

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

THE SEPTUAGINT AND THE DEUTERONOMISTS*

The hypothesis that some of the books of Hebrew Scripture were reworked by (a) Deuteronomistic (Dtr) reviser(s) is well established and has been accepted, with several variations, by virtually all critical Bible scholars. Thus, some scholars assume that earlier forms of Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah¹ were revised in the spirit of Deuteronomy, while others claim that the “Deuteronomists” themselves edited the books.² This reworking involved the reformulating and re-editing of an earlier text in light of the ideas and wording of Deuteronomy. This altering of a biblical book on the basis of Deuteronomy differs from a biblical author’s intimate knowledge of that book, as has been claimed, for example, for Jeremiah’s close connection to Deuteronomy. In any event, it should be noted that all details relating to the Dtr hypothesis are contested (number of revisers; date of the revision(s); methods used; books revised; vocabulary of Dtr; ideology of the reworking; relation to Deuteronomy, etc.).³ The scholarly assumption of a Dtr reworking in Joshua–2 Kings

* Thanks are due to Mindy Anderson Jeppesen for her careful reading of the manuscript and her helpful remarks.

¹ The hypotheses relating to the existence of Dtr elements in additional books are not well founded. Furthermore, they are also irrelevant to the present investigation, since in these cases the evidence is limited to MT and is not challenged by other textual witnesses. A Dtr reworking of Amos is often mentioned in the literature; see, for example, R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 1; Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1978) 175. This assumption was refuted by S. M. Paul, “A Literary Reinvestigation of the Authenticity of the Oracles against the Nations of Amos,” in *De la Tôrah au Messie: Études d’exégèse et d’herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (ed. J. Doré et al.; Paris: Desclée, 1981) 189–204 = idem, *Divrei Shalom, Collected Studies of Shalom M. Paul on the Bible and the Ancient Near East 1967–2005* (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2005) 417–37. A Dtr reworking of Zechariah was suggested by R. F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School* (JSOTSup 167; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

² See n. 71 relating to Jeremiah.

³ For some of the latest literature, see M. A. O’Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis, A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie, *Those Elusive Deuteronomists, The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); *Israel Constructs Its History, Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. A. de Pury et al.; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); A. F. Campbell, S.J. and M.

and Jeremiah is based mainly on the evidence of MT, since in most details relating to a possible Deuteronomistic revision, MT agrees with the other textual witnesses. Among these non-Masoretic witnesses, the LXX is the oldest, dating to the third and second pre-Christian centuries. It is usually assumed that the Dtr reworking was completed long before the creation of the LXX translation, and it therefore stands to reason that this version would reflect little evidence of Dtr activity.

However, this study deals with a substantial number of discrepancies relating to this understanding. It refers to instances in which evidence possibly relating to Dtr is *not* shared by all textual sources. In most of these instances, Dtr phrases in MT are not reflected in the LXX, while in a few cases the LXX provides Dtr evidence not extant in MT. The data are discussed book by book since the textual evidence and content dynamics differ in each book. One of the main points of interest is the question of whether the addition or omission of a Dtr phrase took place in the course of scribal transmission or during one of the compositional stages. In the former scenario, scribal changes are irrelevant to literary procedures. In the latter case, relating to the composition of books, we need to ask ourselves whether the Dtr details added or omitted in one of the textual sources reflect occasional changes by an editor or were part of a systematic attempt to revise the book as a whole. All additions and omissions of Dtr elements in one of the textual sources (with the exclusion of Joshua 20) were applied to an already existing layer of Dtr revision, and therefore the possibility of a second layer of Dtr revision is invoked. An analysis of the MT of Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah shows that the assumption of a Dtr revision is rather stable, but the evidence from the LXX may suggest that this layer actually consists of two segments. We say, “*may suggest*,” since this evidence will be analyzed below. Further, if such a second Dtr layer is detected, we need to ask ourselves whether these two textual strata in Dtr⁴ represent the same

A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History, Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000); *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 14; Leuven: Peeters, 2000); G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville, *Reconsidering Israel and Judah—Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000); T. Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History, A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T & T Clark, 2005); *Die deuteronomistische Geschichtswerke, Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus“-Diskussion im Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte; BZAW 365, 2006).

⁴ The main proponent of such a view is Person; see the monographs mentioned in notes 1 and 79. See especially Person, *Second Zechariah*, 43–54. Not all examples quoted by him are relevant since some of the quoted differences between textual layers refer to phrases that are not Deuteronomistic.

layers that scholars detected in the Dtr revision of the historical books without reference to textual evidence.⁵

The analysis is tentative because of the accumulation of several assumptions:

a. The use of details in the LXX in the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible remains uncertain. Even if the Greek evidence is seemingly unproblematic, as in the case of a short LXX reading in contrast to a long one in MT, the reconstruction of a short Hebrew text on the basis of the LXX remains subjective. In each instance, we vacillate between the possibility of a translator inserting the change himself (in this case, abbreviating his *Vorlage*) and that of a short Hebrew text faithfully rendered into Greek. Accordingly, for each book, we must first address the faithfulness of the translator to his *Vorlage*. Thus, the evidence of the LXX may be trusted if the translation technique is faithful to the underlying Hebrew text.⁶ For example, the literal approach in 1 Kings and Jeremiah allows for the assumption that the lack of the Dtr phrases in these books points to a short Hebrew *Vorlage*.

b. The decision as to whether a certain phrase reflects Dtr vocabulary remains uncertain, as shown, for example, by the discussion below of 1 Kings 6. While old assumptions need not be re-examined time and again, one should be aware of the uncertainty of the procedure. Constant reference is made to lists of Dtr phraseology, especially M. Weinfeld's, which relates to all the Dtr books, and that of Stulman for Jeremiah,⁷ but

⁵ Such views have been expressed since the days of Ewald in the nineteenth century, culminating in the "Double Dtr Redaction" as phrased by what is named the schools of Cross and Smend. These views have been summarized by T. Römer and A. de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 63–74. See F. M. Cross, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in his *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973) 274–89; R. Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: G. von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. W. Wolff; Munich: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1971) 494–509; R. D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981).

⁶ For an analysis, see TCU, 37–89.

⁷ M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 320–61; L. Stulman, *The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah. A Redescription of the Correspondences with Deuteronomistic Literature in Light of Recent Text-Critical Research* (SBLDS 83; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 33–44. The phrases in Weinfeld's list are subdivided into content categories, while the categorization in Stulman's list follows statistical criteria. The logic behind the analysis of Dtr phraseology is based on a combination of arguments: context (a phrase, verse, or paragraph is inappropriate in the context), the distinction between poetry and prose (in Jeremiah), and word distribution in Hebrew Scripture as a whole. The latter argument is based on the observation that a given phrase occurs in Hebrew Scripture mainly in the book of Deuteronomy and/or the Dtr layer in Joshua, Judges, etc.

the characterization of a phrase as Dtr on the basis of these lists is not without problems.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relevance of the textual data for the study of Dtr. The discussion is limited to the LXX since there is no significant evidence known to us from the other textual sources.⁸ For each relevant detail in the LXX, we envisage the following three options:

a. The difference between the LXX and MT is irrelevant to the textual and literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible because it was created by the *translator*.

b. The Dtr element was created by a Hebrew *copyist* in the course of the textual transmission.

c. The Dtr element was created or omitted by a late editor during the continual process of change of the literary shape of the Hebrew book. This process took place either in the forerunner of MT (in the case of a minus in the LXX) or in the parent text of the LXX (in the case of a plus in the LXX).

The analysis refers to those instances known to us in which either MT or the LXX contains a Dtr phrase that is not shared by the other source. In all instances, some or most scholars point to the Dtr nature of one of the phrases (usually minuses of the LXX). Most English translations of the Hebrew phrases or verses follow the NJPS translation.⁹

Joshua

The LXX of Joshua reflects three types of minuses of Dtr phrases vis-à-vis MT, (1a) single Dtr phrases, (1b) a quotation from Deuteronomy, and (1c) a passage revised according to Deuteronomy. The LXX also reflects some pluses based on Deuteronomy (2). Most Dtr phrases were probably inserted in MT (groups 1a–b) and the LXX (group 2) by a scribe at a late stage in the transmission of the book, while the item in group 1c attests to changes made during one of the compositional stages. This item should be viewed in the light of other major differences between the

⁸ A possible exception pertains to 4QJudg^a, which lacks a complete paragraph, Judg 6:7–10. The absence of this paragraph was explained as pointing to a pre-Dtr text. See chapter 11*, n. 44.

⁹ תנ"ך, *JPS Hebrew–English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew Text and the New JPS Translation* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: JPS, 1999).

Greek and Hebrew forms of the book that show evidence of early features in both texts.¹⁰

The instances listed below are presented as if the translator found a different text in front of him. However, this way of presenting the material shows more confidence than is merited in the case of Joshua. The translator could have shortened his text since the translation technique argument is indecisive in this book. On the other hand, in our view, the translation is not sufficiently free to allow for the assumption that the translator left out the details listed below.¹¹ More likely, he found an often-shorter text.

1a. *Single Dtr phrases lacking in the LXX*

Several Dtr phrases in Joshua are not reflected in the LXX.¹² The text quoted below is that of MT with the LXX deviations indicated by parenthesis or italics.

1:1 After the death of Moses (the servant of the Lord); in 1:15; 12:6b; 22:4 the LXX lacks the same phrase.¹³ Driver lists the phrase as Dtr,¹⁴ while Weinfeld, 351, does not mention it. Instead, Weinfeld records the

¹⁰ See my paper "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation," *ScrHier* 31 (1986) 321–9 with references to earlier studies. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 385–96.

¹¹ See the analysis of the translation technique in Mazor (below); C. G. den Hartog, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua*, Ph.D. diss., University of Giessen, 1996, 160–83; J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth* (Moers: J. G. Eckner, 1876) 5–9. On the basis of limited data provided in Tov, "The Growth," 388, n. 13, the translation was ranked as relatively free to relatively literal. At the same time, the freedom of the translator is often predictable, so that the reconstruction of its Hebrew base text is often easier than shown by mere statistics. See further the conclusion of R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979) 285, who includes Joshua in the second of four groups (relatively free), together with Leviticus, Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Further arguments in favor of retroverting elements of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX are provided 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, 27–73 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

¹² Some data were collected for the first time in Tov, "The Growth," 394 (see n. 1 above). These data were quoted by T. Römer and A. de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," in *Israel Constructs Its History*, 24–141 (91). While we believe that the LXX found in these cases a short Hebrew text, M. N. van der Meer, *Formulation and Reformulation—The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 178–93, 246 ascribed the shortening to the translator.

¹³ This phrase is found often in the text shared by MT and the LXX: 1:2, 7, 13; 8:31 (LXX: 9:2b), 33 (LXX 9:2d); 9:24; 11:12, 15; 13:8; 14:7; 18:7; 22:2, 5; 24:29 (= Judg 2:8).

¹⁴ S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Meridian, 1956) 116.

related phrase *עבד את יהוה* as Dtr.¹⁵ The phrase is also used for Moses in the MT and LXX of Deut 34:5; 2 Kgs 18:12; 2 Chr 1:3, 24:6 (LXX: ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ), and before Dtr also in Exod 14:31 and Num 12:7-8. In 12:6a, the phrase occurs in all witnesses, but is lacking in the LXX in its second occurrence in the verse (v 6b). It is therefore likely that a scribe rather than an editor added the phrase in v 6b in the wake of v 6a. At the same time, it is intriguing that the phrase was added in MT in the very first verse of the book, indicating that the scribe knew of its occurrence in the text that follows (vv 2, 7, 13). It is again lacking in v 15 LXX.

1:7 ... to observe faithfully according to (all the teaching which) [that] Moses my servant enjoined upon you.¹⁶ The full Dtr phrase mentioning *שמר*, *עשה*, and *תורה* occurs in different variations in Josh 23:6 and Deut 17:19; 28:58; 29:28; 31:12; 32:46.¹⁷ The translator had the short phrase in front of him, without *תורה*, as is clear from the translation of the masculine suffix *ממנו* אל הסור (“do not deviate from it”). In fact, the masculine suffix in MT is a clear indication that *התורה* was added at a later stage without adapting the context.¹⁸

1:11 the land that the Lord your God¹⁹ is giving you (as a possession [לרשתה]). The additional word in MT is based on the almost identical phrase in Deut 15:4 and 25:19 “in the land that the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance (נחלה) to possess (לרשתה)” as well as in Deut 4:21; 19:10; 20:16; 24:4; 26:1; 1 Kgs 8:36 (all with *נחלה* only).²⁰ The same verb is lacking in the LXX of v 15 (see next entry).

1:15 MT Then you shall return *to the land of your possession*, and you may possess it, that Moses ... gave you. LXX: Then you shall return *each to his territory* that Moses ... gave you.²¹ Although the formulations of the long MT and the short LXX run parallel, that of MT is suspicious since the secondary nature of the added Dtr²² phrase (“and you may possess it”) is evident from the syntax of the continuation of the sentence (*אשר נתן לכם משה*) that refers to the phrase preceding the added phrase.²³ The

¹⁵ Weinfeld, 332 (2).

¹⁶ MT *עבד את יהוה* אשר צוה משה עבדי אל הסור ממנו. LXX (reconstructed) *אשר* לעשות ככל אשר צוה משה עבדי אל הסור ממנו.

¹⁷ Weinfeld, 336 (17b).

¹⁸ For the short phrase *עשה + ככל + verb of command*, see Deut 17:10; 24:8 and other sources (Gen 6:22; 7:5; Exod 29:35; Num 2:34; 2 Kgs 16:16).

¹⁹ LXX “the God of your fathers.”

²⁰ Weinfeld, 341 (1).

²¹ MT *אשר נתן לכם משה* ושבתם איש לנחלתו אשר נתן לכם, LXX *אשר נתן לכם* ושבתם לארץ ירשתכם וירשתם אותה אשר נתן לכם משה.

²² See Deut 4:1, 22; 8:1; 11:8, 31 (Weinfeld, 342 [5]).

²³ The JPS translation removes the difficulties by changing the sequence of the elements in the translation: “Then you may return to the land on the east side of the Jordan, which

formulations of both MT²⁴ and the LXX²⁵ suit the context, but MT is probably secondary because of the syntactical argument.

8:31 (LXX 9:2b) as is written in the (Book of the) Teaching of Moses. Both the short text of the LXX (cf. Josh 8:32; 1 Kings 2:3) and the long one of MT (cf. Josh 23:6; 2 Kgs 14:6) reflect Dtr expressions (Weinfeld, 339 [23, 24]). See also the next item:

8:34 (LXX 9:2c) as is written in the Book of the Teaching. LXX: according to all the things written in the Teaching of Moses. Both phrases occur elsewhere in Dtr.²⁶

24:17 For it was the Lord our God who brought us and our fathers up from the land of Egypt, (the house of bondage, and who wrought those wondrous signs before our very eyes). For the house of bondage (בֵּית עַבְדִּים), see Weinfeld, 326–7 (2), and for אֲדוֹתָ וּמִוִּפְתִּים, see *ibid.*, 330 (18).

1b. A quotation from Deuteronomy in MT-Joshua

23:16b (... then the Lord's anger will burn against you, and you shall quickly perish from the good land that he has given you = Deut 11:17). The previous verse, v 15, describes the calamities that will befall Israel, but as the verse stands it does not explain the reason for these calamities.²⁷ The next verse does provide the explanation (16a: "if you break the covenant"), but is not connected to the previous one, since v 16a forms the protasis of v 16b (lacking in the LXX). The short text of the LXX possibly reflects the earlier formulation that someone misunderstood. In this earlier text (= LXX), v 16a is the protasis to the conditional clause in v 15,²⁸ and the full thought is expressed in vv 15-16a.²⁹ However, someone may have supplemented v 16b, construing the verse as if v 16a began a new thought. A major argument in favor of this

Moses the servant of the Lord assigned to you as your possession, and you may possess it." NRSV adds "the land" removing the difficulty in a different way: "Then you shall return to your own land and take possession of it, *the land* <my italics, E. T.> that Moses the servant of the Lord gave you beyond the Jordan to the east."

²⁴ For אֲרִיץ יִרְשׁוּכֶם, cf. Deut 2:12 "the land of their possession, which the Lord had given to them."

²⁵ The combination of a verb of motion + "each to his territory" (אִישׁ לְנַחֲלָתוֹ) occurs in such contexts as Josh 24:28 = Judg 2:6; Judg 21:24; Jer 12:15.

²⁶ The LXX or its parent text may have been rephrased in accord with v 31 quoted above. The MT phrase, כִּפַּר הַתּוֹרָה, as well as כִּפַּר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת (הָיְתָה) occurs often in Deuteronomy as well as in Josh 1:8; 2 Kings 22:8, 11 (Weinfeld, 339 [23]).

²⁷ However, to some extent the content of Deut 28:63 is phrased similarly.

²⁸ Thus S. Holmes, *Joshua, The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: University Press, 1914) 78.

²⁹ The protasis usually stands before the apodosis, but very occasionally it stands at the end (for example, Gen 18:28). I am grateful to my colleague S. Kogut for providing me with this reference and for discussing the syntactic difficulties of this verse with me.

view is the fact that v 16b equals Deut 11:17, making it likely that this verse was copied here from Deuteronomy.

1c. *A passage revised according to Deuteronomy in MT-Joshua*

The short text of the LXX of Joshua 20, prescribing the establishment of the cities of refuge, does not contain some key elements of MT in that chapter (the greater part of vv 4-6 and the phrase בְּבִלֵי דַעַת “unintentionally” in v 3).³⁰ The earlier formulation reflected in the LXX follows the legislation of the Priestly Code for the cities of refuge (Num 35:9-15). On the other hand, the plus in MT mainly follows the ideas and terminology of Deut 4:42 and 19:4, 11-12 for the same cities, much different from those of P. Most likely, the LXX reflects an earlier formulation of the chapter, while MT (followed by all other witnesses) reflects a later version that brought the formulation of Joshua based on P into harmony with the law code of Deuteronomy.³¹ If this analysis is correct, it was an editor rather than a scribe who altered the earlier message of the book towards Deuteronomy. The insertions from Deuteronomy in MT created contextual tensions between the two layers of the text.³²

2. *Pluses in the LXX based on Deuteronomy*

9:27 in the place that he (LXX: the Lord) would choose.³³ The LXX expands the short text of MT³⁴ to the full Dtr phrase (e.g. Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21).

24:4 +and they became there a great nation, mighty and populous+. The harmonizing addition of the LXX (see the context) is based on a Hebrew version of Deut 26:5 (the LXX versions of Joshua and Deuteronomy differ in several details).

Summarizing the evidence for Joshua, we believe that the variants in groups 1a–b and 2 were created by (a) scribe(s) with no connection to the Dtr reworking of the book. Most instances refer to Dtr phrases in MT that are lacking in the LXX. In 8:31 and 34, MT and the LXX contain alternative Dtr phrases, and in two instances (group 2) the LXX is longer

³⁰ The duplication in MT (בְּשִׁנָּה בְּבִלֵי דַעַת) shows the lateness of the present formulation of that text. It is likely that the LXX lacks דַעַת בְּבִלֵי, but this assumption is not certain, since ἀκουσίως of the LXX in v 3 reflects בְּשִׁנָּה in Num 35:11 and דַעַת בְּבִלֵי in Deut 19:4.

³¹ However, in one important detail, the revised text followed Num 35:25.

³² For a detailed analysis, see A. Rofé, “Joshua 20—Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated,” in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 131–47; A. G. Auld, “Textual and Literary Studies in the Book of Joshua,” *ZAW* 90 (1978) 412–7; idem, “The “Levitical Cities”—Texts and History,” *ZAW* 91 (1979) 194–206; Tov, *TCHB*, 329–30.

³³ LXX ἐκλέξεται κύριος probably reflects יְבַחֵר יְהוָה.

³⁴ See Weinfeld, 324 (1) for the short phrase.

than MT. Most of the variations occur in sections that abound with Dtr phraseology, mainly in chapter 1. In those chapters in Joshua in which Dtr phraseology is either lacking or occurs sporadically, the textual sources do not differ regarding Dtr terminology. Thus, while in chapters 2, 6, 7, and 8 many details are not reflected in the LXX, these details are unrelated to Dtr phraseology. Some of the pluses in MT occur more than once. With refined literary understanding, Holmes pointed out that the lack of similar expressions in MT as in 1:11 and 15 “raises the suspicion that they are insertions by a later hand.”³⁵ All the Dtr phrases that are lacking in the LXX are part and parcel of the standard Dtr vocabulary and could easily have been added in MT by a scribe, as suggested in the above analysis of 1:1.

On the other hand, the variants described in group 1c can only have been inserted at the compositional level. Had there been more evidence of this type, we would have named this a second layer of Dtr reflected in MT. Editorial activity, unrelated to Dtr,³⁶ is also visible in chapters 21 and 24 in MT (not in the LXX)³⁷ but it is unclear whether the same hand was active in all three chapters (20, 21, 24).

1–2 Kings

The LXX of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms) differs much from MT, and its evidence may be trusted since its translation technique is fairly literal. Having said that, we are faced with a major problem since the discrepancies are among the most extensive in the LXX.³⁸ These differences bear on Dtr phraseology in three sections, but their relevance to Dtr remains a matter of dispute. In three instances (1, 3, 4), the LXX has a shorter text, while in item 2 the LXX has a longer text.

1. 1 Kgs 6:11-14 (Then the word of the Lord came to Solomon, “With regard to this House you are building — if you follow My laws and observe My rules and faithfully keep My commandments, I will fulfill for you the promise that I gave to your father David: I will abide among

³⁵ Holmes, *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, 1, 18.

³⁶ See further the analysis below of the plus in MT LXX in 1 Kings 16:34 parallel to the addition in the LXX of Josh 6:26. The addition in Joshua lacks the Dtr fulfillment formula, but its stress on the fulfillment of prophecies may be described as Deuteronomistic. However, by the same token the addition may have been made within the framework of the rewriting of the Hebrew composition that lay at the base of the LXX without connection to Dtr.

³⁷ See A. Rofé, “The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint,” *Hen* 4 (1982) 17–35 = *Shnaton* 2 (1977) 217–27 (Heb.); Tov, *TCHB*, 330–32.

³⁸ See chapter 20*.

the children of Israel, and I will never forsake my people Israel. So Solomon built the house, and finished it).

In 1 Kings, the LXX usually has a longer text than MT in matters unrelated to Dtr, and therefore the absence of a relatively large section in the LXX is rather intriguing. The prophecy of a conditional promise in 6:11-14, in the middle of the description of the building of the temple in 6:1-38; 7:13-51, is out of place in this technical context.³⁹ Gray therefore names these verses a “Deuteronomistic side-note.”⁴⁰ This section reflects the ideas of Nathan’s oracle in 2 Samuel 7, containing some Dtr phrases. In the middle of the technical description of the building of the temple an editor probably considered it important to remind the readers that the presence of the building was not a guarantee of the continued existence of the royal dynasty and the temple. However, the Dtr nature of this section is unclear, although it contains some manifest Dtr phrases:⁴¹

v 12 שמר מצוה (Weinfeld, 336 [16])

v 12 הקים דבר יהוה (Weinfeld, 350 [1])

At the same time this section also contains some priestly terms:

v 12b This verse (אם הלך בחקתי ואת משפטי העשה ושמרת את כל מצותי ללכת בהם) is very close to Lev 18:4a (את משפטי העשו ואת חקתי תשמרו ללכת בהם).

v 13 שכן בחורך בני ישראל (Exod 25:8; 29:45, 46; Ezek 43:7, 9).

One phrase is used both in Dtr and the Priestly Code:

v 12 הלך בחקתי (Lev 18:3; 20:23; 26:3; 1 Kgs 3:3; 6:12; 2 Kgs 17:8, 19; Jer 44 (LXX: 51):10, 23, Ezek 5:6, 7; 11:20; 20:13, 16, 19; 20:21).

While some scholars consider this prophecy to be pre-Dtr, Dtr, or a second layer of Dtr, others consider it a combination of H (Lev 26:3, 14, 15) and P (Exod 25:8).⁴² The passage was possibly added to MT by someone who based himself on the vocabulary of the Bible as a whole.⁴³

³⁹ On the other hand, according to D. W. Gooding, “Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX,” *VT* 17 (1967) 143–72 (154–9), this paragraph separates vv 2-10, describing the outer structure of the temple, from vv 15-36 pertaining to the interior divisions, decorations, and installations of the temple. However, the location of the oracle, together with the summary phrase in v 14 in the midst of a technical description, remains out of place.

⁴⁰ J. Gray, *I & II Kings, A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963) 157.

⁴¹ For a good analysis of the vocabulary, see C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (repr. New York: Ktav, 1970 [1903]) 68–9.

⁴² See the survey of opinions and analysis by van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 142–50 (143, n. 5).

⁴³ Thus V. A. Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House. Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup 115; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 262, n. 3.

In any event, this section is probably irrelevant to the assumption of late Dtr insertions.

2. 1 Kgs 9:9 It is because they forsook the Lord their God who freed them from the land of Egypt LXX +from the house of slavery+ (Weinfeld, 326 [2]). This phrase was added in accord with similar contexts, especially Deut 7:8.⁴⁴

3. An alternative story (AS) of Jeroboam, extant only in the LXX (3 Kgdms 12:24a–z), presents a rival story about Jeroboam juxtaposed with the original story that is found in all textual sources including the LXX (1 Kings 11, 12, 14). The technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture. For example, different accounts of the creation and the flood were juxtaposed and partially intertwined in Genesis. In all these cases, the two versions are now included in all textual witnesses. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),⁴⁵ there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions in one textual witness but not in the others. The AS has been retroverted into Hebrew by Debus and Talshir,⁴⁶ and its text needs to be taken into full consideration in biblical criticism. Scholars' evaluations of the AS vary considerably.

The main story, in chapters 11, 12, and 14, contains several Dtr elements that are lacking in the parallel places in the AS. If the LXX evidence is to be trusted, the AS may well contain a valuable pre-Dtr document. For example, the Dtr phrase in 1 Kgs 14:21 MT LXX (the city the Lord had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to establish His name there) is missing in the parallel verse, 3 Kgdms 12:24a. Likewise, 14:23–24 MT LXX (They too built for themselves shrines, pillars, and sacred posts on every high hill and under every leafy tree²⁴ ... Judah imitated all the abhorrent practices of the nations that the Lord had dispossessed before the Israelites) is missing in 3 Kgdms 12:24a.⁴⁷ The Dtr fulfillment formula in 14:18 MT (in accordance with the word that the Lord had spoken through His servant the prophet Ahijah) is lacking in 3 Kgdms 12:24n. The Dtr verses MT 14:8–9 have no counterpart in the AS.⁴⁸ The Dtr

⁴⁴ Likewise, cf. the long formulation in Judg 6:8 with the shorter one in 1 Sam 10:18.

⁴⁵ In these chapters, the originally short story of the encounter of David and Goliath as narrated in the LXX was joined by an alternative story in MT. See my analysis in "The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version," in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 97–130; revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 333–60.

⁴⁶ See chapter 20*, notes 25 and 26.

⁴⁷ However, the same verse in the AS, 12:24a, does contain a different Dtr phrase (he did what was displeasing to the Lord = MT 14:22).

⁴⁸ Note the following Dtr phrases in these verses:

phraseology in 1 Kgs 14:10 MT (Therefore I will bring disaster upon the House of Jeroboam and will cut off from Jeroboam every male, bond and free, in Israel)⁴⁹ is reflected in the AS in a shorter form, in 12:24m (I will cut off from Jeroboam every male). At the same time, the AS is not devoid of Dtr phrases; for example, 3 Kgdms 12:24x–z (= 1 Kgs 12:21–24) is Dtr (see also n. 41). As a result, both the long version of MT (sometimes followed by LXX *ad loc.*) and the short version of AS are Deuteronomistic, but MT is much more so.

Debus⁵⁰, Treballe⁵¹, and Schenker attach great importance to the AS as a pre-Dtr version. Schenker recognizes some Dtr elements in the story, but he nevertheless considers the story early and pre-Deuteronomistic.⁵²

On the other hand, McKenzie⁵³ believes that the Greek text of 3 Kgdms goes back to a Hebrew text that was already Deuteronomistic. He argues that the AS has no logical structure and therefore cannot have been original. Many details in the AS cannot stand by themselves, and they clearly presuppose MT.⁵⁴ Talshir⁵⁵ likewise stresses that the lack of Dtr elements in the AS derives from the internal dynamics of that version. The AS does not present Jeroboam as a king, and therefore the

v 8 כעברי דוד (cf. Weinfeld, 354 [1])

v 8 שמר מצוה (Weinfeld, 336 [16])

v 8 הלך אחרי יהוה (Weinfeld, 332 [1])

v 8 בכל לבבו (Weinfeld, 334 [9a])

v 8 עשה הישר בעיני יהוה (Weinfeld, 335 [15])

v 9 הלך ועשה אלהים אחרים (Weinfeld, 321 [5])

v 9 להכעיסני (Weinfeld, 340 [6])

⁴⁹ Cf. Weinfeld 352 (12) ביקר והכרתו לירבעם משחין ביקר.

⁵⁰ Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams*, 84–7.

⁵¹ J. C. Treballe Barrera, “Testamento y muerte de David,” *RB* 87 (1980) 87–103 (102); idem, *Salomon y Jeroboan, Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes, 2–12; 14* (Institución San Jerónimo 10; Bibliotheca Salamanticensis 3; Valencia, 1980) 173–4; idem, “Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings,” *BIOCS* 15 (1982) 12–35 (23).

⁵² A. Schenker, “Jeroboam and the Division of the Kingdom in the Ancient Septuagint: LXX 3 Kingdoms 12.24 a–z, MT 1 Kings 11–12; 14 and the Deuteronomistic History,” in *Israel Constructs Its History*, 214–57 (237, 250).

⁵³ S. L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings, The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden/New York/Copenhagen/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1991) 21–40.

⁵⁴ McKenzie, *The Trouble*, 29–31.

⁵⁵ Z. Talshir, “Is the Alternate Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom (3 Kgdms 12:24a–z) Non-Deuteronomistic?” in G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 599–621; eadem, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993).

text does not reflect a dynastic perspective.⁵⁶ As a result, all references to a royal dynasty are omitted, including most Dtr segments.

We accept the views of McKenzie and Talshir, not only because of the arguments given by them, but also because we attach much importance to the overall evaluation of 3 Kingdoms as a faithful rendering of a Hebrew rewritten book of 1 Kings,⁵⁷ differing more from MT than most other books in Hebrew Scripture. Within the framework of that unit, the much rewritten Alternative Story causes no surprise; the AS adds several elements to the MT version and also shortens that story in details it considered inappropriate in the new context, including several Dtr phrases.

4. 1 Kgs 16:34: (During his reign, Hiel the Bethelite fortified Jericho. He laid its foundations at the cost of Abiram his first-born, and set its gates in place at the cost of Segub his youngest, in accordance with the words that the Lord had spoken through Joshua son of Nun.) This Dtr addition is found in all textual traditions with the exception of LXX^{Luc}. The secondary character of this verse is easily recognizable since it is not connected to any detail in the context. V 34 is preceded by an account of the sins of Ahab (up to v 33) and followed by an account of the drought (17:1), which came as a punishment for Ahab's sins. Furthermore, the verse is introduced by the general phrase "during his reign," probably pointing to an insertion in the text. It may have been added at a late stage in the Hebrew (and Greek) tradition, since LXX^{Luc}, when differing from the main Greek tradition, often reflects original elements in the historical books.⁵⁸

When emphasizing that the curse of Joshua was fulfilled, the editor who added the verse in 1 Kings followed the pattern of many other Dtr prophecies,⁵⁹ all using the same fixed phrases as in 1 Kgs 16:34.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ For example, Talshir, "Alternate Tradition," 608 remarks regarding the Dtr phrases in 1 Kgs 14:10-11 missing in 3 Kgdms 12:24m: "Here too the national and dynastic features are missing, and again one has to bear in mind that they are unwarranted in the scene of the sick child where it stands in the alternate tradition: Jeroboam is not yet king, neither was he promised kingship. Naturally his dynasty cannot be threatened." Concerning the lack of the Dtr fulfillment formula of 1 Kgs 14:18 in 3 Kgdms 12:24n Talshir, p. 614 says: "In my opinion they were simply left out by the author to make room for his own carefully construed endings."

⁵⁷ See chapter 20*.

⁵⁸ See my study "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem," *RB* 79 (1972) 101-13. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 477-88.

⁵⁹ For example, 1 Kgs 8:20 referring to 2 Sam 7:13. For additional examples and an analysis, see G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (tr. D. Stalker; London: SCM Press, 1953) 74-91 ("The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings").

⁶⁰ See the list of Dtr terms for this type of prophecy listed by Weinfeld, 350-52.

The same addition, without the Dtr fulfillment formula, is found in the LXX after Josh 6:26, following Joshua's curse: (And so did Hozan of Baithel; he laid the foundation in Abiron his first-born, and set up the gates of it in his youngest surviving son).⁶¹ The plus in the LXX of Joshua, clearly based on a Hebrew source,⁶² is *not* a harmonizing Greek addition based on the LXX of 1 Kgs 16:34, since the texts differ in important details.⁶³ In the plus in the LXX of Joshua, these details are in the nature of a statement of facts; in the MT and LXX of 1 Kings, they are phrased as the fulfillment of a prophecy made "in accordance with the words that the Lord had spoken through Joshua son of Nun." According to some scholars, MT LXX of 1 Kings is based on the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX in Joshua.⁶⁴ While the exact relation between the texts remains unclear, it stands to reason that the brief Dtr note was added in 1 Kings MT during one of the stages of the book's development. The addition in the LXX of Joshua was probably made independently.

5. 2 Kgs 17:32. A long Dtr. addition in the LXX ("And they feared the Lord ... in which they dwelt") must have belonged to the original text, omitted in MT by way of *homoiooteleuton*.

Summarizing the evidence for 1-2 Kings, we note that the LXX of 3 Kingdoms lacks several elements and sections that have been ascribed to Dtr. However, in chapter 6 the Dtr character of MT is unlikely, and in chapter 12 the pre-Dtr nature of the large plus in the LXX has not been proven. On the other hand, LXX^{Luc} reflects a pre-Dtr text in 1 Kgs 16:34.

Jeremiah

Several scholars recognized that many of the differences between MT and LXX in Jeremiah are not scribal (textual), but were created during one of the stages of the book's composition.⁶⁵ Most of the differences

⁶¹ For an analysis and reconstruction of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX in this detail, see L. Mazor, "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho—A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography," *Textus* 14 (1988) 1–26.

⁶² See the reconstruction by Mazor, "Origin," 13.

⁶³ For example, in 1 Kgs 16:34 MT and LXX, Hiel the Bethelite rebuilt the city while in the LXX of Joshua it was rebuilt by Oza. In that translation, the name of his second son, Segub, is rendered etymologically as "his youngest *surviving* son." Holmes, *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, 37 suggests that the translation reflects the root שגב.

⁶⁴ Thus Holmes, *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, 37; A. Rofé, *The Prophetic Stories* (2d ed.; Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986) 156; Mazor, "Origin," 23.

⁶⁵ For the latest summaries, see *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (ed. A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer; BETL 128; Leuven University Press, 1997); *Troubling Jeremiah* (ed. A. R. P.

pertain to minuses of the LXX as opposed to longer readings of MT.⁶⁶ Among these minuses are 44 items (involving more words) reflecting Dtr phrases that may be subdivided into (1) individual phrases and (2) a quote from Deuteronomy. In addition, the LXX reflects a Dtr plus (3). In fact, the largest number of discrepancies between the textual sources in Dtr phraseology in any of the biblical books is found in Jeremiah. The analysis of this vocabulary is complex since beyond the Dtr vocabulary based on Deuteronomy,⁶⁷ the Dtr layer reflects phrases that are characteristic of the reviser himself (C). When listing the Dtr phrases lacking in the LXX, we base ourselves on the lists of Dtr phrases in Jeremiah compiled by Weinfeld and Stulman.⁶⁸ All these phrases occur in Dtr contexts in the C layer, sometimes in small or large segments in Dtr phraseology (for example, 11:7-8; 29:16-20) and less frequently in single verses in poetry (e.g., 13:10; 23:22) or in biographic contexts (40:12; 43:5). In all these cases, the Dtr phrases are surrounded by other redactional words not phrased in the specific Dtr vocabulary.

1. *Individual phrases in MT not represented in the LXX*

7:2 (that enter these gates): Weinfeld, 353 (11); Stulman, 83

7:13 and though I spoke to you (persistently והעבר השכם), you would not listen: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70

11:7 (obey my voice): Weinfeld, 337 (18a); Stulman, 1

11:7 for I have (repeatedly and persistently והעדר השכם) warned your fathers: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70

11:8 (they would not give ear): Weinfeld, 352 (5); Stulman, 72

Diamond et al.; JSOTSup 260; Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); T. Römer, "Is There a Deuteronomistic Redaction in the Book of Jeremiah?," in *Israel Constructs Its History*, 399–421. See, further, the studies mentioned in n. 71.

⁶⁶ Min records 3097 words of MT not represented in the LXX, amounting to some 16 percent of the Hebrew book: Y. J. Min, *The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1977.

⁶⁷ The book of Jeremiah is composed of poetry and prose, since the prophet probably spoke and wrote in both of these forms. However, some of the prose sections referring to Jeremiah in the third person probably did not derive from the prophet, and Dtr elements have been recognized in some of them. Against this background, a theory was devised by S. Mowinckel, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1914) describing the various layers of the book: A (Jeremiah's authentic sayings), B (Jeremiah's biographer), and C (a Dtr layer). In the aftermath of Mowinckel's seminal study, many theories have been launched describing the special nature of the C layer, some of them in defiance of Mowinckel's views, but the assumption of a C layer probably remains the most stable one in the scholarly literature. Within that theory, there is room for several variations.

⁶⁸ See n. 7.

- 11:8 (they all followed the willfulness of their evil hearts: Weinfeld, 340 (8); Stulman, 54
 11:8 (the words of this covenant): Stulman, 42
 13:10 this wicked people who refuse to heed my bidding (who follow the willfulness of their own hearts): Weinfeld, 340 (8); Stulman, 54
 16:4 (and their corpses shall be food) for the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth: Weinfeld, 349 (22); Stulman, 53
 18:11 and mend (your ways and) your actions: Weinfeld, 352 (2b); Stulman 82
 19:9 because of the desperate straits to which they will be reduced by their enemies (who seek their life): Stulman, 77
 21:9 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman 69
 21:12 else my wrath will break forth like fire and burn, with none to quench it (because of your wicked acts): Weinfeld, 352 (3); Stulman, 63
 23:22 and make them turn back (from their evil ways) and wicked acts; Weinfeld, 352 (2–2b); Stulman, 63
 25:7 (to provoke me with the work of your hands): Weinfeld, 340 (6); Stulman 8
 25:18 (as at this day): Weinfeld, 350 (4); Stulman 14.
 27:5 (man and beast): Stulman, 73
 27:8 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69
 27:13 (sword, famine, and pestilence): Stulman, 69
 29:14 (I will restore your fortunes): Stulman, 51
 29:14, 18 (to which I have banished you): Weinfeld, 348 (15); Stulman, 52
 29:17, 18 (sword, famine, and pestilence): Stulman, 69
 29:18 (and an object of horror and hissing and scorn): Weinfeld, 348 (21); Stulman, 56
 29:19 (my servants the prophets): Weinfeld, 351 (9); Stulman, 5
 29:19 when I (persistently *ושלח השכינים*) sent to them my servants: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70
 29:21 (who prophesy lies): Stulman, 75
 32:24 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69
 32:30 (to provoke me with the work of your hands): Weinfeld, 6; Stulman, 8
 33:14 (behold, days are coming): Stulman, 43
 33:14 (I established my word): Weinfeld, 350 (1); Stulman, 15
 33:17 (There shall never be an end to men of David's line who sit upon the throne of the House of Israel): Weinfeld, 355 (8); Stulman, 32
 33:26 [within a large minus] (I will restore their fortunes): Stulman, 51
 34:20, 21 (to those who seek to kill them): Stulman, 77

- 35:15 I (persistently *השכים ושלח*) sent you all my servants: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70
 35:18 (I called to them, but they would not respond): Stulman, 89
 38:16 (to those who seek your life): Stulman, 77
 40:12 All these Judeans returned from all the places (to which they had scattered): Weinfeld 348 (15); Stulman, 52
 43:5 the entire remnant of Judah who had returned (from all the countries to which they had been scattered): Weinfeld 348 (15); Stulman, 52
 44:13 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman 69
 44:23 (as at this day): Weinfeld, 350 (4); Stulman, 14
 48:47 (But I will restore the fortunes of Moab): Stulman, 51
 49:6 (I will restore the fortunes of the Ammonites): Stulman, 51
 52:3 (within a large minus) (He cast them out of His presence): Weinfeld, 347 (11a); Stulman, 33

2. *A quote from Deuteronomy in MT not represented in the LXX*

28:16: you shall die this year (for you have urged disloyalty [*סרה דברת*] to the Lord). The phrase *סרה דבר* occurs in Jer 29:32 MT (not LXX) and elsewhere only in Deut 13:6.⁶⁹

3. *A plus in the LXX*

19:3 +that enter these gates+: Weinfeld, 353 (11); Stulman, 83

As a rule, the LXX of Jeremiah is shorter than MT. Elsewhere, the suggestion has been made that the LXX embodies a short edition of Jeremiah (ed. I)⁷⁰ that was expanded to the long edition of MT (ed. II)

⁶⁹ Weinfeld, 99 quotes the Akkadian parallel to this term (*dabab surrate*), and notes that this “appears to be an expression taken from the political vocabulary of the period.” While the phrase in Deuteronomy refers to a prophet who incites to the worship of “other Gods” (Deut 13:3 let us follow other Gods), the mentioned prophets prophesy in the name of the God of Israel.

⁷⁰ Several scholars believe that the Dtr layer in Jeremiah is not one of the sources of the book, but that Dtr himself was the editor of the book. Thus J. P. Hyatt, “Jeremiah and Deuteronomy,” *JNES* 1 (1942) 156–73 = *A Prophet to the Nations, Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (ed. L. G. Perdue and B. W. Kovacs; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1984) 113–27; idem, “The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah,” in *Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities* (ed. R. C. Beatty et al.; Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1951) 1.71–95 = *A Prophet to the Nations*, 247–67. These views were further developed by Thiel in his 1970 dissertation and subsequent publications, as well as by others: W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); idem, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–52* (WMANT 52; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981); E. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles. A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970); W. McKane, *Jeremiah*, vols. 1–2 (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986, 1996) 1.xlvii–lxxxiii; Person, *Second Zechariah*, 30.

with a layer of exegetical and editorial expansions.⁷¹ This layer includes a sizeable number of Dtr expressions as listed above, but these form but a small percentage of the Dtr layer in Jeremiah (the C layer) that also includes non-stereotyped language. When trying to understand the nature of the Dtr phrases added in ed. II, we note that all of them occur also in ed. I (the material common to the MT and LXX). It therefore stands to reason that these contexts in ed. I influenced the addition of the Dtr phrases in the later ed. II. When trying to understand the nature of these phrases within the framework of the composition of Jeremiah, two explanations suggest themselves:⁷²

a. Editor II (MT) was so well versed in the terminology of Dtr found in ed. I that he occasionally expanded the earlier text with phrases occurring elsewhere in the book⁷³ together with the other, non-Dtr elements.

b. The added Dtr material in MT, together with the other editorial additions in that layer, was added to ed. I by a late Dtr editor. This theory implies that the Dtr school reworked Jeremiah twice.⁷⁴

When assessing these two assumptions, we note that with one exception,⁷⁵ the phrases added in ed. II include no elements that were independently drawn from either Deuteronomy or the Dtr literature beyond the vocabulary of Jeremiah.⁷⁶ This fact precludes the assumption of independent Dtr activity (option 2), while the added layer does reflect editorial activity in other details.

Ed. II was actively involved in the editing and rewriting of ed. I. His ideological and theological trends as well as his post-exilic reflections are

⁷¹ Beyond the studies mentioned in n. 65, see my own studies: "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. P.-M. Bogaert; BETL 54; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1981; rev. ed. 1997 [1998]) 145–67, 430; "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in *Empirical Models*, 211–37. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 363–84 (368, 379–80).

⁷² The one addition of a Dtr element in LXX (group 3 above [Jer 19:3]) may be disregarded for this purpose.

⁷³ Among other things, this editor not only added Dtr phrases, but also supplemented short Dtr phrases with longer ones: 16:4 (and their corpses shall be food) for the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth: Weinfeld, 349 (22), Stulman, 53; 18:11 and mend (your ways and) your actions: Weinfeld, 352 (2b); Stulman, 82; 21:9, 27:8, 32:24, 44:13 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69; 23:22 and make them turn back (from their evil ways) and wicked acts: Weinfeld, 352 (2–2b), Stulman, 63.

⁷⁴ Thus Person, *Second Zechariah*, 75.

⁷⁵ Jer 28:16 quoted in group 2 above.

⁷⁶ Thus also Stulman, 139 with statistical data.

clearly recognizable.⁷⁷ Therefore an analysis that is limited to the Dtr elements in ed. II cannot do justice to the complexity of the issues. The additional layer of ed. II includes a sizeable number of Dtr expressions as listed above, but it is much smaller than the Dtr layer in Jeremiah as a whole (the assumption of the C layer covers both editions I and II). It also forms but a small percentage of the additional layer of ed. II.⁷⁸ As a result, taking our clue from editor II's terminology and ideas, we do not link him to the Dtr school of reworking Scripture.⁷⁹

2 Kings 18–20//Isaiah 36–39 and 2 Kings 24:18–25:30//Jeremiah 52

At first sight, the comparison of the parallel versions in 2 Kings // Isaiah and 2 Kings // Jeremiah is not directly related to the investigation of the Dtr elements in the Bible. However, these chapters in Kings and Jeremiah do contain several Dtr phrases, and some of them are not shared by the parallel chapters or by some of the textual witnesses.

In a very detailed study, Person suggested that in both cases the lack of Dtr elements in some sources (probably better: the addition of Dtr elements in other sources) indicates that these chapters are composed of two Dtr layers.⁸⁰ According to Person, these two layers show that the Dtr revision was created in stages, or was composed by two or three individuals, as had been suggested earlier without any connection to

⁷⁷ See my study "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah," *ErIsr* 26 (ed. B. A. Levine et al.; Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1999) 55–63; Y. Goldman, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO 118; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992); H.-J. Stipp, *Das Masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches, Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); Person, *Second Zechariah*, 69–77 ("Material Unique to MT-Jeremiah").

⁷⁸ See the statistical data in Stulman, 119–44.

⁷⁹ Ed. II "updates" and "corrects" the events described in some prophecies, but he does not use the phrases of the Dtr fulfillment of prophecies (see n. 59 above). See 25:14; 27:7, 19–22; 32:5, and the analysis in Tov, "Literary History," 383–4.

⁸⁰ R. F. Person, *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions* (BZAW 252; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997). The second part of this book replaces the author's earlier study "II Kings 24,18-25,30 and Jeremiah 52: A Text-Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History?" *ZAW* 105 (1993) 174–205. Person's conclusion is summarized on p. 77 of the book: "The text critical evidence strongly suggests that the book of Kings and, by implication, DtrH underwent *at least* two redactions. The earlier redaction is represented by the *Urtext* <that is, Person's reconstructed *Urtext* of Kings, E. T.>; the later by KH <that is, the MT of Kings>."

textual evidence.⁸¹ However, in my view, the system used by Person is flawed methodologically for both 2 Kings//Isaiah⁸² and 2 Kings//Jeremiah.⁸³ For both textual units, Person reconstructs an “Urtext” which he then compares with the known textual witnesses.⁸⁴ As

⁸¹ W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 139–48; E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige* (ATD 11.1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, 1984) 2.474.

⁸² Person includes four Dtr phrases in his reconstructed *Urtext* of 2 Kings//Isaiah (2 Kgs 19:15 “you ... alone are God” [Weinfeld, 331 (6)], 19:15 “you made the heavens and the earth” [Weinfeld, 331 (7)], 19:18 “gods ... made by human hands” [Weinfeld, 324 (7)], and 19:34 “for the sake of David, my servant” [Weinfeld, 354 (1)]). In three of these cases, the reconstructed *Urtext* follows Kings when its text is identical to Isaiah (2 Kgs 19:15 = Isa 37:16 [actually also v 15 = Isa 37:20]; 19:18 = Isa 37:19; 19:34 = Isa 37:35), and once when differing from Isaiah (the second instance in 2 Kgs 19:15 = Isa 37:16). He notes (p. 77) that in two additional instances the 2 Kings text (for him: recension) has a Dtr phrase not shared with Isaiah (2 Kgs 20:6 “for the sake of David, my servant” not found in Isa 38:5 and the direct speech in 2 Kgs 18:25b). The Dtr formulae are evident, but Person’s separation of the reconstructed *Urtext* from the 2 Kings version is less evident. It is unclear why the 2 Kings recension displays the hand of a second Deuteronomist if the one Dtr reading that 2 Kings adds to the reconstructed *Urtext* (2 Kgs 20:6) also occurs in another verse in the 2 Kings recension (19:34 quoted above). The phrase is included in Person’s reconstructed *Urtext* (= the 2 Kings recension in 19:34), and therefore cannot be taken as proof of the existence of a second Dtr recension. The phrase in 2 Kgs 20:6 could have been added by a harmonizing scribe. The fact that Person first removes the 2 Kings reading from the reconstructed *Urtext* because Isaiah does not have the reading, and then claims that the 2 Kings reading is a later addition is problematic. The second case is even less clear. Person removes the direct speech of 2 Kgs 18:25 from his reconstructed *Urtext*, and then claims that it was added in the 2 Kings version as a feature of Dtr. However, the Dtr background of this type of change is not explained (p. 78).

⁸³ The reconstructed *Urtext*, very closely resembling Jeremiah-LXX (see p. 111), is described as Deuteronomistic (pp. 100–102), although no Dtr phrases are listed. Because Person considers the *Urtext* Deuteronomistic, he reconstructed two Dtr stages, although in reality there is only one, that of 2 Kings-MT = 2 Kings-LXX; see 2 Kgs 24:19–20 = Jer 52:2–3 MT (¹⁹He did what was displeasing to the Lord [Weinfeld, 339 (1)] ²⁰ ... so that He cast them out of His presence [Weinfeld, 347 (11a)]). The verse is lacking in the LXX of Jeremiah.

⁸⁴ This is not the first textual analysis of these parallel texts, but it is the first to draw the conclusion that the differences between them reflect two Dtr editions. Previous analyses of Kings//Isaiah include A. T. Olmstead, “The Oldest Book of Kings,” *AJSL* 31 (1915) 169–214; H. M. Orlinsky, “The Kings–Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story,” *JQR* 30 (1939/1940) 33–49; O. Kaiser, “Die Verkündigung des Propheten Jesaja im Jahre 701,” *ZAW* 81 (1969) 304–15; A. Castagnoli, *Isaia ed Ezechia. Studio di storia della tradizione di II Re 18–20//Is. 36–39* (Studi Semitici, Nuova serie 6; Rome: Università degli Studi “La Sapienza,” 1989). For a previous analysis of 2 Kings//Jeremiah, see P.-M. Bogaert, “Les trois formes de Jérémie 52 (TM, LXX et VL),” 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: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 1–17.

indicated in notes 82–83, there is no evidence for the assumption of two different Dtr recensions in Kings or Jeremiah.⁸⁵

Conclusions

The purpose of this investigation is to find textual material that could show that the Dtr layers in Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah were composite. The *raison d'être* for this analysis is the relatively large number of differences between MT and the LXX in Dtr phraseology (especially details appearing in MT but lacking in the LXX) and the opinions expressed about them.

The results were reviewed book by book, since the textual evidence differs in each case. The overall conclusion is that one needs to be very careful in assuming two different entities in the Dtr layers on the basis of the LXX evidence. In Joshua, most of the relevant variants seem to be scribal pluses. In 1 Kings, as well as in the parallel sections 2 Kings 18–20//Isaiah 36–39 and 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30//Jeremiah 52, most of the evidence is probably irrelevant. In Jeremiah, the evidence is not irrelevant but it does not point to two different layers in Dtr.⁸⁶ Rather, several Dtr phrases were probably added routinely in ed. II on the basis of the vocabulary of ed. I, and not of Deuteronomy.

On the other hand, the evidence of the LXX in Joshua 20⁸⁷ and of LXX^{Luc} in 1 Kgs 16:34 could point to a second Dtr layer, but it is too limited when taken by itself. Accordingly, we should be careful when speaking about “the LXX and the Deuteronomists” as in the title of this chapter.

⁸⁵ Person's work on these parallel sections should be viewed in light of this scholar's earlier study, *Second Zechariah*, in which he elaborates on the view that the second part of Zechariah (Zech 9–14) was created by Dtr.

⁸⁶ This conclusion corrects my view suggested in 1972, when I still considered it possible that there were two different Dtr layers in Jeremiah: “L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie,” *RB* 79 (1972) 189–99 (199).

⁸⁷ Wellhausen and Cooke suggested that the MT redaction was created after the time of the LXX translation: 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* (CB; Cambridge: University Press, 1918) *ad loc.* This suggestion is not necessarily valid since the translator may have used an ancient manuscript even after the later manuscripts of MT had been written. Rofé, “Joshua 20” (see n. 32) dates the LXX to the end of the 5th–beginning of the 4th century.