

Exploring the Origins of the Bible

CANON FORMATION IN HISTORICAL,
LITERARY, AND THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov
Editors


Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

© 2008 by Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Exploring the origins of the Bible : canon formation in historical, literary, and theological perspective / edited by Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov.

p. cm. (Acadia studies in Bible and theology)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-0-8010-3242-4 (pbk.)

1. Bible—Canon. I. Evans, Craig A. II. Tov, Emanuel.

BS465.E97 2008

220.1'2—dc22

2008019124

Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Scripture are the authors' own translations.

Scripture quotations labeled JPS are from the Jewish Publication Society Version. © 1917 by The Jewish Publication Society.

Scripture quotations labeled NIV are from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled NKJV are from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled NRSV are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled RSV are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright 1952 [2nd edition, 1971] by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov, editors,

Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective,
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2008. Used by permission.

Contents

- Preface 7
List of Contributors 9
Abbreviations 11
Introduction *Craig A. Evans* 15
- 1 The Septuagint as a Source for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture *Emanuel Tov* 31
 - 2 Writings Ostensibly outside the Canon *James H. Charlesworth* 57
 - 3 Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon *Stephen G. Dempster* 87
 - 4 The Role of “the Septuagint” in the Formation of the Biblical Canons *R. Glenn Wooden* 129
 - 5 The Apocryphal Jesus: Assessing the Possibilities and Problems *Craig A. Evans* 147
 - 6 Paul and the Process of Canonization *Stanley E. Porter* 173
 - 7 Wherein Lies Authority? A Discussion of Books, Texts, and Translations *Lee Martin McDonald* 203
 - 8 Canon and Theology: What Is at Stake? *Jonathan R. Wilson* 241
- Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Writings 255
Index of Subjects and Names 265

Introduction

CRAIG A. EVANS

Most people who read the Bible have little idea how complicated its origins, transmission, preservation, and history of compilation truly are. The word *Bible* means “book,” but in reality the Bible is comprised of many books. The exact number depends on one’s confessional identity. For Jews the Bible (also called Tanak or Mikra—what Christians call the Old Testament) is made up of Hebrew and Aramaic books. For Christians, the Greek New Testament is also part of the Bible. Moreover, Christians differ among themselves whether to include the books of the Apocrypha.

There are many more questions and issues. Not everyone realizes that the Jewish Bible (or Old Testament) at one time circulated not only in Hebrew/Aramaic, but also in Greek. For some, the Greek version was as authoritative as the Hebrew/Aramaic. Aramaic paraphrases (called targums) later emerged, which in some circles were also considered authoritative. In time Jerome translated the Bible into Latin, which eventually became known as the Vulgate, the official version for the Roman Catholic Church.

These facts are familiar to Bible scholars, but some will be new to many readers of this collection of studies. A brief survey of the basic issues will serve as a helpful introduction to this volume.¹

Versions of the Hebrew Bible

Hebrew may have been the original language in which most of the Old Testament was written, but the Hebrew text is extant today in distinct forms: the Masoretic Text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, fragments from the Cairo Genizah (which usually agree with the Masoretic Text), and more than 200 scrolls from Qumran (which mostly agree with the Masoretic Text, but some exhibit a form of Hebrew text that corresponds with the Old Greek, or Septuagint).² It seems that no one of these extant texts represents the exact original form. Let's review these Hebrew texts:

The Masoretic Text. The official version of the Hebrew Bible, or Old Testament, for Judaism and Christianity since the early Middle Ages is the Masoretic Text, which derives its name from the Masoretes, the scribes who preserved, edited, and pointed the text (i.e., added vowel signs, accents, and punctuation of a sort). Their notes are called the Masora. The Masoretic tradition probably originated in the late first or early second century. The Masora provide an interesting and complex array of sigla, whereby the scribes noted their alterations of or reservations about this passage or that. Best known is *Ketib/Qere* ("written"/"spoken"): reluctant to change the written text (*Ketib*), the scribes wrote in the margin

1. Some of the paragraphs that follow are adapted from C. A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), chaps. 4 and 6. See further E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001).

2. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, both those of Qumran and those of Murabba'at and Masada, provided witnesses to the Hebrew text dating from the turn of the era. Probably best known is the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a). More than two hundred scrolls (most in fragments) have been found. For an assessment of the implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the biblical text, see F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975). For an English translation and composite of the biblical scrolls of Qumran, see M. G. Abegg Jr., P. W. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999).

what should be read aloud (*Qere*).³ The oldest Masoretic manuscripts date from the late ninth century CE (e.g., Codex Cairensis [C] on the Prophets). No complete manuscript is earlier than the tenth century (e.g., the Aleppo Codex, which is incomplete). Fragments from the Cairo Genizah date from the sixth (possibly fifth) to the eighth centuries. Codex Leningradensis, on which the modern critical Hebrew Bible is based, dates to 1008 CE.⁴

Samaritan Pentateuch. As a distinct recension the Samaritan Pentateuch probably owes its origin to the schism in the second century BCE. There are 150 manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch, many nothing more than fragments, and most in Hebrew, though some are in Aramaic and Arabic. What makes the Samaritan Pentateuch interesting is that in approximately 1,900 places it agrees with the Greek version (the Septuagint) over against the Masoretic Text. In some places it agrees with New Testament quotations or allusions over against both the Greek and the Masoretic Text (e.g., Acts 7:4, 32). Some fragments of the Pentateuch at Qumran reflect a form of the text on which the Samaritan Pentateuch was apparently based (cf. 4QpaleoExod^{m14}; 4Q158¹⁵; 4Q364; 4QNum^b; 4QDeutⁿ¹⁹; 4Q175).⁵

3. The Masora *marginalis* is the material written in the four margins of the page. The Masora *finalis* represents an alphabetical compilation at the end of the Old Testament. The Masora *parva* ("small Masora") is found in the side margins, while the Masora *magna* ("large Masora") is found at the top and bottom margins.

4. The principal text is that edited by R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica* (with P. Kahle; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968), and the more recent edition by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983). A smaller and less expensive edition has been produced by N. H. Snaith, *Tora, Nebi'im, Ketubim* (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958). For the Leningrad Codex, see A. B. Beck and D. N. Freedman, eds., *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). A series of volumes devoted to the textual variants is being prepared by D. Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–).

5. The rabbis may have known of the Samaritan Pentateuch: "Said Rabbi Eleazar ben R. Simeon, 'I stated to Samaritan scribes, "You have forged your own Torah, and it has done you no good"' (y. *Sotah* 7.3). The text of the Samaritan Pentateuch has been edited by A. F. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (5 vols.; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914–18; repr., Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963–66). See also A. Sadaqa and R. Sadaqa, *The Samaritan Pentateuch: Jewish Version—Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch* (5 vols.; Tel Aviv: Rubin Mass, 1961–65).

Other Versions of the Bible

Old Greek. The Old Greek (OG), or more commonly the Septuagint (LXX, from the Latin *septuaginta*, “seventy”), is the Greek translation of the Old Testament (including the Old Testament Apocrypha). The name “seventy” comes from the legend found in the pseudepigraphal *Letter of Aristeas*, in which it is claimed that King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–247 BCE) commissioned seventy-two Palestinian scribes to translate the Hebrew Pentateuch into Greek for the royal library. In isolation on the island of Pharos the scribes finished the task in seventy-two days. The story is recounted by Josephus (cf. *Jewish Antiquities* 12.11–118). Philo himself accepted the story and regarded the translation as inspired, given, as it were, by divine dictation (cf. *On the Life of Moses* 2.37), a view that became common among many of the early church fathers.⁶

The LXX is an important witness to the Hebrew text that predates the Masoretes. Some of its variations from the Masoretic Text agree with readings found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some of its differing readings appear in the New Testament, whose authors follow the LXX in more than half of their quotations of the Old Testament. The diversity of the first-century Greek Old Testament text has been documented by the discovery and publication of 8HēvXII gr, a fragmentary Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets.⁷ This text differs from the LXX in a number of places, and has several points of agreement with at least three of the recensions (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion).⁸

6. For several reasons the account of Aristeas is generally accepted as legendary rather than historical. Although the date of the LXX (at least as it concerns the Pentateuch) may be as ancient as *Aristeas* purports, the reason for the translation was to make the Bible more readily accessible to the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria. The remaining portions of the Bible were translated in succeeding generations, perhaps not being completed until the first century CE. Evidently several translators were involved in this long process, for the style varies from one book to another. For more on this topic, see the essays by R. G. Wooden (“The Role of ‘the Septuagint’ in the Formation of the Biblical Canons”) and L. M. McDonald (“Wherein Lies Authority? A Discussion of Books, Texts, and Translations”) in the present volume.

7. E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HēvXII gr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

8. The principal text of the LXX is A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935). A multi-volume critical edition has been edited by A. Rahlfs, J. Ziegler et al., *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

For various reasons, several recensions of the LXX were produced in the second and third centuries CE. The oldest was by Aquila, a possible disciple of Rabbi Aqiba who may be the Onqelos associated with the Pentateuch targum of that name (cf. *b. Gittin* 56b; *b. Megillah* 3a). Aquila's Greek recension, which is really a new, woodenly literal translation of the Hebrew text, was published ca. 130 CE. His recension survives in quotations, fragments of Origen's Hexapla, and a few sixth-century palimpsests. Symmachus produced a recension ca. 170 CE that represented a much more stylish Greek than that of Aquila. According to Eusebius and Jerome, Symmachus was a Jewish Christian, but Epiphanius claims he was a Samaritan who had converted to Judaism. Symmachus's work survives in a few Hexapla fragments. Following the Hebrew text, Theodotion revised the LXX (or at least a Greek text that was very similar) sometime toward the end of the second century. Only fragments of Theodotion's translation are extant (principally in quotations).⁹

Old Latin. The Old Latin survives in fragmentary manuscripts, liturgical books, and quotations of early Latin fathers (e.g., Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose). A few books survive in complete form as part of the Vulgate (Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, Wisdom, Sirach, 1 and 2 Maccabees). Jerome did not edit these books because he regarded them as uninspired (principally because they were not extant in Hebrew or Aramaic, and because they were not as ancient

Ruprecht, 1931–). This work is not yet finished, though some two dozen volumes have appeared to date. For critical study, see E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999); idem, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed.; JBS 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997). A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) has been launched by the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) (A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright III, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007]). The first fascicle to appear was by A. Pietersma, *The Psalms: A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Members of the IOSCS are also preparing a commentary on the LXX.

9. For more studies of the Greek recensions, see D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1962); D. W. Gooding, *Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch* (London: Tyndale, 1955); K. G. O'Connell, "Greek Versions," *IDBSup* 377–81; B. M. Metzger, "Lucian and the Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," *NTS* 8 (1962): 189–203.

as the rest of the Old Testament). The Old Latin represents various translations of the LXX. The primary value of the Old Latin is that it provides an important witness to the text of the LXX before the influences of the Greek recensions.¹⁰

Vulgate. In 382 Pope Damasus I commissioned Jerome to prepare a reliable Latin translation of the Bible. Despite Augustine's protests, Jerome, who had studied Hebrew in Bethlehem, based the Old Testament translation on the Hebrew text.¹¹ This translation became the official Bible of the Roman Church and eventually became known as the "Vulgate" (from the Latin, meaning "common"). It was not, however, until the ninth century that Jerome's version finally displaced the popular Old Latin. Many theologians were reluctant to depart from the Old Latin because, unlike the Vulgate, it was dependent upon the LXX, which many (e.g., Augustine) regarded as divinely inspired. The major value of the Vulgate is that it represents an early witness to the Hebrew text.¹²

Targums. Produced over generations in the homiletical and liturgical setting of the synagogue, the targums constitute an Aramaic translation/paraphrase/interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. The word *targum*, from the Aramaic word *trgm*, "to translate," basically means a paraphrase or interpretive translation. The Aramaic translator was called the *meturgeman*. Targums to all of the books of the Old Testament, with the exceptions of Ezra–Nehemiah and Daniel (large portions of which were already in Aramaic), are extant in manuscripts that date, for the most part, from the Middle Ages. Until recent years New Testament interpreters have made little use

10. A multi-volume critical edition of the Old Latin has been undertaken by B. Fischer and others, *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron* (Freiburg: Herder, 1949–). The work is not yet complete. Each volume is published one fascicle at a time over a period of years.

11. See Jerome's letter to Pope Damasus (*Epistle* 18, ca. 381), where he defends the priority of the Hebrew over the Greek.

12. The principal edition of the Vulgate is by R. Weber, ed., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (2 vols.; 3rd ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1985). There are various English translations available. An old classic is the Douay-Rheims, so called because it combines the Douay English translation of the Old Testament (1609) with the Rheims English translation of the New Testament (1582): *The Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate* (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1914). A multi-volume critical edition has also been produced by the Benedictine Order, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem* (16 vols.; Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1926–81).

of them, primarily because it was assumed that they originated too late to be relevant. However, Paul Kahle's discovery and publication of the Cairo Genizah fragments and the discovery of targum fragments among the Dead Sea Scrolls (i.e., 4Q_{tg}Lev, 4Q_{tg}Job, 11Q_{tg}Job, and possibly 6Q₁₉, which may be a targum on Genesis) have led several scholars to reconsider this assumption.¹³

Peshitta. The Syriac version of the Bible came to be called the Peshitta (or Peshitto), which means "simple" (compare the Aramaic word *peshita*, "plain [meaning]"). One of the oldest manuscripts is MS Add. 14,425 of the British Museum (containing the Pentateuch, minus Leviticus), which is dated 464 CE. The origin of the Peshitta is obscure. Scholars are now aware of this version's close relationship to the targums.¹⁴

Contents of the Hebrew Bible

The Hebrew Bible has been traditionally divided into three parts: (1) Law, or Torah, (2) Prophets, or Nevi'im, and (3) Writings, or Ketuvim. The acronym "Tanak" refers to this tripartite division (i.e., Torah [T], Nevi'im [N], Ketuvim [K]).

Torah is made up of the five books of the Law:

Genesis (or Bereshit)

Exodus (or Shemot)

13. The standard Aramaic edition is Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1959–68). One should also see A. Diez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (5 vols.; Madrid and Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968–78); M. L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch: According to their Extant Sources* (AnBib 76; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1980); E. G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1984); M. L. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (2 vols.; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986). Publisher Michael Glazier (now Liturgical Press) is currently preparing an English translation of all extant targums. This work is nearly complete.

14. The principal edition of the Peshitta is A. M. Ceriani, *Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex Codex Ambrosiano II* (Milan: Impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1876–83). A critical edition has been sponsored by the Peshitta Institute of Leiden on behalf of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. An English translation of the Syriac Bible (based on Codex Ambrosianus) has been produced by G. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Manuscripts* (Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 1957).

Leviticus (or Vayiqra)
Numbers (or Bemidbar)
Deuteronomy (or Devarim)

These books were the first to be recognized as authoritative and probably the first translated into Greek. The text of Torah is different at many places in the Samaritan version.

The Prophets are divided into two groups: the Former Prophets and the Latter Prophets. The first group (Former Prophets) is made up of four books (though normally thought of as six):

Joshua
Judges
Samuel (i.e., 1–2 Samuel)
Kings (i.e., 1–2 Kings)

The second group (Latter Prophets) is made up of four books (though usually thought of as fifteen):

Isaiah
Jeremiah
Ezekiel
The Twelve (i.e., the Twelve Minor Prophets, comprising Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi)

Christians should note that books usually thought of as “historical books” (i.e., 1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings) are included in the Prophets, while the book of Daniel is not.

The Writings are the most diverse body of literature in the Jewish Bible. These writings are twelve in number, though commonly thought of as thirteen:

Psalms
Proverbs
Job
Song of Songs

Ruth
Lamentations
Ecclesiastes (or Qohelet)
Esther
Daniel
Ezra
Nehemiah
Chronicles (i.e., 1–2 Chronicles)

In antiquity Ezra and Nehemiah were usually combined in a single scroll. The book of Psalms (or the Psalter) is divided into five books. The genre and character of the psalms are wide-ranging, including psalms of lament, celebration, and imprecation against enemies, to name a few. The books of Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes constitute wisdom literature. Daniel presents an interesting mixture of wisdom, prophecy, narrative, and apocalyptic. Chronicles retells and updates the old stories of Samuel and Kings.

The Writings comprise the third and final portion of the Jewish Bible. Exactly when the contents of this portion became widely known and accepted is unclear and a subject of debate.¹⁵

Contents of the Apocrypha

The Old Testament Apocrypha (meaning “hidden books”) comprise a diverse collection of literature. In all there are fifteen books (though this number sometimes varies). Some of the writings are historical (e.g., 1 Esdras, 1 and 2 Maccabees), some are romantic (e.g., Tobit, Judith, Susanna, Additions to Esther), some are didactic (e.g., Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus), some are moralistic (e.g., Baruch, Letter of Jeremiah, Bel and the Dragon), and some

15. For discussion of the development of the Jewish Bible, see S. Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence* (Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 47; Hamden, CT: Archon, 1976); L. M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 73–113. See the very helpful “Appendix A: Primary Sources for the Study of the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible Canon,” in L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 580–82.

are devotional (e.g., Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children, Prayer of Manasseh). One is apocalyptic (2 Esdras).

Most of these books are recognized as authoritative in the scriptural canons of the Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Russian Orthodox, Eastern, and Coptic Churches. Most Protestant Churches have omitted the books of the Apocrypha, though these texts enjoy a quasi-canonical status in the Anglican Church.¹⁶

Contents of the Pseudepigrapha

The writings of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha are numerous and diverse. Several literary genres are represented in this amorphous collection. Their dates of composition also cover a broad period of time, with *Ahiqar* being the oldest at ca. seventh or sixth century BCE and the *Apocalypse of Daniel* the youngest at ca. ninth century CE. Many of these books were among those to which 4 *Ezra* refers: “ninety-four books were written. And . . . the Most High spoke to me, saying, ‘Make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge’” (14:44–47 [Metzger, *OTP* 1:555]). The “twenty-four” books are the books that make up the Jewish Bible, or Old Testament. The seventy books are the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. In addition to the sixty-six books treated in

16. The Greek text of the Apocrypha is found in the Septuagint. A very fine English translation is found in B. M. Metzger, ed., *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977). This edition contains several helpful notes and tables. Metzger has also edited *A Concordance to the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books of the Revised Standard Version* (London: Collins; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983). See also the translation in the *New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). For current introductions, see D. A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), and D. J. Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999). For current one-volume commentaries on the Apocrypha, see J. L. Mays, ed., *Harper's Bible Commentary* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), and W. R. Farmer et al., eds., *The International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998).

this chapter (many of which did not exist when *4 Ezra* was written), some fifty more apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings were found among the scrolls of Qumran. Thus, in the time of the writing of *4 Ezra* there were probably more than seventy books in this category of those “written last.”

The word *pseudepigrapha* is a Greek word meaning “falsely ascribed,” or what we might call writing under a pen name. The classification “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha” is a label that scholars have given to these writings. Although some of them have been grouped together or associated in one way or another, most never had any connection to one another.

The line that divides the Old Testament Apocrypha from the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha is not clearly drawn. Two writings found in the Apocrypha, the Prayer of Manasseh and *4 Ezra* (contained within 2 Esdras), are usually assigned to the Pseudepigrapha. Three writings found in the Pseudepigrapha—3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, and Psalm 151—appear in some canons of Scripture as part of the Apocrypha.¹⁷

Some of the better known Pseudepigrapha include the following:

1 and 2 Enoch

Pseudo-Philo, Biblical Antiquities

Jubilees

Psalms of Solomon

Testament of Solomon

Testament of Moses

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

Testament of Abraham

2 and 3 Baruch

17. For a convenient collection of the Pseudepigrapha, in English translation with introduction and notes, see J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983–85). For discussion of the relevance of these writings for New Testament study, see J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998). For extensive bibliography, see L. DiTommaso, *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850–1999* (JSPSup 39; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

Omissions of Jeremiah (or 4 *Baruch*)

Lives of the Prophets

Letter of Aristeas

It should also be mentioned that many writings found among the Dead Sea Scrolls exemplify the genres and themes of the Pseudepigrapha: imaginative expansions and paraphrases of Old Testament Scripture, additional psalms, apocalypses and visions, prayers, and hymns.¹⁸ This body of material, taken together with what had been known before the discovery of the scrolls in the 1940s and 1950s, demonstrates dramatically how extensive Jewish literature was in the intertestamental and New Testament periods.

Contents of the New Testament

Although not as complicated as the formation of the Old Testament canon of Scripture, the formation of the New Testament was not without debate and struggle. Most if not all of the twenty-seven writings that make up the New Testament were composed and began to circulate in the second half of the first century. (Many scholars think the Pastoral Letters and 2 Peter were not composed until the first half of the second century.)

Several other writings were treated as authoritative by some church leaders and congregations. The second-century *Gospel of Peter* was read in the Eastern Church, until Bishop Serapion in the early third century forbade it. Several other writings enjoyed favor in the Syrian Church, such as Tatian's harmony of the Gospels (the *Diatessaron*) and the *Gospel of Thomas*. The *Didache* (or "Teaching"), Clement's letter to the Corinthian Christians, and the

18. For English translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see E. Tov and D. W. Parry, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (6 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2004–5). For introduction and discussion of their relevance, see J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002); J. J. Collins and C. A. Evans, eds., *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006).

interesting compilation produced by a church leader known as the *Shepherd of Hermas* commanded great respect in some circles.¹⁹

Other writings that did, in time, gain entry into the New Testament canon were challenged. These writings, known as the Antilegomena, or books “spoken against,” included Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, and Jude. The latter book is especially interesting, for it alludes to one pseudepigraphal book (i.e., *Testament of Moses*; cf. Jude 9) and quotes another (i.e., *1 Enoch* 1:9; cf. Jude 14–15).²⁰

In recent years, some scholars have argued that certain second-century Gospels, such as the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Gospel of Peter*, may have originated as early as the first century and so in some sense may rival the Gospels of the New Testament (i.e., Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John). Recently these writings and others have gained a measure of notoriety in popular publications and television documentaries, especially in reference to study of the historical Jesus. Unfortunately, the treatment of these writings has not always been responsible.

Contributions to These Issues in This Book

The studies that comprise *Exploring the Origins of the Bible* address the questions and diverse literatures surveyed above. Each essay attempts to break new ground, or at least throw an old debate into a new light.

Emanuel Tov assesses the contribution that the Septuagint can make to the literary analysis of Hebrew Scripture. Disregarding the translator’s own exegesis and focusing on those cases in which the LXX differs significantly from its Hebrew counterpart, Tov very much stresses the LXX’s importance. He suggests that it reflects different editorial stages of Hebrew Scripture from that included in the MT, prior or subsequent to that text. In all these cases, the LXX should be used together with the MT and some Qumran scrolls in the literary analysis of Scripture. The relatively large

19. For an English translation of the these writings, with introduction and bibliography, see J. B. Lightfoot, J. R. Harmer, and M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1989).

20. On the development of the New Testament canon, see McDonald, *The Biblical Canon*, 243–421; for Jude, see 397–98.

number of editorial differences from the MT in the LXX should probably be ascribed to the early date of the Hebrew manuscripts from which the LXX translation was made and their derivation from circles different from the ones embracing the MT.

James Charlesworth helpfully defines the word *canon* and discusses aspects of the emergence of the canons of Scripture in the various Jewish and Christian communities of faith. He traces the uncertain history of the recognition of certain writings as authoritative and asks what contribution the books traditionally identified as belonging to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha can make to our understanding. He draws our attention to early forms of interpretation and adaptation of Scripture, as seen in the efforts to paraphrase and “rewrite” Scripture. Charlesworth also devotes a number of pages to the exposure of caricatures and misconceptions of Judaism and the Jewish people in the time of Jesus and the early Christian movement.

Stephen Dempster addresses the much-debated question of the emergence of the tripartite canon, that is, the form of the canon we see in the Jewish Bible, comprising the Law (or Torah), the Prophets, and the Writings. Dempster contends that the early evidence for a tripartite form of canon is stronger than many contemporary biblical scholars have allowed.

Glenn Wooden explores the role of the so-called Septuagint in the formation of the biblical canons of Scripture. After reviewing the legend of the seventy-two Jewish scribes who miraculously translated the Hebrew books of Moses into Greek, Wooden traces the history of the influence that the Greek version of Old Testament Scripture had in shaping the Christian Bible and even the Latin translation of Jerome, which attempted to return to the original Hebrew/Aramaic text. Wooden also raises questions about the significance of the fact that New Testament writers, especially Paul, mostly quote the Greek version of the Old Testament.

Craig Evans undertakes a critical investigation of the usefulness of the extracanonical Gospels for historical Jesus research. Evans focuses on four well-known texts, the *Gospel of Thomas*, Egerton Papyrus 2, the *Secret Gospel of Mark*, and the alleged *Gospel of Peter*, concluding that these texts do not take us closer to the Jesus of history than do the Gospels of the New Testament. Evans finds

repeated indications of lateness and dependency on the older Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

Stanley Porter explores the relationship of Paul to the process of canonization. To this end he reviews and criticizes five standard theories regarding Pauline canonical formation, which he believes are inadequate at various points. In their place Porter proposes a sixth theory, that the Pauline letter canon began as a collection of letters either initiated by the apostle himself or by one of his companions, perhaps near the end of Paul's life or when he was in prison.

Lee McDonald raises the question of authority. He finds that the earliest canon of faith for the early church was Jesus. All authority had been given to the church's Lord, and the Scriptures bear witness to that authority. In this sense we should speak of Scripture as possessing a "derived" authority. Accordingly, McDonald contends that Christians should look for their authority in a person, not in various books, versions, or translations of Scripture.

Jonathan Wilson concludes the volume with an interesting discussion of the theological implications of canon, including the nature of theology and its place in the community of faith. Wilson observes the tendency to shift theological authority away from the church to a book, which complements the point raised by Lee McDonald. Wilson closes his essay by reminding Christians that theological authority ultimately is sourced in the Holy Spirit, who leads and guides God's people.

Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov, editors,

Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective,
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2008. Used by permission.

The Septuagint as a Source for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture

EMANUEL TOV

In several Scripture books, the Masoretic Text displays a substantial number of major differences when compared with the LXX and, to a lesser degree, when compared with several Qumran scrolls and the Samaritan Pentateuch. The other ancient versions were translated from Hebrew texts close to the MT.

The present analysis is limited to variations bearing on literary analysis, usually found in groups of variants. A difference involving one or two words, and sometimes an isolated case of a single verse, is considered a small difference, while a discrepancy involving a whole section or chapter indicates a substantial difference, often relevant to literary criticism. However, a group of seemingly unrelated small differences might also display a common pattern, pointing to a more extensive phenomenon. This pertains to many small theological changes in the MT of Samuel, short renderings in the LXX translation of Ezekiel, and so forth.

Who created these various types of differences between ancient texts? In very broad terms, authors and editors who were involved in the composition of the texts inserted changes that we characterize today as large differences often bearing on literary criticism. At a later stage, scribes who copied the completed compositions inserted smaller changes and made mistakes while copying. However, the distinction between these two levels is unclear at both ends, since early copyists considered themselves petty collaborators in the creation process of Scripture, while authors and editors were also copyists.

While readings found in ancient Hebrew manuscripts provide stable evidence, there are many problems on the slippery road of evaluating the ancient versions, especially the LXX. One of these is that what appears to one scholar to be a safely reconstructed Hebrew variant text is for another a translator's tendentious rendering. Literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible is only interested in evidence of the first type, since it sheds light on the background of the different Hebrew texts that were once circulating. The translator's tendentious changes are also interesting, but at a different level, that of scriptural exegesis. Since a specific rendering either represents a greatly deviating Hebrew text or displays the translator's exegesis, one wonders how to differentiate between the two. For almost every variation in the LXX, one finds opposite views expressed, and there are few objective criteria for evaluating these variations. Probably the best criteria relate to external Hebrew evidence supporting the LXX, the argument from translation technique suggesting either a free or a literal approach, and the existence of Hebraisms supporting an underlying Hebrew text.

We now turn to the first proof text, the LXX of Job. The translation of Job is much shorter than its counterpart in the MT as well as in the Peshitta (S), Targum (T), and Vulgate (V). Is it possible that the translator deleted what amounts to one-sixth of the total verses in the book?¹ In the absence of external evidence such as

1. Some scholars substantiated the view that the translator abbreviated his underlying Hebrew text: G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, Vol. 1, *The Book of Job* (LUÅ 43, 2; Lund: Gleerup, 1946); D. H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBLMS 8; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952); H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book Job, II," *HUCA* 29 (1958): 229–71. The free character of the Greek translation was analyzed in detail by J. Ziegler, "Der textkritische Wert der

Qumran manuscripts, we have to assess the translator's approach from an analysis of his techniques. If a translator represented his underlying Hebrew text rather faithfully in small details, we would not expect him to insert major changes in the text. In other words, when we find major deviations from the MT in a faithful translation, they probably reflect a different Hebrew text. On the other hand, if a translator was not faithful to his parent text in small details, even paraphrasing it occasionally, he could have inserted major changes in the translation. Translators were not consistent, but we would not expect two diametrically opposed approaches in a single translation unit.

This brings us back to the Greek text of Job. In the sample chapter chosen for this purpose (chap. 34), we find a word-for-word rendering of the MT in a very few cases.² There are several unusual equivalents and small changes,³ as well as instances of rewriting on a small scale.⁴ Having established the translator's free style in small elements, it is easy to accept the assumption that he also rephrased complete verses,⁵ sometimes in a major way.⁶ He added

Septuaginta des Buches Job," in *Sylloge, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 9–28.

2. The following verses come closest to a word-for-word translation: vv. 10 (with one exception), 16, 34 (with one exception), and 35.

3. Verse 2 MT "give ear to me" / LXX "give ear to what is good" (influenced by v. 4); v. 10 MT "wickedness // wrongdoing" has been made into an antithetic parallelism in the LXX "impiously . . . to pervert what is right" (by adding a verb "to pervert" [for the phrase cf. v. 11]; the translator made his translation more lively); v. 15 MT "human being" / LXX "mortal"; v. 21 MT "his eyes are upon" / LXX "he is one that views"; v. 22 MT "darkness nor gloom" / LXX "place"; v. 34 MT "to me . . . to me" / LXX "to me . . . my word."

4. Verse 6 MT "I declare the judgment against me false" / LXX "and [the Lord] played false in my judgment"; v. 13 MT "Who placed the earth in His charge? Who ordered the entire world?" / LXX "He that created the earth! And who is it that created what is under heaven and all it contains?"; v. 21 MT "He observes his every step" / LXX "and nothing of what they do has escaped him."

5. Verse 9 MT "For he says, 'Man gains nothing when he is in God's favor'" / LXX "For do not say, 'There will be no visitation of a man'—when there is visitation to him from the Lord!" In the MT, this verse explains the previous one ("For . . ."). In the MT, Job socializes with impious men assuming that pleasing God will not pay off. The translator probably did not understand *yiskon*, added a negation ("For do not say . . ."), and completely changed the idea of this verse to a positive thought (men are looked upon by God).

6. Verse 19 MT "He is not partial to princes; the noble are not preferred to the wretched; for all of them are the work of His hands." / LXX "(It is) he who felt no reticence before a person of worth, nor knows how to accord honor to the prominent, so that their persons be

some elements,⁷ but more frequently shortened the text. Usually, we can only guess at the reason for the abbreviation.⁸ The main argument for assuming that the translator abbreviated and did not find an already shorter Hebrew text⁹ is his free translation style.¹⁰ A major factor in the translator's abbreviation of his Hebrew *Vorlage* may well be the latter's verbosity and repetitiveness.¹¹ The transla-

respected." In the MT, this verse speaks about God's impartiality to people. In the LXX, the verse probably refers to the impious of v. 18 (or is it Job?) who do not honor the great. The Greek does not speak of God, and the last words are completely different. Verse 20 is likewise rephrased in the MT: "Some die suddenly in the middle of the night; people are in turmoil and pass on; even great men are removed—not by human hands." / LXX "But crying out and begging a man will prove to be of no use to them, for they used people lawlessly, when the powerless were being turned aside." The MT continues the thought of the preceding verse, stressing the power of God who can take away life in the middle of the night. The LXX likewise continues the thoughts of the preceding verse in that version, possibly implying that God needs to be honored. Verse 27 MT "Because they have been disloyal to Him and have not understood any of His ways." / LXX "because they turned aside from God's law, and did not recognize his requirements." The LXX made the formulation of the MT more specific by presenting "disloyalty" as moving away from God's law (*nomos*), as in v. 37, and "His ways" as *dikaiōmata* (that is, requirements, referring to the *mitswo*t). The tendency of stressing the adherence to God's *nomos* reflects late biblical as well as postbiblical periods.

7. Verse 15 MT "All flesh would at once expire, and mankind return to dust" / LXX adds "whence too he was formed."

8. Verses 3–4 (v. 3 does not advance the main argument and v. 4 contains merely general thoughts introducing Job's contentions); 6b–7 (v. 6b contains only general thoughts and v. 7 contains a comparison); 11b (superfluous after v. 11a?); 23a (the verse that comes in its stead in the LXX, v. 23b, presents a second translation of v. 21); v. 25b (considered as repeating v. 24?); the largest group of verses omitted in the LXX of this chapter is 28–33 (stylistic abbreviation or considered repetition of 33:14–33, or deleted because of obscure Hebrew?).

9. This is the view of E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889), 215–45, esp. 244–45. According to Hatch (p. 244), after the LXX translation was completed, the MT was expanded "by a poet whose imaginative power was at least not inferior to that of the original writer."

10. For a judicious contextual analysis of the translator's major changes, see C. E. Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech according to the Septuagint," in *Studies in the Book of Job* (ed. W. E. Aufrecht; SR 16; Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1985), 36–53. For an earlier collection of examples, see E. P. Dhorme, *Le livre de Job* (Paris: Gabalda, 1926), clx; ET: *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. A. Knight; London: Nelson, 1967), cxvii–cxviii.

11. Dhorme, *Le livre de Job*, clxii (ET, ccii–cciii) and Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech," 39, point to the fact that the amount of abbreviating usually increases from one group of chapters to the next. Thus in chaps. 1–15 the percentage of abbreviation is 4%, in chaps. 15–21 it is 16%, in chaps. 22–31 it is 25%, in chaps. 32–37 it is 35%, and in the epilogue (chaps. 38–42) it is 16%. Upon the first occurrence of an idea or argument, the translator does not know that it will recur later. When reaching the recurrence, the translator

tor's shortening thus bears on the history of exegesis and not on our understanding of the Hebrew composition.

After this negative example, we now turn to positive ones in which the LXX yields important data for literary analysis supported by a literal translation technique or external Hebrew evidence. Examples are given of evidence from the LXX when its reconstructed parent text either predated (sections A, B, D) or postdated (section C) the editorial stage presented in the MT. In section E the sequence cannot be determined easily. The translated text presented in sections A, B, D, E is that of the MT.¹² In section C the analysis is based on a translation of the LXX.¹³

A. The Two Editions of Jeremiah

The three main versions of Jeremiah that have survived from antiquity are the MT (followed quite closely by S, T, V), LXX, and 4QJer^{b,d}. The LXX version differs from the MT in two central matters: the order of the chapters and verses¹⁴ and the length of the text. The translator rendered in a relatively literal fashion a Hebrew text similar to that contained in the two Qumran scrolls. The existence of literary differences between the MT on the one hand and the LXX and 4QJer^{b,d} on the other thus almost becomes

remembers and shortens. This logic implies that the amount of abbreviation increased as the translator proceeded.

12. *JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew Text and the New JPS Translation* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1999).

13. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright III, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

14. For example, MT 23:7–8 is found in the LXX after 23:40. See further Jer. 10, to be discussed below. The most striking difference in this regard pertains to the chapters containing the prophecies against the nations, which in the MT (S, V, T) are found at the end of the book in chaps. 46–51, before the historical “appendix,” chap. 52, whereas in the LXX they occur in the middle, after 25:13. This verse serves as an introduction to these prophecies: “And I will bring upon that land all that I have decreed against it, all that is recorded in this book—that which Jeremiah prophesied against all the nations” (MT). Usually, the location of the prophecies against the nations in the LXX is taken as original, but strong arguments in favor of the secondary character of that location were provided by A. Rofé, “The Arrangement of the Book of Jeremiah,” *ZAW* 101 (1989): 390–98; G. Fischer, “Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche—Unterschiede zwischen hebräischem und griechischem Text,” *Bib* 72 (1991): 474–99.

a fact, while their interpretation is subjective. The literal translation technique of LXX-Jeremiah and its near-identity with 4QJer^{b,d} facilitate the use of the data in the LXX. The LXX is shorter than the MT by one-sixth. It lacks words, phrases, sentences, and entire sections of the MT. The shortness of this text was considered enigmatic throughout the scholarly inquiry of the Greek text, but is now supported by the Hebrew 4QJer^{b,d}.

The differences between the two text forms, which are not characteristic of scribal intervention, were created at an early stage when the book of Jeremiah was still being composed. The text forms reflect different editions; the LXX and the two scrolls probably contain the earlier, short edition I, while the MT presents an expanded, late edition.

Edition II, created during one stage of the book's literary growth, contains many additional sections to edition I, the largest of which are 33:14–26 and 39:4–13. The date of the textual witnesses of edition I does not bear on its own date, because presumably it was composed long before the time of the LXX translation and was not discarded when edition II was created. Edition I was still known in the second century BCE in Egypt, when it served as the base for the LXX translation, and was present (along with manuscripts close to ed. II) at Qumran in the first half of the second century BCE.

Most of the additions in edition II reflect editorial expansions of ideas and details in the context, stylistic changes, and theological and other concerns of that revision. It is remarkable how well the editor of edition II managed to insert the new elements (sometimes whole sentences) into the earlier text without introducing significant changes in that text. These expansions are exemplified by an analysis of chapters 10, 43, and 27.¹⁵

Jeremiah 10:1–11

The prophecy in edition II (MT) contains both mockery of the idols and praise of the Lord. The disdain of the idols refers to their

15. For background material, see E. Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 211–37; revised and repr. in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible—Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 363–84.

inability to walk, speak, and move around, as well as the fact they are man-made. The mockery is included in verses 2–5, 8–9, 11, while the remaining verses 6–7 and 10 praise the Lord. The verses containing this praise are lacking in the LXX and 4QJer^b, dating to the first half of the second century BCE.

It is often assumed that the short edition I (the LXX and 4QJer^b) reflects the original text of this chapter, and that edition II (MT) reflects a later tradition in which the praise of the Lord has been added in order to stress the futility of the idols. The addition of these verses in edition II¹⁶ went together with the splitting up of verse 5 into two parts.

When comparing the two traditions, we must consider: Is it more logical that the praise of the Lord was added in edition II, or that these elements were deleted by edition I? In the development of Scripture, elements were usually added, not deleted.¹⁷ Moreover, it is intrinsically more plausible that verses of praise were added than omitted.¹⁸

Verses lacking in the LXX and 4QJer^b are printed in bold in parentheses (slight differences are indicated by italics):¹⁹

1. Hear the word which the LORD has spoken to you, O House of Israel!
2. Thus said the LORD: Do not learn to go the way of the nations, and do not be dismayed by portents in the sky; let the nations be dismayed by them!

16. The added layer of the MT, probably deriving from the prophet himself, was added during one of the book's composition stages. It may have been influenced by diatribes against idols in Deutero-Isaiah, such as 44:9–20, which is extremely close to Jer. 10. Cf. Isa. 44:12 with Jer. 10:3b; 44:9 with Jer. 10:5b; etc. However, the argument can also be made the other way, as Jeremiah may have influenced the later Deutero-Isaiah. See W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 1–25* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 326.

17. For an isolated instance of shortening, see Deut. 32:43, analyzed below.

18. Such additions are paralleled by the so-called doxologies at the ends of the first four of the five divisions of the book of Psalms, probably added when the book was divided into these segments (41:14 MT [41:13 Eng.]; 72:18–20; 89:53 MT [89:52 Eng.]; 106:48; cf. 150). See further the addition of Jer. 9:22–23 in the LXX after 1 Sam. 2:10, analyzed below.

19. The sequence of the LXX (and probably of 4QJer^b) is vv. 5a, 9, 5b.

3. For the laws of the nations are delusions; *for it is the work of a craftsman's hands. He cuts down a tree in the forest with an ax,*
4. He adorns it with silver and gold, He fastens it with nails and hammer, so that it does not totter.
- 5a. *They are like a scarecrow in a cucumber patch,* (5b) they cannot speak. They have to be carried, for they cannot walk. Be not afraid of them, for they can do no harm; nor is it in them to do any good.
6. (O LORD, there is none like You! You are great and Your name is great in power.
7. Who would not revere You, O King of the nations? For that is Your due, since among all the wise of the nations and among all their royalty there is none like You.
8. But they are both dull and foolish; their doctrine is but delusion; it is a piece of wood,)
9. Silver beaten flat, that is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz, the work of a craftsman and the goldsmith's hands; their clothing is blue and purple, all of them are the work of skilled men.
10. (But the LORD is truly God: He is a living God, the everlasting King. At His wrath, the earth quakes, and nations cannot endure His rage.)
11. Thus shall you say to them: Let the gods, who did not make heaven and earth, perish from the earth and from under these heavens.

Jeremiah 43 (LXX 40):4–6

The major difference between the sources in chapter 43 pertains to the forms of names. Some names have two components such as “Jeremiah the prophet” as opposed to just “Jeremiah” or “the prophet,” while others have three, such as “Gedaliah son of Ahikam, son of Shaphan,” as opposed to just “Gedaliah” or “Gedaliah son of Ahikam.” The long names are found in edition II, and the short ones in the LXX and 4QJer^d (ed. I).²⁰ Hundreds of

20. As well as in the parallel 2 Kings 25 MT and LXX, e.g., Jer. 52:16 = 2 Kings 25:12.

similar personal names appear elsewhere in edition I in their short form, while in edition II they appear in full. Edition II typically fills in personal names, mainly in the prose sections, including the name of the father, sometimes also the grandfather, a title (king or prophet), and so on. The data must be analyzed not only for the book as a whole but also for individual units. Often edition I mentions the full name or title of the person when introduced in a given unit, but in all or most subsequent references uses a shortened form. In this manner, edition I follows the practice of biblical narrative. Edition II fills in the details of the complete formula in many (sometimes in most or all) occurrences of the name.²¹

⁴So Johanan (son of Kareah) and all the army officers and the rest of the people did not obey the LORD's command to remain in the land of Judah. ⁵Instead, Johanan (son of Kareah) and all the army officers took the entire remnant of Judah—those who had returned from all the countries to which they had been scattered and had sojourned in the land of Judah, ⁶men, women, and children; and the daughters of the king and all the people whom Nebuzaradan (the chief of the guards) had left with Gedaliah son of Ahikam (son of Shaphan), as well as the prophet Jeremiah and Baruch son of Neriah.

Jeremiah 27 (LXX 34):19–22

Chapter 27 tells of Jeremiah prophesying to a group of kings meeting in Jerusalem with King Zedekiah. The prophet calls for the complete submission to Nebuchadnezzar in accordance with God's plans. At the end of this episode, Jeremiah speaks out against the false prophets who prophesy optimistically to the Israelites, telling them that they need not surrender to Nebuchadnezzar. Among other things, he opposes the claim of these prophets that the exiled temple vessels will be returned. Jeremiah says that this

21. A good example of this procedure is "Ishmael son of Nethaniah son of Elishama," introduced in its full form in ed. I in 41:1, but in its short form, "Ishmael," in vv. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 (2x), 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18. The MT left the short name in vv. 3, 10, and 14, but expanded it to "Ishmael son of Nethaniah" in vv. 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18. Likewise, in ed. I, Johanan is introduced in chap. 43 as "Johanan son of Kareah" (41:11), but the next verses refer to him as "Johanan" only (13, 14, 16); in ed. II, he is presented in all four verses with the long form. The same pertains to chap. 43 presented here.

will not happen, and that these prophets should implore God that the temple vessels remaining in Jerusalem not be exiled. Most of the expansions by the MT to the short LXX text are based on ideas or details in the context, or reflect stylistic and theological concerns. The MT shows a great interest in the fate of the temple vessels, adding details from the context in Jeremiah and 2 Kings.

¹⁹For thus said the Lord (of Hosts concerning the columns, the tank, the stands and) concerning the rest of the vessels (which remain in this city), ²⁰which (Nebuchadnezzar) the king of Babylon did not take when he exiled Jeconiah (son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah) from Jerusalem (to Babylon, with all the nobles of Judah and Jerusalem—²¹thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, concerning the vessels remaining in the House of the Lord, in the royal palace of Judah and in Jerusalem): ²²They shall be brought to Babylon (and there they shall remain until I take note of them)—declares the Lord—(and bring them up and restore them to this place).

According to edition I of verse 22, Jeremiah threatens that the temple vessels left in Jerusalem will be carried off to Babylon in the future. Edition II carries the same message, but according to that version, they will be returned to Jerusalem (v. 22 “and bring them up and restore them to this place”). If Jeremiah’s threat included the traditional text of Scripture (MT), his audience did not have to be concerned since they were told that the temple vessels would be returned. However, this idea is not consistent with the spirit of the surrounding verses, which focus on the false prophets and not on the fate of the temple vessels. More significantly, if the temple vessels are to return to Jerusalem, Jeremiah’s threat becomes forceless and anticlimactic. Historically, the statement by the false prophets was correct since the temple vessels did return from the exile to Jerusalem (see Dan. 5:2–3; Ezra 1:7, 11; 6:5). Edition II added these words without taking into consideration the implications of tensions in the context. In this case, there is no external Hebrew evidence supporting the LXX, but since this version is supported by Qumran evidence elsewhere in the book, it is probably reliable in this chapter as well. Besides, the literal translation of the chapter gives it further credence.

B. Two Editions of Deuteronomy 32:43

In Deuteronomy 32:43 also, external evidence (4QDeut^a) and literal translation technique support the assumption of a major literary discrepancy between texts.

Moses's Song focuses on the relationship between God and his people until the end of Moses's life. It starts out inviting heaven and earth to listen to the poet, after which it depicts God's justice, Israel's disloyalty, and God's punishment of Israel and its enemies. The joyous ending of the poem (v. 43) draws on motifs mentioned at its beginning and describes God's vengeance on Israel's enemies.

This festive ending differs in the various versions. In the MT, the poem concludes with an invocation calling upon the nations to rejoice with God for his punishment on Israel's enemies. On the other hand, according to additional colons of verse 43 found only in the LXX and 4QDeut^a, the heavens and divine beings are called upon to rejoice with God, as in verse 4, "Give ear, O heavens, let me speak; Let the earth hear the words I utter." It seems that the MT shortened the long version of the LXX and the Qumran scroll. One detail supporting this assumption is the incomplete poetic structure of verse 43 in the MT, rendering the additional colons necessary.²²

The text presented here is that of the MT. The LXX colons additional to the MT are printed in bold between + signs, while differences between the two are italicized. Agreements between the LXX and the Qumran scroll, 4QDeut^a, are indicated:

- 43 (a) Gladden/acclaim, O nations, His people MT / *Be glad, O skies, with Him* LXX = 4QDeut^a
 (b) **+and let all the sons of God do obeisance to Him.** + = 4QDeut^a
 (c) **+Be glad, O nations, with His people,** +
 (d) **+and let all the angels of God prevail for Him.** +
 (e) For he'll avenge the blood of his servants MT / *sons* LXX

22. Usually the verses in this Song consist of colons followed by parallel colons. However, the first and last colons of the MT (a and g) are not matched by parallel colons, but the alternative text of the LXX does contain such parallels, namely colons b and h.

- (f) wreak revenge on His foes MT / *and take revenge and repay the enemies with a sentence* LXX
 (g) **+and he will repay those who hate,+** = 4QDeut^a
 (h) and the Lord shall cleanse the land of his people. MT

The non-Masoretic witnesses represent a few remarkable readings:

In v. 43a, LXX (= 4QDeut^a) reads “Be glad, O skies, with Him” instead of MT “Be glad (JPS: acclaim), O nations, His people.” In the MT, the “nations” (*goyim*) are invoked to “gladden His people” in contrast to the invitation to the heavens to “be glad . . . with Him” in the LXX. It would not be an unusual scriptural thought if the poet were to address the nations in this way, but in this particular poem the invocation seems out of place. The essence of this poem is that God helped Israel to survive its wars by killing these very nations, and the poem is full of expressions of vengeance against them (e.g., v. 35: “To be My vengeance and recompense, at the time that their foot falters. Yea, their day of disaster is near, and destiny rushes upon them”). It would therefore be unusual if the same nations were invoked to be or make glad. Assuming that the MT reflects a later text, it probably inserted the following changes: (1) “skies” (LXX) to “peoples,” (2) “be glad” (as in Ps. 32:11; 81:2) to “make glad,” (3) *mw* read as *immo* (“with Him”) in the LXX to *ammo* (“His people”).²³

In v. 43b, the LXX reads “and let all the sons of God do obedience to Him.” This colon, occurring also in the Qumran scroll 4QDeut^a, while lacking in the MT, is paralleled by other verses in the MT in which the “sons of God,” also named “divine beings,” are mentioned: Psalm 82:1 “God stands in the divine assembly; among the divine beings He pronounces judgment”; and Psalm 29:1 “Ascribe to the LORD, O divine beings, ascribe to the LORD glory and strength.” In Deuteronomy the “sons of God” are mentioned only in the LXX (twice) and 4QDeut^a, but not in the MT. This colon was probably removed from the MT as theo-

23. That the MT cannot reflect the original text becomes clear from the continuation: “For He’ll avenge the blood of His servants” in the next colon implies the mentioning of a subject in the preceding colon (“with Him” as in the LXX rather than “His people” as in the MT).

logical censorship when the phrase “sons of God” was considered an unwelcome polytheistic depiction of the world of the divine. Tendentious changes are never consistent, and indeed such “sons of God” are mentioned elsewhere in the Bible, as quoted above. A similar polytheistic phrase was likewise removed from verse 8 in the same Song where the MT now reads, “When the Most High gave nations their homes and set the divisions of man, He fixed the boundaries of peoples in relation to *Israel’s* numbers” (emphasis added). The presumed earlier text of that verse referring to “the number of the sons of *El*” is reflected in the LXX and the Qumran scroll 4QDeut.²⁴

C. The Rewritten Book of 1 Kings

Our analysis so far has provided examples of chapters reflecting different editorial stages of Scripture as presented in the MT and LXX. In the two preceding examples (Jeremiah and Deuteronomy), the LXX reflects an earlier stage than the MT. First Kings exemplifies a situation in which the underlying Hebrew text represents a later stage than the MT.

The Greek version of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms in the LXX) differs recensionally from the MT to a great extent. The tendencies visible in the Greek translation display a late²⁵ layer in the development

24. For an analysis, see J. H. Tigay, *The JPS Commentary: Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 314–15, 513–18.

25. On the other hand, A. Schenker believes that the MT changed an earlier edition contained in the LXX (*Septante et texte Massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* [CahRB 48; Paris: J. Gabalda, 2000]). Schenker dates the MT edition to between 250 and 130 BCE, probably closer to the later end of this spectrum (see pp. 36–37, 152–53). Among other things, Schenker’s view is based on the Greek version of 1 Kings 2:35. According to the MT of this verse, Solomon appointed “Zadok the priest” instead of Abiathar, while according to the LXX, Zadok was appointed as “the first priest.” Schenker considers the LXX the earlier version reflecting the appointment of the high priests by the kings, while the MT reflects a later reality that was initiated with Simon Maccabee in 140 BCE when kings could no longer make such appointments. Likewise, the singular *bet habamot* of MT 1 Kings 12:31 and 2 Kings 17:29, 32 replaced the earlier plural reading of *oikous eph’ hypsēlōn* (and similar) in the LXX. According to Schenker (144–46), the plural of the LXX reflected the earlier reality of more than one sanctuary in Shechem, while the changed text of the MT reflects a single Samaritan sanctuary. Therefore, this correction (also reflected in the Old Greek version in Deut. 27:4 reconstructed from the *Vetus Latina*)

of that book, composed in Hebrew after the time of the editorial stage contained in the MT.²⁶ Gooding describes the first ten chapters as being rewritten around 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.²⁷ The revision also reorganizes the book's chronology. One of the literary devices used for this purpose is the adding of two "theme summaries" in chapter 2 repeating various verses in 1 Kings around the theme of Solomon's wisdom.²⁸ Another device is the addition of an alternative account of the rise to power of Jeroboam in 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z juxtaposed with the original account in 1 Kings 12:1–24.²⁹

The differences between the LXX and the other witnesses in 1 Kings are extensive, much greater than anywhere else in Samuel–Kings (with the exception of 1 Sam. 16–18), and among the largest in the LXX. It is safe to say that the changes, especially the three mentioned additions, are based on a different Hebrew version. In this book the translation is faithful to the Hebrew and accordingly, the major discrepancies of the LXX from the MT are based on a different Hebrew composition. The Hebrew background is

may be dated to the period of the existence of a temple on Mt. Gerizim between 300 and 128 BCE. Equally old elements are found in the LXX version of 1 Kings 20:10–20 mentioning groups of dancing men as well as King David's dances, elements that were removed from the MT, according to Schenker, probably in the second century BCE.

26. See E. Tov, "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," in *Flores Florentine: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; JSPSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–66.

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

28. The MT of 1 Kings 2 covers the end of David's reign and the accession of Solomon (vv. 1–12), the tragic end of Adonijah (vv. 13–35), and the death of Shimei (vv. 36–46). The parallel text of the LXX of 3 Kingdoms covers the same events, but in the middle and end of the chapter it adds two long theme summaries relating to Solomon's wisdom. The summaries were intended to stress the God-given (cf. v. 35a) wisdom of Solomon, just as 1–2 Chronicles and 11QPs^a XXVII stress David's wisdom. The first one, Summary 1, inserted after v. 35, contains fourteen verses denoted 35a–o. Summary 2, inserted after v. 46, contains eleven verses denoted 46a–l. Summary 1 is not connected to the context, while Summary 2 is. For an analysis, see P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (VTSup 104; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), 265–75; Tov, "3 Kingdoms."

29. See Z. Talshir, *The Duplicate Story of the Division of the Kingdom (LXX 3 Kingdoms XII 24a–z)* (JBS 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1989).

visible also in a number of Hebraisms in these chapters.³⁰ The special nature of the LXX of 1 Kings is exemplified in chapters 5 and 11.

1 Kings 5

The content of the last verse of chapter 4 (v. 20) and the first 14 verses of chapter 5 of the MT differs much from that of the LXX in 3 Kingdoms. In the MT, this chapter describes the extent of Solomon's realm and its internal prosperity (4:20; 5:1, 4–5), his daily consumption of food (vv. 2–3), the provisions brought to him (vv. 6–8), his wisdom (vv. 9–14), the first preparations for the building of the temple (consisting of Solomon's cooperation with Hiram relating to materials and artisans; vv. 15–26), and the forced labor (vv. 27–32).

Several of the elements of chapter 5 of the MT are included in the LXX in a different sequence, while some are lacking, and new ones have been added. The sequence in the LXX is as follows: the provisions brought to Solomon (v. 1 = vv. 7–8 MT), his daily consumption of food (vv. 2–3), the extent of his realm (v. 4), his wisdom (vv. 9–14), Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (v. 14a = MT 3:1; 14b = MT 9:16–17a), his cooperation with Hiram (vv. 15–26), and the forced labor (vv. 27–32).

The details listed above show that the LXX added the story about Pharaoh's daughter in verses 14a–b. These verses are more appropriate here than in MT 3:1 and 9:16–17 (where they are lacking in the LXX),³¹ as is the placement of MT vv. 7–8 as v. 1 in the

30. See E. Tov, "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2," *Textus* 11 (1984): 89–118; revised and repr. in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 549–70. This study includes a complete retroversion of the Hebrew text underlying the expansions. The Hebrew text underlying 1 Kings 12:24a–z has been reconstructed by J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams* (FRLANT 93; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 55–65 and in Talshir, *Duplicate Story*, 38–153.

31. The story of the marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is in place here and not in MT 3:1 or 2:35c LXX. Verse 14a–b combines most of the elements relating to the first stage of the story of Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (2:35c LXX = 3:1 MT), while not including the second stage narrated in 2:35f_b LXX = 9:24 MT; 8:11a MT and LXX; 9:9a LXX. These elements have been carefully moved to their present place in the LXX, just before Solomon's preparations for the building of the temple. The implication of the

LXX.³² The LXX left out 4:20–5:1 (the extent of Solomon’s realm and its internal prosperity), occurring in the added verses 2:46a–b, and verses 5–6 (internal prosperity and Solomon’s food), occurring in the added 2:46g, i. These verses did not suit the topic of the rewritten and abbreviated form of chapter 5 of the LXX. More so than the MT, the LXX forms a literary unity, which was probably generated after the creation of the disharmonious text of the MT in which diverse material is often juxtaposed.

¹(= MT vv. 7, 8) And thus the officials would supply provisions for King Salomon (Solomon) and everything ordered for the table of the king, each one in his month, they did not alter a thing; and they also used to bring to the place where the king might be, barley and straw for the horses and the chariots, each according to his charge. ²And these were Salomon’s provisions for one day: thirty kors of choice flour and sixty kors of ground meal ³and ten choice calves and twenty pasture-fed oxen and one hundred sheep besides deer and gazelles and choice birds, grain fed. ⁴For he ruled across the river, and he was at peace on all sides round about.

⁹And the Lord gave Salomon discernment and very great wisdom and volume of mind like the sand that is by the sea, ¹⁰and Salomon was greatly multiplied, above the discernment of all ancient people, and above all the discerning people of Egypt. ¹¹And he was wise beyond all humans, he was wise beyond Gaithan (Ethan) the Ezraite (Ezrahite) and Haiman (Heman) and Chalkal (Chalkol) and Darda, son of Mal (Mahol). ¹²And Salomon spoke three thousand proverbs, and his songs were five thousand. ¹³And he spoke of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon and as far as the hyssop that comes out through the wall, and he spoke of animals and of birds and of reptiles and of fish. ¹⁴And all the people used to come to hear the wisdom of Salomon, and he would receive gifts from all the kings of the earth who were hearing of his wisdom.

^{14a}(= MT 3:1) And Salomon took the daughter of Pharaoh for himself for a wife and brought her into the city of Dauid (David)

change is that the second stage in that story, the moving of Pharaoh’s daughter to her own house, took place only after Solomon finished building the temple.

32. This verse describes the provisions for King Solomon by the prefects in the immediately preceding verses in the LXX (4:7–19 [v. 20 is lacking]), and its position is thus more appropriate in the LXX than in the MT. In the MT, the position of this verse as v. 7 is problematic as it mentions “all those prefects” even though the list of the prefects appears at a considerable distance.

until he finished the house of the Lord and his own house and the wall of Ierousalem (Jerusalem). ^{14b} (= 9:16–17a MT, not LXX) Then Pharao king of Egypt went up and captured Gazer (Gezer) and burned it and the Canaanite who lived in Mergab, and Pharao gave them as send-off gifts to his daughter, Salomon's wife; and Salomon built Gazer.

¹⁵And King Chiram (Hiram) of Tyre sent his servants to anoint Salomon in place of his father Daudid, for Chiram had affection for Daudid all the days.

1 Kings 11

The content of the first eight verses of chapter 11 of the MT differs from that of the LXX. Both versions depict the sins of King Solomon in marrying foreign wives and being involved in idolatry, but the LXX makes the latter sin more acceptable to the reader. In the LXX, Solomon's main sin consists of his love for foreign women,³³ which was forbidden according to Deuteronomy 7:1–4 and 17:17 (“And he [i.e., the king] shall not have many wives, lest his heart go astray”), while his other sins result from the initial one. The fact that he was married to foreign women in his old age made him easy prey for them, since they induced him to venerate non-Israelite gods. The MT of verse 1 (“King Solomon loved many foreign women”) stresses Solomon's sins more than the LXX by mentioning that the king had many women and that they were “foreign.” More importantly, the several variations between the two versions (change of sequence, addition/omission of details) create a slightly different image of the king. The LXX combines the first phrase of verse 1 with the beginning of verse 3a of the MT “He had seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines.” In this way the LXX

33. The LXX has changed the emphasis in the first verse of the chapter by leaving out details and combining v. 1 with v. 3. MT: “King Solomon loved many foreign women . . . (3) He had seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines . . .” / LXX (1) “And King Salomon (Solomon) loved women. And he had seven hundred ruling women and three hundred concubines . . .” In the new context of the LXX, the word “many” of the MT has been left out, as well as the word “foreign.” Solomon's major sin was that he loved women, which is further stressed by the move of the elements from v. 3 to their present position at the beginning of the chapter: all subsequent sins (idolatry) of Solomon derived from his love for women.

joins similar statements about Solomon's wives and further stresses that his major sin consisted of his love for women.

Furthermore the LXX omits verse 5 "For Solomon followed Astarte the goddess of the Sidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites." By doing so, it does not portray Solomon as initiating idolatrous acts, like the MT.³⁴ The description of the sins of 1 Kings 11 was problematic also for the Chronicler, who omitted the chapter in his account of Solomon.

¹(= MT vv. 1, 3) And King Salomon (Solomon) loved women. And he had seven hundred ruling women and three hundred concubines. And he took foreign women, even the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians and Idumeans (Edomites), Chettites (Hittites) and Amorites, ²from the nations that the Lord forbade to the sons of Israel: "You shall not go in to them, and they shall not go in to you, lest they turn away your hearts after their idols," Salomon clung to them for love. ⁴And it happened at the time of Salomon's old age that his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God as was the heart of his father Daudid (David), and his foreign wives turned away his heart after their gods. ⁵(= MT v. 7) Then Salomon built a high place to Chamos (Chemosh), idol of Moab and to their king, idol of the sons of Ammon ⁶(= MT v. 5) and to Astarte (Ashtoreth), abomination of the Sidonians. ⁷(= MT v. 8) And thus he did for all his foreign wives, they were offering incense and sacrificing to their idols; ⁸(= MT v. 6) and Salomon did evil before the Lord, he did not go after the Lord as Daudid his father.

D. A Combined Book Joshua–Judges?

Joshua 24 contains Joshua's speech at the end of his career. He reviewed Israel's history and invoked the people to renew the covenant with the Lord. After the tribes' renewal of that covenant the chapter narrates the deaths of Joshua and Eleazar (Josh. 24:33), at which point the LXX contains a section (vv. 33a–b) that is not found in the MT, at the very end of the book. The Hebraic diction of this passage allows for a relatively reliable reconstruction of the

34. For thorough analyses of this episode, see van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 202–21 and Z. Talshir, "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms—Origin and Revision, Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kings 11)," *Textus* 21 (2002): 71–105.

Greek text into Hebrew. For example, the phrase “And it happened after these things” in the beginning of verse 33 in the LXX, but not in the MT, reflects *wayehi ’ahare hadebarim ha’eleh* (cf. Josh. 24:29) frequently occurring in Scripture.

The addition of verses 33a–b in the LXX repeats phrases found elsewhere in Joshua–Judges. Verse 33b ends with Judges 3:12, that is, with the account of the “judge” Ehud and his oppressor Eglon, bypassing the stories of Judges 1–2, and the first half of chapter 3. The added section of the LXX is not a real addition to the MT. These verses at the end of the book together with the remainder of Joshua point to the existence of a combined book Joshua–Judges. In that early version the present end of Joshua was followed directly by the story of Ehud in Judges 3.

The author of the *Damascus Document* (CD) V, 1–5, a member of the Qumran community, probably knew the Hebrew text now reflected in the LXX of verse 33a–b. This is the only known text that mentions in one context the ark, the death of Eleazar, the death of Joshua, the elders, and the worship of the heathen Ashtaroth.³⁵

The sequence of events narrated at the end of the Greek book of Joshua depicts what may well have been the original sequence of events: the death of Joshua and Eleazar (24:29–33 MT), movement of the ark, service of Phinehas, beginning of the people’s sin, and the first story typifying the chain of events in the book of Judges involving the oppression of the Israelites by Eglon and the miraculous saving by Ehud (vv. 33a–b LXX).

Joshua 24:33 (MT + LXX), 33a–b (LXX): ³³And it happened after these things that Eleazar son of Aaron, the high priest, died, and was buried in Gabaath of Phinees his son, which he gave him in Mount Ephraim. ^{33a} + On that day the sons of Israel took the ark of God and carried it around in their midst. (Cf. v. 33 and Judg. 20:28.) And Phinees served as priest in the place of Eleazar his father until he died, and he was interred in Gabaath, which was his own. ^{33b} (Cf. v. 28.) And the sons of Israel departed each to their place and to their own city. (Cf. Judg. 2:6, 12–13; 3:12–14.) And the

35. This was suggested by A. Rofé, “The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint,” *Henoah* 4 (1982): 17–36. See also E. Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation,” *SerHier* 31 (1986): 321–39; revised and repr. in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 385–96.

sons of Israel worshiped Astarte, and Astaroth, and the gods of the nations round about them. And the Lord delivered them into the hands of Eglom, the king of Moab, and he dominated them eighteen years.+

E. The Three Editions of the Song of Hannah (1 Samuel 2)

The Song of Hannah is a song of praise (hymn) for God, even though in the MT it is described as a prayer (v. 1). Hannah thanks God that she has given birth after a long period of infertility (cf. v. 5 MT “While the barren woman bears seven, the mother of many is forlorn”). However, several other verses do not suit Hannah. For example, Hannah was not saved from an enemy as mentioned in verse 1. This Song may have been composed as a thanksgiving hymn applicable to different situations of salvation and subsequently placed on Hannah’s lips.

The greater part of the Song (vv. 2–8) praises the absolute power of God over mortals, enabling God to bring about changes, especially from a bad to a good situation, as in the case of the barren woman. The moral of the Song as expressed in verses 9–11 differs much in the three major textual traditions: the MT, the LXX, and 4QSam^a (the latter dating to 50–25 BCE). The main idea of the original form of the Song—namely, the absolute power of God over mortals—has been reinterpreted in two different directions in the preserved texts. Each of these witnesses makes the Song of Hannah more relevant to its context on the theological level.

1. And (**Hannah prayed**) **+she said+**: My heart exults in the LORD; I have triumphed through the LORD. I gloat over my enemies; I rejoice in Your deliverance.
2. There is no holy one like the LORD, truly, there is none **+righteous+** beside You; there is no rock like our God.
3. Talk no more with lofty pride, let no arrogance cross your lips! For the LORD is an all-knowing God; *by Him actions are measured.*
4. The bows of the mighty are broken, and the faltering are girded with strength.

5. Men once sated must hire out for bread; men once hungry hunger no more. While the barren woman bears seven, the mother of many is forlorn.
6. The LORD deals death and gives life, casts down into Sheol and raises up.
7. The LORD makes poor and makes rich; He casts down, He also lifts high.
8. *a* He raises the poor from the dust,
b lifts up the needy from the dunghill,
c setting them with nobles,
d granting them seats of honor.
(e For the pillars of the earth are the LORD's;
f He has set the world upon them.)
9. (*a* He guards the steps of His faithful, but the wicked perish in darkness.)
 + *a'* Granting the prayer to the one who prays,
b' he has also blessed the years of the righteous+
c For not by strength shall man prevail.
10. *The foes of the LORD shall be shattered;*
 +The Lord is holy.
 Let not the clever boast in his cleverness,
 and let not the mighty boast in his might,
 and let not the wealthy boast in his wealth,
 but let him who boasts boast in this:
 to understand and know the Lord
 and to execute justice and righteousness in the midst of the land+ (= Jer. 9:22–23).
He will thunder against them in the heavens. The LORD will judge the ends of the earth. He will give power to His king, and triumph to His anointed one.
11. (Then Elkanah and Hannah went home to Ramah) +And they left him there before the Lord and departed to Har-mathaim+; and the boy entered the service of the LORD under the priest Eli.

The Hebrew base of the LXX can be reconstructed with relative confidence because of the partial support of 4QSam^a and the

fairly faithful nature of the translation. A few remarks follow on the major tendencies visible in the LXX and the MT.³⁶

In verse 8, the MT and 4QSam^a add to the earlier text of the LXX—probably reflecting the original text—what is now verse 8e–f: “For the pillars of the earth are the LORD’S; He has set the world upon them.” The MT’s addition takes the earlier text of the LXX in a completely different direction. Starting with the conjunction “for,” the added verse is supposed to explain the previous colons by referring to God’s cosmic powers (“pillars of the earth”), but in actuality it fails to do so. Colons 8a–d, as well as verse 9, focus on God’s ability to determine the fate of individuals, while 8e–f, the added clause of MT (and 4QSam^a), praises God’s universal powers. Why would someone wish to stress God’s cosmic powers in this context? The added verse 8e–f is not inappropriate in ancient Israelite thinking. However, it presents the divine from a different angle than was probably intended by the original poet.³⁷

The contextual relevance of 9a–b MT (“He guards the steps of His faithful, but the wicked perish in darkness”), much different from the LXX, needs to be examined. Verses 4–5 mention unexpected changes for the better and the worse in the fate of individuals. Likewise in verses 6–8 the Song refers to God’s power to change the personal fate of individuals. The implication of these two groups of verses is that the unexpected change in one’s personal condition is due to God. For example, in verse 4a God determines the fate of the strong one whose power fails. Therefore, verse 9a–b MT, “He guards the steps of His faithful . . .,” seems contextually appropriate. However, in the original short version of the Song, the sudden changes described in verses 4–8 merely exemplify the strength and autonomy of God (for similar ideas cf. Ps. 113:7–8). The original ideas of the Song have been given a

36. See further E. Tov, “Different Editions of the Song of Hannah,” in *Tehillah le-Moshe, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (ed. M. Cogan, B. L. Eichler, and J. H. Tigay; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 149–70; revised and repr. in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 433–55.

37. The universal power of God is mentioned again in v. 10, but in that verse this description fits the context of God overpowering his enemies. The juxtaposition of a description of the personal fate of individuals and God’s greatness in the universe is found also in Ps. 113, which in many ways resembles the Song of Hannah, but that fact cannot be used as an argument in favor of the originality of v. 8e–f MT.

theological slant in the MT by stressing the power of loyalty to God. It is the person who is loyal to God who will experience an improvement in his or her condition. For example, the God-fearing barren woman will give birth, while the barren woman who is not loyal will not be blessed.

The presumed earlier text has been interpreted differently in the LXX (and 4QSam^a). We name this different text verses 9a'–b'. The verse that is found in the LXX and 4QSam^a but not in the MT mentions a person who makes a vow—a clear allusion to Hannah. After the various categories of a powerful change from a bad to a good situation and from good to bad (vv. 4–8), God's granting the vow to the person who vows in verse 9a'–b' seems a mere afterthought. This verse in the LXX may well reflect an attempt to relate the Song more closely to Hannah's situation.³⁸

According to verse 9c found in all traditions, physical force does not give strength to people ("For not by strength shall man prevail"). The idea in this colon forms the logical conclusion of verses 4–8, and not 9a–b, showing that the only power determining the fate of humans is that of God. If this understanding is correct, the reconstructed original form of the Song has been reinterpreted in two directions in the preserved texts, therefore constituting different editions of the Song and its narrative framework.³⁹

The Special Status of the LXX

Further analysis yields additional examples of texts in which the LXX reflects an editorial stage of the Hebrew books different from that in the MT.⁴⁰ Not all examples are equally convincing, and much

38. The mentioning of the righteous in the LXX and 4QSam^a in v. 9b' in a way runs parallel to the mentioning of the persons who are loyal to God in v. 9a in the MT. The phrase in the LXX may be taken to imply that the persons who witness a change in their personal fate, as mentioned in vv. 4–5, are the righteous.

39. In the three main textual sources that have been preserved, these changes are evidenced either in individual witnesses or in groups of two, without any consistency. Sometimes the change is evidenced in the MT and sometimes in the LXX, and either one is sometimes joined by 4QSam^a. The position of 4QSam^a is thus rather peculiar, but the evidence of this scroll brings to light the true nature of the two other texts.

40. See E. Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in *The Earliest Text of the*

depends on the amount of support for the reconstruction of a variant text from the LXX. In most cases we may invoke support from external sources (Qumran scrolls, SP), the existence of Hebraisms/Aramaisms, or a faithful translation technique, while some books remain problematic because of their free translation style.

The MT is often considered the major textual source for the study of Hebrew Scripture, but actually the LXX is equally important, the only problem being that its Hebrew parent text cannot be reconstructed easily. At the same time, of all the texts that have come down from antiquity, the LXX is not the only source differing from the MT at the literary level. Similar evidence is contained in a few Qumran scrolls,⁴¹ but even if we allow for more such parallels on the basis of a maximalistic approach,⁴² the LXX still reflects more evidence than the Qumran scrolls.⁴³ The “SP-group,” that is the SP together with the so-called pre-Samaritan Qumran texts, also contains parallel material. The literary material embedded in these texts is of a special nature since their additions to the MT do not provide new material but duplicate verses of the MT.⁴⁴

As we turn now to the background of the relatively numerous major deviations from the MT in the LXX, we are groping

Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuaginta Reconsidered (ed. A. Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 121–44.

41. See the aforementioned scrolls 4QSam^a, 4QJer^{b,d}, probably 4QJosh^a, and possibly also 4QJudg^a.

42. A maximalistic approach would include 4QRP, a reworked Bible composition, on which see E. Tov, “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday* (ed. J. Zsengeller; Leiden: Brill, 2008). It could also include one or two of the so-called abbreviated texts, such as 4QCant^{a,b}, on which see E. Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 581–600.

43. Our assessment of the data is subjective, and furthermore the complexity of comparing the entire Qumran corpus with a single text, the LXX, should be kept in mind. However, such a comparison seems legitimate. The Qumran corpus is very fragmentary, but often a book’s character is recognizable in a small fragment, such as the Jeremiah fragments from cave 4. If the two hundred (very) fragmentary Qumran scrolls of Scripture books are compared with the twenty-four canonical books of Greek Scripture, the latter group contains more evidence of different editorial stages of Hebrew Scripture than the Qumran corpus.

44. For details, see E. Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54.

in the dark. The special character of the *Vorlage* of the LXX seems to derive from two factors: (1) the Hebrew manuscripts used for the Greek translation were not embraced by the circles that fostered the MT;⁴⁵ and (2) at the time of the translation (275–150 BCE), still earlier Hebrew manuscripts were used that reflect some vestiges of earlier editorial stages.⁴⁶ Typologically late LXX texts (1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel) probably representing editorial stages subsequent to the MT⁴⁷ show that the key to unraveling the mystery is likely the fact that these manuscripts were non-Masoretic.

Any reply to the question of why texts of the MT family were not used for the LXX translation remains a matter of conjecture. The realm of MT influence may have been limited to certain circles, and we do not know from which circles the Hebrew manuscripts translated were sent or taken to Egypt. Clearly, the circle or persons who sent or took the manuscripts of the Torah to Alexandria did not include Eleazar the high priest and the sages, as narrated in the *Letter of Aristeas* 176. Any high priest would undoubtedly have encouraged the use of a text from the MT family for such an important enterprise. Incidentally, the *Letter of Aristeas* praises

45. On the socio-religious background of the MT, see E. Tov, “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; idem, “The Nature of the Masoretic Text in Light of the Scrolls from the Judean Desert and Rabbinic Literature,” *Shnaton* 16 (2004), 119–39 (Heb. with Engl. summary).

46. When ascribing the non-Masoretic character of the Hebrew manuscripts included in the LXX to their early date, we find some support in the Qumran corpus. A few early Qumran texts, similarly deriving from the third and second centuries BCE, reflect redactional differences from the MT. Two Qumran manuscripts contain the same early redactional stage as the LXX, namely 4QJer^b and 4QJer^d (both 200–150 BCE), while 4QJosh^a is relatively early (150–50 BCE). At the same time, one other manuscript probably reflecting an early literary stage is relatively late: 4QSam^a (50–25 BCE). The evidence for Qumran is thus not clear-cut, but neither is it unequivocal for the LXX. For only some of the LXX books reflect redactionally different versions and by the same token only some of the early Qumran manuscripts are independent vis-à-vis the MT.

47. 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.

the abilities of the translators as well as the external features of the scrolls, but says nothing about their nature.

In summary, in this study we analyzed some large differences between the MT and the LXX. Disregarding discrepancies that were created by the translator, we turned to such differences as were likely found in the translators' *Vorlagen*. Probably only the large deviations in the LXX of Job were produced by the translator, while all other such discrepancies were already found in the manuscripts used by the translators. Most books yielded support for such assumptions (external evidence in Hebrew manuscripts, Semitisms, literal translations), but the decision is difficult in free translation units. We analyzed a few chapters in detail (Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, 1 Kings, Joshua, 1 Samuel). In all these cases, the LXX reflects different editorial stages of Hebrew Scripture from that included in the MT, prior or subsequent to that text. In all these cases, the LXX should be used together with the MT and some Qumran scrolls in the literary analysis of Scripture. The relatively large number of editorial differences from the MT in the LXX should probably be ascribed to the early date of the Hebrew manuscripts from which the translation was made and to their derivation from circles different from the ones embracing the MT.