Text 20* (2000): 141–68.

Kooij, Arie van der. "Jeremiah 27:5–15: How Do MT and LXX Relate to Each Other?" *JNSL* 20 (1994): 59–78.

———. "The Story of David and Goliath—The Early History of Its Text." *ETL* 68 (1992): 118–31.

———. "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele." Pages 185–202 in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995*. Edited by John A. Emerton. VTSup 66. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Kratz, Reinhard. *Historical and Biblical Israel: The History, Tradition, and Archives of Israel and Judah*. Translated by Paul Michael Kurtz. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*. UTB 2157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

———. "Redaktionsgeschichte/Redaktionskritik I Altes Testament." *TRE* 28:367–78.

Kreuzer, Siegfried. "5.4 Septuagint (Samuel)." *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0005040000.

———. "5.5 Septuagint (Kings)." *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0005050000.

Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua)*. London: Macmillan, 1886.

———. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Schulze, 1890.

Lange, Armin. "5.3.1 Ancient and Late Ancient Manuscript Evidence." Pages 319–31 in vol. 1 part 2 of *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0005030100.

———. *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Latvus, Kari. *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings*. JSOTSup 279. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Lemche, Niels Peter. *The Old Testament between Theology and History: A Critical Survey*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

Levin, Christoph. "Das Königsritual in Israel und Juda." Pages 231–60 in *Herrschaftslegitimation in vorderorientalischen Reichen der Eisenzeit*. Edited by Christoph Levin and Reinhard Müller. ORA 21. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

———. *Der Jahwist*. FRLANT 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

———. "Der neue Altar unter Ahas von Juda." Pages 55–72 in *Ein Herz so weit wie der Sand am Ufer des Meeres: Festschrift für Georg Hentschel*. Edited by Susanne Gillmayr-Bucher. ETS 90. Würzburg: Echter, 2006.

———. *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt*. FRLANT 137. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.

———. *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. BZAW 316. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

———. *The Old Testament: A Brief Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

———. "The Poor in the Old Testament: Some Observation." Pages 322–38 in *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. BZAW 316. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

———. *Re-reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament*. FAT 87. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

———. "Tatbericht und Wortbericht in der priesterschriftlichen Schöpfungserzählung." Pages 23–39 in *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. BZAW 316. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Lied, Liv. "New Philology—in a Nutshell." Lecture presented to the faculty of theology at the University of Helsinki. 16 April 2015. https://www.academia.edu/12026818/_New_Philology_-_in_a_Nutshell_.

Lied, Liv, and Hugo Lundhaug, eds. *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*. TUGAL 175. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.

Liwak, Rüdiger. "Vierzig Jahre Forschung zum Jeremiabuch: I. Grundlagen." *TRu* 76 (2011): 131–79.

Lloyd, John. *The Book of Joshua: A Critical and Expository Commentary of the Hebrew Text*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1886.

Lohfink, Norbert. "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1:39." Pages 30–43 in *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis; Studies in Honour of Anthony F. Campbell for His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Mark A. O'Brien and Howard N. Wallace. JSOTSup 415. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

———. *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium: Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer*. OBO 111. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Loretz, Oswald. "Das 'Ahnen und Götterstatuen-Verbot' im Dekalog und die Einzigkeit Jahwes: Zum Begriff des Göttlichen in altorientalischen und alttestamentlichen Quellen." Pages 491–527 in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalistischen Religionsgeschichte*. Edited by Walter Dietrich and Martin Klopfenstein. OBO 139. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

Lundbom, Jack R. "Haplography in the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Jeremiah." *HS* 46 (2005): 301–20.

———. *Jeremiah 21–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 21B. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

Lust, Johan. "The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case." *JNSL* 20/1 (1994): 31–48.

———. "*The Story of David and Goliath* in Hebrew and in Greek." Pages 5–18 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism; Papers of a Joint Research Venture*. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. OBO 73. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Mäkipelto, Ville. *Uncovering Ancient Editing: Documented Evidence of Changes in Joshua 24 and Related Texts*. BZAW 513. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.

Mäkipelto, Ville, Timo Tekoniemi, and Miika Tucker. "Large-Scale Transposition as an Editorial Technique in the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 22 (2017): 1–16. https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101a.

Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. JSOTSup 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

Maskow, Lars. *Tora in der Chronik: Studien zur Rezeption des Pentateuchs in den Chronikbüchern*. FRLANT 274. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.

Mayes, Andrew D. H. *Deuteronomy*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Mazor, Lea. "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho: A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography." *Text* 14 (1988): 1–26.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. AB 8. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980.

McCarthy, Carmel, ed. *Deuteronomy*. BHQ 5. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

McCullagh, Behan. *Justifying Historical Descriptions*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

McKane, William. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986, 1996.

———. "Note on 2 Kings 12 10 (Evv 12 9)." *ZAW* 71 (1959): 260–65.

Meer, Michaël van der. "3.3 Septuagint. Joshua." 3.3.3; 3.3.4 in *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0003030000.

Merendino, Rosario Pius. *Das deuteronomische Gesetz: Eine literarkritische, gattungs- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Dt 12–26*. BBB 31. Bonn: Hanstein, 1969.

Meyers, Carol. *Exodus*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Milstein, Sara J. *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Möhlenbrinck, Kurt. "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua." *ZAW* 56 (1938): 238–68.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings*. ICC. New York: Scribner, 1951.

Moore, George F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Judges*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Die nachchronische Redaktion des Buches: Die Listen*. Vol. 1 of *Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964.

Müller, Reinhard. "The Altar on Mount Gerizim (Deuteronomy 27:1-8): Center or Periphery?" Pages 197–214 in *Centers and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin. FAT 108. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

———. "Das theophore Element '-Baal' zwischen Samuel und Chronik." Pages 107–29 in *Rereading the Relecture? The Question of (Post)chronistic Influence in the Latest Redactions of the Books of Samuel*. Edited by Uwe Becker and Hannes Bezzel. FAT 2/66. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

———. "Treue zum rettenden Gott: Erwägungen zu Ursprung und Sinn des Ersten Gebots." *ZTK* 112 (2015): 403–28.

Müller, Reinhard, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny. *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*. RBS 75. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Mulder, Martin J. *1 Kings 1–11*. HCOT. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Murphy, James. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866.

———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*. Andover: Draper, 1874.

Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

———. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 18. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

———. *Joshua: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

———. *Oral World and Written Word: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Israel*. London: SPCK, 1996.

Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Josua*. 2nd ed. HAT 1.7. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.

———. *Das dritte Buch Mose: Leviticus*. ATD 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

———. *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri*. 4th ed. ATD 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

———. *Das zweite Buch Mose: Exodus*. ATD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

———. *Könige*. BK 9.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.

Nowack, Wilhelm. *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*. HKAT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.

O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. OBO 92. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

O'Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. VTSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Oettli, Samuel. *Deuteronomium, Josua und Richter*. KKAT. Munich: Beck, 1893.

Olyan, Saul M., and Jacob L. Wright, eds. *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*. BJS 361. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018.

Otto, Eckart. *Deuteronomium 1,1–4,43*. HTKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder: 2012.

———. "Treueid und Gesetz: Die Ursprünge des Deuteronomiums im Horizont neuassyrischen Vertragsrechts." *ZABR* 2 (1996): 1–52.

Pakkala, Juha. *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7–10 and Nehemia 8*. BZAW 347. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

———. *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*. FRLANT 251. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

———. *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*. PFES 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999.

———. "Literary Criticism and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible." *Marginalia: Los Angeles Review of Books,* February 10, 2014. https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101d.

———. Review of *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz*, by Benjamin Ziemer. *Bib* 102 (2021): 463–68.

Paterson, James. *The Book of Numbers*: *Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text*. Sacred Books of the Old Testament 4. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900.

Perlitt, Lothar. *Deuteronomium*. BK 5.2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.

———. *Deuteronomium 1–6**. BK 5.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2013.

Person, Raymond F. "Formulas and Scribal Memory: A Case Study of Text-Critical Variants as Examples of Category-Triggering." Pages 147–72 in *Weathered Words: Formulaic Language and Verbal Art*. Edited by Frog and William Lamb. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2021.

———. "Text Criticism as a Lens for Understanding the Transmission of Ancient Texts in Their Oral Environments." Pages 197–215 in *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*. Edited by Brian B. Schmidt. AIL 22. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

Person, Raymond F., and Robert Rezetko, eds. *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. AIL 25. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Prestel, Peter, and Stefan Schorch. "Genesis: Das erste Buch Mose." Pages 145–257 in vol. 1 of *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

Procksch, Otto. *Die Genesis: Übersetzt und erklärt*. KAT 1. Erlangen: Deichert, 1924.

Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 2. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Das Erste Buch Mose: Genesis*. ATD 2.4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.

———. "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings." Pages 74–91 in *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. London: SCM, 1953.

———. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Psalmi cum Odis*. 3rd ed. SVTG 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Rehm, Martin. *Das erste Buch der Könige: Ein Kommentar*. Würzburg: Echter, 1979.

Richelle, Matthieu. "The Relevance of the Septuagint for the Reconstruction of the History of Ancient Israel." Pages 573–87 in *Die Septuaginta: Geschichte—Wirkung—Relevanz; 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.–24. Juli 2016*. Edited by Martin Meiser, Michaela Geiger, Siegried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund. WUNT 405. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Rietzschel, Claus. *Das Problem der Urrolle: Ein Beitrag zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Jeremiabuches*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1966.

Rofé, Alexander. "The Scribal Concern for the Torah as Evidenced by the Textual Witnesses of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 229–42 in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*. Edited by Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael J. Williams. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Römer, Thomas. *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition*. OBO 99. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Rösel, Hartmut N. *Joshua*. HCOT. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Rudnig, Thilo A. *Davids Thron: Redaktionskritische Studien zur Geschichte von der Thronnachfolge Davids*. BZAW 358. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik? An der Genesis Erläutert*. BZAW 63. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1933.

———. *Jeremia*. HAT 1.12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1947; 3rd ed., 1968.

Salo, Reettakaisa Sofia. *Die judäische Königsideologie im Kontext der Nachbarkulturen: Untersuchungen zu den Königspsalmen 2, 18, 20, 21, 45 und 72*. ORA 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Šanda, Vojtěch. *Die Bücher der Könige: Übersetzt und erklärt*. 2 vols. Münster: Aschendorff, 1911–1912.

Sanders, James A. *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text: Canon as Paradigm*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Saur, Markus. *Die Königspsalmen: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie*. BZAW 340. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

Schattner-Rieser, Ursula. "Garizim *versus* Ebal: Ein neues Qumranfragment samaritanischer Tradition?" *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 277–81.

Schmid, Joseph. "Septuagintageschichtliche Studien zum 1. Samuelbuch." PhD diss., University of Breslau, 1941.

Schmid, Konrad. "Outbidding the Fall of Jerusalem: Redactional Supplementation in 2 Kings 24." Pages 87–103 in *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Saul M. Olyan and Jacob L. Wright. BJS 361. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018.

Schniedewind, William. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Schreiner, Josef. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. NEchtB Ergänzungsband zum AT. Würzburg: Echter, 1995.

Schulz, Alfons. *Die Bücher Samuel*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1919.

Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger. *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie*. BZAW 188. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.

Seebass, Horst. *Numeri*. BK 4.1–3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993–2007.

Seppänen, Christian. "David and Saul's Daughters." Pages 353–64 in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, Marketta Liljeström. CBET 72. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

———. "The Hebrew Text of Samuel: Differences in 1 Sam 1 – 2 Sam 9 between the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Qumran Scrolls." PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2018. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:ISBN 978-951-51-4297-9.

Shenkel, James. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. HSM 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Sipilä, Seppo. *Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges Regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by waw and ki*. PFES 75. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999.

Skinner, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910.

Smend, Rudolf. "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 124–37 in *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Smith, Henry P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.

Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges: A Commentary*. Translated by John Bowden. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.

Stade, Bernhard. "Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 10–14." *ZAW* 5 (1885): 275–97.

Stade, Bernhard, and Friedrich Schwally. *The Books of Kings: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text Printed in Colors Exhibiting the Composite Structure of the Books*. Sacred Books of the Old Testament 9. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904.

Steck, Odil H. *Exegese des Alten Testaments: Leitfaden der Methodik; Ein Arbeitsbuch für Proseminarie, Seminarie und Vorlesungen*. 12th ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.

Steins, Georg. *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*. BBB 93. Beltz: Athenaum, 1995.

Steuernagel, Carl. *Das Buch Josua*. HKAT 3.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899.

———. *Deuteronomium und Josua: Und allgemeine Einleitung in den Hexateuch*. HKAT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900.

———. *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1912.

Stipp, Hermann-Josef. *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches*. OBO 136. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

———. "A Semi-empirical Example for the Final Touches to a Biblical Book: The Masoretic Sondergut of the Book of Jeremiah." Pages 295–318 in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* Edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala. CBET 84. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

———. "Sprachliche Kennzeichen jeremianischer Autorschaft." Pages 148–86 in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*. Edited by Hans M. Barstad and Reinhard G. Kratz. BZAW 388. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

Stoebe, Hans Joachim. *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. KAT 8.1. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1973.

———. *Das zweite Buch Samuelis*. KAT 8.2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994.

———. "Die *Goliathperikope* 1 Sam. XVII 1–XVIII 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta." *VT* 6 (1956): 397–413.

Stolz, Fritz. *Das Erste und zweite Buch Samuel*. ZBKAT 9. Zurich: TVZ, 1981.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *I and II Kings: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament." Pages 335–83 in *Studies in the Bible*. Edited by Chaim Rabin. ScrHier 8. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961.

Talshir, Zipora. "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms—Origin and Revision: Case Study; The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11)." *Text* 21 (2002): 71–105.

———. "19.3.1 Septuagint." Pages 615–620 in *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0019030100.

Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51–100*. WBC 20. Nashville: Nelson, 2000.

Tekoniemi, Timo. "A Game of Thrones: Textual History of 2 Kings 17 in Light of the Old Latin." PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2019.

———. *A Textual History of 2 Kings 17. Compiled in Light of the Old Latin*. BZAW 536. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021.

Thenius, Otto. *Die Bücher der Könige*. 2nd ed. KEH 9. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1873.

———. *Die Bücher Samuels*. KEH 4. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1842.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Toorn, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tov, Emanuel. "Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert" Pages 232–63 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11." Pages 470–89 in vol. 3 of *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Writings*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. VTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "Midrash-Type Exegesis in Joshua in the Septuagint of Joshua." Pages 153–63 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts." *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29.

———. "The Nature of the Differences between MT and the LXX"; "Response by E. Tov"; "Conclusion by E. Tov." Pages 19–46; 92–94; 129–137 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism; Papers of a Joint Research Venture*. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. OBO 73. Fri-

bourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

———. "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah." Pages 145–67 in *Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu; les oracles et leur transmission*. Edited by Pierre Maurice Bogaert. BETL 54. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.

———. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 1st ed. Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

———. "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24." *TC* 22 (2017). https://tinyurl.com/SBL03101b.

———. "Textual Harmonization in the Five Books of the Torah: A Summary." Pages 31–56 in *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*. Edited by Magnar Kartveit and Gary N. Knoppers. Studia Samaritana10. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.

———. "Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs." Pages 166–88 in vol. 3 of *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*. VTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy." Pages 15–28 in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*. Edited by Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael J. Williams. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Trebolle Barrera, Julio C. "Division Markers as Empirical Evidence for the Editorial Growth of Biblical Books." Pages 165–216 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Raymond F. Person and Robert Rezetko. AIL 25. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

———. *Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9–11*. Institución San Jerónimo 17. Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1984.

———. "Textual Criticism and the Composition History of Samuel: Connections between Pericopes in 1 Samuel 1–4." Pages 261–86 in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*. Edited by Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker. VTSup 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Tur-Sinai, Naftali Herz. "אביר." Cols. 31–33 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia Mikra'it*. Edited by Eleazar Sukenik and Umberto Cassuto. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955.

Ueberschaer, Frank. *Vom Gründungsmythos zur Untergangssymphonie: Eine text- und literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1Kön 11–14*. BZAW 481. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

Ulrich, Eugene. "4QJosh^a (Pls. XXXII–XXXIV)." Pages 143–152 in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD XIV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

———, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. VTSup 169. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudg^a and 4QJer^a." Pages 489–506 in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*. Edited by Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen. PFES 95. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008.

———. "The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh^a." Pages 361–75 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Andres Piquér Otero and Pablo Torijano Morales. JSJSup 157. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. HSM 19. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1978.

Veijola, Timo. *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,17*. ATD 8.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

———. *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. AASF B 193. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1975.

Volz, Paul. *Der Prophet Jeremia*. KAT 10. Leipzig: Scholl, 1922.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Weis, Richard D. "Jeremiah. 7.1: Textual History of Jeremiah." Pages 495–513 in vol. 1 of *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0007010000.

Weiser, Artur. *Das Buch Jeremia: Kapitel 25,15–52,34*. ATD 21. Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 1982.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871.

———. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1899.

———. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Edinburgh: Black, 1885.

Werlitz, Jürgen. *Die Bücher der Könige*. NSKAT. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002.

West, Martin L. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973.

Wevers, John William, ed. *Deuteronomium*. SVTG 3.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

———. "Exegetical Principles underlying the Septuagint Text of I Kings ii 12–xxi 43." *OtSt* 8 (1950): 300–322.

———, ed. *Exodus*. SVTG 2.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

———. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SCS 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

———. *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*. MSU 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Willi, Thomas. *Chronik: 1Chr 1–10*. BKAT 24. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009.

Williamson, Hugh G. M. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.

Worthington, Martin. *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*. SANER 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.

Würthwein, Ernst. *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Könige 1–16*. ATD 11.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

———. *Die Bücher der Könige 1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25*. ATD 11.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Zahn, Molly M. "Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology." Pages 93–119 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Zapletal, Vincenz. *Das Buch der Richter*. EHAT 7.1. Munich: Aschendorff, 1923.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta*. MSU 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

Ziegler, Werner Carl Ludewig. "Kritik über den Artikel von der Schöpfung nach unserer gewöhnlichen Dogmatik." *Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte* 2 (1794): 1–113.

Ziemer, Benjamin, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz.* VTSup 182. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Ancient Sources Index

Josephus

Modern Authors Index