

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE NATURE OF THE LARGE-SCALE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LXX AND MT S T V, COMPARED WITH SIMILAR EVIDENCE IN OTHER SOURCES

1. *Background*

The contribution of the LXX to the literary criticism of the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible has gained increasing interest in recent years both by scholars specializing in the Hebrew Bible and by LXX specialists. The presence of special elements in the LXX that may date to early periods in the history of the biblical books has always intrigued scholars.¹ Before turning to the general background of these elements, which are not evenly spread in the books of the Bible, we present a brief survey² of the evidence relating to the contribution of textual to literary criticism in the canonical books.³

¹ On Samuel, see Wellhausen, *Samuel*; O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (KEH; ed. M. Löhr; 3d ed.; Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1898); N. Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1899). Some earlier and later studies were analyzed by D. Barthélemy, "L'enchevêtrement." Several studies, but by no means all those relevant, are mentioned in the following notes while, in addition, many others are referred to in the notes of my own study mentioned in n. 2. In addition, see the following general studies, in chronological sequence: N. C. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (GBS, Old Testament Series; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971); R. Stahl, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des hebräischen Bibel-Textes als Problem der Textkritik—Ein Beitrag zu gegenwärtig vorliegenden textgeschichtlichen Hypothesen und zur Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Text- und Literarkritik*, Ph.D. diss., Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, 1978 <cf. TLZ 105 (1980) 475–8>; the articles collected by Lust, *Ezekiel*; H.-J. Stipp, "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neueren alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen," *BZ* n.s. 1 (1990) 16–37; idem, "Textkritik–Literarkritik–Textentwicklung —Überlegungen zur exegetischen Aspektsystematik," *ETL* 66 (1990) 143–59; J. Treballe Barrera, *La Biblia judía y la Biblia cristiana* (Madrid: Trotta, 1993) 412–27 = *Jewish Bible*, 390–404; Z. Talshir, "The Contribution of Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to Literary Criticism of the Bible," in Greenspoon–Munnich, *VIII Congress*, 21–41; eadem, "Synchronic Approaches" (see chapter 20*, n. 1); Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*; further bibliography is found in the detailed descriptions of the individual books in P.-M. Bogaert, "Septante et versions grecques," *DBSup* XII (Paris 1993 [1994]) cols. 536–692, esp. 576–650.

² See further my *Greek and Hebrew Bible* and *TCU*.

³ The last chapter in my *TCU* defines the nature of and boundary between "textual" and "literary criticism," and the relevance, paradoxical as it may seem, of textual sources to literary criticism. By the same token, a study by Z. Talshir is named: "The Contribution of

The scope of the analysis should not be limited to the canonical shape of the Hebrew Bible. Previously⁴ I thought that only reflections of early editorial stages such as those in the LXX of Jeremiah and Ezekiel were relevant to the literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible, while those subsequent to the MT edition are not, pertaining only to exegesis. However, such a distinction is incorrect, since both types of evidence are relevant to literary analysis and exegesis.⁵

One group of literary divergences should, in my view, always be excluded from the present discussion, namely large-scale differences between MT S T V and LXX that can demonstrably be assigned to the translators themselves.⁶ Only if a Greek version reflects an underlying

Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to Literary Criticism of the Bible" (see n. 1) and a long section in Treballe Barrera, *Jewish Bible* is called "Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism, Duplicate and Double Editions" (pp. 390–404). Also Ulrich speaks often about "duplicate and double editions" (see n. 22 below).

⁴ The literary investigation of the *canonical* books of the Hebrew Bible is joined by textual data, which I formulated as follows at an earlier stage of my thinking: "the redactional stage reflected in MT S T V represents the lower limit of the literary analysis, while literary developments *subsequent* to that stage are located beyond the scope of literary analysis in the traditional sense of the word. Such later developments may be important for the subsequent understanding of the literary shape of the canonical books, but they really belong to the realm of exegesis. Thus, from the point of view of the canonical Hebrew shape of the book, the additional headers of the Psalms in the LXX and Peshitta are exponents of exegesis beyond the MT edition, and so are probably the so-called apocryphal Additions in the LXX versions of Esther and Daniel. If several of the large-scale additions and changes in the LXX of 1 Kings are midrashic, as suggested by Gooding (see chapter 20,* n. 24), they too are later than the canonical shape of the Hebrew Bible. In *TCU*, 240 I therefore still said: "The purpose being thus defined, literary developments subsequent to the edition of MT S T V are excluded from the discussion. This pertains to presumed midrashic developments in the books of Kings, Esther, and Daniel reflected in the LXX*." However, there is now room for a more refined appraisal of the data.

⁵ The literary development between the assumed first, short, edition of Jeremiah (LXX, 4QJer^{b,d}) and the second one (MT S T V) is exegetical, and is of major interest for scholarship as it presumably preceded the edition included in MT S T V. At the same time, had the LXX of Jeremiah preserved an edition subsequent to that of MT S T V, one that may have been termed midrashic, it should have been of similar interest. This is the case with the LXX forms of Esther, Daniel, and 1 Kings (see chapter 20*), and therefore the major deviations from MT in these books should not be brushed aside because they possibly postdate the MT edition. Besides, another aspect should also be taken into consideration: some scholars consider the literary divergences in Esther and Daniel anterior to the literary shape of MT S T V (see below), while others regard them as subsequent to that edition. It would therefore be safest to consider all these series of divergences relevant to literary analysis.

⁶ Obviously, it is difficult to make a distinction between differences created by translators and similar ones found in the translator's *Vorlage*, but when such a distinction can be made, the translator's input should be considered exegetical only, and not relevant to the literary history of the book. See below, group 4.

Semitic text, may it be thought of as representing a link in the chain of the literary development of the book.⁷

2. *The Evidence of the LXX*

When turning to the evidence of the LXX, in spite of the open approach advocated in § 1 above, the description nevertheless makes a distinction between different types of material in the LXX. The following relevant LXX evidence is known to me, although undoubtedly more data are waiting for literary analysis in the treasure stores of that translation.⁸

a. In several books, major elements in the text of the LXX have been recognized as reflecting an *earlier* edition of a biblical book or chapter(s). No consensus has been reached on the nature of most of the literary divergences between textual witnesses, thus rendering this summary subjective, stressing certain divergences between the LXX and MT S T V, while omitting others. In each instance, some scholars express a different opinion on what is considered here a redactional difference between the LXX and MT S T V; for example, when someone ascribes the divergence to a translator's tendency to expand or shorten. In all these cases, we make a shortcut in the description when accepting here, without analysis, the view that a translator found before him a different Hebrew text, while cases in which the translator presumably shortened or expanded his *Vorlage* are mentioned in group 4.

In four instances, the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX differed from MT S T V mainly with regard to its shortness (see *TCHB*, chapter 7).

- The most clear-cut case is Jeremiah in which the LXX (joined by 4QJer^{b,d}), some fifteen percent shorter than MT in its number of words, verses, and pericopes, and sometimes arranged differently (chapter 10 and the oracles against the nations), reflects an earlier edition, often named "edition I." The second edition added various new ideas. See chapter 26*, notes 66, 71, and 77.

- The LXX of Ezekiel is 4–5 percent shorter than MT S T V and in one case (7:3-9) the arrangement of the two editions differed much, involving new ideas. Furthermore, two small sections (12:26-28 and 32:25-26) and one large section (36:23c-38) are lacking in P. Chester Beatty (Pap. 967) dating to the second or early third century CE, in the latter case attested

⁷ The situation is a little more complicated, since the LXX developed from its status as a mere translation of the Hebrew Bible to an independent literary source for generations of Christian interpretations. Nevertheless, the literary shape of the LXX is less relevant to literary criticism of the Hebrew Bible if it was created by a translator.

⁸ Earlier less complete lists were provided by Swete, *Introduction*, 242–64; O. Munnich in *Bible grecque*, 172–82; Treballe Barrera, *Jewish Bible*, 390–404.

to also in La^{Wirc}. According to Lust, probably all three sections were lacking in the Old Greek translation as well as its Hebrew source.⁹

- The LXX of 1 Samuel 16–18 is significantly shorter than MT S T V (by some forty-five percent) and apparently represents one version of the story of David and Goliath, to which a second one, with different tendencies, was juxtaposed in the edition of MT S T V which therefore contains a composite account.

- The list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the LXX of Nehemiah 11 (2 Esdras 21) is considerably shorter than in MT S T V in vv 25-35, and possibly more original, displaying two different stages in the development of the list.¹⁰ That list or those lists are again different from the parallel list in 1 Chronicles 9.¹¹

In several other instances the differences between the two literary editions pertain to *more than one aspect* of the text and not only to length.

- The edition of Joshua reflected in the LXX differs in several ways from MT S T V. In some segments, the LXX is shorter (possibly joined by 4QJosh^a frg. 18 in Josh 8:14-18) and in other segments it is longer (note especially the end of Joshua in the LXX pointing to a shorter, combined version of Joshua–Judges), and in yet other pericopes different details are found, including the different position of Josh 8:30-35 of MT.¹²

⁹ J. Lust, “Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel,” in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 83–92. See also earlier studies by Lust: “De samenhang van Ez. 36–40,” *TvT* 20 (1980) 26–39; “Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517–33. See further P.-M. Bogaert, “Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante: Ezéchiel et Daniel dans le papyrus 967,” *Bib* 59 (1978) 384–95. Lust noted that the minuses in 12:26-28 and 32:25-26 could have been created by way of *parablepsis* (note the same phrases at the beginnings and endings of the minuses), but he considered the assumption of a shorter text more likely. In all three cases, the main manuscripts of the LXX reflect a longer text, like MT; the longer Greek text was created secondarily, according to Lust, who recognized signs of lateness in the main text of 12:26-28 and 36:23-38. Lust also recognized common themes in the segments that would have been added in Hebrew and later in Greek (“eschatological and apocalyptic themes”).

¹⁰ See *TCU*, 257. According to D. Böhler, “On the Relationship between Textual and Literary Criticism—Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra–Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX),” in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 35–50 (48), the MT edition reflects a geographical reality of Maccabean times.

¹¹ See, in great detail, G. N. Knoppers, “Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem’s Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9,” *Textus* 20 (2000) 141–68. Knoppers (p. 167) talks about “two stages in the growth of a single literary unit.”

¹² Beyond the analyses adduced in *TCU*, different editions of the same unit in Joshua were described in detail by L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua—Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994 (Heb. with Eng. summ.). Singled out for treatment were: the account of the Israelites’ circumcision at the Hill of Foreskins (5:2-9), the curse upon the builder of Jericho (6:26), the victory at Ai (8:1-29), and the tribal allotment (according to Mazor, the LXX almost always reflects an earlier text, and MT shows signs of lateness and revision). In Joshua 24, A. Rofé described

- In Genesis, the SP and LXX (albeit with differences between them) on the one hand, and MT S T V on the other, differ systematically in their presentation of the chronological data in the genealogies, especially in chapters 5, 8, and 11. The originality of any one system has not been determined.

- In the Song of Hannah, three parallel editions in MT, LXX, and 4QSam^a display distinct theological tendencies.¹³

- 1–2 Kings displays extensive chronological differences between MT S T V and the LXX with regard to synchronisms and the counting of the years of the divided monarchy. According to several scholars (see *TCU*, 253), the chronological system underlying the LXX has been altered to the system now reflected in MT. Also in matters of content, the Greek version of 1–2 Kings (3–4 Reigns) differs recensionally much from MT. The Greek version could reflect a later version of the Hebrew book (see below), or a redactional stage anteceding that of MT. In his study of 1 Kings 2–14, A. Schenker accepts the second possibility, assuming that the edition of MT S T V changed the earlier edition reflected in the LXX.¹⁴ Equally old elements are found in the LXX version of 1 Kgs 20:10-20 mentioning groups of dancing men as well as King David's dances, elements which were removed from MT, according to Schenker, probably in the second century BCE.

- The Greek text of Chronicles is sometimes redactionally shorter,¹⁵ while in one case it adds elements.¹⁶

the variants of the LXX as reflecting a coherent picture: "The Story of the Assembly in Shechem (Josh 24:1-28, 31)," *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress for Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999) 17–25.

¹³ *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, chapter 29.

¹⁴ Schenker, *Septante*. Schenker dates the MT edition to between 250 and 130 BCE, probably closer to the later end of this spectrum (see pp. 36–7, 152–3). Among other things, Schenker's view is based on the Greek version of 1 Kgs 2:35. According to the MT of this verse, Solomon appointed "Zadok the priest" instead of Ebiatar, while according to the LXX, Zadok was appointed as "the first priest." Schenker considers LXX the earlier version reflecting the appointment of the high priests by the kings, while MT reflects a later reality which was initiated with Simon Maccabee in 140 BCE when kings could no longer make such appointments. According to Schenker, MT repressed the earlier formulation in this case as well as in one other. The singular בית הבחירה of MT 1 Kgs 12:31 and 2 Kgs 17:29, 32 replaced the earlier plural reading οἴκους ἐφ' ὑψηλῶν (et sim.) in the LXX. According to Schenker (pp. 144–6), the plural of the LXX reflected the earlier reality of more than one sanctuary in Shechem, which was changed by MT to reflect the building of a single Samaritan sanctuary. Therefore, this correction (also reflected in the OG, reconstructed from the *Vetus Latina* in Deut 27:4) may be dated to the period of the existence of a temple on Mt. Gerizim between 300 and 128 BCE.

¹⁵ The text omits the posterity of Ham, except for the Cushites, and the longer of the two lists of the posterity of Shem (1 Chr 1:10-16, 17b-23).

- According to Pohlmann and Böhler, the literary shape of several chapters in 1 Esdras is older than the MT edition of the parallel chapters in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles.¹⁷ Böhler describes in detail how 1 Esdras depicts the situation in Jerusalem differently from the picture drawn by Ezra-Nehemiah. In Esdras, Jerusalem was inhabited at the time of Zerubbabel and Ezra, while in Ezra-Nehemiah this occurred during Nehemiah's time.¹⁸

- According to some scholars, the recensionally different editions of the LXX and "Lucianic" text (A-Text) of Esther preceded the edition of MT S T V.¹⁹ According to Milik,²⁰ another early version of that book was reflected in 4Q550 and 4Q550^{a-e} (4QprEsther^{a-f} ar), although most scholars see no connection between these Qumran texts and the biblical book of Esther.²¹

- According to some scholars, the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Daniel differing recensionally from MT, especially in chapters 4–6, preceded that of MT.²² In addition to the main text of the LXX, Pap. 967 displays

¹⁶ It adds elements from 2 Kgs 23:24-27, 31b-33 and 34:1-4 in 2 Chr 35:19a-d, 36:2a-c, 5a-d. For an analysis, see L. C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles* (VTSup 25; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974) 213–6.

¹⁷ K.-F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum dritten Esra. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Schloss des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (FRLANT 104; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).

¹⁸ Various opinions, reviewed in 1991 by A. Schenker, have been suggested concerning its relation to the canonical books; according to Schenker himself, this book contains midrashic, and hence late, elements (pp. 246–8): A. Schenker, "La relation d'Esdras A' au texte massorétique d'Esdras-Néhémie," in *Tradition of the Text—Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of His 70th Birthday* (ed. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; OBO 109; Freiburg/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 218–49.

¹⁹ See TCU, 255. According to Clines and Fox, the L text reflects a different and pristine text, which helps us to reconstruct the development of the book. See D. J. A. Clines, *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* (JSOTSup 30; Sheffield, 1984); M. V. Fox, *The Redaction of the Books of Esther* (SBLMS 40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991). As for the "Lucianic" text, this version has little to do with the Lucianic tradition in the other books of the LXX; see R. Hanhart, *Esther, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum, etc.*, VIII, 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 87–95.

²⁰ J. T. Milik, "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," in *Mémorial J. Starcky* (ed. E. Puech and F. García Martínez; Paris: Gabalda, 1992) 321–406.

²¹ See especially S. White Crawford, "Has Esther Been Found at Qumran? 4QProto-Esther and the Esther Corpus," *RevQ* 17 (1996) 315 ff.

²² See O. Munnich, "Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel," in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 93–120; Albertz, *Daniel*. R. Grelot assumes a different editorial model in chapter 4, see "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique," *RB* 81 (1974) 5–23; idem, "La chapître V de Daniel dans la Septante," *Sem* 24 (1974) 45–66. A similar view on Daniel was developed on the basis of Notre Dame dissertations by D. O. Wenthe and S. P. Jeansonne by E. Ulrich, "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated," in *DSS*, 34–50, esp. 40–44. According to Ulrich, the editions of both MT and the LXX (OG) reflect revised expansions of an earlier edition.

the chapters in a different sequence (1–4, 7, 8, 5, 6, 9–12, Bel, Suzanna), an arrangement which may reflect an earlier edition.

- Smaller differences between the LXX and MT S T V are mentioned in *TCU* as “differences in sequence” (pp. 257–8) and “minor differences” (pp. 258–60). These smaller differences (such as Deut 6:4; 32:43 in the LXX) also may be relevant for literary analysis especially when combined into a larger picture or tendency.

b. In some cases, the LXX has been recognized as reflecting large-scale redactional differences from MT S T V which were created *after* the edition of MT.

- The OG of Esther reflects a rewritten book reworking a text like MT.²³ The A-Text (“Lucianic text”)²⁴ likewise reflects a later text.²⁵

- According to some scholars, the large-scale differences between MT S T V and LXX in 1 Kings belong to the same category.²⁶

- The translator and reviser of Jeremiah considered Bar 1:1–3:8 an integral part of Jeremiah when including these chapters in the translation and, probably, revision, as shown by the Greek version of the second part of the book (Jeremiah 29–52 [according to the sequence of the LXX] + Bar 1:1–3:8).²⁷

- The OG of Daniel 4–6 reflects a rewritten book of a text like MT.²⁸

c. The editorial deviations of the LXX from MT S T V were described above as either preceding or following that edition.²⁹ In several instances, however, such a decision cannot be made; in these cases the existence of parallel Hebrew editions cannot be excluded. Thus, in the editorial differences between the LXX and MT S T V in Proverbs regarding the internal sequence of chapters and pericopes in chapters 24–31, no single sequence can be preferred. The LXX of Psalms differs from the edition of MT S T V in a few limited, but important, editorial details, namely the inclusion of Psalm 151 and the combining or

²³ See chapter 20*.

²⁴ See n. 19.

²⁵ See my *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, chapter 37. Also Jobes believes that the L text of Esther is based on a Hebrew original, much shorter than MT S T V, but very similar to that text where the two overlap: K. H. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS 153; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996). On the other hand, K. de Troyer, *Het einde van de Alpha-tekst van Ester* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) believes that L presents an inner-Greek revision not based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

²⁶ See chapter 20*.

²⁷ See my study *Jeremiah and Baruch*.

²⁸ See chapter 20*.

²⁹ Their inclusion in either group 1 or 2 is subjective and, as mentioned above, different opinions have been expressed on each group of variations.

separating of some Psalms differently from the edition of MT S T V.³⁰ The much deviating Greek text of Exodus 35–40 probably reflects a deviating Hebrew text.³¹

d. In yet other cases, when large-scale differences between the LXX and MT S T V were most likely created by the translators themselves, by definition they do not pertain to the literary development of the LXX, but rather to the exegesis of a single translator or reviser. This appears to be the case with the Greek translation of Job.³²

3. *The LXX and the Other Ancient Sources*

In spite of the uncertainties described above, the LXX does reflect many large-scale redactional deviations from MT S T V. Before trying to understand the unique relation between the LXX and MT S T V, the LXX's comparative position with regard to the other ancient sources should be evaluated.³³

When comparing the LXX with the other ancient versions one notes that beyond MT, the LXX is the single most significant source of information pertaining to the editorial development of the biblical books. No such information is included in any other ancient version. Some evidence of the Old Latin runs parallel with the LXX,³⁴ but since that

³⁰ MT 9, 10 = LXX 9; MT 114, 115 = LXX 113; MT 116 = LXX 114 + 115; MT 147 = LXX 146 + 147.

³¹ See chapter 20*, n. 7.

³² This translation is one-sixth shorter than its counterpart in MT S T V, and also appears to have been created by a free translator who shortened his *Vorlage* considerably. See G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, I. The Book of Job* (LUÅ 43, 2; Lund: Gleerup, 1946); D. H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBL Monograph Series 8; 1952); H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book Job, II," *HUCA* 29 (1958) 229–71. The free character of the Greek translation was analyzed in detail by J. Ziegler, "Der textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job," *Sylloge, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 9–28.

³³ In this comparison, we try to assess the relation between the LXX and the other ancient sources, but in some instances we are not certain that the LXX reflects a different Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage* relevant to the literary history of the Bible. Nevertheless, in the following discussion it is taken for granted that the LXX does indeed reflect important differences in such books as Joshua, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc. At the same time, the situation is not as difficult as these remarks imply, since there is *some* external evidence supporting the aforementioned reconstruction of the LXX, namely 4QJer^{b,d} and 4QJosh^a, and some support from SP for the chronological deviations of the LXX from the MT of Genesis.

³⁴ This pertains to the shorter Old Latin version of Jeremiah 39 and 52: P.-M. Bogaert, "La libération de Jérémie et le meurtre de Godolias: le texte court (LXX) et la rédaction longue (TM)," in Fraenkel, *Septuaginta*, 312–22; see further Bogaert's study "L'importance de la Septante et du 'Monacensis' de la Vetus Latina pour l'exégèse du livre de l'Exode (chap. 35–40)," in M. Vervenne, *Studies in the Book of Exodus—Redaction—Reception—Interpretation* (BETL 126; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1996) 399–427. This also

version was translated from Greek, this evidence points in the same direction as that of the LXX. A few deviations from MT in the Peshitta of Chronicles should also be mentioned.³⁵

The LXX may also be compared with the SP and the pre-Samaritan Qumran texts (the SP-group) which likewise contain material that is significant on a literary level:

- 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b, and the later SP systematically reworked the recounting of Israel's history in Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.³⁶

- The SP and the pre-Samaritan Qumran texts systematically harmonized a *few* select stories in the Torah so as to avoid what they considered to be internal inconsistencies.³⁷

- The single most pervasive change in the SP is probably the rewritten Decalogue in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 involving the addition³⁸ of a sectarian tenth commandment³⁹ referring to the sanctity of Mount Gerizim.

All this material is comparable to the aforementioned LXX evidence and the Qumran evidence to be mentioned below. With regard to the SP group, all the evidence for redactional changes seems to be subsequent to the literary edition included in MT,⁴⁰ but that assumption does not make the material less important. The editing involved was meant to create a more perfect and internally consistent textual structure. However, the editing procedure itself was inconsistent, since certain details were changed while similar ones were left untouched.

This leads us to the Qumran biblical texts reflecting scattered information relevant to literary criticism and hence potentially parallel to

pertains to the Old Latin version of Ezek 36:23c-38 in codex Wirceburgensis, as well as to individual readings, not involving large-scale variations, in the historical books as recognized by J. C. Trebolle Barrera: *Jehú y Joás. Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9–11* (Institución San Jerónimo 17; Valencia, 1984); "From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kings 10,23-25)," *Textus* 11 (1984) 17–36; "La primitiva confesión de fe yahvista (1 Re 18,36-37). De la crítica textual a la teología bíblica," *Salmanticensis* 31 (1984) 181–205; "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Book of Kings (1 Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)," *Textus* 13 (1986) 85–94; "Le texte de 2 Rois 7,20–8,5 à la lumière des découvertes de Qumrân (6Q4 15)," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 561–8.

³⁵ A few clusters of verses are lacking in this translation, e.g. 1 Chr 2:47-49; 4:16-18, 34-37; 7:34-38; 8:17-22.

³⁶ See chapter 6*.

³⁷ See *ibid.*

³⁸ See chapter 6*, n. 12.

³⁹ See F. Dexinger, "Das Garizingebot im Dekalog der Samaritaner," in *Studien zum Pentateuch Walter Kornfeld zum 60 Geburtstag* (ed. G. Braulik; Vienna/Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1977) 111–33.

⁴⁰ See chapter 6*.

the LXX. As in the case of the LXX, our assessment of the data is subjective, and furthermore the complexity of the comparison of the complete Qumran corpus with a single text, the LXX, is also problematic. However, it seems that such a comparison is legitimate, because the amalgam of the different books of the LXX is comparable to the Qumran corpus of biblical texts, even if the latter is more extensive than the LXX. The Qumran corpus is very fragmentary, but often the character of a book is recognizable in a small fragment, such as the Jeremiah fragments from cave 4. This analysis allows us to claim that the Qumran corpus, though much larger than the LXX, reflects much fewer literary differences of the type found in the LXX.

- 4QJer^{b,d}: The best example of early redactional evidence is probably found in these two texts whose evidence in shortness and sequence tallies with the LXX, while deviating from the edition of MT S T V.

- 4QJosh^a: The section which in MT LXX S T V reports the building of an altar after several episodes of the conquest (8:30-35), is located at an earlier place in the story in 4QJosh^a, before 5:1, immediately after the crossing of the Jordan, probably parallel to its position *apud* Josephus, *Ant.* V:16-19. According to Ulrich, the sequence of events in 4QJosh^a, which probably reflects the original shape of the story, shows that the Qumran text constituted a third formulation of Joshua, alongside MT S T V and LXX.⁴¹ Furthermore, 4QJosh^a contains an occasionally shorter text similar to that of the LXX.⁴²

- 4QSam^a probably reflects a different edition of the Song of Hannah from those reflected in MT and the LXX (see above). Many other details in this manuscript reflect a different, possibly older version of Samuel,

⁴¹ E. Ulrich, "4QJoshua^a and Joshua's First Altar in the Promised Land," in Brooke-García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts*, 89-104. On the other hand, according to A. Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a," *ibid.*, 73-80, the scroll displays a later, nomistic change of the MT sequence. For similar sequence differences in other passages, see Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 411-8. On the other hand, M. N. van der Meer, *Formation & Reformulation—The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 511-9 claimed that the Qumran scroll does not reflect the sequence suggested in the scroll's edition in *DJD* XIV. In his view, part of the description of Josh 8:30-35 (*viz.*, the reading of the Torah) was included in the story of crossing the Jordan at Gilgal in the scroll, and repeated *ad loc.* in 8:30-35. Another study that suggests literary differences between the various texts of Joshua is K. De Troyer, "Did Joshua Have a Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15, 17 and 23," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 571-89.

⁴² Frgs. 15-16 of this scroll present a recensionally shorter text than MT that runs parallel to the shorter text of the LXX, although the two are not identical. Cf. Mazor, *Septuagint Translation*, 54-6 and eadem, "A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8," in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters, Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Heb.; Jerusalem 1994) 73-108.

but it is unclear to what extent it also reflects a redactionally earlier stage in these details. Some material may be midrashic (see the beginning of col. II), as suggested by Rofé⁴³ for the scroll as a whole.

- 4QJudg^a lacks an entire section found in MT LXX S T V, viz., Judg 6:7–10. If this minus did not stem from a textual accident, such as the omission of a complete paragraph ending with open sections, it could reflect an earlier edition of the book, in which part of the deuteronomistic framework, contained in these verses, was lacking.⁴⁴

- 1QIsa^a 38:1-8. The different hands in chapter 38 in the scroll *may* reflect different stages of the development of 2 Kgs 20:1-11.⁴⁵

- 4QRP, reclassified as a biblical manuscript, contains several long exegetical additions.⁴⁶

- It is more difficult to categorize the evidence of other Qumran manuscripts, whose short or different text deviates from MT LXX S T V but is not related to the issue at stake because the compositions do not constitute biblical manuscripts in the usual sense of the word. The relevant evidence, relating to the short texts of 4QCant^{a,b}, 4QDeutⁿ, 4QDeut^j, 4QDeut^{k1} (sections of Deuteronomy 5, 11, and 32) and other texts is described in chapter 4*. The Deuteronomy texts were probably liturgical excerpts. Likewise, several Psalms texts are considered by most scholars to be non-biblical liturgical collections.⁴⁷ The Canticles manuscripts⁴⁸ are probably excerpted versions of the edition of MT LXX S T V.⁴⁹ The Qumran corpus also contains excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts which were probably compiled for personal purposes: 4QExod^d,⁵⁰ 4QDeut^q (Deut 32:37-43); 4QEzek^b,⁵¹ 1QPs^a,

⁴³ A. Rofé, "The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and its Occurrence in 4QSam^a," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 247–54.

⁴⁴ See TCHB, 351 and J. Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 229–45; idem, in *DJD* XIV, 161–9; N. Fernández Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 1–16. On the other hand, Rofé believes that the omission in the scroll was created by a scribal mistake (deletion of a paragraph), and that the relatively late scroll would not reflect such an early development: A. Rofé, "The Biblical Text in Light of Historico-Literary Criticism—The Reproach of the Prophet-Man in Judg 6:7-10 and 4QJudg^a," in *Border Line*, 33–44.

⁴⁵ See TCHB, 346–8.

⁴⁶ See chapter 20*, § E and Tov, "Many Forms."

⁴⁷ See chapter 4*.

⁴⁸ See *DJD* XVI, 195–219 and plates XXIV–XXV.

⁴⁹ On the other hand, E. Ulrich describes these texts as earlier than or parallel with MT: "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 51–9, esp. 57–8.

⁵⁰ See chapter 4*, § 2.

⁵¹ See J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* XV, 216.

4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 5QPs all containing Psalm 119; 4QPsⁿ (135:6-8, 11-12; 136:23-24); 4QPs^l (Psalm 104); 4QDan^e.⁵²

In short, probably only five or six biblical texts from Qumran, and none at all from the other sites in the Judaean Desert, provide *early* material relevant to the editorial development of the Hebrew Bible.⁵³

The list of biblical Qumran texts attesting to early redactional stages different from MT LXX S T V is thus rather limited. Should we present a longer list, most additional items contributing to the literary analysis of the Bible will probably be conceived of as subsequent to the edition of MT LXX S T V. Consequently, according to this understanding, in addition to MT, the LXX remains the major source for recognizing different literary stages (early and late) of the Hebrew Bible.

4. *Evaluation of the Literary Evidence of the LXX*

Having reviewed the evidence of the LXX, other biblical versions, and the Qumran manuscripts, we note that beyond MT, the LXX preserves the greatest amount of information on different stages in the development of the Hebrew Bible, early and late.

When turning now to the background of this situation, we may not be able to explain the data. If we were groping in the dark in the earlier parts of this study, this section is even more hypothetical. Yet, if our assessment of the totality of the biblical evidence is correct, the assumption is unavoidable that the Hebrew manuscripts used for the Greek translation were important copies of the Hebrew Bible, since otherwise they would not have contained so much material which scholars consider relevant to the literary development of the biblical books. How should this phenomenon be explained?

The special character of the *Vorlage* of the LXX seems to be related to two factors or a combination of them: (1) the idiosyncratic Hebrew manuscripts used for the Greek translation were *not* embraced by the circles that fostered MT; and (2) the relatively early date of the translation enterprise (275–150 BCE), involving still earlier Hebrew manuscripts, could reflect vestiges of earlier editorial stages of the biblical books.⁵⁴ The earlier the date assigned to the *Vorlage* of the LXX,

⁵² See E. Ulrich, *DJD XVI*, 287.

⁵³ We exclude from this analysis the evidence of 4QTestimonia (4Q175) and the *tefillin*, even though they contain biblical passages. These texts were compiled on the basis of biblical texts for specific purposes, literary (4QTestimonia) and liturgical (*tefillin*).

⁵⁴ There is no evidence for the alternative assumption that the LXX was based on Hebrew texts of a local Egyptian vintage. If the Jewish population of Egypt hardly knew

the more likely the text was to reflect early redactional stages of the biblical books. However, only a combination of the two factors explains that very old texts, such as probably reflected in the LXX, still circulated in the third-second centuries BCE, when some of the proto-Masoretic texts known to us already existed. This approach does not explain the cases in which the LXX presumably reflects editorial stages subsequent to MT. In these cases we have to appeal also to the special status of the *Vorlage* of the LXX in ancient Israel, in other words to its independence from the circles which embraced MT (factor 1).

When ascribing the idiosyncratic character of the Hebrew manuscripts included in the LXX to their early date, we find some support for this approach in the Qumran documents. A few early Qumran texts, similarly deriving from the third and second centuries BCE, reflect redactional differences from MT. Thus, two Qumran manuscripts contain the same early redactional stage as the LXX, namely 4QJer^b and 4QJer^d (both: 200–150 BCE), while 4QJosh^a is relatively early (150–50 BCE). At the same time, two other manuscripts *possibly* reflecting early literary stages are later: 4QJudg^a (50–25 BCE) and 4QSam^a (50–25 BCE). The evidence for Qumran is thus not clear-cut, but neither is it unequivocal for the LXX. For only some of the LXX books reflect redactionally different versions and by the same token only some of the early Qumran manuscripts are independent vis-à-vis MT. Nevertheless, the picture is rather clear. Among the eighteen Qumran manuscripts which were assigned by their editors to the same period as the LXX,⁵⁵ the two mentioned manuscripts of Jeremiah contain redactionally different elements, but the number of non-Masoretic manuscripts which are textually non-aligned in small details is very high.⁵⁶ Thus, according to our tentative working hypothesis, the early date of the Hebrew manuscripts used by the LXX translations in some books and of some of the Qumran manuscripts may explain their attesting to early literary traditions. The assumption that the LXX was based on very ancient Hebrew manuscripts that were brought to Egypt in the fifth or fourth century would seem to provide an adequate explanation for the

Hebrew, they would not have developed their own Hebrew version of the biblical text (*pace* the assumption of local texts as developed by Albright and Cross; see *TCHB*, 185–7).

⁵⁵ This information is based on B. Webster, “Chronological Indices of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” *DJD* XXXIX, 351–446.

⁵⁶ Of these eighteen manuscripts, seven are considered textually independent in small details: 4QExod^d (225–175 BCE), 4QDeut^b (150–100 BCE), 4QDeut^c (150–100 BCE), 5QDeut (200–150 BCE), 6QpapKings (150–100 BCE), 4QQoh^a (175–150 BCE), 4QXII^a (150–125 BCE), and one is close to SP: 4QExod-Lev^f (250 BCE). The others are either close to MT, or their textual affiliation cannot be determined.

background of the LXX, but since we find redactionally early manuscripts from the second and first centuries BCE also in Qumran, that explanation need not be invoked.

A supplementary explanation of the special character of the LXX seems to be that the scrolls used for that translation came from circles different from the temple circles which supposedly fostered MT.⁵⁷ This argument pertaining to the textual situation at the time when manuscripts were selected for the Greek translation, is hypothetical with regard to the central position of MT in temple circles. However, the fact remains that none of the MT texts was used for the Greek translation.

While we cannot depict the early history of the biblical text on the basis of the limited evidence described so far, nevertheless an attempt will be made to illuminate a few shady areas.

It seems that most cases of different literary editions preserved in the textual witnesses reflect editorial developments in a linear way, one edition having been developed from an earlier one, preserved or not, while there also may have been intervening stages which have not been preserved. For example, the long editions of MT in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and 1 Samuel 16–18 probably developed from earlier shorter editions such as reflected in the LXX and 4QJer^{b,d}. In other cases the evidence is more complex, such as in Joshua where the LXX edition is both shorter, longer, and different in wording. However, in all these instances, a linear development between the LXX and MT editions *or vice versa* may be assumed, with the later edition mainly expanding the earlier one, while at times also shortening and changing its message.⁵⁸

Any reply to the question of why texts of the MT family were not used for the LXX translation remains a matter of conjecture. It probably

⁵⁷ Several statements in the rabbinic literature mention one or more master copies of the Torah in the temple, as well as limited textual activity, including correcting and revising (for some references, see *TCHB*, 32). Since the only text quoted in the rabbinic literature and used as the base for the Targumim and Vulgate is MT, it stands to reason that it was the text embraced by the rabbis. Furthermore, all the texts used by the religious zealots of Masada and the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba found at all other sites in the Judean Desert except for Qumran are identical to the medieval MT. These are probably the “corrected copies” mentioned in *b. Pesah.* 112a, while the proto-Masoretic texts found at Qumran are one step removed from these “corrected texts.” See chapter 12*.

⁵⁸ The alternative assumption of the existence of pristine parallel editions has been raised often in scholarship, but it seems that it cannot be supported by the preserved evidence, neither with regard to major variations, nor with regard to smaller ones. A possible exception would be the case of Proverbs, where two equally viable arrangements of the pericopes are reflected in the LXX and MT S T V. However, even this case does not necessarily prove the existence of early parallel editions. It only shows that scholars are often unable to decide which text developed from another one, while in reality one may have developed from the other.

seems rather unusual to us, having been exposed for two thousand years to the central position of MT, that MT was not used for this purpose. But in the reality of the third and second centuries BCE the non-use of MT was not unexpected. The realm of MT influence may have been limited to certain circles, and we do not know from which circles the Hebrew manuscripts used for the translation were sent or brought to Egypt. Clearly the circles or persons who sent or brought the manuscripts of the Torah to Alexandria were *not* Eleazar the High Priest and the sages, as narrated in the Epistle of Aristeas § 176. Any High Priest would undoubtedly have encouraged the use of MT for such an important enterprise. Incidentally, the Epistle of Aristeas praises the qualities of the translators as well as the external features of the scrolls, but says nothing about their content.

Our point of departure is that the proto-Masoretic copies existed already when the Greek translation was made. Several such copies were indeed found at Qumran. In the case of Jeremiah, the MT form is extant in 4QJer^a, which is dated around 200 BCE. Why then was a copy of the tradition of 4QJer^{b,d} used for the LXX, and not its MT counterpart? Was it preferred to MT because it was considered more ancient (which it really was, in our view) or more authentic? Was that text possibly accepted by specific circles as opposed to the MT version adopted in the temple circles? The text used for the LXX was a good one, as opposed to many of the carelessly written copies found at Qumran. It was not one of the Palestinian “vulgar” copies involving much secondary editing such as the SP group.⁵⁹ But it remains difficult to determine the background of this text. At the same time, the choice of certain texts for the Greek translation could not have been coincidental. After all, the LXX contains important early and independent material.

The evidence discussed in the anthology *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* represents only some of the literary material reflected in the LXX. One should therefore consider the totality of the LXX evidence. It would be one-sided to consider only chronological factors, as was done in several studies which suggest a Maccabean date for elements in MT, thus explaining the background of the various redactional stages as chronologically different. However, at the time of the translation, ancient copies still circulated, while the edition of MT had already incorporated editorial stages meant to replace these earlier texts. The assumption of a Maccabean date of MT would explain several cases in which the LXX antedated MT, but that solution seems to be unrealistic since several

⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the Greek Torah contains a fair number of harmonizing readings in *small* details, almost as many as the SP group; see chapter 19*.

early (pre-Maccabean) MT manuscripts are known from Qumran. Nevertheless, such a late date has been suggested for several biblical books or parts of them, especially Psalms, without reference to the LXX.⁶⁰ As for the LXX, on the basis of a single reading and a small group of readings, Schenker dated the MT edition of 1–2 Kings to the period between 250 and 130 BCE, probably closer to the later end of this spectrum (see n. 14). According to Schenker, an equally late revision is found in MT of 1 Kings 20:10–20.⁶¹ Likewise, Lust dated the MT edition of Ezekiel to the second century BCE, the time of Jonathan Maccabee.⁶² Böhler notes that the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the edition of MT in Nehemiah 11 reflects the reality of the Maccabean times with regard to the scope of Judea.⁶³ Likewise, in the case of the MT version of Joshua 20 differing redactionally from the LXX, Wellhausen and Cooke suggested that the MT redaction was created after the time of the LXX.⁶⁴

While not trying to refute these specific “Maccabean” arguments in detail, it seems that the basis for the Maccabean dating of MT is one-sided, and that several details are debatable. At least in the case of Jeremiah the chronological argument does not hold, and furthermore one should be attentive to the textual forces in ancient Israel in the third-second centuries BCE. At that time, the MT manuscripts were embraced by certain circles only, while others used different, often older, manuscripts.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ For a discussion, see R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1978) 192–3.

⁶¹ Those verses mention groups of dancing men as well as King David’s dances. These elements suited the Hellenistic culture, and were therefore omitted in MT, according to Schenker, probably in the second century BCE.

⁶² “Ezekiel 4 and 5 in Hebrew and in Greek,” *ETL* 77 (2001) 132–52 (132–5). Lust’s point of departure is a comparison of the 390 years of punishment of MT in Ezek 4:4–6 (actually 390 + 40 = 430) and the 190 years of the LXX (= 150 years for the iniquity of Israel [v 4] + 40 for that of Judah). Lust considers the figure of 190 of the LXX as more original, while the 390 years of MT show its late date. According to the edition of MT, if the 390 years are to be calculated from the date of the destruction of the first temple, together with the mentioned 40 years, we arrive at 157/156 BCE, during the era of Jonathan Maccabee. Lust does not explain the exact relation between the figures of MT and the LXX.

⁶³ D. Böhler, “On the Relationship between Textual and Literary Criticism—The Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra-Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX),” in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 35–50 (48).

⁶⁴ J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963) 132; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua* (Cambridge: University Press, 1918) *ad loc.* See also A. Rofé, “Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated,” in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 131–47, esp. 145.

⁶⁵ My own intuition tells me that more often than not the LXX reflects an earlier stage than MT both in the literary shape of the biblical books and in small details. Thus also Barthélemy, “L’enchevêtrement,” 39: “Souvent cet état [*scil.* ... littéraire autonome et distinct du TM] est plus ancien que celui qu’offre le TM. Parfois il est plus récent. Mais cela

5. *Conclusions*

a. An open approach was advocated in the discussion of the large-scale differences between MT S T V and the LXX, involving both Greek segments which presumably preceded the literary stage included in MT and those which were created subsequently. It was found that a substantive number of such differences preceded the MT edition.

b. When comparing the LXX evidence with that of the other sources, we found that beyond MT, the LXX is the single most important source preserving redactionally different material relevant to the literary analysis of the Bible, often earlier than MT. The other biblical translations preserve no such material, while a limited amount of redactionally different material has been preserved in some Hebrew biblical texts from Qumran, especially in early texts.

c. The preservation of redactionally different material in the LXX was ascribed to two factors or a combination of them: (1) the idiosyncratic nature of the Hebrew manuscripts used for the translation not shared by the circles which embraced MT; and (2) the relatively early date of the translation enterprise (275–150 BCE), involving still earlier Hebrew manuscripts which could reflect vestiges of earlier editorial stages of the biblical books. These factors may explain the special nature of the LXX in different ways, but sometimes they need to be combined. For example, the texts that circulated at the time of the Greek translation beyond the circles which embraced MT may have contained very early elements.

d. In view of the above, I allow myself to retain reservations regarding the possibility of a Maccabean date for details in MT. Such a dating is based only on the chronological argument, and not on recognition of the textual situation in ancient Israel, where early texts could have been circulating for decades or centuries outside the temple circles.

ne saurait amener à préférer l'un à l'autre. LXX et TM méritent d'être traités comme deux formes bibliques traditionnelles dont chacune doit être interprétée pour elle-même."