Emanuel Tov

(The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

# Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch

## 1. Background

In modern society, the Bible has many faces both in Hebrew and in translation, but they all present more or less the same content. Thus *bereshit bara elohim et hashamayim we-et ha-aretz* is represented exactly by "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (RSV) as well as by "Im Anfang schuf Gott Himmel und Erde." More complicated verses likewise indicate that the Hebrew and European versions represent exactly the same text. The background of this identity lies in the fact that almost all modern translations were made from the very same Hebrew text, namely the Masoretic Text (MT), the traditional text of the Bible as transmitted in Judaism. This text form is well documented, but, strange as it may sound, we still know nothing of its background nor the date of its creation, and it is difficult to define its essence. Probably the most conspicuous feature of MT is its meticulous transmission over the course of a little more than two millennia. The precision with which the Masoretic manuscripts were copied is proverbial, since the copying included the smallest details in the manuscripts such as small dots above letters and the distinction between small and large letters. The rabbis did not allow a manuscript to be used for public reading if there were more than three corrections in one of its columns.[1] It is quite natural that our own evaluation of MT and of the transmission of the Bible as a whole is influenced by this precision.

---

[1] The opinions quoted in *b. Menaḥ.* 29b and *y. Meg.* 1.71c allow for two or three corrections per column (but not four), while the opinions in *Sof.* 3.10 allow for one to three corrections. According to these opinions, scrolls containing a greater number of corrections in a single column could not be used by the public, but according to *b. Menaḥ.* 29b there was a certain leniency with regard to superfluous letters, which were less disturbing when erased or deleted than were added letters. According to these criteria, many of the Qumran biblical scrolls would not have passed the scrutiny of the rabbis, as is evident from a comparison of the average number of corrections with the number of lines per column.

From the third century B.C.E. onwards, the period covered by the scrolls found at Qumran, MT was the most frequently used text in ancient Israel. This is visible from scrolls from Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert as well as the much later rabbinic literature.[2] At that time, the precursors of MT contained only consonants, but vocalization and cantillation signs were added towards the end of the first millennium, together with the details of the Masorah. The 6000 medieval manuscripts of MT differed only slightly in all these details. It is a miracle, albeit a man-made one, that the MT remained unchanged over the past 2000 years. This lack of textual intervention is visible when one compares the fragments found at Masada, Nahal Hever, and Nahal Murabbaʿat with manuscripts from the Middle Ages. There are almost no differences in consonants between codex Leningradensis or the Aleppo codex from the early Middle Ages and the texts from Masada, Nahal Hever, and Nahal Murabbaʿat; the level of variation between them is no higher than that among the medieval texts themselves.[3] A slightly higher level of variation is seen when comparing the medieval text with the Qumran fragments.[4] Excepting the LXX, all ancient translations, namely the Targumim, Saadyah's Arabic translation, as well as the Syriac Peshitta and Latin Vulgate, more or less reflect MT. Rabbinic literature likewise only reflects MT.

The reason for the preponderance of the precursors of MT in this period is evident. Since MT was the text form used by the Temple circles, the Pharisees, and rabbis, it is understandable that all ancient sources after 70 C.E. reflect this form; many, possibly most, sources preceding the destruction of the Temple also used this text.

Before the destruction of the Temple, however, many additional texts were used in Judaism, and they are the focus of our study. We learn about them from the Qumran discoveries, the Septuagint translation, and the Torah of the Samaritans, the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP). The influence of these texts within Judaism is felt only until the middle of the first century C.E. Various developments during that period changed the nature of the tex-

---

2 See my study "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 139–66.

3 For precise statistics, see I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?," *DSD* 9 (2002): 364–90.

4 In my study "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *The Ancient Synagogue: From Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University October 14-17, 2001* (ed. B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm; ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), 237–59, I suggested that the texts from the sites other than Qumran reflect the texts named "corrected" in rabbinic literature. These scrolls were corrected on the basis of the Temple copies, while the Qumran texts are one stage removed from them.

tual evidence. These changes were socio-religious and demographic in nature, but are sometimes incorrectly interpreted as relating to the texts themselves. Before the destruction of the Temple, MT was one of the main texts used but not the only one, while after 70 C.E. it was the only text used in Judaism. The reason for the change was that nascent rabbinic Judaism was the only surviving form of Judaism after that date. There were no other forms of Judaism remaining in existence that could have used a different form of the Hebrew Bible. How the pluriformity of the period preceding 70 C.E. developed into the uniformity of the later period is a matter of debate among scholars.[5] This development is often described as the 'stabilization' of MT, but in my view the survival of MT as the sole text rather than the preponderant one is merely a result of sociological developments as described above.[6] There was no *Kulturkampf*; rather, the groups that had embraced other texts simply ceased to exist.

After the destruction of the Temple, other biblical texts were in circulation but no longer *within Judaism*. In the meantime, Christianity had been born, and early Christians used the Greek Septuagint, which was originally a Jewish translation but had subsequently been adopted by Christianity. Greek-speaking Jews no longer used the LXX, focusing instead on its more recent Jewish revisions. The Samaritans, another group that had split off from Judaism probably in the third century B.C.E., turned to their own Torah, which was based on a text that had been used previously in Judaism. The practical result of these developments was a division of texts among the religious communities after the destruction of the Temple. The central stream of Judaism held on to the Hebrew MT, most Christians to the Greek LXX, and the Samaritans to their own Hebrew Torah. Whatever texts were in use before that period, such as those known from Qumran, were no longer used since there were no religious groups who could have embraced them.

As a result, archeology and the preservation of ancient religions come to our aid in understanding the textual situation in ancient times. Without the

---

[5] For an analysis, see A. van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," in *The Bible as Book,* 167–77, especially 170–71**.**

[6] See A. S. van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament," in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. van der Woude* (ed. J. N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 151–69. Van der Woude believes, as does the present author, that in different circles in Second Temple Judaism, there must have been different approaches towards the text. Most circles did not insist upon a single textual tradition, as is visible in the collection of the Qumran texts. At the same time, a single textual tradition, the Masoretic Text, was held in esteem by the temple circles, and later, the Pharisees. My own ideas have been developed in "The History and Significance of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, part 1: *Antiquity* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 49–66.

purely coincidental finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and other sites in the Judean Desert, we would not have known so much about the early text of the Hebrew Bible. Religions come to our aid, too, since Christianity preserved the LXX and the Vulgate, the Samaritan community preserved their own Pentateuch, and traditional Judaism held on to MT.

We mentioned the existence of a pluriform textual tradition before the destruction of the Second Temple. Vestiges of such textual variety are visible even in modern translations. Thus, against all other translations, the NRSV and one of the French African translations include a long section from the Qumran scroll 4QSam[a] at the end of 1 Samuel 10. This added section explains the background of the siege of Jabesh Gilead by Nahash the Ammonite,[7] and thus provides a new context. In this very important detail, the readers of the NRSV use a different Bible, one based on novel material from Qumran. Not all scholars agree to this procedure, since some claim that the Qumran paragraph is not original but represents a late Midrash.[8] Similarly, in Jer 27:1, MT places the framework of the story in the reign of Jehoiakim, while other modern translations, among them the NRSV, mention Zedekiah's reign as the chronological setting.

The Bible as represented by the NRSV is still the same Bible as in all other translations, in spite of these borrowings from sources other than MT. Even though modern translations usually reflect MT, in several details they represent the LXX, a Qumran scroll, or another ancient source, and through them we get a glimpse of the textual variety in antiquity. This situation makes us increasingly aware that the traditional Jewish text, MT, is *not* the Bible but only one of several text forms and/or representatives, albeit a very good one.[9]

These non-Masoretic text forms are the focus of our study. In some books, MT differs much from the LXX and the SP. These two sources are ancient and modern at the same time. They were created in antiquity, but are still authoritative in modern times. The SP is the Holy Writ of the Samaritan community. The LXX remains the Holy Writ of the Eastern Orthodox Church; while it was authoritative for the whole of Christianity for a long period, it was replaced in the Western Church by the Vulgate. The

---

[7] (10:27) Now Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had been grievously oppressing the Gadites and the Reubenites. He would gouge out the right eye of each of them and would not grant Israel a deliverer. No one was left of the Israelites across the Jordan whose right eye Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had not gouged out. But there were seven thousand men who had escaped from the Ammonites and had entered Jabesh-gilead. (11:1) About a month later …

[8] See A. Rofé, "The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam[a]," *IEJ* 32 (1982): 129–33.

[9] The edition that bears the misleading name *Biblia Hebraica* should have been named *Biblia Masoretica.* See my analysis "The Place of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 234–51.

so-called Apocrypha of the LXX, including such books as Baruch and 1–2 Maccabees, are still part of the Holy Scriptures of the Roman Catholics today, though named deutero-canonical.

We are paying attention to the contents of the LXX because of its acceptance in Second Temple Judaism. For this purpose, we need to understand the nature of the differences between MT and the LXX especially when they pertain to major issues. We exclude from the discussion those LXX books that in our view reflect the translator's own major changes, such as the book of Job, while realizing that this is a subjective decision. Our analysis is thus based on presuppositions that reflect one of several views. If one of these alternative views is more convincing than the one presented here, my own analysis may well be irrelevant. If, for example, someone believes that it was the translator of 3 Kingdoms who created the greatly differing version and not an earlier Hebrew reviser, as I do, the view presented here with regard to that book may be irrelevant. At the end of our analysis, we will turn to matters of text and canon, in an attempt to understand which text forms were authoritative for which communities and why.

## 2. Major Content Differences between MT and the Hebrew Source of the LXX

We start with a discussion of books in the LXX that differed much from MT. We will not focus on books that presumably contained an edition preceding MT, such as Jeremiah or 1 Samuel 16–18, but rather on three books that show signs of literary editions produced *after* the edition of MT – in our view –: 1 Kings, or as it is named in the LXX, 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel.[10] In the course of the analysis, we wish to point out some parallels

---

10 An additional case may be 1 Esdras. However, that book is not a rewritten book like the other compositions discussed in this study, but a new creation based on three different sources, 2 Chronicles 35–36, Ezra 1–10 and Neh 8:1–12, and also contains an additional source in the "Contest between the Three Courtiers" in 3:1–5:3. For a penetrating analysis of the nature of the book, see S. Japhet, "The Picture of the Restoration Period in 1 Esdras," *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007): 109–28. For a detailed commentary and discussion of the various aspects of 1 Esdras, see Z. Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999); eadem, "Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Editions," in *Yahwism after the Exile* (ed. R. Albertz; Studies in Theology and Religion 5; Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 199–218 = "Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Redactions: New Approaches to 1 Esdras," in *On the Border Line: Textual Meets Literary Criticism* (ed. Z. Talshir and D. Amara; Beer Sheva XVIII; Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2005), 77–97 (Hebrew).

between these three books and Hebrew rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran.

## 2.1 3 Kingdoms

The Greek 3 Kingdoms differs completely from its counterpart in MT, 1 Kings, and the background of the relation between the two is a matter of dispute among scholars.[11] In my view, the Hebrew composition behind the LXX extensively rewrote the text now included in the MT of 1 Kings. King Solomon is portrayed as a wise man in MT, but in the first ten chapters of the LXX his wisdom is emphasized more strongly. The LXX reinterprets several of the chapters dealing with Solomon and rearranges various sections, paying special attention to their chronological sequence. Gooding presents the simplest analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten to emphasize Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chapters 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chapters 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab.[12] The rewriting in 3 Kingdoms uses the following techniques:[13]

a. The LXX adds two long "theme summaries" in chapter 2 repeating various verses in 1 Kings around the theme of Solomon's wisdom, altogether 24 verses (vv 35a–o and 46a–l). These extensive summaries, repeating verses occurring elsewhere in 1 Kings 3–11[14] are out of chronological order in chapter 2, since the Solomonic history only starts with chapter 3. These added summaries describe Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter, his building activities, administration, and offerings, all of them described as exponents of his wisdom. The closest parallel to this technique is the added summary before the LXX of Daniel 5 (see below), although that summary is not a theme summary.

b. *Duplication* of sections. Beyond the passages mentioned in section i, the rewritten text of 3 Kingdoms repeated 1 Kgs 22:41–51 (description of Jehoshaphat's activities) in 3 Kingdoms 16:28a–h, and 1 Kgs 9:24 in v. 9a of the same chapter in 3 Kingdoms. To the best of my knowledge, the

---

[11] See my own analysis in "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (eds. A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Supplements to JSJ 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–66.

[12] D. W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969): 1–29.

[13] For details, see the paper mentioned in note 10.

[14] In verses 35k–l the MT and LXX contain no parallels.

device of repeating sections is not used elsewhere in the Greek Bible or MT.

c. Inclusion of an *alternative version*. An alternative history of Jeroboam extant only in the LXX (3 Kgdms 12:24a–z) presents a rival story juxtaposed with the original one 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. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),[15] there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions appearing in one textual witness but not in the other ones.

d. The transposition of verses to other environments in accord with the reviser's tendencies, especially his chronological rearrangements: For example, 1 Kgs 3:1 and 9:16–17 are repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:14a; 1 Kgs 5:7–8 is repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:1; 1 Kgs 5:31–32 and 6:37–38 are moved to 3 Kgdms 6:1a–d; 1 Kgs 8:11–12 is placed in 3 Kgdms 8:53a; verses from 9:15–22 are placed in 10:22a–c; etc. This technique is also evidenced elsewhere in the LXX and MT.

The new elements of the LXX are based on a Hebrew text,[16] and this Hebrew text is secondary in relation to MT. It rewrites MT in a way similar to the rewriting in the SP and some Qumran rewritten Bible compositions (see below).

## 2.2 Esther

An evaluation of the differences between Esth-LXX and MT poses many challenges.[17] The LXX is very free and sometimes paraphrastic; it also contains six large narrative expansions (the so-called Additions A–F) that are traditionally considered to be independent units. However, the use of the term 'Additions' gives a false impression of their nature and may lead to

---

[15] 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 *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 97–130. Revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 333–60. See further D. Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Venture* (OBO 73; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1986).

[16] See the paper quoted in note 8.

[17] See my own analysis: "The LXX Translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation of MT or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version?," in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (ed. A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg; Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 507–26.

wrong conclusions. They are better described as narrative Expansions A–F, adding more than 50% to the amount of the words of the Greek book.[18]

In as far as a consensus exists regarding the textual value of the Greek version of Esther, it is negative[19] because of its free and sometimes paraphrastic translation technique. It should however be recognized that the LXX reflects some variants and that the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F in the LXX was Hebrew. Further, the Greek translations of the canonical sections and of the Expansions were produced by the same person.[20] Esth-LXX thus reflects a rewritten Hebrew composition that included various expansions.

There is no reason to distrust the ancient evidence of all manuscripts according to which all the elements of Esth-LXX represent one integral unit that formed the basis for Josephus, *Ant*. 11:184–296 (including Expansions B–E). We should not be influenced by Jerome's removal of Expansions A–F from their context, thereby mutilating the translation.[21] His action was arbitrary and inconsistent since by the same token one could excise equally large segments from the Greek translation of 3 Kingdoms 2 and 12, such as mentioned above and place them at the end of the book. Furthermore, the canonical segments and the Expansions are intertwined in an organic way in chapters 4 and 5, making it impossible to mark an uninterrupted group of verses as constituting 'Expansion D.'[22] The unity of the canonical text and the narrative expansions is further supported by several close connections in content between the two segments.[23]

---

18 Due to the uncertainty pertaining to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, a comparison of the length of the LXX and MT is little more than an exercise. According to the calculations of C. V. Dorothy, *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre, and Textual Integrity* (JSOTSup 187; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 16, the LXX added 77% to MT, the AT text 45%, and Josephus 32%.

19 This judgment was probably best formulated by D. J. A. Clines: "Almost everyone agrees, however, that no matter how free the Septuagint translator has been, it is essentially the Masoretic Hebrew text that was his *Vorlage*" (*The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* [JSOTSup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984], 69). A similar view had been expressed earlier by T. Nöldeke, "Esther," in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (ed. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black; London: A. & C. Black, 1899–1903) 2:1406: "The tendency, so common at the present day, to overestimate the importance of the LXX for purposes of textual criticism is nowhere more to be deprecated than in the Book of Esther. It may be doubted whether even in a single passage of the book the Greek manuscripts enable us to emend the Hebrew text."

20 See the paper quoted in note 17.

21 W. H. Brownlee, "Le livre grec d'Esther et la royauté divine: Corrections orthodoxes au livre d'Esther," *RB* 73 (1966): 161–85 (162) uses this term.

22 For details, see Tov, "The LXX Translation of Esther."

23 See Tov, "The LXX Translation of Esther." For a different case, see the translation of Daniel that includes several long additions now considered "apocryphal." However, those additions do not form an integral part of the story, as in Esther. Furthermore it is unclear whether there ever existed an expanded Semitic book of Daniel on which the Greek translation would have been based. By the same token, there never existed an expanded Semitic book of Jeremiah that included Baruch even though one translator rendered both Jeremiah and Baruch. See E. Tov, *The Septuagint*

The following features characterize the rewriting that took place in the Hebrew source of Esth-LXX:

1. The addition of large *narrative expansions* at key points in the story: A and F before the beginning and after the end ('Mordecai's Dream' and its 'Interpretation'), and C ('Prayers of Mordecai and Esther') and D ('Esther's Audience with the King') after chapter 4.

2. Probably the most characteristic feature of the LXX is the addition of a *religious background* to the earlier MT version that lacks the mentioning of God's name. These details are added not only in the large expansions but also in small pluses such as 2:20; 4:8; 6:13. Likewise, God's involvement is mentioned everywhere in the Midrash and Targum.[24]

3. The addition of *new ideas* in small details. For example, the identification of Ahashuerus as Artaxerxes; the description of the first banquet as a wedding feast for Vashti (1:5, 11); length of the second banquet (1:5); the description of the opulence at the banquet (1:5–6); the identification of Mehuman as Haman (1:10); the king's active participation in the hanging of the two eunuchs (2:23) and of Haman (8:7); the king's placing the ring on Haman's hand (3:10); the naming of Haman as a Macedonian (E 10; 9:24); Esther's concern for her own safety (8:6).

In light of the preceding analysis, we suggest that the *Vorlage* of Esth-LXX included the so-called Expansions A, C, D, and F. The royal edicts in Expansions B and E were probably added by the translator himself.

## 2.3 Daniel[25]

The relationship between many details in MT and LXX in Daniel 4–6 cannot be determined easily, but most scholars believe that the LXX reflects a later reworking of a book resembling MT, while occasionally the LXX

---

*Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976).

24 Thus Esther's concern for dietary laws in C 27–28 should be compared with *b. Meg.* 13a, *Targum Rishon,* and *Targum Sheni* 2:20. See B. Grossfeld, *The Two Targums of Esther: Translated with Apparatus and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible 18; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991). For LXX Esth 2:7 "he trained her for himself as a wife" (MT "Mordecai adopted her <Esther> as his own daughter") cf. *b. Meg.* 13a "A Tanna taught in the name of R. Meir: Read not "for a daughter" [*le-bat*], but "for a house" [*le-bayit*] <that is, a wife>." For a different view on the relation between the LXX and the Midrash, see M. Zipor, "When Midrash Met Septuagint: The Case of Esther 2,7," *ZAW* 118 (2006): 82–92.

25 For details in this analysis, see E. Tov, "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere," in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–93.

reflects an earlier form. Some scholars go as far as to argue that the LXX of Daniel as a whole preceded MT.[26] Because of complications like these, the two versions could also be presented as two independent works that revised an earlier composition.[27] Be that as it may, in the main, the parent text of the LXX revises an earlier text resembling MT.[28] The Semitic substratum[29] of the Greek text is often visible.[30]

Three examples of rewriting in the LXX follow:

a. A composition very similar to the MT of chapter 4 has been reworked in the LXX. The LXX changed, added, and omitted many details. Among other things, the Greek text places the opening verses of chapter 4 (3:31–33 in MT) later in the chapter, in a greatly expanded form, as v. 34c.[31] The story in MT starts with these verses, which contain the king's confession of guilt and his recognition of God's greatness, while in the LXX they are found at the end of the account in the form of a doxology, as in 6:26–27 and else-where.

---

[26] Thus R. Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988); O. Munnich, "Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuaginta Reconsidered* (ed. A. Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 2003), 93–120.

[27] Thus, according to Ulrich, the *parallel* editions of both MT and the LXX (OG) expanded an earlier text form in different ways: E. Ulrich, "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated," in *Perspectives on the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Walter J. Harrelson* (ed. J. L. Crenshaw; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988), 101–16 = idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 34–50, esp. 40–44. This view was developed on the basis of the Notre Dame dissertations by D. O. Wenthe and S. P. Jeansonne mentioned there.

[28] The revisional character of the LXX is described in detail by R. Grelot, "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique," *RB* 81 (1974): 5–23; idem, "La chapitre V de Daniel dans la Septante," *Sem* 24 (1974): 45–66. J. J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 4–11, 216–20, 241–43 makes many judicious remarks on the relation between the two texts.

[29] J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964) 37, 248, argued for an Aramaic substratum, while Grelot, "Daniel IV" assumed a Hebrew parent text.

[30] According to Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls,* 43, the Greek translation was "a consistent, unified document with a consistent translation technique. Therefore, the significant variation between the OG and the MT in 4–6 seems to indicate that the OG is a faithful translation of a different literary edition of these chapters." If this judgment is correct, we have good insights into the Aramaic parent text of the LXX. Even if this judgment about the translation technique is only partially correct, at least major aspects of the Aramaic text underlying the LXX can be reconstructed.

[31] The position of these verses at the end of the Greek chapter is secondary as they refer to the future, although the events themselves have already been described in the preceding verses: "And now, I *will* show to you the deeds that the great God has done with me (v. 34c)." In MT this verse (3:33) correctly appears before the events.

b. MT has a tendency to change details in the wording of the dream in chapter 4 to agree with the subsequent description of its interpretation. The LXX goes one step further by reporting the fulfillment of God's command to the king within the dream itself, in the added verse 14a (17a). This long verse, which repeats the wording of the earlier verses, reports the cutting down of the tree and its metamorphosis, now symbolizing the king, into a beast: "He ate grass with the animals of the earth …" (for the wording, cf. v 12).

c. Preceding the beginning of chapter 5 (King Belshazzar's banquet and the writing on the wall), the LXX adds a summary of the chapter that is neither matched by MT nor Theodotion's version. This summary includes a new element, namely the transliterated inscription written on the wall (v. 25), which is not included in the LXX. The summary partially duplicates the content of the chapter; thus it begins with the same words as v. 1 that introduce the king's feast. There are also differences in details between the summary on the one hand and MT and the LXX on the other. Therefore, this addition must have summarized a slightly different form of the chapter. The underlying text of the summary was probably Aramaic. The summary may be compared to the theme summaries in the LXX of 3 Kingdoms 2 (see above, a). The summary in Daniel recaps the events told in the chapter, while the LXX of 3 Kingdoms 2 duplicates verses around a common theme.

The essence of the examples given from 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel is that these Greek books reflect Hebrew compositions that were very different from the ones included in MT. All three rewrote compositions like the ones included in MT, as suggested in greater detail in another study.[32] What 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP), the Hebrew source of some LXX books, and the SP group have in common is the interaction of stretches of Scripture text and exegetical expansions, although they had different tendencies.

If our analysis so far is correct, the collection of Greek Scripture contained some works that rewrote compositions included in the Hebrew canon (as well as compositions that preceded MT, like in Jeremiah and Ezekiel).

---

[32] See Tov, "Three Strange Books."

### 3. Comparison of the Three LXX Books with Rewritten Bible Compositions in Hebrew

We now expand our observations on the LXX to other rewritten Bible compositions, in Hebrew, as found among the Qumran scrolls and in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The Samaritan version of the Torah rewrote a composition like MT. The rewriting is partial, as all rewriting, but it is manifest. In the main, the rewriting in the SP does not bear a Samaritan character, since earlier non-sectarian texts (named pre-Samaritan)[33] from Qumran carry the exact same content as the SP. However, the SP goes its own way by adding a small number of Samaritan sectarian readings. Together these texts are named the "SP group."

Some of the Hebrew Qumran compositions likewise resemble the rewriting in the LXX books, even more so than the SP group. The best preserved rewritten Bible texts[34] from Qumran are 11QT[a] cols. LI–LXVI, the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), and Jubilees.[35] These parallels strengthen our aforementioned assertions relating to the rewriting in some LXX books and reversely the LXX helps us in clarifying the canonical status of the Qumran compositions.

The main feature these compositions and the SP have in common with the reconstructed sources of the LXX translations relates to the interaction between the presumably original Scripture text and exegetical additions. All the Qumran compositions and the SP group present long stretches of Scripture text, interspersed with short or long exegetical additions.

In the past, the aforementioned three LXX translations have not been associated with the Qumran rewritten Bible texts. When making this link, we recognize the similarity in the rewriting style of Scripture books. More

---

33 Especially 4QpaleoExod[m] and 4QNum[b]; see E. Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54.

34 For the evidence and an analysis, see G. J. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 2:777–81; idem, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book*, 31–40; E. Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen–Exod," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–34; M. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–29; D. J. Harrington, "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 242–47.

35 Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* also provide valuable parallels, but they are less relevant since they make no claim to sacred status.

specifically, the LXX translations meet some of the characterizing criteria that Segal set for rewritten Hebrew Bible compositions: new narrative frame, expansion together with abridgement, and a tendentious editorial layer.[36] We will now review the similarities in techniques:

### 3.1 3 Kingdoms

Two of the central techniques used in the Greek 3 Kingdoms, not known from MT or Greek Scripture, were also used in the SP group, viz., the duplication of sections in 3 Kingdoms and the insertion of theme summaries in chapter 2.

a. *Duplication.* Central to the literary principles of the SP group is the wish to rewrite Hebrew Scripture based on its editorial tendencies without adding new text pericopes. The addition of new passages would have harmed the authenticity of the rewritten Bible compositions, and therefore the SP group limited itself to copying. For this purpose they duplicated, for example, all the segments of Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 in Exodus and Numbers as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy.[37] In the SP group and 3 Kingdoms, the duplications have a different purpose. In the Greek 3 Kingdoms 2, they serve an exegetical or chronological purpose, while in the SP group the duplication of segments from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers is meant to make the earlier books comply with Moses' speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.[38]

b. *Theme summaries.* The two collections of verses in 3 Kingdoms 2 summarize in the beginning of the Greek book verses relating to the central theme of chapters 3–10, namely Solomon's wisdom. By the same token, the added[39] tenth commandment of SP (not found in the pre-Samaritan texts) is a theme summary of verses describing the sanctity of Mt. Gerizim. The tenth commandment of SP in both versions of the Decalogue describing and prescribing the sanctity of Mount Gerizim is made up of verses occurring elsewhere in Deuteronomy.[40]

---

36 Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20–26.

37 For a detailed analysis, see Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions."

38 A similar duplication is found in 4QDeut[n] V 5–7 where the motive clause for the Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:11 has been added after the motive clause of Deuteronomy. See J. H. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in *Empirical Models,* 53–96 (55–57).

39 The Samaritans consider the first commandment of the Jewish tradition as a preamble to the Decalogue, so that in their tradition there is room for an additional commandment.

40 Deut 11:29a, 27:2b–3a, 27:4a, 27:5–7, 11:30 – in that sequence.

## 3.2 Esth-LXX

The Hebrew source of Esth-LXX rewrote a composition very similar to MT. The most salient technique used in the course of the rewriting is the addition of the large narrative Expansions A, C, D, and F. These expansions expand the story in a meaningful way. The interaction of the previous Bible text and the long expansions may be compared with the relation between the Qumran rewritten Scripture compositions and their presumed sources. All these rewritten compositions exercise freedom towards their underlying texts by adding large expansions wherever their authors wished.

## 3.3 Daniel

Two of the techniques used in the Greek Daniel are also used elsewhere:

a. *Command and execution*. The technique used in the LXX addition in 4:14a (17a), which relates the execution of God's command of vv 11–14 (14–17), is known from several other compositions. The closest parallel is the story of the Ten Plagues in Exodus 7–11 in the SP group. In this story, the SP group expanded the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague by adding a detailed account of their execution.[41] That these additions are not only typical of these texts is shown by the similar addition of the execution of Kish's command to Saul in 1 Sam 9:3 in LXX[Luc] and the Peshitta.

b. *Summaries*. The summary description of the events of Daniel 5 that is placed at its beginning reminds us of the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 and in the SP.[42]

---

[41] For example, after Exod 8:19 the SP and 4QpaleoExod[m], following the formulation of vv. 16ff. add: "And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him: 'Thus says the Lord: Let my people go that they may worship Me. For if you do not let my people go, I will let loose …'" Similar additions are found in 4QpaleoExod[m] and SP after 7:18, 29; 9:5, 19.

[42] The nature of the rewriting has been described in the studies listed in n. 27, but whether the rewriting in 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel is adequately covered by these descriptions still needs to be examined. Attention also needs to be given to the question of whether or not the rewritten editions were intended to replace the older ones. We believe that this was the intention of the three mentioned rewritten books. The rewritten ed. II of Jeremiah (MT) likewise was meant to replace the earlier ed. I (LXX, 4QJer[b,d]).

## 4. Text and Canon

The rewritten compositions within the LXX canon and the Hebrew texts from Qumran resemble each other with regard to their rewriting procedures and probably also with regard to their canonical position.

T h e *Greek* versions of 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel had an authoritative status following their completion, since all the books of the LXX, including the so-called Apocrypha, probably enjoyed such a status, at first within Judaism[43] and subsequently within Christianity.[44] However, after a few centuries, the Greek Apocrypha were no longer accepted within Judaism. This process probably took place when the LXX books as a whole had been rejected by Judaism, among other things because they had been accepted by Christianity. In the Christian communities, all the books of the LXX, together with the Apocrypha, were accepted as Scripture although not all the details are clear and there are differences between the various traditions. Only much later, with the Reformation, were the Apocrypha relegated to a secondary status. This pertains also to the so-called Additions of Esther and Daniel even though these Expansions never had a separate existence.

While the erstwhile authoritative status of all of the Greek books of the LXX is a fact, the authoritative status of these books in their original languages (Hebrew and Aramaic) is less certain. However, it stands to reason that the Semitic *Vorlagen* of all the books of the LXX, including those of the Apocrypha, once enjoyed authoritative status. The Greek translator of Esther would not have translated the now-apocryphal sections had they not been considered authoritative by him and by the community in whose midst he lived. By the same token, the short book of Baruch was considered authoritative by the translator of Jeremiah, who included it in his translation, and by the inner-Greek reviser who revised the two books.[45] Likewise, *kaige*-Th rendered Baruch as well as Bel, Susanna and the "Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men" inserted between

---

[43] In actual fact, we have no direct reference in Jewish sources to the Jewish community's acceptance of individual books of Greek Scripture, but I see no reason to distrust the early Church lists such as recorded by H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1900), 203–14 as Jewish Scripture. It is possible that Jewish Greek Scripture encompassed more books such as, for example, Enoch, but the collection probably did not contain fewer books than those included in the lists. I am grateful to A. Lange for pointing this out to me.

[44] In our view, the A-Text of Esther reflects a similar rewritten composition of a text like the MT of that book, but it did not enjoy any authoritative status. See "The 'Lucianic' Text of the Canonical and the Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book," *Textus* 10 (1982): 1–25. Revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 535–48.

[45] See Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*.

Dan 3:23 and 3:24. This translator, working in the first century B.C.E., must have considered these books authoritative.

The hypothesis about the authoritative status of some or all Semitic books, including the Apocrypha, rendered by the LXX translators may now be applied to the Hebrew rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. We noted above that some of the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions share characteristics with the LXX rewritten books. We may now apply this observation to their canonical status. The rewritten forms of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel with all their expansions and changes from MT were authoritative in their Greek shape and probably also in their original Semitic forms. Since they share characteristic features with Qumran rewritten Bible compositions, some of the latter also may have enjoyed authoritative status. However, such a status can only be assumed if there was a community that accepted these compositions, and in the case of the Qumran scrolls this assumption is unclear. The fact that several manuscripts of the same composition were found at Qumran does not necessarily imply that they were accepted as being authoritative by that community or any other group. Thus, we do not know of a religious group that accepted the Temple Scroll, 4QRP, or Jubilees as binding. There is circumstantial evidence for Jubilees as a relatively large number of copies of that book were found at Qumran, and for the Temple Scroll due to the existence of a luxury copy of 4–11QTemple, namely 11QT$^a$.[46] The decision is very difficult since no surviving group such as Judaism, Christianity or the Samaritans, has endorsed these compositions. Because of the lack of convincing evidence relating to all the rewritten compositions, we turn to one group of manuscripts that from the content point of view so closely resembles the rewritten works within Greek Scripture that it probably enjoyed the same authoritative status as the books translated in Greek Scripture. I refer to the manuscripts of 4QReworked Pentateuch, which typologically very much resemble the Semitic source of the LXX books of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel, since they contain long stretches of unaltered Scripture text as well as small and large exegetical additions and changes. The manuscripts of this group should therefore be considered Scripture to the same extent as the mentioned Greek texts and their *Vorlagen* were considered Scripture.[47]

---

[46] On the surface, it is hard to imagine that 4–11QTemple was accepted as Scripture because its first-person account of the Torah renders it a very artificial work. However, the luxurious character of 11QT$^a$ possibly indicated sacred status. See my monograph *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125–29.

[47] This composition was published by E. Tov and S. A. White, "4QReworked Pentateuch$^{b–e}$ and 4QTemple?," in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 187–351, 459–63 and plates XIII–XXXXVI.

These manuscripts, published as a non-biblical composition,[48] thus have to be reclassified as Bible texts.[49]

4QRP is represented by five manuscripts,[50] two of which are very extensive (4Q364–365). Compared with the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions, this source exhibits the longest stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture such as found in either MT or the SP group.[51] This source also rearranges some Torah pericopes.[52] As far as we can tell, 4QRP has a relatively small number of extensive additions. The exegetical character of these texts is especially evident from several pluses comprising 1–2 lines and in some cases more than 8 lines. The most clear-cut examples of this technique is the expanded "Song of Miriam" in 4Q365 (4QRP[c]), frgs. 6a, col. ii and 6c consisting of at least 7 lines.[53] In all these pluses, 4QRP resembles the Hebrew compositions behind the Greek 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel.

In conclusion, if our analysis is correct, we are faced with many different Scripture texts all of which need to be taken into consideration in the exegetical and literary study of Hebrew Scripture. The meticulously transmitted MT is a given, but beyond that text there were many widely

---

[48] S. White Crawford, with whom I published 4QRP, recognized the possibility that this was an authoritative Bible text, but decided against it: "The Rewritten Bible at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1: *The Hebrew Bible at Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; N. Richland Hills, Tex.: Bibal, 2000), 173–95; eadem, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 39–59.

[49] M. Segal and E. Ulrich were ahead of us when claiming in 2000 that this text is Scripture, Ulrich with general background reasons and Segal with very detailed arguments: M. Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 391–99; E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 67–87.

[50] 4Q158 = 4QRP[a], 4Q364 = 4QRP[b], 4Q365 = 4QRP[c], 4Q366 = 4QRP[d], 4Q367 = 4QRP[e]. The latter four were published in *DJD* 13, while we identified 4Q158, published by Allegro in *DJD* 4, as belonging to the same composition.

[51] The pre-Samaritan text is clearly the underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364 (see *DJD* 13, 192–96).

[52] In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP. In the case of juxtaposed laws on a common topic (*Sukkot*) in 4Q366 4 i (Num 29:32–30:1; Deut 16:13–14), one does not know where in 4QRP this fragment would have been positioned, in Numbers, as the fragment is presented in *DJD* 13, or in Deuteronomy.

[53] By the same token, the text added in 4Q158 (4QRP[a]), frg. 14 consists of at least 9 lines. 4Q365 (4QRP[c]), frg. 23 contains at least ten lines of added text devoted to festivals and festival offerings, including the Festival of the New Oil and the Wood Festival. Further, if 4Q365a, published as "4QTemple?", is nevertheless part of 4Q365 (4QRP), that copy of 4QRP would have contained even more non-biblical material (festivals, structure of the Temple) than was previously thought.

divergent texts within ancient Israel. Among them were several texts earlier than the ones included in MT as well as compositions rewriting a text like MT. In this presentation, we focused on the rewritten texts incorporated into the LXX (3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel). An early rewritten Bible text, Chronicles, was included in the Hebrew and Greek canon.[54] Some of these literary reshapings were not accepted by all communities. Thus, some of them made their way to the Jewish LXX translators, but not to the collection of MT. Other texts circulating in ancient Israel made their way to the Qumran community. 4QReworked Pentateuch, to be reclassified as a biblical text (something like "4QPentateuch"), was one such text, about whose authoritative status we have no further information. Maybe it was considered to be authoritative Scripture by the Qumran community or another group.[55] What 4QRP, the Hebrew source of some LXX books, and the SP group have in common is the interaction of stretches of Scripture text and exegetical expansions, although these expansions differ in nature and tendency. If all these texts were considered authoritative, probably 4QRP enjoyed a similar status. All these texts need to be studied as Hebrew Scripture.

---

[54] Chronicles differs much from Samuel-Kings. Had we found this book at Qumran as an unknown composition, we would probably have classified it as a rewritten Bible composition.

[55] One is reminded of a scribal habit in 4Q364 (4QRP[b]) of writing a dicolon ( **:** ) before each occurrence of the divine name, followed by a space, serving as a *Qere* note.