"Les problèmes textuel de 2 Sam 11, 2-1 Rois 2, 11," pp. 24f., who adds to my arguments for a Hillelite date.

32. E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian," *RB* 79 (1972), 101-113; and D. Barthélemy, "Les problèmes textuel de 2 Sam 11, 2-1 Rois 2, 11, reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques de *Devanciers d'Aquila*," *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 2 (1972), 16-89.

33. "Lucian and Proto-Lucian," p. 103.

34. Tov would argue, I am sure, that in the formula G^L 4QSam $\neq$ MG^B, where M and G^B are in agreement, the text of G^B was corrected secondarily toward M. Thus G^B would take on a very different character from that we have generally attributed to it, having suffered very extensive Hebraizing and/or Hexaplaric contamination. Indeed, G^B would have the strange look - having exceedingly frequent corrections to M which involve the omission of Greek readings, very rare corrections to M where M has a plus over the common Greek witnesses (asterisked passages in the Hexapla). I prefer to regard most of the shorter readings of G^B as primitive, stemming from its *Vorlage*.

Even so, there remain a sprinkling of proto-Lucianic readings which cannot be identified as Old Greek. To introduce "another Old Greek" rather than *the* Old Greek is, in the present state of our knowledge, a less "parsimonious" solution than positing a proto-Lucianic stratum.

See also Ralph W. Klein, "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns," *HTR* 60 (1967), 93-105.

35. *Antiq*. 6.68-71.

36. *HTR* 57 (1964), 295f., n. 44.

The Textual Study of the Bible - A New Outlook

Shemaryahu Talmon
Hebrew University

I The History of the Bible Text - The Present Stage of Research

The discovery of the biblical manuscripts from Qumran triggered a widespread renewed interest in the comparative textual research of the Bible, and foremost in the history of the Bible text.[1] Of special importance in this respect was the late W. F. Albright's attempt in 1955 to throw "New Light on Early Recensions of the Bible."[2] In retrospect, it may be said that this short article in fact became the launching pad of a whole new school in biblical textual studies, in the formation of which Frank M. Cross, Jr. has played a dominant role. It appears, though, at present that the impetus effected by Albright's initial paper, and accelerated by later papers and monographs in which followers of the "three recensions" school developed the new lines, recently has perceptibly slowed down, possibly or even probably because scholars quite legitimately now are busy consolidating the new positions won during the last twenty years or so. This situation prompts me to present here some thoughts about new directions which should be and could be profitably explored in the field of textual research in direct conjunction with the wider realm of biblical studies. These new tasks are not incumbent exclusively on scholars whose preoccupation is the Bible text proper and the history of its transmission in the original Hebrew and in the Versions,[3] but rather do they call for the cooperation of students in areas of biblical research which traditionally are considered separate domains of investigation.

Before mapping out some such new avenues, it seems advisable to offer in a nutshell a summary of the main stages that have led to the situation which one encounters now in biblical textual studies.[4]

Before the discovery of the biblical scrolls from Qumran, i.e., until the middle of this century, an impasse had occurred with respect to theories about the early history of the Bible text, its genesis, and the ways and vicissitudes of its subsequent development. Rival conceptions had hardened into two polarized theories: de Lagarde's "Urtext" hypothesis

and P. Kahle's "Vulgaertexte" theory, with some scholars working out variations on the basic ideas within the framework of one or the other. One had turned away, to a large degree, from theorizing about those ultimately unattainable "first stages," i.e., the earliest form or forms of the Bible text. Instead scholars became preoccupied with the sifting of extant variants, and tried to establish "textual families," especially within the field of the Greek translations, and the relations of these families to each other. Textual errors, assumed or real, were collected, collated and categorized, and attempts were made to devise by a synopsis of all Versions a typology or typologies of inter-versional emendations.[5]

One wonders why, in view of these variegated endeavours, no attempt was made to publish an eclectic text of the Hebrew Bible, parallel to what von Gall, e.g., did for the Samaritan Pentateuch.[6] True, scholars occasionally tried their hand at re-establishing the presumed original text of this or that piece of biblical literature.[7] But one refrained, and in my judgment justifiedly so, from going all the way by putting before the reader a reconstructed, supposedly original text of Hebrew Scriptures. The situation has not changed to this very day. At best, scholars will speculate on the "proto-text" of one or another version, but will not attempt to recover the Hebrew Urtext of a biblical book, let alone of the entire Bible.

The discovery of the Qumran biblical material opened up new horizons. After some initial doubts and varying appreciations of its antiquity, the preponderant majority of scholars subscribed to the opinion that the bulk of the scrolls and fragments discovered at Qumran stem from the last two centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E., with some dating certain fragments earlier into the third, and even fourth century B.C.E.[8] One now had access to biblical manuscripts from a very early period which previously had been altogether beyond the scope of textual research proper, i.e., research based on actual manuscript evidence.

The sifting and evaluating of individual variants continued, and with renewed vigor. The field was enriched by the crop of novel readings that turned up in Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran, and by the emergence of what sometimes can be taken to be the "Hebrew originals" of previously known versional variants. At the same time, new possibilities opened up for

manuscript-based investigations into the early history of the Bible text. These possibilities were made especially attractive by the circumstance that, *mutatis mutandis*, the Qumran biblical material *in toto*, and the problems that it presents to the student, approximate the Massoretic Text and Versions issue. Concomitant with the horizontal cross-section of the Bible text at Qumran during the last phases of the Second Temple period, the material affords us a vertical cross-section, i.e., a diachronic view which reflects at least three centuries of the history of the Bible text, within a closely circumscribed geographical setting. It thus can cause no wonder that the Qumran manuscripts soon became the point of departure for a novel theory with respect to the early history of the biblical text.

As said, it was W. F. Albright who laid the foundations of the new hypothesis. An analysis of the Qumran biblical materials available in 1955 led him to the suggestion that most manuscripts and fragments essentially can be aligned with the known ancient Versions of the Bible, including the MT, which *in toto* can be traced back to three local revisions that solidified in Babylon, Palestine and Egypt during the second half millennium B.C.E. Albright's mere sketch of this theory was fully worked out by Frank M. Cross who thus defined its bases: "Any reconstruction of the biblical text before the establishment of the traditional text in the first century A.D. must comprehend this evidence: the plurality of text-types, the limited number of textual families, and the homogeneity of these textual families over several centuries of time. We are required by these data...to recognize the existence of *local texts* which developed in the main centers of Jewish life in the Persian and Hellenistic age."[9] Cross commendably introduced a significant change in Albright's terminology: "Against Albright, we should argue, however, that the local textual families in question are not properly called 'recensions.' They are the product of natural growth or development in the process of scribal transmission, not of conscious or controlled scribal recension."[10]

This theory, which is yet in the process of being revised and further refined by Cross and his students, appears to have attracted surprisingly little comment either from European scholars, with few exceptions, or for that matter, Israeli students of the Bible text. It has remained largely confined to a rather restricted setting on the American scene. One does

not gain the impression that the "three local texts" hypothesis has aroused, as it surely deserves, a new debate on the basic issues in question. Actually one seems to observe again a concentration on partial problems which indeed are constituents of the overall theory,[11] and a concomitant shying away, as it were, from the very heart of the matter. Much attention is given to the internal developments of the Greek Version or Versions, evoked especially by Barthélemy's critical appraisal of the fragments of a Greek Dodekapropheton from Qumran[12] which sparked a spate of publications on the *kaige* revision of the Old Greek translation.[13] The question of the relationship of this revision to Theodotion and proto-Theodotion,[14] to Lucian and proto-Lucian,[15] to Josephus' Greek text,[16] and to the MT is in the forefront of ongoing textual research. This reflects on the major problem of the internal composition of Reigns,[17] and the unity or compositeness of the Greek translation of other biblical books.[18] Of exceeding importance is the renewed debate on whether the diverse Greek sources, or at least some, e.g., Aquila and Symmachus, should be judged independent translations made directly from the Hebrew original, or whether they are rather in the nature of revisions of one basic first translation. This discussion has some repercussions on the "two-translators" theory which had been proposed by Thackeray,[19] Baab,[20] Herrman-Baumgaertel[21] and others,[22] by which one attempted to explain the inner linguistic and sometimes terminological diversity or duality of the Greek renditions of several biblical books, e.g., Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Now, a trend makes itself felt to substitute for "two translators" "one translator and a reviser."[23]

In reference to the *Urtext* versus *Vulgaertext* debate, recent developments, on the whole, appear to weigh the scales in favour of a more consolidated concept of the early text of the Bible, although it would seem that the new school has not aligned itself outright with the de Lagardians.[24] While highly appreciative of the systematic effort to bring some method and order into the baffling diversity of text-types and textual variants which can be observed at Qumran, and certainly within the wider compass of the Hebrew Text and Versions, I yet entertain some reservations with regard to certain major aspects of the "three local families" theory. The theory implies that the three local texts derived directly from one

Hebrew proto-type, and that this archetype is to be dated at the latest in the fifth century B.C.E., that is to say more than half a millennium earlier than de Lagarde's *Urtext* or Rosenmueller's *Ur-rezension*. I would yet maintain, as I did several years ago, that notwithstanding the additional information and further analyses along these lines which have been forthcoming lately, the "three local texts" hypothesis cannot satisfactorily explain the restricted plurality of text-types at the end of the pre-Christian era.[25] It appears that the extant text-types must be viewed as the remains of a yet more variegated transmission of the Bible text in the preceding centuries, rather than as witnesses to solely three archetypes. The more ancient manuscripts are being discovered and published, the more textual divergencies appear. The relatively limited number of distinct textual families which are extant at the end of the pre-Christian era may be explained to have resulted from two factors, among others: historical vicissitudes which caused other textual families to disappear; and the lack of a major prerequisite for the preservation of a text tradition, namely its acceptance by a sociologically definable integrated body.

This last factor raises an issue which is not sufficiently considered by students of the Bible text: the social and societal aspects of the preservation of literature, first and foremost of sacred literature. A hallowed text-form adopted by a specific group has a decidedly integrating effect. A *Gruppentext* is as much a socializing agent as is a *Gruppensprache*. This certainly applies to the Massoretic Text which became the standard version of the Synagogue; the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch which gained authoritative status in the Samaritan community; the Greek Version, and later the Latin, that were hallowed by the Church. One does not encounter the same degree of textual solidification at Qumran. The diversity of textual traditions preserved in the Covenanters' library may in part have resulted from the variegated sources of provenance of at least some of the manuscripts. These probably were brought to Qumran by members of the Community who hailed from diverse localities in Palestine, and from various social strata. From the very outset, one therefore should expect to find in that library, as indeed one does, a conflux of text-traditions which had developed over a considerable span of time in different areas of

Palestine, and also outside Palestine, as in Babylonia, and in different social circles. These diverse *Vorlagen* were continuously copied by the Covenanters' scribes at Qumran, even in the restricted compass of their *scriptorium*. The relatively short period of uninterrupted existence of the Covenanters' community possibly was not conducive to the emergence of one stabilized text form, if they were at all concerned about establishing a *textus receptus*.[26] It stands to reason that also other constituted deviant Jewish communities may have embraced one specific text-type in their time. But with the disappearance of these groups also their respective literary heritages disappeared or were suppressed, and with them their particular biblical textual traditions.

The scope of variation within all these textual traditions is relatively restricted. Major divergencies which intrinsically affect the sense are extremely rare. A collation of variants extant, based on the synoptic study of the material available, either by a comparison of parallel passages within one Version, or of the major Versions with each other, results in the conclusion that the ancient authors, compilers, tradents and scribes enjoyed what may be termed a controlled freedom of textual variation. The exact limits of this "variation-scope," though, cannot be accurately established intuitively, nor can they be gauged from mere sample collations. An investigation into this matter, based on a thorough and comprehensive synopsis of all types of variants, glosses, intentional modifications, etc., which can be ascertained in our sources is an urgent *desideratum*.

The limited flux of the textual transmission of the Bible appears to be a legitimate and accepted phenomenon of ancient scribal tradition and not a matter which resulted from sheer incompetence or professional laxity. This fact, and our ignorance of literary standards and norms practised in the crucial period of the second half-millennium B.C.E., seems forever to proscribe any endeavour to restitute an assumed original of the biblical books. Beyond that, there arises an operational problem which harasses the editor of a critical edition of the Bible, and with which e.g. we are at present faced, working on the Book of Jeremiah for the Hebrew University Bible Project. The one-time existence of a short text of the Book, deduced from the Greek Version which exhibits a text which is considerably

shorter than the MT,[27] gains further probability from the Hebrew fragments of Jeremiah found at Qumran. The preliminary reports published by their prospective editor, Frank Cross, and now also by J. G. Janzen, suggest that Qumran has preserved for us fragments of what amounts to a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the short Greek Text of Jeremiah.[28] The considerable difference in sheer bulk makes labelling these traditions "pristine" and "expansionist" sound rather inadequate.[29] The very comparability of so widely divergent traditions seems to be questionable. From here follows the further question, whether the collation of the short Greek and/or Hebrew text in the apparatus of the considerably fuller Massoretic Version can at all be justified on methodological grounds. Similar considerations pertain to the Book of Esther.[30] The variance of the Greek traditions among themselves, and *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew, appears to preclude a systematic collation of these widely divergent texts.

In view of these facts, I would propose that a major problem to be investigated with regard to the history of the Bible text is not so much the existence of a limited plurality of text-types, but rather the loss of other presumably more numerous textual traditions. Thus phrased, the issue of whether a single *Urtext* broke up into "three distinct local families" in which subsequently and separately manuscript variants emerged, or whether conversely, primal traditions which varied among themselves to a limited degree progressively lost their lease on life and ultimately crystallized in a restricted number of *Gruppentexte* should be studied from a new angle.

II "Higher" and "Lower" Criticism - New Perspectives

The Albright-Cross hypothesis has considerably extended the historical reach of the enquiry into the history of the Bible text. Kahle already had attempted to push the study of the history of the text in all its ramifications beyond the *terminus non ante quem* which his predecessors had tacitly or explicitly considered as the starting point of their investigation, namely the end of the Second Commonwealth or the early period after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.[31] The "three textual families" theory penetrates deeper into history, since it assumes that these textual families "developed slowly between the fifth and first centuries B.C., in

Palestine, in Egypt, and in a third locality, presumably Babylon."[32] Thus, the investigation of textual phenomena, and of the developmental history of the Bible text is carried down into a period in which some biblical literature was yet being authored, and other parts were being redacted or edited. To put it differently, in that period diverse literary processes which affected biblical writings in their totality, then were carried out concurrently. The recognition of this circumstance should have alerted scholars to some new issues and endeavours in the wider field of biblical studies: the investigation of the possible comparability and likely interdependence of literary phenomena which, on the surface, obtain on different levels of the literary process. If the history of the Bible text is no longer considered to become the object of systematic study only after the creative impulse, i.e., after the authoring of biblical literature had come to an end, but rather as partly overlapping with it, then it obviously becomes legitimate to probe into the possibility that the textual enquiry, designated "lower criticism," may illuminate issues that are usually debated in the orbit of "higher criticism." The "shorter" versus the "expansionist" text of Jeremiah on the surface is a textual problem and thus comes under the heading of "lower criticism." But if the roots of the question go as deep as the fifth century B.C.E., the issue, in fact, connects and concurs with problems of "higher criticism," namely the presumed intrusion of non-Jeremianic material into the book ascribed to the prophet.

Another illustration of the same issue is the pericope in Isaiah ch. 38 which reports on Hezekiah's illness and the prophet's intervention as a healer could be similarly viewed. The absence of Hezekiah's מכתב,[33] the King's prayer-psalm[34] recorded in the Book of Isaiah (*ib.* vv. 9-20), both from the parallel in 2 Kings 20 and 2 Chr. 32 (where also other parts of the narrative in which the prayer is set are missing),[35] *prima facie* is a structural problem which belongs in the realm of "higher criticism." As against this, the somewhat different textual order of the components of the pericope in the First Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^a) will correctly be dealt with as an issue of "text," and thus comes under the heading of "lower criticism."[36] Would it not be in order to investigate whether one set of problems could not have some bearing on the other, foremost the "textual" on the "structural"?

In the present context, a full analysis of the rather complex problem would be cumbersome, and therefore will be discussed in a separate paper. Here it must suffice to outline the main points involved, highlighting their bearing on the issue under review. In doing so, we shall concentrate on the Hebrew text, with only occasional references to Versional variants.

Of the four extant Hebrew parallels, 2 Chr. 32 presents by far the shortest and Is. 38 the most expansive text. The latter also is reflected in 1QIs^a with one significant deviation, shortly to be analysed. 2 Kings 20 occupies a medial position with respect to the extent of text presented. There can be little doubt that the Chronicler's text, which clearly is based on the 2 Kings version, has been severely abbreviated. The account comprises 22 verses in Is. 38, and 11 in 2 Ki. 20. It was compressed into one single verse in 2 Chr. 32:24. The process of editing appears to have been carried out rather mechanically by telescoping the beginning of the narrative - בימים ההם חלה (יי)חזקיהו (עד) למות (cp. 2 Ki. 20:1 and Is. 38:1 MT and 1QIs^a) - with the catchphrase - ומופת נתן לו - which alludes to the "sign" - אות (2 Ki. 20:8-11; Is. 38:7-8, 22) - given by the prophet to the king to assure him that he will recover from his illness. The two components were awkwardly combined by the apocopated phrase ויאמר לו, presumably referring to Isaiah, with the contents of the message missing. LXX has here the more fitting but probably "improved" rendition καὶ ἐπήκουσεν (וישמע or BH: ויעתר) [κυριος] αὐτῷ which does not require a direct object. Neither the summary in 2 Chr. 32:4 nor the full narrative in 2 Ki. 20:1-11, reflected also in both the MT and 1QIs^a of Is. 38, exhibit any hint that would make the reader expect the additional psalm - מכתב - which follows in Is. 38:9-20 upon the conclusion of the narrative. This obvious addition which elaborates on Hezekiah's short prayer (*ib.* vv. 2-3) bears witness to a paraphrastic tendency that affected the prophetic narrative,[37] most probably after it had been incorporated into the Book of Isaiah. Upon weighing the evidence, the expanded Isaiah parallel is found to be secondary to the shorter, or more "pristine" Kings account. In essence, the issue is of a structural nature and pertains to the field of "higher criticism." It resembles the contrast between the short Greek (and Qumran Hebrew) and the expanded Massoretic text of Jeremiah, which standard

procedure considers a textual problem, and which is discussed under the heading of "lower criticism."

A "textual" dimension attaches to the relationship between the two witnesses to the Isaiah text, the MT and 1QIs^{a}. The Qumran text lacks verses 38:21-22 which in the present MT conclude the composite narrative (vv. 1-8) *cum* prayer-psalm (vv. 9-20) pericope: "Then Isaiah said, 'Let them take a cake of figs, and apply it to the boil, that he may recover.' And Hezekiah said, 'What is the sign that I shall go up to the house of the Lord?'" It is generally agreed that these two verses are misplaced in the MT, probably as a result of *homoioteleuton*, since both the מכתב and the concluding appendix end on the words בית יהוה, preceded in one instance by על (Is. 38:20) and in the other by the graphically similar אעלה (*ib.* v. 22). Therefore they are generally transposed after v. 6, to a position parallel to the one they occupy in the 2 Kings arrangement. The verses clearly were before a reviser of 1QIs^{a}. He supplied the missing passage *s.m.* by squeezing most of v. 21 into the remainder of the last line of ch. 38 - omitting, though, the word ישאו - and then wrote the word ויחי and all of v. 22 vertically in the left-hand margin. However, the fact that the first scribe neatly ended his copying of ch. 38 by using up only about one-fourth of the last line, leaving the remainder blank, seems to suggest that his *Vorlage* contained a shorter text than the MT. This supposition gains in probability when one bears in mind that 1) the unemended 1QIs^{a} text and the MT without the appendix read smoothly, indeed read better than the fuller 2 Kings text; 2) Hezekiah's question מה (ה)אות כי אעלה בית יהוה, with the telling reference to the fig-cure in 2 Ki. 20:8 - כי ירפא יהוה לי - conveniently left out in the Is. reading, is a pedantic and superfluous enlargement; 3) the reference to a fig-pad דבלת תאנים which the prophet prescribed as a cure for the King's affliction makes Isaiah the type of wonder-healer that is known from prophetic narratives in the historiographies, but is altogether out of tune with the traditions told about him in his book. The reference to the "cure" (v. 21) in the appendix to Is. 38 thus is recognized as a secondary intrusion from the 2 Kings parallel.[38] 4) The definition of the King's malady as שחין - "boil" (NEB) - on the surface looks like an "informed" interpretation of the very general remark that Hezekiah had been taken critically ill

בימים ההם חלה חזקיה למות (2 Ki. 20:1; cp. *ib.* v. 13; Is. 38:1; cp. 39:1). In actual fact it is a tendentious elaboration which probably was intended to present the king's illness in the typical manner of a divinely decreed affliction. Whereas חלה usually refers to any illness which affects man in the course of nature (cp. e.g. Gen. 48:1; 1 Sam. 19:14; 30:13; 1 Ki. 14:15; 15:23, 17:17; 2 Ki. 8:7, 29; Neh. 2:2 *et al.*), שחין like דבר - plague[39] and equally צרעת - leprosy[40] in the narrative parts of biblical literature, is conceived of as a *topos*, a sign of divine wrath (Ex. 9:9-11; Deut. 28:27, 35), especially in the Job story (Job 2:7).[41] Since the fig-pad element is not alluded to in the compressed 2 Chr. account nor in the base text of 1QIs^{a}, it is conceivable that it should be viewed as an alternate tradition of the sun-dial sign which also indicates God's acceptance of Hezekiah's prayer. This latter is present in all four versions of the narrative, including the catch-phrase reference ומופת נתן לו in 2 Chr. 32:24.

We are led to the suggestion that the retrospective reference to the healing of Hezekiah's illness, defined as שחין, and the recapturing of the sun-dial sign in MT Is. by the question put into the king's mouth, constitute an appendix. Together with the main narrative in vv. 1-8, it is intended to form an inclusio-like frame for the inserted prayer-psalm מכתב: while v. 21 (the fig-pad) is a topical doublet of vv. 7-8 (the sun-dial sign), v. 22 links the renewed reference to the King's illness in Is. 39:1 (= 2 Ki. 20:12) with the initial narrative, thus arching, as it were, over the intrusive element of the prayer-psalm.[42] The present 1QIs^{a} text indeed contains the psalm. But the omission of the closing verses, i.e., the fig-pad parallel and the *inclusio*, seem to reflect a shorter version in which the psalm and the "fig-pad" episode had not yet been incorporated into the Isaiah version of the 2 Kings tradition. 1QIs^{a}, with the prayer-psalm, thus represents, on the one hand, a medial stage of structural development between MT Is. and MT Kings, and lacking the fig-pad reference, on the other hand, appears to have a more pristine tradition than MT Kings in which the sun-dial sign and the fig-pad already are conflated.

The above analysis rooted in structural criteria that divide MT Is. from MT Kings (and Chr.), on the one hand, and in textual criteria which constitute a deviation of 1QIs^{a} and MT Chr. from MT Is. and Kings, on the

other, clearly illustrates the interdependence of the two phenomena and of the respective disciplines of structural-"higher" and textual-"lower" criticism. It reveals the parallelism of the "fig-pad" and the "sun-dial" signs which presumably had been alternately employed in parallel versions of the Hezekiah story. The transposition of MT Is. 38:21-22 after v. 6 in order to align the text with MT Kings, subscribed to by virtually all commentators and translators, must be considered improper procedure, both from the viewpoint of structural and of textual analysis.

III Biblical Stylistics and the Textual Study of the Bible

It would appear that another field of comparative research is even closer at hand than the "lower" and "higher" criticism issue. It concerns the study of biblical stylistics on the one hand and the textual study of the Bible on the other. In this area of prospective interdisciplinary research, new ground can be broken.[43]

Let me explain what I have in mind.

It may be considered an established practice in biblical studies to separate the discussion of stylistics from the study of the forms and the history of the Bible text. The subject-matter examined in the one field is adjudged to be intrinsically different from that which comes under scrutiny in the other. Biblical stylistics are taken to deal exclusively with the ways and techniques of literary creativity, while in the study of the text one is concerned with processes which were operative in the preservation and transmission of the finished product. Consequently, distinctive methods seem to be required for an analytical investigation into these disparate fields of research. These distinctive methods again call for a specialization and a degree of expertise which result in a rigid departmentalization of the study of biblical literature. The scholar who has made the problems of biblical stylistics his main pursuit will be drawn away from questions which pertain primarily to the history of the Bible text. On the other hand, the student who has chosen as his domain the comparative study of the witnesses to the Bible text seldom will occupy himself with the genesis of literary forms or with the evolution of biblical stylistic devices. The few notable exceptions that there are only prove the rule. The resulting division of labor further widens the gulf

between these two areas of biblical studies which become oriented towards different frameworks of references and which are subjected to analysis by different sets of tools. In practice we arrive at the crystallization of two self-contained disciplines covering two areas which barely touch upon each other.

In this division also a time element is involved. The study of biblical stylistics is rooted in the phase of biblical literary creativity which is taken to have come to an end in the initial stages of the codification of biblical literature, when style stopped developing. Roughly at that stage divergent textual traditions emerged which make possible the study of the textual history of the Bible. The dividing line between these two phases may be set approximately at the end of the third century B.C.E.[44]

As a technical corollary of the division between biblical stylistics and the study of the Bible text in matters of method, these issues often are examined independently of each other in specialized works whose scope is consciously limited to the one or the other. On the one hand, there are histories and descriptions of the "biblical literature" which take no notice of textual problems whatsoever, such as, e.g., K. Budde, *Geschichte der althebraeischen Literatur* (Leipzig 1909), J. Hempel, *Die althebraeische Literatur und ihr hellenistisches-juedisches Nachleben* (Potsdam 1930), and A. Lods, *L'histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (Paris 1950). On the other hand, concerns of stylistics and literature, together with other problems, are altogether excluded, e.g., from F. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh 1892), B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff 1951) and E. Wuerthwein, *Der Text des Alten Testaments*[4] (Stuttgart 1973) which deal solely with aspects of the textual history of the Bible. Even more revealing is the arrangement of the discussion of these subject matters in comprehensive Introductions to the (Literature of the) Old Testament. The part or parts which deal with style and literary forms usually precede the analysis of the biblical books in their traditional order, while the formation of the canon and the history of the Bible text are dealt with in what amounts to an appendix.[45] This arrangement forcefully underlines the distinctiveness of the field of biblical stylistics from that of the study of the Bible text. With this

division of spheres goes the notion that a transfer of analytical tools from one to the other can hardly be justified, since one cannot assume *prima facie* any inherent similarity in the processes under observation in the one and in the other.

One certainly has to acknowledge the methodological necessity and the practical advantages which are provided by this division of the spheres of study. However, since we are dealing with one closely-knit complex of literature - notwithstanding the variety and diversity of phenomena involved - we should ask ourselves whether or not there are common basic features which can be discerned in these different emanations of biblical literary creativity. We do not refer to the widely practised employment of stylistic criteria, such as *parallelismus membrorum*, for the emendation of a supposedly faulty text. What we have in mind are fundamental formative elements which assumedly were operative on the author level as stylistic patterns and in the transmission-stage as their editorial and textual modification.

The mere quest for such common fundamental elements in biblical literature *ab initio* implies that we do not rule out the possible transfer of principles and formative techniques from the sphere of literary composition to that of textual transmission. In fact we expect such transfers to occur to a high degree of probability in a literature which experienced the transition from a state of relatively flexible and modifiable oral tradition to a more stabilized written transmission and ultimately to textual uniformity. The transition from one stage to the other was not disruptive, but rather was it a smooth and gradual process which moreover affected biblical literature in a staggered sequence: different biblical books were subjected to the progressive stages of transition at different periods. This even-flowing development allowed for a continuum of values and for a transfer of standards from one stage to another, by means of variation and adaptation. Thus, stylistic conventions which had been of decisive importance in the formation of oral tradition did not cease from being operative in the stage of written transmission.[46] They also left their imprint on the work of editors and revisers, and are reflected in scribal techniques which were conducive to textual stabilization. Therefore, in analyzing the processes and methods that are mirrored in the

transmitted text-forms of the biblical books which represent the final written crystallization of initially oral traditions, we should not lose sight of the continuous impact of basic stylistic maxims on processes of textual transmission.

Let me illustrate the continuity posited here by an example of a scribal technique which most probably was employed already in the biblical setting on different levels of the creative literary process, and persisted in the same duality of employments in post-biblical writings. In the scribal category of *finis* notations, biblical literature twice employs the technical term עד הנה. Both instances are found in the Book of Jeremiah. It seems likely that in one, Jer. 48:47b, the notation עד הנה משפט מואב which concludes the Oracle against Moab (48:1-47) was part of that unit before it became integrated into the Book of Jeremiah. We may surmise that it is the concluding remark of an author, although the definition of the term in this context would be rather difficult. In the second instance, Jer. 51:64b, the notation עד הנה דברי ירמיהו decidedly should be ascribed to an arranger or editor of the book who appended it here after a preceding expansion of the collection of oracles credited to Jeremiah. The *finis* notation at the end of ch. 51 quite definitely proves ch. 52 to be in the nature of an appendix.[47]

The very same term עד הנה again serves as a *finis* notation in the post-biblical collection of proverbs that are known under the name of Ben-Sira. There it introduces a colophon-like summary, appended to the end of ch. 51, which is closed by a doxology of the type found at the endings of each of the five collections which constitute the Book of Psalms: עד הנה דברי שמעון בן ישוע שנקרא בן סירא: חכמת שמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא. יהי שם יי מבורך מעתה ועד עולם. There can be little doubt that this notation stems from the pen of a copyist or an editor of Ben-Sira's proverbs, and not from the pen of the author, who in fact had closed his book by a preceding colophone that comes at the end of ch. 50:29 (42):[48] מוסר שכל ומושל אופנים לשמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא... Now, while the author's colophon is extant in all versions of the book, the line עד הנה דבר שמעון בן ישוע... in 51:30b (56b) which we take, with others,[49] to be a scribe's or an editor's notation, is found only in the Hebrew text and is missing from the Greek, the Syriac and the Latin.

The proposed analysis of the employment of the *finis* notation thus illustrates the persistence of a biblical literary technique which has its equivalent in pre-biblical Mesopotamian scribal tradition and in post-biblical literature. At the same time it exemplifies the diversified employment of one and the same technique on different stages of the literary process - by an author, an editor or arranger, and possibly a copyist - and thus proves the literary process to constitute a continuum which facilitates the transfer and the adaptability of underlying basic norms and concepts.

IV

The assumed continuity of literary maxims and techniques, employed by literati who were active in the creation, preservation and transmission of the literary product, viz. the books of the Bible, becomes practically a certainty when, as is done by the "three recensions" school, the process of text recension and preservation is taken to have begun as early as the fifth century B.C.E. It stands to reason that at that stage of the development of biblical literature, and also before it, authors and copyists were not clearly separable classes of literary practitioners. One rather may presume that a *unio personalis* was the rule: an author often served, when the need or the occasion arose, also as the editor, transmitter, scribe or copyist of his own works or of the work of others.[50] A comprehensive integrated concept of the diverse facets of this literary process would help us better to understand the biblical prophet's variegated literary pursuits which crystallize in the complexity of a prophet "book."[51] In the early post-exilic period, Ezra the Scribe represents this type of literate. Later in the Mishnaic period, the eminent Tanna R. Meir (second century C.E.), Akiba's most prominent disciple, was active both as a creative teacher and as a prodigious scribe.[52] Now, if the post-exilic fifth century and the Tannaitic סופר alike indeed was a man of many parts, a comprehensive literate who could be author, editor, transmitter, scribe or copyist when performing different aspects of his profession, it surely must be agreed that his literary techniques would not automatically change whenever he turned from one task to another. Quite to the contrary, it may be taken for granted that some basic canon of literary conventions

would be followed by him in all the variegated performances of his craft, obviously with some variation and adaptation of the basic rules and modes to the specific requirements. It is possible, or even probable, that such scribes were busy at Qumran with copying sanctified literature while creativity of a biblical or a quasi-biblical stance continued,[53] as can be deduced e.g. from the supernumerary compositions in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11,[54] the *Hodayoth*, and possibly the Temple Scroll, etc.[55]

We can go one step further. The contemporaneity of the diverse literary processes of authoring, editing and copying, with regard to different components of the biblical canon, makes it likely that similar literary traditions were followed, at least to some degree, also by men who specialized in one specific aspect of the literary process, if such specialisation had already begun to emerge. That is to say, the professional copyist in his work would follow, mechanically and instinctively or deliberately, literary prototypes and techniques by which the historiographer abided and which the historiographer emulated, let us say, from the narrative or the oratory biblical style. The phenomenon could be defined as "variations on common basic literary standards." This continuity of literary modes over the centuries, and across the diverse aspects of the literary process, appears to be reflected in the gamut of connotations that attach to such a basic term as כתב in biblical and in post-biblical rabbinic literature. The famous *Baraitha* in Baba Bathra 14b-15a defines by the term כתב Moses' authoring of the Torah (the Balaam Pericope and the Book of Job) - משה כתב ספרו ופרשת בלעם ואיוב; the compilation of the Book of Psalms by David with the help of (or transmitted by) ten sages of old - דוד כתב ספר תהלים עיי עשרה זקנים; as well as the transmission or the canonisation of Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes by (King) Hezekiah and his college - חזקיה וסיעתו כתבו ישעיה, משלי, שיר השירים וקהלת. Our modern differentiation between the diverse aspects of the literary process, for which we also would coin and employ different terms, simply did not concern the ancients, who entertained, so it seems, an all-inclusive comprehensive view of literature.

The same comprehensiveness seems to be reflected in the diverse manifestations of what I would define as "basic literary modes." The issue requires a full-fledged study. Here space permits only the presentation of some examples.

Returning for a moment to *parallelismus membrorum* which we mentioned in passing, it certainly is true that this basic device of biblical and other ancient Near Eastern writers is not to be taken as merely an ornamental figure,[56] but rather as "the main building principle"[57] of biblical poetry and to some extent also of biblical prose. One concurs with L. Alonso-Schoekel's statement that *parallelismus membrorum* "ist kein rein auesserliches Stilmittel, sondern eine Haltung und eine Denkweise."[58] If this is indeed the case, it would be shortsighted to assume that this fundamental principle was employed exclusively by "productive" writers and had no impact whatsoever on the "reproductive" arranger, scribe and copyist. *Parallelismus membrorum* and the underlying tendency to reiterate matters stated once in a somewhat different phrasing, together with some other cardinal literary modes, must be considered emanations of fundamental Semitic and Hebrew thought processes and literary concepts which permeate the entire range of biblical literary activity.

IV Stylistic and Textual Interchangeability of Words

Let me begin by discussing the phenomenon of "interchangeability" rooted in pragmatic synonymity[59] which often results from the break-up of word-pairs[60] that sometimes are in the nature of a *hendyadys*.

Ia. On the creative-literary level, interchangeability expresses itself in the employment of a word-pair in *parallelismus membrorum*, in a fixed (A-B) or an indiscriminate order (A-B or B-A)[61] where one component in practice can substitute for the other.

1. A pair in case is אדם - איש.[62] In Is. 2:9 we encounter the pair in the A-B sequence: וישפל איש || וישח אדם. In Is. 31:8 the sequence is B-A: ונפל אשור בחרב לא-איש || בחרב לא-אדם תאכלנו (cp. further: Job 9:12; 38:26; Prov. 30:2 etc.). Because of their synonymity, אדם and איש can serve alternately in one and the same idiom. Is. 21:9 has רכב איש whereas in 22:6 we encounter the parallel expression רכב אדם. Cp. further Is. 2:20 - ביום ההוא ישליך האדם את אלילי כספו [= 1QIs^a; G] with Is. 31:7 - ימאסון איש אלילי כספו [= 1QIs^a; G].

2. How do we now assess the character of the very same interchange when it occurs between two MT parallels such as

Ps. 105:14 לא הניח אדם לעשקם compared with
1 Chr. 16:21 לא הניח לאיש לעשקם.
Is this instance to be considered a *textual variant* or a *stylistic variation*?

b. The issue becomes further complicated when one comes to consider this very same interchange of אדם and איש when it occurs between the MT and a translation and between a biblical Hebrew text and its citation in extra-biblical literature.
In the rendition of

3. Lev. 27:28-29 אך כל חרם אשר יחרם איש ליהוה מכל אשר לו מאדם ובהמה ומשדה אחזתו ... כל חרם אשר יחרם מן האדם לא יפדה

the Aramaic Targums clearly follow the MT in differentiating consistently between גבר and אנש. In contradistinction, the LXX uniformly render both Hebrew words by ἄνθρωπος. This is in keeping with the apparent inconsistency of the LXX in rendering the two Hebrew terms[63] which are kept well apart by Aquila - איש = ἀνήρ, אדם = ἄνθρωπος with a limited number of exceptions.[64] In view of the foregoing examples, it can be surmised that this Greek custom does not reflect consistency but rather may indicate the continuity of the biblical synonymous employment of the pair of words as a literary device[65] which as a result could be used interchangeably.

c. This suggestion can be buttressed by the following observation. The biblical verses quoted above turn up as a telescoped quotation in the Damascus Fragments which read (*editio* C. Rabin):

4. CD ix, 1: ... כל אדם אשר יחרים אדם מאדם

Although there are some queries with regard to the exact interpretation of the passage,[66] it should not have gone unnoticed that the Qumran text in its threefold reiteration of the noun אדם[67] reflects the Greek threefold mention of ἄνθρωπος. It thus presents additional proof for the one-time existence of a text-tradition of Leviticus which differed from the MT in precisely the same interchange of אדם and איש which constitutes the core of the variation between two identical verses in parallel accounts (Ps. 105:14 and 1 Chr. 16:21) and in recurring imagery within one and the same biblical book in the Massoretic Version (Is. 21:9 and 22:6; 2:20 and 31:7).

IIa. Another example of the same kind is the following:

5. איש גבור serves as a *hendyadys*, e.g. in 1 Sam. 14:52 - וראה שאול כל איש גבור וכל בן חיל and in Ruth 2:1 - ולנעמי מודע לאישה איש גבור חיל, which can be broken up into its two components which then serve separately in a parallelistic structure, as in Jer. 14:9 - כאיש נדהם || כגבור לא יוכל להושיע.[68]

b. So far we certainly are in the realm of biblical stylistics. Is this yet so when the two terms in question are employed alternately in two parallel expressions but in two different books of the Bible:

6. Ps. 24:8 יהוה עזוז וגבור יהוה גבור מלחמה as against
Ex. 15:3 יהוה איש מלחמה, or should this be counted as a "textual variant"?

c. By established rules, we certainly must consider the same interchange as a textual variant when it occurs between two Versions:

7. In distinction from the above MT reading in Ex. 15:3: יהוה איש מלחמה, the Samaritan reads there יהוה גבור מלחמה.[69] It seems that this decidedly textual variation, irrespective of whether it is unpremeditated or intentional, illustrates the persistence of modes of style in the practices of text transmission. The tradent or the copyist of the Samaritan Version made use of the same controlled freedom in the transmission of the text *vis-à-vis* the MT as did the writer of Psalm 24 in respect to Ex. 15, or vice versa. Should these two instances, indeed can they, be dealt with in complete separation from each other, one under the discipline of stylistics and the other under textual criticism?

III. שים and נתן are a pair of synonymous verbs which are employed interchangeably

a. on the creative-stylistic level in parallel members of one and the same sentence, in either the A-B or the B-A order, as e.g. in the following instances to which many more could be added:

8. Gen. 27:37 הן גביר שמתיו לך || ואת כל אחיו נתתי לו לעבדים
Josh. 7:19 שים נא כבוד ליהוה אלהי ישראל || ותן לו תודה
Ez. 4:2 ונתת עליה מחנות || ושים עליה כרים סביב

Hos. 11:8 איך אתנך כאדמה || אשימך כצבאים

b. The two verbs can be alternately employed in the same context, as e.g. in the matter of appointing a king. The basic passage:

9. Deut. 17:14-15 אשימה עלי מלך ... שום תשים עליך מלך ... מקרב אחיך תשים עליך מלך לא תוכל לתת עליך איש נכרי

is reflected in the wording of 1 Sam. 8:5-6 which deals with the negotiations between Samuel and the people that preceded the election of Saul. There, as well as in 1 Sam. 9:23-24 שים and נתן are consistently employed as alternatives (cp. further Hos. 13:10-11).[70]

c. Again, שים and נתן can serve alternately in a given idiom.

10. Whereas in Lev. 26:6; Num. 25:12; Hag. 2:9 and 1 Chr. 22:9 the notion of "peace" is expressed by נתן שלום, Num. 6:26 has the phrase: וישם לך שלום..

11. The opposite notion of "destruction and waste" can be indicated either by אשימך שממה (Jer. 6:8) or alternately by ואתנך לחרבה ולחרפה (Ez. 5:14). A similar interchange obtains between Mal. 1:3: ואת עשו שנאתי ואשים את הריו שממה and Ez. 35:1-9 where the combination נתן שממה[71] is recurrently used to describe the future fate of Edom (vv. 3, 7, 9), but where also שים turns up in a similar phrase עריך חרבה אשים (v. 4).[72]

d. While all the above instances come under the heading of stylistic interchanges, the very same verb-couple constitutes the variant element in two *variae lectionis* between the MT and the Samaritan Version.

12. Ex. 40:22 MT reads: ויתן את השלחן, the Samaritan: וישם את השלחן.

13. In Lev. 8:9 an inverted situation obtains: MT has twice וישם את המצנפת whereas Sam. in both instances reads ויתן.

We surely must ask ourselves whether the Sam. deviation from the MT is intrinsically different from the interchange of the two verbs in question in synonymous expressions in the MT, such as discussed above, or in parallel members of a biblical verse. Unless definite criteria can be established for a methodological differentiation between the above identical phenomena, the Sam. variants *vis-à-vis* the MT must be viewed as emanations of the same literary-stylistic modes and processes which underlie the

internal interchangeability of the two verbs. In editing the biblical text of Leviticus, one would record the Sam. readings for practical purposes as variants in the apparatus. But this appositioning of the one reading in the main text and the other in the apparatus in no way can reflect on their relative merits, nor does it establish the variation to be of a "textual" (in distinction from being of a "stylistic") nature.

e. The complexity of the issue increases when translational Versions are brought into the picture.

14. The Greek verb-pair τιθήναι and διδόναι exhibits the same, or at least a similar, interchangeability as the Hebrew pair נתן and שים.[73] Both Greek verbs, in complete parallelism with the two Hebrew equivalents, express e.g. the notion of appointing someone to office. It therefore cannot cause any surprise that in the LXX either one of the Hebrew pair can be rendered by either one of the Greek pair. The usual rendition of נתן would be διδόναι[74] whereas שים is preponderantly rendered by τιθήναι.[75] However, in Jer. 1:5 MT: נביא לגוים נתתיך is translated in LXX: τέθεικά δε (cp. v. 10).[76] The same situation obtains in v. 18, MT: נתתיך, LXX: τέθεικά δε and in v. 15, MT ונתנן, LXX: καὶ θήσουσιν. In Jer. 9:10(11) the LXX renders the double employment of נתן in MT (ונתתי ... אתן) once by δώσω and once by θήσομαι, possibly to avoid repetition. Josephus, however, preserved also in the first instance a form of τιθήναι: καὶ θήσω, and thus may reflect a tradition which rendered the Hebrew root נתן twice by τιθήναι, unless he avoided repetition by rendering like Aq. the second mention - δώσω.

f. A conflux of the literary and the textual interchangeability of שים and נתן can be observed in the Book of Ezekiel with respect to the idiom .. שים or ב נתן פנים, in the meaning of 'turn accusingly or threateningly towards someone or something.'

15. In 6:2; 13:17; 21:2 (G 20:46); 21:7 (G 21:2); 25:2; 28:21; 29:2; 38:2 the LXX render the expression by στηρίζω which translates שים/שום in Jer. 17:5; 21:10; 24:6; Am. 9:4.

16. The same stem is employed twice to render נתן, in

Ez 14:8 MT: ונתתי פני באיש ההוא
LXX: στηριῶ

15:7 MT: ונתתי את פני בהם ... משרפי אש פני בהם
LXX 'εν τῷ στηρίξαι στηριῶ[77]

g. while these cases can be categorized as "textual interchanges," the pragmatic synonymity of the word-pair נתן/שים quite legitimately became a fructifying element in biblical and subsequently in post-biblical midrashic expostulation. In the description of Israel's iniquities in ch. 14, the two verbs alternate in a recurring phrase. Once the reading is

17. Ez. 14:3 MT: ומכשול עונם נתנו נכח פניהם
LXX: ἔθηκαν , while in
14:4,7 MT: ומכשול עונו ישים נכח פניו
LXX: τάξῃ the variation with שים is introduced. At the culmination of the passage, when Judah is threatened with retribution, measure for measure, the two verbs are skilfully combined in midrash-fashion imagery:

18. 14:8 MT: והשמתיהו לאות ולמשלים II ונתתי פני באיש ההוא
LXX: θήσομαι στηριῶ

It is probable that the unusual *hiph.* of שים here was chosen on purpose. It suggests a possible derivation of the form והשמתיהו from the root שמם[78] in evoking an association with

15:8 MT: ונתתי את הארץ שממה
LXX: καὶ δώσω τὴν γῆν εἰς ἀρανισμόν

and obviously was thus understood by the Greek translator of 14:8: θήσομαι αὐτὸν εἰς ἔρημον καὶ εἰς ἀρανισμόν.[79]

It is of interest to note that the midrashic utilization of the pragmatic synonymity of נתן-שים was carried over into post-biblical literature. The Qumran Pesher of Habakkuk (1QHab^{p} v. 1 ff.) quotes verbatim:

19. Hab 1:12MT: יהוה למשפט שמתו, but then goes on to interpret the phrase: וביד בחירו יתן אל את משפט כול הגוים. Although the choice of יתן in this instance may be a mere free variation, in view of the foregoing discussion, it is better taken to constitute a post-biblical reflex of a biblical stylistic-textual tradition.

V Stylistic and Textual Conflation

Another phenomenon which can be observed on diverse levels of the biblical literary tradition is that of "doubling" or "conflation." Again, I intend to indicate here only the main lines of approach which I think should be followed in a full-fledged investigation of the issue. I shall do so by choosing an inverted order of presentation, beginning with "doubling" on the textual level, and tracing from there the impact of the same phenomenon on the "stylistic" levels.

IVa. The issue of "double readings" resulting from textual conflation is well known and so widespread that it requires little if any illustration. Conflation can be observed in a wide variety of configurations in the Hebrew Versions of the Bible - MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, Qumran biblical manuscripts - as well as in the ancient translations. In a previous discussion of this phenomenon, I proposed to explain the motivation of the scribe or the translator to record more than one reading in a given context as revealing his reverence for transmitted readings between which he could not choose, with the aid of the criteria at his disposal.[80] Textual conflation thus is not merely a technical corollary of multiple text transmission, but at the same time also points to an important aspect of the ancient literati's attitude towards the biblical text.[81] The awe for the hallowed material and a basic conservatism balanced the concomitant tendency to modulate and diversify, and thus helped in bringing about a progressive stabilization of the Bible text. The inclination to preserve diverging traditions, which should not be identified with a predisposition towards "expansion," becomes especially strong in later strata of the textual evidence, such as e.g. the Lucianic revision of the LXX. However, it is by no means restricted to them. "Doublets" turn up also in the main LXX tradition on which the Lucianic revision is based. Often such doublets result from the conflation of diverging Hebrew readings which were preserved alternately in two parallel accounts in the MT. Thus the

20. LXX of 2 Sam. 7:13 αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου combines the MT הוא יבנה בית לשמי with the variant in the parallel 1 Chr. 17:12 - הוא יבנה לי בית. There the Greek follows the Hebrew verbally.[82]

b. An analogous situation obtains in the following instance, except that

here the Greek doublet appears in the Chronicles reading.

21. 1 Chr. 19:3 οὐχ ὅπως ἐξεραυνήσωσιν τὴν πόλιν τοῦς κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν γῆν

2 Sam. 10:3 ἀλλ οὐχι ὅπως ἐρευνήσωσιν τὴν πόλιν καὶ κατασκοπήσωσιν αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦ κατασκεφασθου αὐτήν

The LXX of Chr. exhibits a combination of the parallel readings in the MT which deviate from each other in the alternate employment of עיר and ארץ which in the context were considered to be of pragmatic equivalence:

1 Chr. 19:3 בעבור לחקר ולהפך ולרגל הארץ באו

2 Sam. 10:3 בעבור לחקר את[84] העיר ולרגלה ולהפכה באו[85]

It is of interest to note that within the 2 Sam. tradition the said interchange of עיר and ארץ was preserved in T^J.[86] The main manuscript evidence renders העיר somewhat surprisingly ית ארעא, i.e. exhibits, as it were, the Chronicles variant. However, some manuscripts (y w)[87] and printed editions which represent the Tiberian tradition (T), adjusted the translation to the MT by reading: ית קרתא.

The above MT variants, and their "conflation" in the LXX of Chronicles, indicate, as said, that עיר and ארץ were considered by the Hebrew biblical writers to be a pair of pragmatically synonymous nouns which therefore could be substituted for each other under controlled circumstances. Again, as already stated, we have no reason to assume that this "freedom of variation," in this as in other such cases, was restricted to the Hebrew authors of Samuel and Chronicles. To the contrary, we may expect that identical or similar interchanges affected the text tradition of the above vocables also in different settings. This indeed is the case. It is found, at least three times in the Book of Jeremiah:

22α. Jer. 4:29 MT: מקול פרש ורמה קשת ברחת כל העיר

LXX: χώρα

Here, V, S and Sperber's main text of T^J follow the MT, with T^J ms. g reading ארעא. Jerome adduces in his commentary[88] both readings: *(civitas sive) regio*. Again,

β. Jer. 29:7 MT: ודרשו את שלום העיר

LXX: τῆς γῆς

All other ancient Versions reflect the MT in the above and in also the

following instance:

γ. Jer. 40:5 MT: בערי יהודה
LXX: ἐη γῇ Ιουδα[89]

Commentators tend to prefer in these passages the Greek reading over the Hebrew (at least with regard to the first two cases), and justify their decision by considerations of contents and meaning.[90] One tends to explain the "inferior" MT reading in 4:29 as a possible *lapsus calami* engendered by העיר in the second half of the verse.[91] Volz (*op.cit.*, p. 31) even posits that an assumed abbreviation (ע)ור was misunderstood as = עיר ער. This reconstruction and the professed preference for the Greek readings are unwarranted in the light of the recognition of עיר and ארץ as a pair of interchangeable synonyms, which also are employed parallelistically, as e.g. in Is. 1:7$^{a\alpha}$ II 7$^{a\beta}$; Lev. 26:33$^{b\alpha}$ II 33$^{b\beta}$; 31 II 32 *et al.*

c. In other instances, the doubling gives evidence to Vokabel-Varianten[92] in the Greek tradition which a copyist saw fit to combine, as e.g. in:

23. Am. 6:9-10 MT: והיה אם יותרו עשרה אנשים בבית אחד ומתו ונשאו דודו ומסרפו
LXX: καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν ὑπολεφθῶσιν δέκα ἄνδρες ἐν οἰκία μιᾷ ... και ὑπολειφθήσουνται οἱ καταλοιπος καὶ λήμφονται οἱ οἰκεῖοι αὐτῶν...

In some cases, the double translation has preserved for us two different interpretations of the Hebrew text which may go back to divergent Hebrew *Vorlagen*, or else originated in the translation setting. They sometimes reveal a "midrashic" impact. The crucial term ואמיץ in Am. 2:16 MT: ואמיץ לבו בגבורים is derived in the tradition either from אמץ or, by way of inversion, from מצא. Both derivations were conflated in some Greek witnesses, among them a third century papyrus fragment, to read: ὁ κραταίος οὐ μὴ εὑρήσαι. The interchange of אמץ and מצא which generated this Greek doublet in no way is restricted to the Greek version or to the translations alone. It emerged also in the synoptic study of other witnesses to the Bible text, e.g., Deut. 32:10 MT: בארץ מדבר[93] ימצאהו Sam: יאמצהו.

d. A comparable case of a Hebrew *Vokabel-Variante* appears to underlie the LXX doublet in:

24. 2 Sam. 20:19: ἐι ἐξέλιπον ἃ ἔθεντο οἱ πίστοι τοῦ Ισραήλ ... ἔγω εἰμι εἰρηνικά τῶν στηριγμάτων Ισραήλ where the MT reads: אנכי שלמי אמני ישראל. Whereas εἰρηνικά renders שלמי of the MT (=T^{J}: שלמין), ἃ ἔθεντο[94] clearly reflects a no longer extant Hebrew reading שמו. Barthélemy considers ἔθεντο to be "la forme ancienne," while "la second phrase (i.e., εἰρηνικά) parte la signature du recenseur palestinen" of the *kaige* group.[95]

The Greek doublet appears to point to the interchangeability of the two Hebrew roots שלם and שים. This supposition is buttressed by the fact that they also constitute the measure of variation between 1 Sam. 2:20

25. MT: ישם יהוה לך זרע מן האשה הזאת and
LXX: ἀποτίσαι σου κύριος which now has turned up

in 4QSam^{a}:

There can be little doubt that the Greek version here reflects the Qumran reading. ἀποτίνειν renders some thirty times forms of שלם, whereas the case under review is the only instance where it would reflect שים.[97]

Again, it would seem that the "textual variability" of שלם and שים which generated the "double reading" in the LXX to 2 Sam. 20:19 emanated from their "stylistic variability." This may be seen from the following example.

26. There are four occurrences in biblical literature of the phrase: שלם רעה תחת טובה (Gen. 44:4; Jer. 18:20; Ps. 38:21; Prov. 35:12) and three additional partial mentions of it (1 Sam. 24:20; 2 Sam. 3:39; Prov. 13:21). As against these we find once the reading Ps. 109:5 - וישימו עלי (רעה תחת טובה) which is correctly rendered by LXX: και ἔθεντο κατ' ἐμοῦ and by T: ושוון עלי. In view of the above parallel examples, there is no need to emend the MT to read simply וישלמו.[98] Neither is there scope for M. Dahood's proposition to retain וישימו, but to link with it the closing words of the preceding verse: ואני תפלתי, and to translate "My prayer they set down to my debit."[99] The interchangeability of שים and שלם on the "textual" level has led us to the recognition of the same interchangeability on the "stylistic-formative" level which is reflected in the singular wording שים רעה in Ps. 109:5 instead of the usual phrase שלם רעה, and makes any emendation unwarranted.

27. The recognition of the stylistic interchangeability which inheres in the verb-pair שים - שלם on the one hand, and in the pair שים - נתן on the other hand, leads to the conclusion that an interchange of שלם - נתן/שים underlies also the variation between the MT and the LXX in the following instance:

Is. 57:18 MT: ואשלם נחמים לו ולאבליו (= 1QIs^{a}, T^{J}, S)
LXX: καὶ ἔδυκα αὐτῷ (= אתן or אשים).[100]

The contention that what on the surface appear to be inner-Greek cases of "textual conflation" sometimes are the reflex of a Hebrew stylistic phenomenon is further borne out by the following example:

28. 1 Sam. 25:12 MT: ויגידו לו ככל הדברים האלה is rendered verbally in LXX: κατὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα

However, in v.9 which constitutes the narrative basis of this reference, the MT: וידברו אל נבל ככל הדברים האלה is represented twice in the LXX: καὶ λαλοῦσιν τοὺς λόγους τούτους ... κατὰ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα
It may be assumed that the LXX mirrors two alternative renditions of ככל הדברים האלה or, what is more likely, two original parallel Hebrew wordings: ככל הדברים האלה and את הדברים האלה.

e. The interchangeability of these expressions, despite the slight difference in their connotations, can be easily proved from an inner-Hebrew comparative analysis of parallel passages:

29. Deut. 32:46 לשמר לעשות את כל דברי התורה הזאת
Josh. 1:7 לשמר לעשות ככל התורה אשר צוך משה

30. Jer. 27:12 ואל צדקיהו דברתי ככל הדברים האלה
34:6 וידבר .. אל צדקיהו .. את כל הדברים האלה

31. The two expresions interchange generally in the Book of Jeremiah. Next to את כל דברים האלה (16:10; 19:2 *et al.*), also ככל הדבר(ים) האלה is used (27:12; 42:5 *et al.*).[101]

A similar interchange obtains between the parallel or synonymous pair (acc. pronoun +) אשר צוה (ככל) את כל and other equivalents, such as עשה, אמר etc.

32. Jer. 1:7 MT: ו)את כל אשר אצוך, LXX: καὶ κατὰ πάντα 35(42):10; 36(43):8; 50(27):21 - (acc. pronoun +) MT: ככל אשר צוה, LXX: κατὰ πάντα.[102]

f. Of the same type is the linguistically legitimate employment of partitive (ן)מ, in the sense of *e numero*,[103] for the all-inclusive direct accus. prefaced by את. Let us illustrate this feature by again adducing at first what appears to be a "double reading," this time in the MT.

33. Num. 13:33 MT: ושם ראינו את הנפלים בני ענק מן הנפלים (= Sam.; Trgs.)
LXX: [om.] καὶ ἐκεῖ ἑωράκαμεν τοῦς γύγαντας

Whether or not one accepts the likely definition of the second Hebrew clause as a gloss,[104] it stands to reason that prior to the identification of the בני ענק, who are mentioned exclusively in Conquest traditions (cp. Num. 13:22, 28; Deut. 1:28; 2:10, 11; 9:2; Josh. 11:22; 14:12; 15:13, 14; 21:11; Judg. 1:20), with the נפלים who turn up only in the antediluvian tradition of Gen. 6:4, the verse Num. 13:33 had been extant in two slightly divergent readings. One employed the direct object clause את הנפלים בני ענק in identifying the נפלים as *benē ʿanaq*, whereas the partitive clause בני ענק מן הנפלים presented the *benē ʿanaq* as being part of the נפלים. What interests us here, though, is not the exegetical issue but rather the textual conflation of two parallel readings in the MT.

g. The very same "textual-stylistic" difference constitutes three or four times the core of variation between the MT and the Sam., with the Greek and other verstions aligning themselves here with the one, there with the other:

34: Ex. 18:12 MT: ויבא אהרן וכל זקני ישראל (= LXX: Targs.)
Sam: ויבא אהרן ומזקני ישראל

35. Ex. 20:24(21)
MT: וזבחת עליו את עלתיך ואת שלמיך את צאנך ואת בקרך (= LXX, TFr.)[105]
Sam: וזבחת עליו את עלתיך ואת שלמיך מצאנך ומבקרך (= T^{Sam},T^{O},T^{J})[106]

and possibly

36. Num. 23:10 MT: ומספר את רבע ישראל (= LXX, T^{Sam})
Sam: ומי ספר מרבעת ישראל[107] (= T^{O}, T^{J} ?)

One last example -

37. Lev. 11:28 MT: והנשא את נבלתם (cp. v.40; 15:10)
Sam: והנשא מנבלתם (= LXX, MT 11:25).

The interchange of והנשא את נבלתם (Lev. 11:28) with מנבלתם (*ib.* v.25) in the MT proves that we are concerned with a phenomenon of stylistic synonymity which reverberates in variant readings in diverse witnesses to the biblical text.

h. 38. In Prov. 15:14 MT: לב נבון יבקש דעת ופני כסילים ירעה אולת, the *qerē* reading ופי instead of the *kethīb* ופני could be explained to have arisen from a simple scribal error, or from contamination by the adjacent mention of פנים in v.13a, or else from the approximation of לב II פני/פי to the parallel couple לב II שפתים in 15:7. Because of these considerations, and because of the fact that the LXX - στόμα, S and T - ופומהון give substance to the *qerē* reading, most commentators prefer it over the *kethīb*.[108] This preference indeed may be justified. However, in view of the recurrence of the very same interchange in biblical[109] and post-biblical writings, the explanation of the variance between the *kethīb* on the one hand and the *qerē* and the Versions on the other as resulting from mere scribal processes, graphic error or contamination does not seem to be satisfactory. There are two instances of the same variation between פי and פני in the textual tradition of Ben-Sira:[110]

39. B-S 1:29 (26): אל תתלהלה בפני אדם ובשמחתיך השמר (= S, Syh, L)
G: ἐν στόμασιν[111]

40. 8:11 (15): אל תזרח מפני לץ להושיבת כאורב לפניך (= S: לפני)
G: τῷ στόματί σου[112] (= L: oritu)[113]

A similar relationship obtains between the MT and the main Greek tradition in

41. Neh. 2:13 MT: ואל פני עין תנין
LXX: καὶ πρὸς στόμα πηγῆς τῶν συκῶν

It is further possible that the Greek renditions of the two alternative readings were combined in

42. Jer. 4:1 MT: ואם תסיר שקוציך מפני ולא תנוד
LXX: ἔαν περίελῃ τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου μου εὐλαβηθῇ

Because of the similar terminology, the translator presumably associated the Jeremiah passage with

Zech. 9:7 MT: והסירתי דמיו מפניו ושקוציו מבין שניו
LXX: καὶ ἐξαρῶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν ἐκ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτῶν ἐκ μέσου ὀφύτων αὐτῶν.[114]

i. What is of importance in the present context is that the interchangeability of פנים/פני and פה/פי has left some traces also within the Hebrew textual tradition, and possibly is rooted in a stylistic convention. A phrase based on פה in

43. Num. 12:8 MT לא כן עבדי משה ... פה אל פה אדבר בו (= Vss)

turns up with a פנים variation in

Ex. 33:11 MT: ודבר ה' אל משה פנים אל פנים (= Vss)

and is reflected also in

Deut. 34:10 MT: ולא קם נביא עוד בישראל כמשה אשר ידעו ה' פנים אל פנים (= Vss)

which at the same time appears to constitute a reminiscence of

Num. 12:6 MT: אם יהיה נביאכם יהוה במראה אליו אתודע בחלום אדבר בו (= Vss).

Similarly, the reading of

44. Ps. 80:17 MT: מגערת פניך יאבדו (= Vss) is to be retained[115] as a variation of the more usual image which appears to connect the concept of God's fury with an auditive impression emanating from His mouth. Cp. e.g. Ps. 104:7: "At your roar - געדתך - they fled, at the sound of your thundering they took flight"; Ps. 18:16 (= 2 Sam. 22:16): "At your roar - גערתך - Yahweh, at the blast from your nostrils" etc. (cp. further Is. 51:20). In Prov. 13:1, 8 and Eccl. 7:5 גער is connected with שמע (cp. also Gen. 37:10; Jer. 29:27; Zech. 3:2).[116]

45. Viewed in the light of the foregoing discussion, also the reading Num. 33:8 MT: ויסעו מפני החירת[117] should be judged as a variation on פי החירת that occurs in the preceding verse (Num. 33:7,[118] cp. Ex. 14:9), and which probably is the more correct transliteration of an Egyptian place name.[119] If this argument can be maintained, one suspects that the MT contained a textual or stylistic doublet in

46. Ex. 14:2 - ויחנו לפני פי החירת. It is probable that the reading פני החירת instead of פי החירת resulted from a substitution, considered quite

legitimate, of one member of this word-pair for the other, and that this interchange was facilitated by the Hebrew place name פני(ו)אל[120] which like פי החירת is constructed of the name of a deity and the prefixed noun פני which here replaces the Egyptian פי whose Hebrew translation would be בית.[121]

j. Upon analysis it thus becomes apparent that the proclivity to conflate does not emerge late, as it were, in the frame of text transmission, but rather has deep roots in earlier stages of biblical literature. It would be considered another basic literary mode. This mode expresses itself on the "creative" level, e.g. in the intentional retention of synonymous alternate idioms in a given unit, irrespective of its compass. Here are some illustrations of this feature:

47. 1 Sam. 18:12 tells us that Saul feared David because God was with him: וירא שאול מלפני דוד כי היה יהוה עמו. Verse 15 in the same chapter repeats the statement, but gives as the reason for Saul's fear the fact that David succeeded in whatever he did: וירא שאול אשר הוא משכיל מאד.

48. A similar case is Deut. 31:24: ויהי ככלות משה לכתב את דברי התורה הזאת על ספר עד תמם. The verse poignantly picks up the *finis* formula עד תמם of v.30, and the word ויכל of v.1 preserved in the Qumran text tradition and mirrored in the Greek καὶ συνέτελεσεν, but probably mistakenly read וילך in MT: וילך משה וידבר את הדברים האלה אל כל ישראל.

49. In some instances this type of stylistic conflation comes at the end of a more comprehensive unit. In the Sinai traditions, Israel's readiness to accept God's commandments is expressed in Ex. 19:8 by their saying: Whatever God said we will *do* - כל אשר דבר יהוה נעשה. The same idea underlies the request that Moses mediate between them and God, with the undertaking that they will "listen," i.e., "obey" and "do" what God commands, 20:19: ויאמרו אל משה דבר אתה עמנו ונשמעה. The two decisive expressions נעשה and נשמעה were combined in the culminating statement in 24:7: ויאמרו כל אשר דבר יהוה נעשה ונשמע.[122] This combination on its part is reflected in an inverted order of its components in Deut. 4:24:[123] ואתה תדבר אלינו את כל אשר ידבר יהוה אלהינו אליך ושמענו ועשינו.

k. At this stage, we enter the realm of "higher criticism," if we follow

established practice and terminology, since the above examples seem to derive from different sources. But is this really the case? Does this variation in Deuteronomy compared with the three Exodus passages indeed reflect a different source? Could we not simply be concerned with another instance of stylistic conflation with added inversion?

How do we judge the following case against the background of the foregoing discussion?

50. MT of Jer. 44:3 exhibits what at first glance may be taken as a double reading:[124] מפני רעתם אשר עשו להכעסני ללכת לקטר לעבד לאלהים אחרים. Upon further investigation one finds that one of the two expressions - לקטר לאלהים אחרים - is employed in the latter part of the book, in that very chapter, not less than nine times (vv.5,8,15,17,18,19,21,23,25), and turns up only twice in the earlier part (1:16; 19:4). Against this, the other - לעבד אלהים אחרים - is used exclusively in the first part of the book, up to chapter 35 (8:2; 11:10; 13:10; 16:11, 13; 22:9; 25:6; 35:15), and never occurs after 44:3. The conflation in 44:3 thus is recognized as another "transition doublet," most probably of the stylistic variety, and therefore should be retained. A problem, though, arises with the collation of the Greek evidence. The overwhelming Old Greek tradition has θυμῖαν, i.e. לקטר only. Exceptions are the Hexapla (with asterisk) and one minuscule (538) which exhibits Lucianic influence which add και λατρεύειν. Can the shorter LXX reading here be judged "pristine" and superior to the MT reading which on the surface appears to contain a textual conflation? Or should we not rather accept the stylistic vindication of the apparent "textual doublet," and explain the shorter Greek reading to have resulted from a wrongly applied reductionist tendency?[125]

l. Another clear case of retention of two alternate expressions and the concomitant emergence of a stylistic transition doublet can be observed in the Book of Jeremiah.

51. In the first chapter (1:8, 19) we encounter twice the expression אתך אני להצילך which the LXX render ἐξαιρεῖσθαί σε. The same expression turns up with a variation in Jer. 30:11[126] אתך אני להושיעך. The main Greek tradition here has no rendition at all of the Hebrew text. But the Hexapla

and Theodotion have retained a translation in which להושיעך is rendered by σῴζειν. The same holds true for the preceding verse. The third mention of the same phrase comes exactly in the middle between the above instances, and here the MT exhibits a transition doublet: Jer. 15:20 אתך אני להושיעך ולהצילך, accurately rendered in T^J למפרקך ולשיזבותך, whereas the Greek has only one verb: τοῦ σῴζειν. In the next verse ... והצלתיך ופדיתיך is consistently translated in T^J ואפרקנך ... ואשיזבינך, but the LXX again have only one verb - ἐξαιρεῖσθαί δε - which patently is meant to render והצלתיך.

One could surmise that the MT represents here a conflate expanded text, and could define the Greek as "pristine." However, taking into account other cases of "transition doublets," we are inclined to give preference to the fuller MT which exhibits a good biblical stylistic practice, and to regard the shorter Greek version as resulting from a pedantic mistaken predilection for brevity.

52. A similar situation obtains in the Book of Ezekiel. Here a singular reference in the first part of the book, Ez. 10:19 MT: שער בית יהוה הקדמוני, rendered in the main Greek tradition ἀπέναντι, is set off by the recurring reference in the latter part, 44:1 MT: שער ממקדש החיצון הפונה קדים (cp. 46:1, 12; 47:1, 3) which the Greek translates consistently κατ' ἀνατολάς.[127] In one intervening instance, again a "transition doublet" occurs: 11:1 MT: שער בית יהוה הקדמוני הפונה קדימה which the Greek faithfully renders: τὴν κατέναντιτὴν βλέπουσαν κατ' ἀνατολάς.[128]

53. A less distinct case of a structural transition doublet may be found in Jer. 15:11 MT: אם לוא הפגעתי בך בעת רעה ובעת צרה. Interestingly enough, here the Versions reflect the apparent conflate Hebrew text,[129] with T^J exhibiting a paraphrastic rendition.[130] The first of the two crucial idioms - עת רעה - is employed four more times in the book, 2:27,[131] 28; 11:12, 14, all of which precede the mention in the above transition doublet. The second - עת צרה - turns up twice more. Once, as could have been expected in view of the previous examples, subsequent to the doublet, in 30:4. However, the other occurs in 14:8, i.e., before the doublet, thus marring the expected symmetry of distribution. It nevertheless remains evident that the author of 15:11 (and one does not seem to doubt the

ascription of the verse to Jeremiah) purposefully retained here a combination of expressions which he uses elsewhere alternately.[132] The same alternation may be observed, e.g., in Psalm 37. In describing the righteous' hope for delivery in times of stress, the poet once defines these as עת רעה (v.19), and once as עת צרה (v.39).

m. In the following instance of idioms-conflation in the book of Jeremiah, the "textual" and the "stylistic" aspects are most manifestly intertwined and constitute two interrelated emanations of one basic literary phenomenon.

Throughout the book, the two alternate expressions בעת ההיא (3:17; 4:11; 8:6; 31:1) and בימים ההם(ה) (3:16, 18; 5:18; 31:19; 33:16) are employed without any discernible pattern of distribution. In all cases, T^J faithfully renders the Hebrew in accord with the MT: בעת - בעדנא ההוא ההיא and בימים ההם - ביומיא האינון. LXX render the first expression consistently ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ,[133] and the second ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις.

In these instances, the MT exhibits a conflation of the two expressions which is mirrored in T^J and in the LXX:

54. Jer. 50:4 MT: בימים ההם ובעת ההיא[134]
T^J: ביומיא האינון ובעדנא ההוא
(27:4, 20) LXX: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ

In the third - 33:15[135] - no LXX rendition is extant,[136] but the Hexapla (with asterisk), Theod. and Luc, as could be expected, have preserved the above faithful Greek translation of the Hebrew.

Interestingly enough, these doublets occur as the last mentions of the expressions under review in the book (33:15; 50:4, 20) with the one exception of בימים ההם in 33:16. We cannot be far off in assuming that they were meant to tie together the alternate idioms in what amounts to a "summary-doublet."

In addition to these, the LXX alone exhibit one further such doublet, exactly at the opposite end, i.e., at the beginning of the book preceded in 3:16 by one single mention of ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις

55. 3:17 MT: בעת ההיא
T^J: בעדנא ההוא
LXX: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ ἐν καιρῷ εκείνῳ[137]

In view of this situation, the unavoidable conclusion presents itself that the stylistic combinatory process exhibited in the MT and Versions in Jer. 33:15 (with the exception of LXX); 50:4, 20 transcended to the Greek translational level in 3:17. The *obelos* in the Hexapla relative to the second clause makes it unlikely that the Old Greek is based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the MT which already contained the doublet. Any discussion of the textual problem involved certainly must be informed by its stylistic background.

n. In some other instances, "conflation" turns up in a "summary doublet":

56. Jos. 9:27: ויתנם יהושע ביום ההוא חטבי עצים ושאבי מים לעדה ולמזבח יהוה welds together significant alternate terms of the two parallel narrative strands in the chapter. לעדה echoes v.21 and the "tribal leaders" variant of the event reported: ויאמרו אליהם הנשיאים יהיו ויהיו חטבי עצים ושאבי מים לכל העדה. As against this, למזבח יהוה reflects the "Joshua" variant and the crucial verses 22-23 in which Joshua appoints the Gibeonites to become: חטבי עצים ושאבי מים לבית יהוה.

We surely must ask ourselves to what degree the conflation of the expression עדה with בית יהוה or מזבח is, methodologically speaking, different from the conflation of salient expressions which characterize different versions of one and the same motif in biblical literature, as, e.g.,

57. Deut. 32:10 tells of God's finding Israel in the desert: ימצאהו בארץ מדבר.[138] Ps. 80:9, in distinction, considers the Exodus to have been the initial encounter of God and His people. The redemptive event is likened to the transplantation of the vine Israel from Egypt to the fertile grounds of Canaan,[139] גפן ממצרים תסיע. Is it too farfetched to assume that Hosea combined these two separate motifs by saying that God *found* Israel like *grapes* in the desert: כענבים במדבר מצאתי ישראל (Hos. 9:10)?

c. While in the previous instances some vestige of the possibility that the doublets under review resulted from "textual" conflation yet remains, the following example patently belongs to the realm of biblical stylistics pure and proper. It is an instance of combination of literary images which culminates in a duplex or mixed metaphor. Both constitutive elements express figuratively protection from danger. One likens it to sheltering in the shade of a tree.

58. Jud. 9:15 ויאמר האטד אל העצים ... באו חסו בצלי

and, transferred to the human scene:

Is. 30:2-3 לעוז במעוז פרעה ולחסות בצל מצרים (לכלימה);

the other to seeking safety under the wings of a bird:

Ps. 91:4 באברתו יסך לך II ותחת כנפיו תחסה

again transferred to a different scene:

Ruth 2:12 מעם יהוה אלהי ישראל אשר באת לחסות תחת כנפיו.

In this second image, the notion of shadow obviously is immaterial. Nevertheless, we twice find the two expressions stylistically combined in:

59. Ps. 36:8 ובני אדם בצל כנפיך יחסיון

57:2 ובצל כנפיך אחסה,

with a further variation in:

60. 17:8 בצל כנפיך חסתירני[140]

There can be no doubt whatsoever that here we are concerned with a literary-creative phenomenon which must be ascribed to the authors of the above psalms and not to an editor or a copyist.

The last examples analyzed lead us back to the ones with which we began our discussion in this section. Again, a basic maxim of biblical literature, the interchangeability of pragmatically synonymous words and expressions from which sometimes resulted a combining of the alternate elements was found to be operative in diverse developmental strata of biblical writings. On the "textual" level it fathered "double readings" in practically all witnesses to the Bible text. On the "stylistic" level it engendered "literary conflation," "transition doublets,"[141] "summary doublets" and "mixed" or "amalgamated metaphors." Once the inherent similarity which underlies all these emanations of one fundamental phenomenon is recognized, extreme caution is required when one comes to judge in specific instances whether one is confronted with a late copyist's "textual conflation" or with an author's primary "stylistic-structural amalgam." The decisions whether in a given case a "fuller" reading points to an underlying "expansionist" tendency, and whether the "shorter" variant represents a "pristine" tradition, must be informed by a concomitant literary analysis of the "stylistic" motivations that may underlie the "textual" facts.

VI Stylistic Metathesis and Textual Inversion

One other basic mode of biblical writing in the widest sense of the word appears to be the principle of "inversion." Its impact is of special weight and importance within the setting of "repetition" for which biblical writers and editors exhibit a distinct propensity.[142] This concerns not only repetition of single words,[143] often erroneously deleted by the ancient translators, and for that matter also by modern scholars,[144] but also the reiteration of whole phrases, either in a direct sequence or as "distant parallels."[145] "Reiteration" is an important feature of Hebrew and also of ancient Canaanite, foremost of Ugaritic composition. It makes for fixity of form and pattern. "Inversion" introduces movement into this fixity and variation into stereotype patterns. Repetition and variation by inversion thus should be viewed as primary complementary principles of biblical literature. Being such, we have no reason to believe that they were embraced solely by the creative writer. Rather, we should expect them to have been followed also by arrangers, revisers and editors whose endeavours affected biblical writings in subsequent stages of "inlibration." In fact, we may assume from the very outset that the effect of these standards can be traced also in the latest stages of the history of the biblical literature, i.e., in the diverse forms of its written textual transmission.

a. The most widely represented and best known manifestation of "inversion" in biblical literature is the chiastic arrangement of reiterative components in parallelistic sentence structure. The phenomenon had been already recognized by medieval Jewish commentators,[146] but became common knowledge in the wake of Bishop Lowth's treatise on biblical *parallelismus membrorum*,[147] probably the most essential feature of biblical writing which had its counterparts and antecedents in ancient Near Eastern literature.[148] The increasing preoccupation with comparative research and the recognition of modifications within the principle of *parallelismus membrorum* which make themselves manifest in Ugaritic literature produced new insights into the diversified employments of *parallelismus membrorum* and chiasm in biblical literature.[149] The intensity and multi-facetedness of research in this field highlights the centrality of the issue under review.

There is no need to illustrate here in detail the abundantly employed technique of parallelistic chiasm in adjacent cola. It prevails in poetic passages, but is found also in prose compositions which often exhibit this distinct literary feature. The following two examples will suffice:

61. Is. 28:7[150]

וגם אלה ביין שגו ‖ ובשכר תעו[151]
כהן ונביא שגו בשכר ‖ נבלעו מן היין[152]
תעו מן השכר ‖ שגו בראה[153]

The interdependence of stylistic and textual considerations become apparent already in this first case. In distinction from the chiastic A-B ‖ B-A arrangement in the MT of the first two lines, the LXX twice exhibit the A-B sequence and retain only parts of the third line: οὗτοι γὰρ οἴνῳ πεπλανημένοι εἰσίν ‖ ἐπλανήθησαν διὰ τὸ σικερα; ἱερεὺς καὶ προφήτης ἐξέστησαν διὰ τὸν οἶνον[154] ‖ ἐσείσθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς μάθης τοῦ σικερα.[155] It cannot be decided on objective grounds whether the translator had a different *Vorlage* at his disposal, or whether he preferred the simple parallelistic structure to chiasm, legitimately availing himself of the literary licence to introduce slight changes into the text before him.

62. Prov. 1:26 גם אני באידכם אשחק ‖ אלעג בבא פחדכם
1:27 בבא כשאה פחדכם ‖ ואידכם כסופה יאתה

We shall turn now to cases of "distant chiastic parallelism" which transcend the confines of one verse or adjacent verses, arching over at least one intervening verse:

63. Jer. 16:4 לא יספדו ‖ ולא יקברו
16:6 לא יקברו ‖ ולא יספדו[156]

64. Jer. 3:7 בגודה אחותה[157] יהודה
3:8 בוגדה יהודה אחותה
3:10 בגודה אחותה יהודה

b. In the following examples, distant chiastic parallelism is a formative element in passages which belong to different literary units in one and the same book:

65. Ez. 24:16 ולא תספד ‖ ולא תבכה ולוא תבוא דמעתך
24:23 לא תספדו ‖ ולא תבכו ...
27:31 ובכו אליך במר נפש מספד מר

This example elicits the attractive suggestion, which yet has to be further investigated, that literary inversion may be connected with reversal of contents. That is to say, when in a positive statement a word-pair is used in the A-B pattern, the B-A pattern will be chosen by the author, or by another writer who refers to this statement, in a recurrent employment when the statement takes on a negative sense, or vice versa.[159]

66. Jer. 2:27 אמרים לעץ אבי אתה || ולאבן את ילדתני[160]
3:9 ותנאף את האבן ואת העץ[161]

67. Is. 5:11 הוי משכימי בבוקר שכר ירדפו || מאחרי בנשף יין ידליקם
5:22 הוי גבורים לשתות יין || ואנשי חיל למסך שכר[162]

68. Ez. 16:3 אביך האמרי || ואמך חתית
16:45 אמכן חתית || ואביכן אמרי

69. Ez. 17:17 ולא בחיל גדול ובקהל רב יעשה ... במלחמה
38:15 רכבי סוסים כלם קהל גדול וחיל רב[163]

70. Is. 40:21 הלא תדעו || הלא תשמעו
48:8 גם לא שמעת || גם לא ידעת

c. In the next cases, the chiastic parallelism is rooted in a word-couple which in (a) actually resembles a hendyadys, and involves the further feature of the break-up pattern, and in (b) introduces a third component for the sake of variation. The construct ארץ מולדת (Gen. 11:28; 24:7; Jer. 22:10; 46:16; Ez. 23:15) and the syndetic parataxis ארץ ומולדת[164] (Gen. 12:1; 24:4; 32:10; Num. 10:30, cp. also Gen. 31:3), in the break-up pattern are the basis of chiastic parallelism in:

71. Esth. 2:10 לא הגידה אסתר את עמה ואת מולדתה
2:20 אין אסתר מגדת מולדתה ועמה
8:6 כי איככה אוכל וראיתי ברעה אשר ימצא את עמי || ואיככה אוכל וראיתי באבדן מולדתי

72. Esth. 5:10 וישלח ויבא את אהביו ואת זרש אשתו
5:14 ותאמר לו זרש אשתו וכל אהביו
6:13 ויספר המן לזרש אשתו ולכל אהביו ...
ויאמרו לו חכמיו וזרש אשתו

d. Inverted parallelism can be applied to more comprehensive speech units. Thus, e.g., the formula והייתי לכם לאלהים ואתם תהיו לי לעם is employed in the Book of Jeremiah in alternating A-B and B-A arrangements. The A-B pattern is used in the first and in the two last mentions of the formula (Jer. 7:23 and 31:1, 33), forming an *inclusio*-like frame for the B-A examples (11:4; 24:7; 30:22).

Inversion sometimes is present in what may be described as inner-biblical quotations. In some such cases a passage is recurrently used in one book, either by the author or an editor.

73. Deut. 7:5 מזבחתיהם תתצו || ומצבתם תשברו
ואשרתם תגדעון || ופסיליהם תשרפון באש
12:3 ונתצתם את מזבחתם || ושברתם את מצבתם
ואשריהם תשרפון באש || ופסילי אלהיהם תגדעון[165]

In two parallel passages which deal with transgressions which are to be punished by stoning, the procedure once is described in the A-B and once in the B-A pattern:

74. Deut. 13:10-11 α ידך תהיה בו בראשונה ויד כל העם באחרונה
β וסקלתו באבנים ומת
17:5-7 β וסקלתם באבנים ומתו ...
α יד העדים תהיה בו בראשונה ויד כל העם באחרונה

e. Independent employment of a common phrase or formula by two authors or quoting of the one by the other[166] constitutes the matter of the following instances of distant chiastic parallelism:

75. Jer. 18:18 כי לא תאבד תורה מכהן ועצה מחכם ודבר מנביא
Ex. 7:26 ובקשו חזון מנביא ותורה תאבד מכהן ועצה מזקנים

76. Ps. 95:6-7 נברכה לפני יהוה עשנו כי הוא אלהינו || ואנחנו עם מרעיתו וצאן ידו
100:3 דעו כי יהוה הוא אלהים הוא עשנו || ולו אנחנו עמו וצאן מרעיתו

77. Jer. 51:58 ויגעו עמים בדי ריק || ולאמים בדי אש ויעפו
Hab. 2:13 וייגעו עמים בדי אש || ולאמים בדי ריק יעפו

A somewhat more involved situation obtains in a formula which appears

to have originated in the Book of Deuteronomy, and turns up recurrently as an inverted quotation in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

78. Deut. 32:35-36 כי קרוב יום אידם[167] II לי נקם ושלם לעת תמוט רגלם
Jer. 46:21 עת פקדתם[168] II יום אידם בא עליהם

In the following instances, one member of the synonymous pair is employed in an apocopated form, *pars pro toto*, either by retaining יום:

79. Jer. 50:27 כי בא יומם עת פקדתם[169]
50:31 כי בא יומך עת פקדתיך
Ez. 21:30, 34 אשר בא יומו(ם) בעת עון קץ[170],

or by mentioning only[171] איד:

80. Jer. 49:8 כי איד עשו הבאתי עליו עת פקדתיו, and somewhat differently
Ez. 35:5 בעת אידם בעת עון קץ

f. In some of the above examples, inversion could be discerned not only as a stylistic phenomenon, *sensu stricto*, but also as a structural principle which, to a degree, ties together "distant parallels." In some instances, we suggest that the two thus connected references may be viewed as complementary units of a literary frame of the *inclusio* or *Ringkomposition*[172] type, which together delineate the extent of a given unit. It must be stressed that we are concerned with a phenomenon that can be established only empirically. Our approach perforce must remain descriptive. No prescriptive dimension can be attached to the results of the enquiry. In other words, principles which are elicited from selected passages by careful analysis cannot be employed subsequently to revise by them other units which do not follow plainly the same or similar lines of structure.[173]

These restrictions apply to a degree to most aspects of literary analysis, and more so with respect to biblical writings whose canon of literary concepts and techniques was not handed down to us by the ancient writers themselves, but must be distilled by the student from the material. They are especially stringent in the issue under review, distant parallelistic inversion which serves as an *inclusio*, since in it the diverse phenomena of style, structure and text tradition are intricately interwoven. The analysis involves aspects of literary criticism which, as stated previously, usually are considered under separate headings. Moreover, since we have no

definitely objective means by which to control the results of our analysis, the discernment of actual illustrations of this technique, and their appraisal, depend to some extent on the sensibility of the individual scholar, and of his readers, to such literary intricacies and on his susceptibility to accrediting biblical writers with the technical accomplishments that are prerequisite for their application in literary practice.

With this caveat in mind, we can now turn to the presentation of the said technique, again demonstrating it by only a few examples.

81. An interesting illustration of intricate structuring can be seen in 1 Sam. ch.18. Although differing over details, commentators are unanimous in the identification of vv.17-28 as a unit which is set apart from the context, internally by subject matter, and externally by the features of a *Ringkomposition*, or by the *Wiederaufnahme*[174] of vv.15-16 in vv.29-30. There can be no doubt that the diverse components of the passage were not simply juxtaposed but rather were they skilfully interwoven with each other, though without disguising the underlying compositeness. The overall issue requires a more detailed treatment than can be given in the present context. Therefore, we shall limit our analysis to the pericope 18:20-28 which, as is well known, in itself is composite. The passage combines two vignettes that depict Saul's attempts to ensnare David in what he hopes would become a fatal fight with the Philistines, by offering him in marriage either both his daughters - בשתים תתתן בי היום - (v.21b),[175] or else first the elder Merab and then the younger Michal. The narrative reflects salient motifs of the Jacob - Laban and his two daughters episode (Gen. 29:15-30), and possibly is modelled upon this prototype.

The Merab passage (vv.17-19) which ends in her being given in marriage to one Adriel of Meḥolah (cp. 2 Sam. 21:8 where Merab instead of Michal must be read with the Pesh. and LXX^{L}), possibly is an intrusive element, and is missing in the LXX version. In any case, it can be clearly separated from the Michal pericope which is encased between

18:20 ותאהב מיכל בת שאול את דוד

and the complementary "distant inverted parallel":

18:28 ומיכל בת שאול אהבתהו

The stylistic relationship of these two distant parallels may be likened to that which often obtains between two adjacent cola in which identical verbs are recurrently employed: in the first, the predicate, a verb in the imperfect *(yqṭl)* with waw consecutive, will precede the substantive; in the second, the predicate in the perfect *(qṭl)* will follow upon the substantive. This schema is widely employed in biblical [176] as well as in Ugaritic literature.[177]

The discernment of an ancient stylistic-structural technique in the instance under review gives support to the results of compositional analysis arrived at by the literary-historical method.

g. A textual problem connects with the issue in the following instance.

82. In the introduction to the Book of Esther, Ahasuerus' courtiers are referred to by the term חיל פרס ומדי (1:3). This sequence "Persia and Media" is retained in the three other mentions in ch.1 (vv.14, 18, 19). These are all that there are until we come to the finale. There, in 10:2, the last reference למלכי מדי ופרס is best understood as a "distant inverted parallel" of 1:19 פרס ומדי(בדתי)[178] which together encase the Esther-Mordechai-Ahasuerus story proper which begins in 2:1[179] and which the redactor of the book wishes to conclude with the "chronistic appendix" 10:1-3.[180]

It is of interest to note that the LXX follow the MT as far as the three first mentions of the term are concerned (1:3, 14, 18)[181] but reverse the order with respect to the remaining two cases which are crucial for our argument.[182] In distinction from the preponderant sequence in ch.1, the rendition of v.19 is Μήδων καὶ Περσῶν[183] (against the MT), and in 10:2 Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων (also against the MT). Thus the LXX preserve the chiastic relationship of these two references, but reverse the internal order. The effect of the inverted distant parellelism thus is retained also in the Greek.

83. Passing from narrative to poetry, *inclusio* by "distant inverted parallelism" can be illustrated by two recurring cola in David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan. Our sole concern is structural, and therefore real or imagined cruxes of interpretation will not engage our attention here.

2 Sam. 1:19 איך נפלו גבורים II הצבי ישראל על במותיך חלל (α-β)

1:25 איך נפלו גברים (בתוך המלחמה) II יהונתן על במותיך חלל (β-α)

In this instance, the LXX and T^J reflect the MT in all details, including the traditional reversed order of the components under review, as correctly observed by S. Gevirtz in the most recent detailed study of the poem.[184] But neither Gevirtz nor previous commentators[185] appear to have given heed to the *inclusio* pattern which arises from this repetition. Just as vv.17-18 are in the nature of a superscription to the "Lament" and are shown to be such by their exclusion from the *inclusio*, so v.26, though intimately related to the "Lament" is proved by it to be in the nature of an "afterthought" which refers solely to Jonathan and makes no mention of Saul. It is cemented to the "poem" by the repetition of a reflex of בתוך המלחמה (v.25[a]) and v.21[b] in the closing line (v.27[b]), and by the repetition of the phrase איך נפלו גבורים (vv.19[a] and 25[a]) in v.27[a]. The above two lines constitute the frame of a congruent structure which embraces the whole poem. Its second half constitutes an inverted reflection of the first: v.25 parallels v.19; v.24 II v.20; v.23 II vv.21[b]-22. V.21[a] is an expansion which calls for a separate analysis.

84. A good example of *Ringkomposition* in prophetic literature, defined by Zimmerli as *Rahmung*,[186] is found in Ez. 43:7-9.

V.9: עתה ירחקו את זנותם ופגרי מלכיהם ממני ושכנתי בתוכם לעולם,

takes up in an inverted telescoped sequence two salient phrases of

v.7 ויאמר אלי ... את מקום כסאי ... אשר אשכן שם בתוך בני ישראל לעולם ולא יטמאו עוד ... בזנותם ובפגרי מלכיהם ...

The two verses encase v.8 which is a distinct reflex of the prophet's Temple-oracle in ch. 8:7-12.[187] It shares with that passage the references to a wall inside the Temple building - קיר (8:7-8, 10) and תעבות - "abominations" (8:9, cp. 6 and 13) which equals גלולים (8:10) in the combination with עשה (8:9, 12, cp. v.6). By means of the inclusion in inverted parallels, the short text-segment Ez. 43:7-9, introduced by v.6 is recognized as a self-contained sub-unit.

In an analogical fashion, *Ringkomposition* seems to be involved in the pair of inverted parallels in

85. Is. 13:9 .. הנה יום יהוה בא אכזרי ועברה וחרון אף II לשום הארץ לשמה (α-β)
13:13 בעברת יהוה צבאות II ביום חרון אפו (β-α) על כן שמים ארגיז ותרעש הארץ ממקומה

The tenor of the included passage, 13:10-12, which is of a cosmic-general character and remindful of the "doxologies" in Amos (4:12-13; 5:8-9; 9:5-6), decidedly sets it apart from the "oracle against Babylon" in which it is enveloped (13:1-8 and 14ff.). To put it differently: Is. 13:9-13, encompassed by inverted parallels, quite legitimately could be taken as a sub-unit which may have had a literary history of its own and which was inserted into the oracle against Babylon, either by the prophet himself or by a reviser. Viewed thus, what was defined as an *inclusio* assumes the function of a *Wiederaufnahme* which served to delineate the extent of the secondarily integrated material. This double entendre is basic to "inverted distant parallelism." It is often difficult to decide whether in a particular instance such parallelism should be taken as a structural-literary principle of the *inclusio* type and should be ascribed to the author, or whether it should rather be viewed as a "repetitive resumption," i.e., as a structural device of an "arranger" or an "editor." This inherent duality is highlighted in the following example: By content, imagery and compositional circumstance, the above unit presents some similarities with Jer. 30:22-31:1. This passage again is structured on the principle of "inverted distant parallelism":

86. 30:22 והייתם לי לעם. II ואנכי אהיה לכם לאלהים
31:1 בעת ההיא נאם יהוה אהיה לאלהים לכל משמחות[189] ישראל II והמה יהיו לי לעם[188]

We should mention from the outset that the separation of the second member from the preceding text, as indicated by the chapter division, is open to debate. This division follows one Hebrew manuscript tradition and the Greek (38:1), and begins an altogether new pericope with 31:1. Our printed editions are arranged accordingly, including BH. However, a number of old Hebrew manuscripts,[190] among them the noted Leningrad codex which underlies the BH, have an empty space *after* 31:1, and none before it. This proves that their *sedarim* division connected 31:1 with the preceding verses[191] and regarded it as a subscription rather than a superscription,[192]

as the chapter system implies. This massoretic division, though, has a new *parashah* begin with 30:22, and thus does not put in full relief the *inclusio* pattern posited here.

The above two parallels develop a short oracle of doom against "the wicked" which basically is of a general nature. By means of the parallels, and the context, it becomes a vision of hope for Israel:

30:23 הנה סערת יהוה חמה יצאה סער מתגורר על ראש רשעים יחול
30:24 לא ישוב חרון אף יהוה עד עשתו ועד הקימו מזמות לבו באחרית הימים תתבוננו בה.

J. Bright correctly says of these verses: "They sit loosely in context here and may have been inserted to place further stress upon the judgment of Israel's foes hinted at in vss. 11, 16, 20c."[193] But, like other commentators mentioned further on, he altogether disregards the *inclusio* by which the short passage is framed. Bright also refers to the assumed source of this intrusion, namely the repetition of these verses in Jer. 23:19-20, with minor variations and without the *inclusio*. There, in his judgment, "they fit splendidly after v.18 etc."[194] In this appreciation he sides with, e.g., P. Volz: "30:23-24 aus 23:19-20 wiederholt,"[195] and "es ist nicht ein versprengter jeremianischer Spruch, sondern ein spaeterer Beitrag."[196] Also W. Rudolph, S. Mowinckel, H. Schmidt[197] and others stress the originality of the version in ch.23. As against this, Streane does not express a definite opinion with respect to the genuineness of vv.23-24 in ch.30,[198] but states emphatically that they were introduced into 23:19-20 from ch.30.[199] H. Cornill is less definite. He rejects the said "Achtzeiler" in ch.23 and admits that in ch.30 "wuerde er passen," but then concludes that also here we have a secondary intrusion: "die beiden Verse (sind) hier aus spaeteren Stimmungen und Verhaeltnissen heraus interpoliert."[200]

It should have become apparent that in the case under review the stylistic-structural phenomenon connects with a literary-historical problem, namely the genuineness of the said passage in either Jer. 23:19-20 or in 30:23-24 or in both. The failure to observe the two-sidedness of the issue, to analyze the implications that arise therefrom, and to bring them to bear on the overall question underlines the lack of coordination in modern biblical studies of "stylistics" with "literary-historical" research.

We have yet to consider the "textual" dimension of this case. The investigation of the minor variations between the two Hebrew versions has not contributed to solving the question of the genuineness of the one or the other or both. Nor are the differences between the two Greek renditions of import in this matter.[201] But the collation of the Hebrew with the Greek shows that the LXX has no rendition for the first of the two members of the assumed "chiastic parallelism," i.e. for Jer. 30:22. Cornill tends to discard the MT here for a variety of reasons, including two that concern us here directly: "v.22 ist ein isolierter schlecht gebauter Zweizeiler, welcher LXX fehlt, 31,1 uebel vorwegnimmt und schon durch die in dem ganzen Complex (chs.) 30 31 unerhoerte Anrede in der 2. Pers. Plur. hinlaenglich verdaechtig waere."[202] P. Volz, echoed by W. Rudolph *(ad loc.)* defines it as "ein formelhafter Ausdruck" and an addition which "fehlt in G mit Recht."[203] The possibility that a "reductionist tendency" of the LXX here may have ruined a perfect Hebrew stylistic-structural device[204] simply never was considered. This is hardly an admissible procedure. In view of the forgoing discussion, the shorter LXX reading at the best can represent a different redaction of the Jeremiah text, but certainly should not be given preference over the MT, mistakenly designated "expansionist."

f. The variegated employment of "inversion" as a stylistic and structural tool in a diversity of forms forcefully underlines the deep-seated effect this technique had on biblical literature in the "creative" and the "recensionist" stages. Consequently, we may expect this literary phenomenon to have affected biblical writings also in the transmission stage: within the text tradition of one Version, foremost the MT; in inter-Version variants; and in extra-biblical quotations from Scriptures.

The conflux of the stylistic principle of "inversion" with the predilection for the preservation of stylistic variables by conflation sometimes results in "textual doublets" in which two inverted parallel expressions are conjoined. I have discussed some cases of this phenomenon in detail in earlier publications.[205] Therefore I shall illustrate it here by only a few examples in which the literary analysis helps in solving an exegetical crux:

87. 2 Kings 5:18

(α) לדבר הזה יסלח יהוה לעבדך
(γ) בבוא אדני בית רמון להשתחות שמה והוא נשען על ידי
(β) והשתחויתי בית רמון
(β′) בהשתחויתי בית רמון
(α′) יסלח נא[206] יהוה לעבדך בדבר הזה

Although many emendations of this apparently clumsy bit of diction have been suggested, Montgomery correctly concludes that the MT which is reflected also in the ancient Versions [207] is best retained.[208] It appears that in the present Hebrew text two variants were conjoined which differ in the inverted arrangement of the two lines α-α′ and β-β′, of which α-α′ in addition present an internal chiasm:[209]

1. לדבר הזה יסלח נא יהוה, עבדך ... והשתחויתי בית רמון
2. בהשתחוותי בית רמון ... יסלח נא יהוה לעבדך בדבר הזה

The ensuing two examples are somewhat more speculative

88. Num. 14:27

עד מתי לעדה הרעה הזאת אשר המה מלינים עלי
את תלנות בני ישראל אשר המה מלינים עלי [210] שמעתי

The MT is mirrored in the ancient Versions,[211] but nevertheless seems to contain a doublet of inverted parallel readings. We suggest the following reconstruction of the underlying variants:

(α) עד מתי לעדה הרעה הזאת[212]
(β-α) אשר המה מלינים עלי את תלנות ישראל
or
(α-β) את תלנות ישראל אשר המה מלינים עלי
(α) שמעתי

89. Lev. 11:21 כל איש אשר בו מום[213] ... מום בו[214] ... את לחם אלהיו לא יגש להקריב

The immediately following opening phrase of v.22 .. לחם אלהיו should in fact be connected with v.21 and should be understood as a variant of את לחם אלהיו. One of these variants is missing in the Sam. Pent. which combines elements of both to read: כל איש ... לא יגש להקריב את לחם אלהיו. מקדשי ... הקדשים. We propose to reconstruct the following inverted parallels:

את לחם אלהיו לא יגש להקריב
כל איש ... אשר מום בו
לא יגש להקריב לחם אלהיו [215]

and to read v.22 with the Samaritans: [216] מקדשי הקדשים ומן הקדשים יאכל.

90. Lev. 17:14 (α) כי נפש כל בשר דמו בנפשו הוא
(β) ואמר לבני ישראל דם כל בשר לא תאכלו
(α′) כי נפש כל בשר דמו הוא[217] כל אכליו יכרת

The Versions, with the exception of the Targums, do not render the contextually difficult בנפשו which most probably is an intrusive element from Gen. 9:4. Thus, the *stichoi* α and α′ are fully identical, are in better accord with the similar phrases in v.11, and suggest the above reconstruction of the inverted parallel readings that were combined in the verse.

91. 1 Sam. 28:19 (α) ויתן יהוה גם את ישראל עמך ביד פלשתים
(β) ומחר אתה ובניך עמי
(α′) גם את מחנה ישראל יתן יהוה ביד פלשתים

The Versions render the crucial *stichoi* α and α′ almost verbally. (The most probably paraphastic changes in the Greek translation are of no concern in the present context.) In spite of the unanimity of our sources, commentators generally recognize α and α′ as parallels and tend to delete one of them although without analyzing the genesis of the doublet.[218] The suggestion to view it as another instance of conflation of inverted synonymous readings appears to be a satisfactory explanation.[219]

g. Stylistic inversion constitutes an intra-Version variation between two parallel wordings of the same subject matter, e.g., in the following instances:

92. 2 Sam. 22:45 (α-β) בני נכר יתכחשו לי II לשמוע אזן ישמעו לי
Ps. 18:45 (β-α) לשמע אזן ישמעו לי II בני נכר יכחשו לי[220]

93. 2 Sam. 5:11 (אבן) וחרשי חרשי עץ II with אבן[221] missing in 4QSam[a][222]
1 Chron. 14:1 וחרשי עצים וחרשי קיר

94. Ex. 23:18 לא תזבח על חמץ דם זבחי II ולא ילין חלב חגי עד בקר (= Sam)
34:25 לא תשחט על חמץ דם זבחי II ולא ילין לבקר זבח חג הפסח (= Sam)

Notwithstanding some differences in wording, there is no mistaking the basic identity of these verses which are embedded in two versions of a short cultic catalogue of the pilgrim festivals.[223]

h. Viewed against this background, the widely encountered textual phenomenon of inter-Version variation in the form of syntactical inversion cannot be judged to be merely an indication of ordinary scribal laxity. Many such

instances of textual inter-Version variation, even though not all, rather should be considered evidence for the existence of equally valid text-traditions which cannot be reduced to one common archetype, and/or scribal manifestations of stylistic conventions which were continuously and legitimately operative in the transmission stage of biblical literature.

These factors are more readily recognized in a synopsis of Hebrew Versions than in a collation of Hebrew readings with translational variants. To be sure, attention must be paid to the expected impact from changing conventions of syntax in a collation of Hebrew inversion-variants in sources which may have been affected by diachronic linguistic developments, such as MT versus Sam. or Qumran material.[224] This aspect, though, more particularly requires consideration when inversion-variants in the Hebrew original and in translations are compared, especially in a non-Semitic target language. Here, the greater probability that peculiarities of the meta-language may have induced a translator or a copyist to transpose syntatical elements must be carefully evaluated. A cautious analysis will reduce the number of instances in the translations that should rightfully be dealt with under the heading of "original inversion variants" stemming from a Hebrew *Vorlage*. However, the remaining cases suffice to demonstrate the impact of legitimate stylistic inversion on translational Versions which makes itself manifest in textual transposition.

α. A sampling of inversion-variants in non-massoretic witnesses to the text of the Bible will sufficiently illustrate the validity of the above argument. We shall first adduce examples from the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch Version and then present comparable evidence from the Qumran Scrolls. The discussion of these will be kept to a bare minimum:

95. Ex. 5:3 MT: נלכה נא דרך שלשת ימים במדבר
Sam: נלכה נא המדברה דרך שלשת ימים

96. Lev. 20:13 MT: תועבה עשו שניהם מות יומתו
Sam: תועבה עשו מות יומתו שניהם

97. 20:22 MT: ולא תקיא אתכם הארץ
Sam: ולא תקיא הארץ אתכם

In the above instances, the inversion amounted to a reversal of the

order of some syntatical components (such as can be found in intra-MT parallels, e.g., 2 Sam. 7:20-1 Chr. 17:18; 2 Sam. 6:17-1 Chr. 16:1; 2 Sam. 10:11-1 Chr. 19:12) which often also constitutes the element of variation between the MT and parallel Qumran material.

β. In the following cases, the relation between the MT and Q material reflects the A-B versus the B-A arrangement of the two components of a pair of synonyms:

98. Is. 49:6 MT:[225] להקים את שבטי יעקב ונצורי ישראל להשיב
Is[a]: להקים את שבטי ישראל ונצירי יעקוב להשיב

99. 49:25 MT: גם שבי גבור יקח מלקוח עריץ ימלט[226]
Is[a]: גם מלקוח גבור ילקח ושבי עריץ ימלט[227]

100. 52:13 MT: הנה ישכיל עבדי ירום ונשא וגבה מאד
Is[b]:[228] ירום וגבה ונשא מאד[229]

In other instances, inversion effected a syntatical rearrangement in Qumran parallels *vis-à-vis* the MT which is of the same type as the one observed between MT and Samaritan variants (examples 95-97) as well as between intra-MT parallels:

101. Is. 36:12 MT: האל אדניך ואליך שלחני אדני (= 2 Kings 18:27)
Is[a]: האליכמה ועל[230] אדוניכמה שלחני אדוני

102. 1:30 MT: וכגנה אשר מים אין לה
Is[a]: וכגנה אשר אין מים לה

103. 37:7 MT: הנני נותן בו רוח
Is[a]: הנני נותן רוח בוא[231]

104. 38:19 MT: חי חי הוא יודך כמוני היום[232]
Is[b]: היום כמוני

105. 62:8 MT: אם אתן את דגנך עוד מאכל לאויביך
Is[b]: עוד את דגנך

106. 2 Sam. 24:16 MT: om.
4QSam[a]: (פנ)יהם מת(כסים בשק)ים[233]
1 Chr. 21:16 MT: מכסים בשקים על פניהם

A collation of the MT with Qumran parallels also reveals instances of

inversion of complete sentence parts, which was found to constitute the element of variation between intra-MT parallels (examples 92-93) and which sometimes resulted in 'double-readings' (examples 87-91). A case in point is

107. Is. 37:33 MT: ולא יורה שם חץ ולא יקדמנה מגן ולא ישפך (= 2 Ki.19:32)
עליה סללה
Is[a]: ולוא ישפוך עליהא סוללה ולוא ירא שם חץ ולוא יקדמנה מגן

γ. There is ample documentation for changes of word-order in the LXX tradition or part of it *vis-à-vis* the MT as well as between the major witnesses to the Greek text. Discussing this issue with reference to the text of Jeremiah, Ziegler quotes Origen who in his letter to Africanus poignantly remarks on the numerous (syntactical) inversions:[234] πολλὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐν τῷ Ιερεμίᾳ κατενοήσαμεν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πολλὴν μετάθεσιν καὶ εναλλὰγην τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευομένων εὕρομεν (Migne PG 11,50 B). It remains, though, an open issue whether, as Ziegler does, it is correct to define[235] the numerous examples of word-order variants in the A text *vis-à-vis* the MT as *Umstellungen*, implying that the Greek tradition in these cases changed the Hebrew text: "Es koennen 40 Stellen genannt werden, wo A allein oder von einigen abhaengigen Zeugen begleitet, eine Umstellung vornimmt," presumably for Greek stylistic reasons.[236] A similar explanation is offered for *Umstellungen* in the B text tradition in comparison with the MT where this is followed by the A text, although the suggestion is weighed that B preserved in such instances an original different word sequence.[237] However, what was not pondered at all is the possibility that at least some cases of inverted word-order in the Greek translation may reflect the same margin of stylistic licence which can be observed in a collation of parallel Hebrew traditions of the Bible text.

This suggestion gains in probability in instances in which the LXX concur with the MT arrangement of the verse, whereas the hexaplaric or the Lucianic revision, which preponderantly correct towards the MT, exhibit a surprising inverted arrangement. In analyzing some such cases in the Greek tradition of Isaiah, Ziegler rather carefully raises the question whether such transpositions indeed can be ascribed to Origen or whether they were not already contained in his *Vorlage*: "Bei den Umstellungen erhebt sich

wiederum die Frage, ob sie alle auf Origenes zurueckgehen. Es ist moeglich, das bereits in dessen Vorlage solche Umstellungen standen."[238] Bearing in mind the preceding discussion, we are inclined to answer this question more decidedly in the affirmative, especially when the inversion involves the transposition of components of a pair of synonyms in one of the revisions, and *a fortiori* in the basic LXX tradition:

108. Jer. 2:19 MT: תיסרך רעתך ‖ ומשבותיך תוכחך
LXX: παιδεύσει σε ἡ ἀπόστασια σου ‖ καὶ ἡ κακία ἐλέγξει σε

The second Greek noun κακία renders 89 times the Hebrew רעה which is the first noun in the MT. In view of this fact, it is only natural to assume that ἀποστασία renders here משובה,[239] being derived from ἀφίσταναι which translates שוב and שבב, e.g., in Jer. 3:14. It therefore is not surprising that the hexaplaric tradition adjusted the Greek to the MT by inverting the two translational nouns. Similarly, we discern an identical case of inversion of a pair of parallels in:

109. Jer. 8:20 MT: עבר קציר ‖ כלה קיץ
LXX: διῆλθε θέρος ‖ παρῆλθευ ἄμητος and

110. Prov. 26:1 MT: כשלג בקיץ ‖ וכמטר בקציר
LXX: ὥσπερ δρόσος ἐν ἄμητῳ ‖ καὶ ὥσπερ ὑετὸς ἐν θήρει

In five other passages θέρος renders the Hebrew noun קיץ (Gen. 8:22; Zach. 14:8; Ps. 74[73]:17; Prov. 6:8; 30:25 [24:60]), whereas ἄμητος translates 14 times קציר (and once קצר). Only once more, in addition to the above instances, it is used to translate קיץ (Micah 7:1).

The proposed identification of ἄμητος with קציר is buttressed by a comparison of Prov. 26:1 with

111. Is. 18:4 MT: כחם צח עלי אור ‖ כעב טל בחם קציר
LXX: ὡς φῶς[240] καύματος ‖ και ὡς νεφέλη δρόσου ἡμέρας ἀμήτου μεσημβρίας

νεφέλη δρόσου recalls δρόσος in Prov. 26:1, both terms being connected in the two instances with ἄμμτος = קציר. In parenthesis we may add that the rearranged word-order of the LXX in the first *stichoi* of Is. 18:4 possibly reflects an original reading. It is suggested that the difficult עלי אור should be read[241] טל עלי אור (כ) or טל אור (ס), an expression which is employed in Is. 26:19 - כי טל אורת טלך.

Accordingly we would emend Is. 18:4 to read: כעב ‖ עלי אור (כטל) בחם צח קל בחם קציר; or in accord with the Greek positioning of φῶς at the beginning of the verse: כעב טל בחם קציר ‖ עלי אור בחם צח[242] (כטל). Outside the LXX, ἀμήτος always equals 'crop-harvest.' It never carries the connotation of 'summer' which attaches to קיץ that also can mean 'summer-fruit' (cp., e.g., Am. 8:1-2), exactly as does θέρος in extra-LXX usage. It is, therefore, reasonable to posit that the Greek translation of Jer. 8:20 and Prov. 26:1 inverted the MT sequence of the nouns קיץ and קציר.

In the last example to be discussed, the reversal of the massoretic word sequence in the LXX certainly can be explained to have arisen from translational stylistic reasons or from 'literary logic':

112. Jer. 4:28 MT: על כי דברתי זמתי ‖ ולא נחמתי ולא אשוב ממנה
LXX: διότι ἐλάλησα καὶ οὐ μετανοήσω ὥρμησα καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέφω ἀπ' αὐτῆς

The MT here presents two word-pairs of opposite meanings, arranged in an a-a' b-b' order, whereas the Greek displays the more elegant a-b a'-b' pattern. Although it must be admitted that we may be concerned here with an inner-Greek inversion effected by a translator, we feel inclined to accord as much probability to the suggestion that the present Greek text reflects a Hebrew inversion variant displayed in its *Vorlage*.

δ. Having retraced the impact of stylistic inversion on the textual transmission of the Bible text in various Hebrew and translational witnesses, we shall now turn to the investigation of the effect which this literary phenomenon had on quotations from biblical literature in post-biblical writings. The transposition of syntactical elements of a biblical verse in its secondary employment as a quotation in Qumran and rabbinic writings, or in the Apocrypha, often is interpreted to have resulted from scribal laxity or from lapses of memory, assuming that the post-biblical author quoted by heart and did not rely on a written source.[243]

It is agreed from the outset that in a large percentage of cases of quotational inversions the above explanations indeed are valid. It may further be assumed that in other instances, inverted quotations reflect Hebrew or possibly translational variants which the quoting author found in his *Vorlage* of the biblical text in question. However, in view of the

foregoing discussion, it is suggested that also in this sphere of biblical text transmission the possibility should be considered that the principle of 'controlled variation' which was the legitimate right of biblical authors, editors, and likewise of transmitters and copyists retained a lease on life also in the post-biblical period and was utilized by writers who employed biblical quotations as building stones in their own compositions. We have no reason to doubt that if already in the early post-biblical period the later emerging insistence on literal exactness with regard to the Bible text would have been the established norm, rabbinic and Qumran authors would have meticulously abided by this norm. Even after discounting the inversion variants which can be readily explained to have resulted from transmissional phenomena such as mentioned above, some of the remaining instances require a different interpretation.

Rabbinic literature presents us with many instances of a fruitful employment of transposition and inversion in Scripture quotations for midrashic-exegetical and homiletic purposes, to the extent that it coined a special technical term for this technique - סרוס,[244] and established the exegetical rule - סרס המקרא ודרשהו - 'invert (or rearrange) a verse and (then) expound it.'[245] It would appear that in essence this method was considered a means by which to re-establish the supposedly original syntactical order of a verse which in the MT seemingly presented a case of *hysteron proteron*.[246] Like other literary-textual terms, such as אל תקרא - ... אלא ... 'do not read ... , but rather ...,[247] סרוס in the course of time lost its original exact technical connotation,[248] and inversion became a midrashic *Spielelement* in Scripture quotations. However, the progressive dissipation of exactness in the employment of the term and the technique should not prevent us from recognizing the initially literary-technical character of the rabbinic concept of סרוס.

Qumran writings have not preserved for us any specific terminology by which to identify literary phenomena and techniques that were operative in the Covenanters' setting. However, there is no lack of proof that quotation-inversion was fully accepted by Qumran authors, whether deliberately and consciously or as a matter of tradition and routine. In some instances, as, e.g., in the comparison of

113. CD I,2: כי ריב לו עם כל בשר || ומשפט יעשה בכל מנאציו with
Jer. 25:31: כי ריב ליהוה בגוים || נשפט הוא לכל בשר (= Vss),

we are concerned with a simple reversion and paraphrase of the biblical text.

The midrashic-paraphrastic character of transposition becomes even more apparent in the following examples:

114. Zech. 11:11: וידעו כן עניי הצאן השמרים אתי (= Vss)
CD VII,20: והשומרים אותו הם עניי הצאן

115. Is. 59:5: ביצי צפעוני בקעו || וקורי עכביש יארגו
CD V,13-14: קורי עכביש קוריהם || ובצי צפעונים ביציהם

In other instances it would appear that the possible employment of literary chiasm to express by it contrasting moods or meanings to which attention already was drawn[249] may be reflected in inverted quotations in Qumran literature, e.g.:

116. Ps. 119:22: גל מעלי חרפה ובוז
1QH II,33-34: וישימוני לבוז ולחרפה

Since the combination חרפה ובוז, probably a hendyadys, is unique in biblical Hebrew, little doubt is left that we are dealing here with a direct quotation by the author of 1QH from Psalm 119.

117. Ez. 22:26: בין קדש לחל לא הבדילו || ובין הטמא לטהור לא הודיעו
CD VI,17: ולהבדיל בין הטמא לטהור || ולהודיע בין הקודש לחול

The unique combination of elements and the ensuing reference to the Sabbath in both instances again make it abundantly clear that CD VI,17 presents a paraphrased inverted quotation of Ez. 22:26. Similarly,

118. Deut 32:22 כי אש קדחה באפי ותיקד עד שאול תחתית ותאכל ארץ ויבלה ותלהט מוסדי הרים is paraphrased with inversion of the main syntactical elements in 1QH XVII,13 ה(אוכל) בשאול תחתיה[250] (ביקוד) מוסדי הרים ואש., The proposal to read [ביקוד] or possibly [בלהוט] at the beginning of the line, rather than [בהשרף] with Licht, derives from the recognition of the dependence of the Hodayoth passage on the text of Deut. 32:22, which Licht failed to recognize,[251] and illustrates the potentials of stylistic analysis for textual research.

Similar instances of quotation inversion may be observed in a comparison of, e.g.

119. 1QW I,1-2 with Is. 11:14,

120. 1QW XI,7 with Num. 24:18,

121. 1QH VIII,23-24 with Jer. 17:6-8, and many more examples that follow the same pattern.

VII 'Biblical' and 'Post-biblical' - The Issue of Literary Continuity

The rich crop of quotation variants from biblical writings in Qumran compositions suggests that 'inversion' was considered by their authors a legitimate quotation technique. In this, as in many other matters, Qumran writers obviously followed basic trends and tenets of biblical literature. Since some of the earlier Qumran works are contemporaneous with the latest parts of the biblical canon, such as, e.g., the second half of the Book of Daniel, the comparability of the two sets of literature becomes almost self-evident. The specific issue discussed here, viz. the interrelation of biblical stylistics and the history of the Bible text and its relation to biblical qutations in Qumran writings, must be viewed in the wider setting of the Qumran Covenanters' ideology and their historical conceptions. The Covenanters conceived of themselves as the 'biblical Israel.' In their self-understanding, they identified their community with the 'remnant' of biblical prophetic visions (Is. 6:13; 7:3; 10:20-22; 46:3; Jer. 23:3; Micah 2:2 etc.). The 'New Covenanters' were, in their own view, the 'holy seed' (Is. 6:13; 7:3; Ezra 9:2 etc.), the direct descendants of pre-exilic Israel, who had returned to the Land. As a reward for their faithfulness to Israel's God and their steadfast adherence to His commandments they, and only they, had been saved from the utter dissolution of Israel and the destruction of the Temple (CD I,4-8; II,8; etc.). In their community, pre-exilic Israel was embodied and reconstituted.[252]

In actual fact, the emergence of the Qumran community occurred in a historical setting which from the point of view of nascent rabbinic Judaism must be defined as post-biblical, whatever definition is accorded to this term. However, conceptually speaking, the Covenanters perceived themselves as standing within the framework of the biblical period, not less so than, e.g., the author of the Book of Daniel. In this fundamental aspect, the

'commune of the Bene Zadok' differs radically from other biblicizing ramifications of post-exilic Judaism that considered the biblical period a closed chapter in the history of Israel, a period which served them as a major source of inspiration. These contemporaneous Jewish communities, and foremost rabbinic Judaism, consciously had terminated the writing of 'biblical' literature. They innovated new styles and types of literary composition: the Apocrypha on the one hand and on the other the Mishnah and the various forms of Midrash. The emerging 'oral Torah' was deliberately segregated from the biblical 'written Torah.'[253]

The rationalist teaching of the Rabbis found its expression in literary forms which most probably by intention differed fundamentally from the biblical literary genres in which was concretized the inspired teaching of former generations. In contradistinction, the Qumran Covenanters did not subscribe to the idea that the biblical era had been terminated, nor did they accept the concomitant notion that 'biblical' literature and literary standards had been superseded or replaced by new conceptions. It appears that the very concept of a 'canon of biblical writings'[254] never took root in their world of ideas, whatever way the term 'canon' is defined. Ergo, the very notion of a closing of the canon was not relevant. This applies to the completion of the canon of Scriptures as a whole, and also to the closure of its major components. It would seem that not only did the complex of the Hagiographa remain an open issue, but also the collection of prophetic books was not considered sealed. Prophetic or quasi-prophetic 'inspiration' continued to inform the leaders of the Qumran community, who did not subscribe to the rabbinic dictum that with 'the demise of the last (i.e., the post-exilic) prophets Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi (prophetic) inspiration had departed from Israel' (Tos. Sotah 13,2 ed. Zuckermandel 318,21-23; Bab. Tal. Sotah 48b; Sanh. 11b, etc.; and Seder Olam 30).[255] Qumran literati condidered biblical literature a living matter, and participated in the ongoing process of its creation. Their attitude to the biblical books and to the text of Scriptures may be better compared to that of the author of the Book of Chronicles toward earlier biblical writings, rather than to that of rabbinic authors toward the books of the canon. Like the Chronicler, or for that matter the author of Daniel, they related to the biblical literature from within, and not from without

its orbit, as did the authors of the Apocrypha and the Rabbis. Like the Chronicler, the copyist and possibly also the author of the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11Q Ps[a]),[256] as well as the authors of the Hodayoth, the Damascus Documents and similar works, introduced into the copies based upon their *Vorlagen*, and into their biblical quotations, paraphrases, word-substitutions and glosses and skipped phrases and passages which they considered unsuitable. In all these aspects they maintained a biblical stance, worked in a biblical vein, and used biblical stylistic techniques.

I am fully aware of the fact that a great number, probably an overwhelming majority, of Qumran variants in biblical scrolls and in Bible quotations resulted from insufficiently controlled copying and/or sometimes represent diverging *Vorlagen*. But I would also maintain that an undetermined percentage of these *variae lectiones* derive from the impact of ongoing literary processes of an intra-biblical nature, as illustrated by the examples adduced above. This proposition, no doubt, calls for further detailed investigation. However, already at this preliminary stage its potential importance for biblical studies becomes apparent when it is discussed within the frame of reference established by the 'three recensions' or 'three text-types' school. As was stressed at the very outset of this presentation, this new hypothesis has widened the scope of biblical textual research. It purports to evince the history of the text, as far back as the third century B.C.E., basing its arguments on manuscript evidence, and has deduced from this evidence preceding stages of the text in as early as the fifth or even sixth century B.C.E. In other words, in the Qumran material coalesce the phase of creative authoring of biblical literature with the ancillary phase of text transmission. The synchronous execution of these intrinsically different processes within the orbit of one set of literature, viz. the biblical writings, lends additional force to the suggestion that the diverse practitioners, the authors and the copyists, *mutatis mutandis*, employed the same or similar literary tenets and techniques. In view of the inherent ideologically biblical stance, Qumran literature, which chronologically speaking is set in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, closes to a large degree the developmental gap between biblical and rabbinic literature. The literary and stylistic analysis of Qumran works thus could provide new insights into the interdependence of these diverse sets

of ancient Hebrew writings and could help in recapturing some aspects of the continuance of biblical literary norms into what customarily is designated as the post-biblical period.

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion sufficiently illustrated the hypothesis that in ancient Hebrew literature no hard and fast lines can be drawn between authors' conventions of style and tradents' and copyists' rules of reproduction and transmission. It may be said that in ancient Israel, and probably also in other ancient Near Eastern cultures, especially in Mesopotamia, the professional scribe seldom if ever was merely a slavish copyist of the material which he handled. He rather should be considered a minor partner in the creative literary process. To a degree, he applied on the reproductive level norms and techniques which had informed his predecessors, the ancient authors, and which had become his literary legacy. The right to introduce variations into the biblical text, within limits, had come to the Bible-oriented copyists and quoting authors of post-biblical works, together with the transmitted writings. Mechanical faithfulness to the letter of the sanctified traditional literature is to become the rule only after the undirected and intuitive process of canonisation had completed its course, i.e., not earlier than the first century B.C.E. and not later than the second century C.E. The recognition of the ongoing impact of stylistic techniques and norms on the textual transmission of the biblical literature which results from the above analysis must be given due attention in the scholarly discussion of issues pertaining to the 'Text and Versions' of the Bible.[257]

Notes

1. The publications in this field are far too numerous to be recorded here. The pertinent material is listed in the standard bibliographies of Qumran studies, viz. W. S. LaSor, "Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1957," *Fuller Library Bulletin* 31 (1958). Fuller Theological Seminary Bibliographical Series 2 (Pasadena, Calif. 1958); Chr. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer*, vol. I, *BZAW* 76 (Berlin 1957); vol. II, *BZAW* 89 (Berlin 1967); J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Bibliographical Aid to the Study of the Qumran Cave IV Texts," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 59-71; B. Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah* 1958-1969 (Leiden 1971), *et al.*

2. *BASOR* 140 (1955) 27-33.

3. The term "Version" is used here in reference to all witnesses of the Bible text, including the MT which, *sensu stricto*, is but a version of the now unattainable original Hebrew text.

4. A more detailed account may be found in S. Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," in: *Cambridge History of the Bible* vol. I etc., reprinted in the present volume.

5. A complete listing of pertinent bibliographical material would transcend the scope of this essay. Some notable works are, e.g.: F. Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* (Berlin und Leipzig 1920); J. Kennedy, *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh 1928); F. Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments* (Muenchen 1895); *Neue Folge* (Leipzig 1922), *et al.*

6. A. von Gall, *Der hebraeische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen 1918). Like von Gall's main text, such an eclectic edition of the MT would present a hypothetical text which never had had a manuscript existence. See my remarks on this issue in "Aspects of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in: *Biblical and Armenian Studies* ed. M. Stone, Suppl. to *Sion* vol. I (forthcoming).

7. Cp., e.g., F. M. Cross - D. N. Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Baltimore 1950); Cross, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Sam. 22 = Psalm 18," *JBL* 72 (1953) 15-34; *idem*, "The Song of Miriam," *JNES* 14 (1955) 237-250; I. L. Seeligmann, "A Psalm from Pre-Regal Times," *VT* 14 (1964) 75-92; *et al.* A. Bruno, *Rhytmische Untersuchungen von Genesis etc.* (1953-1959) has not convinced scholars that rhythmic considerations are a sufficient basis for full-scale text reconstructions.

8. A convenient summary of the history of the Qumran discoveries and a survey of theories about their dating and the identity of the Covenanters may be found in the standard works on these finds. See, most recently: J. A. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Scrolls - A Quarter Century of Study," *BA* 36,4 (1973) 110-148.

9. F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 85.

10. *Ib.* n. 21.

11. For surveys consult: H. M. Orlinsky, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," in: *The Bible and the Ancient Near East, Essays in Honour of W. F. Albright*, ed. G. E. Wright (New York 1961) 113-132; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford 1968); F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," *SCS* 2 (1972) 108-126 (reprinted in this volume); J. A. Sanders, *op. cit.*

12. D. Barthélemy O.P., "*Les Devanciers d'Aquila* etc.," *SVT* X (Leiden 1963).

13. Cp. D. Barthélemy, "A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam. 11:2 - 1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticisms of *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," *SCS* 2 (1972) 16-89; E. Tov, "The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions," *ib.*, 3-15.

14. K. G. O'Connell, *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 3 (Cambridge, Mass. 1972) and current publications surveyed there.

15. Cp. the survey presented by E. Tov, *op. cit.*; *idem* "Lucian and Proto-Lucian - Toward a New Solution of the Problems," *RB* 79 (1972) 101-103.

16. For a discussion of the pertinent issues and for current bibliography consult: G. Howard, "*Kaige* Readings in Josephus," *Textus* VIII (1973) 45-54.

17. Cp. items listed in note 13, and especially D. W. Gooding's studies: "Ahab According to the Septuagint," *ZAW* N.F. 35 (1964) 269-280; "Pedantic Timetabling in 3rd Book of Reigns," *VT* 15 (1965) 153-166; "The Septuagint Version of Solomon's Misconduct," *ib.* 325-335; "Temple Specifications: a Dispute in Logical Arrangement Between the MT and the LXX," *VT* 17 (1967) 143-172; "Text-Sequence and Translation-Revision in 3 Reigns ix 10-x 33," *VT* 19 (1969) 448-463; J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 1 (Cambridge, Mass. 1968).

18. E.g., the Book of Daniel. Cp. P. Grelot, "Les versions grecques de Daniel," *Biblica* 47 (1966) 381-402; A. Schmitt, "Stammt der sogenannte ϑ'-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?" *MSU* 9 (Goettingen 1966).

19. H. St.J. Thackeray, "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS," *JThSt* 9 (1907/80 88-98; "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah," *JThSt* 4 (1902/3) 245-266; "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *ib.*, 398-411; "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," *ib.*, 578-585; "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JThSt* 8 (1906/7) 88-98.

20. O. J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis," *JBL* 52 (1933) 239-243.

21. J. Herrmann - F. Baumgartel, *Beitraege zur Enstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta*, *BWAT* ii,5 (Stuttgart 1923).

22. E.g., G. C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah* (Edinburgh 1889); P. F. Frankl, "Studien ueber die Septuaginta und Peschitto zu Jeremia," *MGWJ* 21 (1872) 444-456; 497-509; A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge 1896); G. B. Gray, "The Greek Version of Isaiah: Is it the Work of a Single Translator?," *JThSt* 12 (1911) 186-293; N. Turner, "The Greek

Translators of Ezekiel," *JThSt* 7 (1956) 12-24; T. Muraoka, "Is the Septuagint Amos viii 12 - ix 10 a Separate Unit?," *VT* 20 (1970) 496-500 contra G. Howard, "Some Notes on the Septuagint of Amos," *VT* 20 (1970) 108-112, and recent publications mentioned in these articles.

23. This theory was applied to the LXX of Jeremiah by E. Tov in an unpublished thesis: "The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch" (Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1973) where also recent literature is adduced. See further n. 13.

24. P. Kahle has restated his views in: *Die hebraeischen Handschriften aus der Hoehle* (Stuttgart 1951); *The Cairo Geniza*[2] (Oxford 1959); "Der gegenwaertige Stand der Erforschung der in Palaestina neu gefundenen hebraeischen Handschriften," *ThLZ* 79 (1954) 81-94, etc. Proponents of the de Lagarde school like H. M. Orlinsky and P. Katz have not expressed themselves unequivocally on the 'three recensions' theory.

25. See my remarks in *CHB*, 193ff. (reprinted in this volume).

26. S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in Light of the Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* IV (1964) 95ff.

27. K. H. Graf, *Der Prophet Jeremia erklaert* (1862) xl ff., calculated that 2700 Hebrew words of the MT, or about one-eighth of the overall text, are not represented in the LXX. Cp. also F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*[2], *HAT* (Goettingen 1907) xxv ff.; A. W. Streane, *op. cit.*; E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199.

28. F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, rev. ed. (New York 1961) 186-187; *idem*, "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 82; J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 6 (Cambridge, Mass. 1973).

29. Cp. E. Tov, *RB* 79 (1972) 189ff.

30. A concise survey of the problem may be found in C. A. Moore, *Esther*, *AB* (New York 1971) lxi ff.; *idem*, "A Greek Witness to a Different Hebrew Text of Esther," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 153-158; *idem*, "On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther," *JBL* 92 (1973) 382-393.

31. Cp. Kahle's writings mentioned in n. 24.

32. F. M. Cross, Jr., *IEJ* 16 (1966) 86.

33. It is immaterial for our present purpose whether the MT=Is[a] reading מכתב is retained or whether מכתם is preferred.

34. I. Engnell defines the composition 'Royal Psalm of Lament.' See: "Figurative Language of the O.T." in: *Critical Essays on the O.T.*, trans. J. T. Willis (London 1970) 265.

35. A detailed textual analysis was given by H. M. Orlinsky, "The Kings-Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story," *JQR* 30 (1939/40) 33-49. Cp. further: J. Begrich, *Der Psalm des Hiskia*, *FRLANT* N.R. 25 (Goettingen 1926).

36. An ancillary attempt to probe into the possible overlapping of issues of 'higher' and 'lower' criticism is made by E. Tov, *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199.

37. For this type of homiletic expansion which initially may have been of an extra-scriptural character see S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emṣa' Pasuq and 11QPs[a]," *Textus* V (1966) 12-21.

38. *Vide* Y. Zakowitz, "2 Kings 20:7 - Isaiah 38:21-22," *Beth Mikra* 17 (1972) 302-305 (Hebrew).

39. Cp., e.g., Ex. 5:3; 9:3, 15; Lev. 26:25; Num. 14:12, 2 Sam. 24:13-15; Ez. 5:17; 7:15, *et al.*

40. Cp., e.g., Num. 12:10; 2 Ki. 5:27; 15:5; 2 Chr. 26:20-23, *et al.*

41. It may be assumed that the elaboration which introduces שחין into the Hezekiah narrative constitutes a typological approximation to the tradition about King Uzziah's affliction by צרעת (2 Ki. 15:5 = 2 Chr. 26:19-21).

42. This technique of 'recapitulation' is widely employed in the biblical writings and can also be found in other literatures of the ancient Near East. The phenomenon which is to be discussed elsewhere in greater detail can be found, e.g., in Essarhaddon's vassal treaties. See for the present: R. Frankena, "The Vassal Treaties of Essarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy," *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14 (1965) 128, 132. I am indebted to Dr. J. H. Tigery for bringing this reference to my attention.

43. In some Introductions to biblical literature, stylistics are not discussed at all, and likewise literary forms and textual history. Issues of 'canon' are dealt with in a rather cursory fashion. See, e.g., S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.*, rev. ed. (New York 1950).

44. The schematic division which appears to obtain in biblical studies can be illustrated by the following table:

Discipline	*Literary Process*	*Techniques*	*Practitioner*	*Period*
Biblical Stylistics	Creative Writing	Composition (predominantly oral)	Poet, Narrator, Historiographer, etc.	1200 -
Literary Criticism	Compilation, Redaction	Oral and Written Tradition	Compiler, Redactor	900 -
Study of Text	Reproduction	Written Transmission	Copyist	300 -

45. This system is exemplified in the 'Introductions' by O. Eissfeldt[3] (Tuebingen 1964); E. Sellin - G. Fohrer (Heidelberg 1965); M. Z. Segal (Jerusalem 1946, Hebrew). In spite of some departures from this model also F. Bleek - J. Wellhausen[5] (Berlin 1866), C. H. Cornill (Tuebingen 1905), R. H. Pfeiffer (New York/London 1941), *et al.*, follow the same lines.

46. The assumed profound difference between the forms of oral tradition and written transmission should be toned down considerably. An investigation into transitional stages and into the possible transfer of techniques from one to the other is an urgent desideratum. These issues were not touched upon in such systematic works as E. Nielsen's *Oral Tradition*, *STB* 11 (London 1954) and A. B. Lord's *The Singer of Tales* (New York 1970),

especially pp. 124-138. For a suggestive new approach to the problem with reference to the rabbinic 'oral law' see J. Neusner, "Types and Forms in Ancient Jewish Literature: Some Comparisons," *History of Religions* vol. 11,4 (1972) 354-390; *idem*, "The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees Before A.D. 70, The Problem of Oral Transmission," *JJS* xxii (1971) 1-18.

47. The growth in stages of the latter part of the Book of Jeremiah (chs. 45-52) will be discussed in a separate publication.

48. R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin 1906). Verse numbers in brackets refer to M. Z. Segal's edition of the book (Jerusalem 1953, Hebrew).

49. Cp. Segal, *op. cit.* 350,13; 363 *ad loc.* G. H. Box - W. O. E. Oesterley in: R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* vol. I (Oxford 1913) 511-512 and 517, define both notations as 'subscriptions' without further clarifications.

50. An illustration of the interdependence of these diverse literary processes may be found in S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, "Aspects of the Literary Structure of the Book of Ezekiel," *Tarbiz* xlii (1972/73) 27-41 (Hebrew).

51. The required integrative approach in exegesis of biblical literature is most fruitfully applied by W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, *BKAT* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969).

52. A detailed portrait of R. Meier may be found in W. Bacher, *Die Aggada der Tannaiten*, vol. ii (Strassburg 1890) 1-69. Tradition has it that R. Meier dedicated one-third of his income from his scribal activities to the maintenance of needy scholars (Midrash Koh. Rabba *ad* Eccl. 2:18ff.).

53. See below, examples 113-121.

54. J. A. Sanders, *The Psalm Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^{a})*, *DJD* IV (Oxford 1965); *idem*, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Cornell 1967).

55. To be edited by Y. Yadin. For the present see the editor's preliminary observations: "The Temple Scroll," in *Jerusalem Through the Ages* (Jerusalem 1968) 72-84 (Hebrew).

56. S. Mowinckel, "Zum Problem der hebraeischen Metrik," *Festschrift A. Bertholet* (Tuebingen 1950) 391.

57. S. Segert, "Problems of Hebrew Prosody," *SVT* 7 (1960) 285.

58. L. Alonso-Schoekel, "Die stylistische Analyse bei den Propheten," *ib.*, 164.

59. Most synonymities are in fact of the pragmatic type and are not necessarily rooted in etymology. They reflect the 'conditioned meanings' which result from the actual employment of two words in parallelistic structures in a given literary context. Cp. M. Dahood, in: ed. L. R. Fisher, *Ras Shamra Parallels* *Analecta Orientalia* 19 (Roma 1972) 83; M. Z. Kaddari, "On Semantic Parallelism in Biblical Hebrew Poetry," *Lešonénu* XXXII (1967/68) 37-45.

60. Cp. E. Z. Melamed, "Break-up of Stereotype Phrases as an Artistic Device in Biblical Poetry," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* VIII, ed. C. Rabin (Jerusalem 1961) 115-144; S. Talmon, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Tradition of the O.T.," *ib.*, 335ff.; M. Dahood, *Psalms*, *AB* vol. I, xxiv; II, xxiii; III, xxxix-xli and indexes *s.v.* 'Break-up of Stereotyped Phrase.'

61. An up-to-date survey of the rapidly growing literature on this stylistic phenomenon which is shared by biblical with Ugaritic literature is given by M. Dahood in *Ras Shamra Parallels*, 73ff. To the list presented there, add Y. Avishur, "Pairs of Synonymous Words in the Construct (and in Appositional Hendyadys) in Biblical Hebrew," *Semitics* 2 (1971/72) 17-81.

62. Cp. S. Talmon, *op. cit.*, 359.

63. איש is translated ἀνής 764x and ἄνθρυπος 400x. אדם is rendered ἄνθρωπος 460x and ἀνής 27x. Cp. E. C. Dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem n.d.) *x.v. cit.*

64. Cp. J. Reider, *An Index to Aquila etc.*, completed and revised by N. Turner, *SVT* 12 (Leiden 1960) *s.v. cit.*, with further additional corrections by E. Tov, *Textus* VIII (1973) 164-174.

65. Cp. T. Muraoka, "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *ib.* 25.

66. The *hif'il* יחרים suggests that the phrase is a contracted quotation from Lev. 27:28 MT מאדם ... אשר יחרים איש with an interchange of אדם and איש, and not from v.29, *pace* C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford 1954) 45 and others, who adjust the CD reading to the *hof'al* that occurs in MT Lev. 27:29 אשר יחרם מן האדם. The assumed dependence on v.29 causes the further suggestion that the second mention of אדם in CD ix,1 which has no counterpart in the MT is a free addition of the Qumran author (Rabin, *ib.* n.3). A comparison of the CD reading with the parallel MT passage leads one to propose that in any case the first אדם should be emended to חרם:

Lev. 27:29	אך כל חרם אשר יחרם איש ... מאדם
CD ix,1	< כל אדם אשר יחרים אדם > מאדם

67. Most translators of the passage throughout read אדם - 'man.' Cp. Rabin, *loc. cit.*; M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York 1955) 358; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, tr. G. Vermes (Cleveland and New York 1961) 148, *et al.* Th. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (New York 1964) 85 distinguishes between 'man' and 'fellow being.'

68. Cp. S. Talmon, *op. cit.*, 370-371.

69. Cp. S. Talmon, *ib.*, 373.

70. שרם interchanges with שית, as e.g. in

Jer. 2:15	וישיתו ארצך לשמה עריך נצתה מבלי יושב
4:7	לשום ארצך לשמה עריך תצינה מאין יושב

Therefore it also can form a parallel pair with נתן, as e.g. in

Jer. 3:19	איך אשיתך בבנים ואתן לך ארץ חמדה

71. For reasons of assonance and paronomasy one would have expected here the combination שים שממה instead of נתן שממה.

72. Comparable variations in the composition of idioms and epithets can be observed in the Versions. For the LXX see T. Muraoka, *op. cit.*, especially p. 25ff.

73. See W. Bauer, *Griechisches Woerterbuch zum N.T.*[2], tr. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago 1965) *s.v. cit.*

74. Some 1450x, and almost 300x more with a preposition. As against this τιθηναι renders נתן only some 150x, and another 180x with prepositions.

75. Altogether close to 400x. διδοναι is employed as a rendition of שים 27x. Cp. Dos Santos, *op. cit., s.v. cit.*

76. All references are to the text and apparatus of the LXX Goettingen edition where available. In other instances the Cambridge (A. E. Brooke - N. McLean) or A. Rahlfs's *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart 1950) are used.

77. Ms. B here reads δώσω, possibly in approximation to the MT.

78. A. B. Ehrlich prefers this derivation in his מקרא כפשוטו, vol. iii (1901) 310. But in his *Randglossen zur hebraeischen Bibel*, vol. v (Leipzig 1912) 48, he adopts the widely accepted emendation of the unusual *hif'il* to the *qal* form ושמתיהו.

79. See Ehrlich, *ib.*

80. Cp. S. Talmon, "Double Readings in the MT," *Textus* I (1960) 144-184.

81. Cp. S. Talmon, "Aspects, etc.," *Textus* IV (1964) 95-132.

82. A similar case may be observed in 2 Sam. 5:14-16 where the MT parallel reading of 1 Chr. 14:4-8 (+ ואלפלט ונגה) turns up in what amounts to an appendix in the LXX (2 Sam. 5:16[a]).

83. For the phenomenon of such inner-Greek variants see J. Ziegler, "Die Vokabel-Varianten der O-Rezension im griechischen Sirach," *Festschrift G. R. Driver* (Oxford 1963) 172-190 = *Sylloge* (Goettingen 1971) 615-633.

84. Chr. Ginsburg lists one printed edition and BH[4] four Mss which read here הארץ.

85. The MT of Sam. is distinguished from the Chr. parallel by a more balanced structure.

86. Not too much weight, though, can be accorded to the Targumic evidence which derives from late manuscripts or even early printed editions.

87. The Targums are quoted according to S. Sperber's edition, *The Bible in Aramaic* (Leiden 1959-1968).

88. Cp. his *Commentarius* ed. Vallarsi, *ad loc.* On Jerome's *sive* readings see J. Ziegler, "Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Buch des Propheten Jeremias" in: *Colligere Fragmenta, Festschrift A. Dold* (Beuron 1952) 13-24 = *Sylloge*, 345-356.

89. With the exception of the cases listed here, the LXX never render עיר by χωρα or γη which translate ארץ, אדמה, שדה, מדינה. Hatch-Redpath do not list עיר under χωρα (1418a) or γη (240c), nor χωρα or γη under עיר (254).

90. *Vide* e.g., P. Volz, *Studien zum Text des Jeremia* (Leipzig 1920) 31,217; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia, HAT* (Tuebingen 1947) 30,154; J. Bright, *Jeremiah, AB* (New York 1965) 208. Volz admits, though, that in Jer. 40:5 "beides ist moeglich" (*op. cit.*, 278).

91. Thus Volz and Rudolph, *loc. cit.*

92. See n.83.

93. LXX: αὐταρκήσεν and TO: סמיק צרכיהון possibly reflect a *hif'il* reading ימציאהו.

94. Recorded by F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt*, vol. I (Oxford 1875) 578 as an *ἄλλος* reading.

95. Cp. D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers, etc.*, 72, 132-33.

96. The editor of this fragment, F. M. Cross, Jr., considers the Qumran reading superior to the MT (*BASOR* 132 [1952] 22). In view of the above discussion this preference cannot be sustained on objective grounds.

97. *Vide* Hatch-Redpath *s.v.*

98. Thus F. Buhl in *BH*.

99. See his *Psalms, AB*, vol. III, 101.

100. The rendition of שלם by δίδωμι possibly resulted from an inner-Greek process facilitated by the fact that שלם predominantly is rendered by a compositum of δίδωμι viz. ἀποδίδωμι.

101. Cp. the doublet in 1 Sam. 2:23, and my analysis in *Textus* I, 180.

102. Jer. 35(42):18 - καθότι.

103. Cp. W. Genesius - E. Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd Engl, ed. A. E. Cowley (Oxford 1910) 382. 119 v.w.

104. G. B. Gray, *Numbers, ICC* (Edinburgh 1903) 151.

105. Targ. מן תורך ומן ענך.

106. Targ. ית ענכון ויתתורכון.

107. It follows that the Sam. text is not intrinsically different from the MT and that the clause there is understood as a partitive rather than as an all-inclusive direct object. In this Sam. goes with the Targumic tradition - T[O]: חדא מארבע משריתא דישראל T[J]: חדא מן ארבעתי משריתא דישראל. Both the MT masc. form רבע and the Sam. fem. form רבעת are pragmatically synonymous with עפר. W. F. Albright's suggestion that MT את רבע actually is a misread תרבע = Acc. *turbu'tu* (*JBL* LXXIII [1944] 213) which also is found in the forms *turbu'u, turubû, turubu, tarbu'um* (W. v. Soden, *Orientalia* XXII [1954] 343) makes the synonymity of this noun with עפר certain. Cp. the detailed analysis presented by S. E. Loewenstamm, "Notes on the Origin of Some Biblical Figures of Speech," in: *Studies in the Bible, Presented to M. H. Segal* (Jerusalem 1964) 183-187 (Hebrew).

108. See, e.g., C. H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs, ICC* (Edinburgh 1904); B. Gemser, *Spruecher Salomos, HAT* (Tuebingen 1963); W. McKane, *Proverbs, OTL* (Philadelphia 1970); H. Ringgren, *Sprueche/Prediger, ATD* (1962) *ad loc.*

109. Cp. 2 Sam. 17:9 MT: על פני הבאר; Mss. and Seb. read על פי possibly adjusting the text to the prevailing idiom (Gen. 28:2, 3, 8, 10). - It further is reasonable that Prov. 10:6 ברכות לראש צדיק ופי רשעים יכסה חמס

should be understood or should be actually read ופני, with G. Beer, *BH*; Gemser, *op. cit.*; Toy, *op. cit. ad loc.*; I. L. Seeligmann, *SVT* I (1953) 164 who correctly compares Jer. 51:51; Ps. 44:16; 69:8, Job 9:24; against McKane, *op. cit.* and R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs/Ecclesiastes, AB* (New York 1965) *ad loc.* who translate the phrase 'speech' or 'mouth of the wicked.' Scott further renders יכסה - 'uncovers' instead of the correct rendition 'conceals' (McKane). The assumed interchange of פני/פי would help in understanding the difficult לפי קרת in Prov. 8:3 MT: ליד שערים לפי קרת to mean לפני קרת - 'outside the city.' For לפני קרת cp. פני העיר (Gen. 33:18); על פני יריחו (Deut. 32:49; 34:1) and similar idioms. A good Ug. parallel would be present in 2 Aqht V:6-7 (*CTA* 17 V:6-7): *ytb.bap. tĝr. tḥt adrm. dbgrn* (cp. also 1 Kings 22:10 and R-S Parallels I,46).

110. Cp. J. Ziegler, *Sylloge*, 182.

111. Box - Oesterley *apud* R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha, etc.*, 321.

112. H. P. Rueger, *Text und Textform im hebraeischen Sirach*, *BZAW* 112 (Berlin 1970) 99.

113. An assumed interchange of פי / פני may be of some help in recovering the 'original' reading of CD III,4 (ed. Rabin, 11): ויענשו לפני משגותם which I. Lévi correctly read לפי. This reading may be compared with 1QS IX,14: להבדיל ולשקול בני צדוק לפי רוחו. It is further possible that in CD IX,9-10 (ed. Rabin, 45-46) איש אשר ישביע על פני השדה אשר לא לפנים השפטים או מאמרם לפנים should be understood as מאמרם ‖ לפי, both meaning 'according to the judges' instruction.'

114. Cp. further Hos. 2:17(19). - The assumed association by the translator of Jer. 4:1 with Zech. 9:7 does not militate against the assumption that the LXX to Jer. 4:1 contains a doublet, as implied by J. Ziegler, *ib.* The instance must be judged against the background of other interchanges between פני - פי such as are discussed in examples 38-41, 43-45, and especially the MT doublet in Ex. 14:2 (ex. 46). *Beitraege zur Ieremias Septuaginta* (Goettingen 1958) 90.

115. Thus, e.g., H. Graetz, *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Psalmen II* (Breslau 1883) 470-472; A. B. Ehrlich, *Die Psalmen* (Berlin 1905) 196; M. Buttenwieser, *The Psalms* (Chicago 1938) 609 *ad* Ps. 79:12; C. A. Briggs, *The Book of Psalms, II* (Edinburgh 1925) 209; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms, II* (London 1939) 368; against F. Buhl, *BH*[4]: *prps* פיך. The MT also is followed by M. Dahood, *Psalms, II, AB*, 260 who, though, interprets פנים - 'fury' (*op. cit.*, I, 133, 207; *Biblica* 44 [1963] 548).

116. M. Dahood, *ib.*, failed to take these facts into account in his comment on the passage.

117. Sam., some MT Mss., printed editions, and *seb.* read מפי which reading also is reflected in the Latin and Syriac renditions.

118. LXX render here ἐπὶ στόμα Εὔρωθ, in Num. 33:8 ἀπέναντι Εὔρωθ and in Ex. 14:2, 9 ἀπέναντι τῆς ἐπαύλεως, misreading חירת as חצרת = 'courtyards.' For the graphic interchange of ancient Hebrew *yod* and *ṣade* cp. S. Talmon, "The Town Lists of Simeon," *IEJ* 15 (1966) 233-241, and literature adduced there.

119. The component *pi* = 'house' occurs once more in Ez. 30:17 in the

Egyptian *nom. loc.* פיבסת LXX: Βον Βαστον.

120. In Gen. 32:31, 32 the LXX do not transcribe but rather translate Εἶδος (τοῦ) θεοῦ. This is an adequate rendition of the Hebrew פניאל. The critical note in *BH* '? ראיאל' is gratuitous. In Jud. 8:8, 9, 17; 1 Kings 12:25 the LXX transliterate φανουηλ.

121. Thus understood, פניאל would equal בית אל. The biblical traditions about Peni(u)el indeed exhibit striking similarities with those pertaining to Bethel (Gen. 28:11-19). There are two traditions constitute an *inclusio*-like frame for the Jacob - Esau confrontations, one preceding Jacob's flight before his brother, the other signaling his return to Canaan, and the re-encounter with Esau. At both locations the patriarch experienced a theophany which in each case culminated in a covenant between him and the deity, and in the change of his name to 'Israel' - Gen. 32:28-29 and 35:9-10, unless the latter passage is understood as a Peni'el insert into a Bethel tradition. If P(n)i'el is taken to be another 'bethel,' Jeroboam's I choice of this city as his capital after abandoning Shechem is more readily explained (1 Kings 12:25).

122. Cp. Jer. 35:10 ונשב באהלים ונשמע ונעש ככל אשר צונו יונדב אבינו
with *ib.* v.18 יען אשר שמעתם על מצות יונדב אביכם ותשמרו את כל מצותיו ותעשו את כל אשר צוה אתכם

123. The complementary techniques of 'stylistic conflation' and 'break-up pattern' are discussed in the publications listed in note 60.

124. Cp. *Textus* I (1960) 163-164.

125. Such a reductionist tendency possibly may be observed also in the LXX rendition of Jer. 1:17. See my analysis of this case: "An Apparent Redundant MT Reading - Jer. 1:17," *Textus* VIII (1973) 160-163. - The shorter Greek text obviously will be accorded preference by scholars who tend to identify 'short' with 'pristine,' and 'long' or 'fuller' with 'expansionist.' See, e.g., E. Tov, *RB* LXXIX (1972) 195, and H. W. Juengling, "Ich mache dich zu einer ehernen Mauer," *Biblica* 54 (1973) 1-24 which came to my attention only after the completion of this paper. The tendency to delete as secondary what appears to be redundant phrases or words is a highly dubious procedure which violates the character of biblical writing. (Cp. J. Muilenburg, "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," *SVT* I (1953) 99.

126. In addition to the instances discussed here, נצל is found six times in the Book of Jeremiah (7:10; 15:21; 20:13; 21:12; 22:3; 39:17) whereas הושיע is employed sixteen further times (2:28; 3:23; 4:14; 8:20; 11:12 twice; 14:8, 9; 17:14; 23:6; 30:7, 10; 31:7; 33:16; 42:11; 46:27). No pattern of distribution within the book can be recognised.

127. Th. renders both Heb. terms uniformly κατ' ἀνατολάς. Sym. and Syh. translate in 10:19 ἀνατολική. In the two other mentions of קדמוני with reference to 'gate' (47:8, 18; cp. further 48:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 18) the LXX too render ἀνατολάς.

128. T[J] renders the two terms uniformly מדנחאה.

129. This case, and examples 5 and 8, were not listed by E. Tov, *op.*

cit., who presented a classification of 'amplifications' without aiming at an exhaustive listing of all instances.

130. Most commentators do not discuss the doublet. See, e.g., C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia* (Leipzig 1905); F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, *GHAT* (Gottingen 1907); P. Volz, *Studien zum Text des Jeremia* (Leipzig 1920); *idem*, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, *KAT* (Leipzig 1928); W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, *HAT* (Tuebingen 1954); J. Bright, *Jeremia*, *AB ad loc.*

131. S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae*, wrongly records here: ובעת צרתם.

132. Another parallel pair which is based on the same synonyms is יום צרה (Jer. 16:19) and יום רעה (*ib.* 17:17, 18; 51:2).

133. In 31:1 Ziegler relegates to the apparatus the prevalent reading ἐν τῷ χαιρῷ and records in the main text the B-S-A-106'-46 rendition ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ.

134. The same double phrase turns up in the MT, LXX and T^J of Joel 4:1.

135. Cornill, *op. cit.*, 497 deletes ובעת ההיא together with נאם יהוה in 50:4, 20 "aus metrischen Gruenden," but retains the MT in 33:15, hardly sound methodological procedure. Volz, *KAT*, 423-425 takes 50:4, 20 to be parts of more comprehensive 'glosses,' and does not apply himself to the above textual problem. Rudolph, *op. cit.*, follows the MT in all three instances.

136. Jer. 33:14-26 is the most extensive consecutive MT unit which is omitted in the LXX.

137. None of the commentators cited remarks on this case.

138. It is immaterial for the present discussion whether the *hif'il* ימצאהו or the *qal* ימצָאהו is read here.

139. Cp. Ex. 15:17.

140. Cp. further Ps. 61:5 אחסה בסתר כנפיך, and the parallel idiom Gen. 19:8 באו בצל קרתי for which Ug. *'rb.bzl.ḫmt* (Krt: 159 = *CTA* 14 III:159) may be compared.

141. Also other cases of presumed textual doublets, in fact, may be stylistic transition doublets, as, e.g., 2 Kings 11:13[a] - הרצין העם compared with vv.4, 6, 11 הרצים and vv.13[b], 17 העם; *ib.* 11:19 הרצים וכל עם הארץ cp. with vv.4, 6, 11 הרצים and with vv.14, 18, 20 עם הארץ. Further: *ib.* 10:6[a] ראשי אנשי בני אדניכם compared with vv.1, 2, 3, 6[b] בני אדניכם, בנים, v.8 ראשי בני המלך and v.7 שבעים איש ... בני המלך. See S. Talmon, *Textus* I, 167.

142. Cp. Muilenburg, *SVT* I, 97ff.

143. The same feature may be observed in Ug. literature. See M. Dahood's remarks in *R-S Parallels*, 79-80.

144. Cp. Muilenburg, *op. cit.*, 99 and Dahood, *ib.*

145. We use the term somewhat differently from M. Dahood, *ib.*, 80-81.

146. Especially by Rashi, Ibn Ezra and David Kimḥi. See G. B. Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (London 1915) 17-18.

147. R. Lowth, *De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicae* (1753), tr. G. Gregory, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (London 1847). A very useful "Annotated Bibliography on Hebrew Poetry from 1915 to the Present" may be found in D. N. Freedman's Prolegomenon to the reissue of G. B. Gray's book (New York 1972) xli-liii.

148. See M. Dahood's discussion of this phenomenon in *R-S Parallels*, I ch.2, 71ff.

149. See the selection of publications in this field given by D. N. Freedman, *ib.*

150. Cp. Gevirtz, *Patterns*, 39, and example 67 *infra*.

151. For the pair *yyn* // *škr* cp. Is. 5:22; 24:9; 29:9; 56:12; Prov. 20:1; 31:4; Ug. 601:3-4, 16. Cp. further M. Dahood, *R-S Parallels* II, 248 (p. 209) where additional biblical examples are listed.

152. For the inverted couple *škr* // *yyn* cp. Is. 5:11; Prov. 31:6 and in Ug. 2 Aqht I:31-32; II:5-6; 19-20 (CTA 17 I:31-32; II:5-6, 19-20). For additional biblical examples consult M. Dahood, *ib.* II, 543 (p. 351).

153. The Greek translators derived בראה from *r'h* = 'see': LXX: φάσμα - φαντάσμα Sym.: ἐν ὄρασει. As against this, the T^J rendition - אתפניאו בחר מיכל בסים - implies that the translator associated בראה with 'food,' possibly connecting the term with 2 Sam. 12:17 MT: ולא ברה אתם לחם; T^J: ולא אכל עמהון לחמא. בסים = 'pleasant, tasty,' most probably is a free addition. In a review of A. L. Oppenheim, *Assyrian Dictionary* vol. XVI (1962), S. R. Driver posited the existence of a root *r'h* II = *rwh*. The interchange of *r'h/rwh* also can be observed in Is. 34:5 MT: רוחה בשמים חרבי = LXX: ἐμεθύσθη as against 1QIs[a]: כיא תראה בשמים = T^J: ארי תתגלי; Ps. 60:5 MT: הראית עמך קשה השקיתנו יין תרעלה || for which cp. B-S 31:28 (47): יין בשתה בעת וראי שמחת לב וששון רעדוי. The same phenomenon appears to underlie the employment of *r'h* in synonymous parallelism with *śb'*, as in Ps. 16:11; 91:16; Job 10:15 and Is. 53:11. For a discussion of this latter verse see: I.L. Seeligmann, "ΔΕΙ ≡ AI AYTΩI ΦΩΣ," *Gershom G. Scholem Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem 1958) pp. 1ff. (Hebrew). Additional examples of the same interchange may be found in Ps. 69:33 ראו ענוים ישמחו = 'the humble drank and rejoiced' (since wine proverbially makes the heart glad - Ps. 104:15), when compared with Ps. 22:7 יאכלו ענוים וישבעו. See also Prov. 23:31; Job 20:17 where אל ירא parallels יינק in the preceding verse; Eccl. 2:1 - אנסכה בשמחה וראה בטוב; and possibly also Job 33:21 MT: יכל בשרו מראי ושפי עצמותיו לא ראו = 'his flesh withered because of lack of moisture *(mem privativum)* and the marrow (?) of his bones was not moistened' (i.e., they dried up), bearing in mind the reference to food in the preceding verse. - D. Winton Tomas, *VT* XII (1962) 599-600, proposed to read *rww* for *'w* in Prov. 31:4[b] in parallelism with *šth* in the first colon. - the assumed interchange of *r'h/rwh* caused a mistranslation in the Greek to 1 Macc. 6:34 - καὶ τοῖς ἐλέφασιν ἔδειξαν (= הראו) ἅιμα σταφυλῆς καὶ μόρων in order to induce them to go into battle, which surely goes back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* ראו הפילים הרוו דם ענבים = 'they made them *drunk* with the blood of grapes,' i.e. with wine (cp. 3 Macc. 5:1-2). Thus correctly A. Kahane, *The Book of 1 Maccabees*, in: *The Apocrypha, etc.*

vol. II, p. 88 *ad loc.* Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch* (1853) refers to Aelian, *De Animal* XXIII,8 for proof that spiritous liquors were *given* (my italics) to elephants in order to excite them. In the case under review (1 Macc. 6:34), though, the liquor only "was *shown* to them, for had they drunk of it they would have got out of control."

154. O' L'- 233-456 403' 770 Syh. Syl Tht. Hi. read + διὰ τὸ σικερα κατεπόθησαν adjusting the Greek text to the Hebrew. Ms. 538 has simply τὸ σικερα for τὸ οἶνου.

155. A clear case of conflation of the transliteration - σικερα with the translation - μέθη.

156. The pair *qbr // spd* in this order parallels *bkh // qbr* in Job 27:15 and in Ug. 62:16-27 (CTA 6 I:16-17); 1 Aqht:111, 126, 140, 146 (CTA 19 III:111, 126, 140, 146), since *bkh* and *spd* are employed in parallelism and as interchangeable synonyms, either in the A-B or the B-A pattern, in biblical (Gen. 23:2; 2 Sam. 1:12; 3:31-32; Is. 22:12; Ez. 24:16; 27:31; Joel 2:12; Eccles. 3:4; Esth. 4:3) and in Ug. literature (1 Aqht:171-172, 183 = CTA 19 IV:171-172, 183). See S. Gevirtz, *Patterns, etc.*, 71-75; Dahood, *R-S Parallels*, 143, no. II,106).

157. The LXX do not render the word in either of the three occurrences. J. Bright, *op. cit.*, records the omission only for vv.8 and 10. ἡ ἀδελφή αὐτῆς is added in all three instances in a number of Lucianic manuscripts which, though, have also in v.7 the sequence of MT v.8 אחותה יהודה. O, λ and Syh. exhibit the MT order. In vv.8 and 10, O-233 and Q adjust the Greek to the MT by adding ἡ ἀδελφή αὐτῆς in the appropriate positions, but do not supply the phrase in v. 7. For α', ϑ' the addition can be established only in v.10.

158. The recurring a-b-c sequences in vv.7 and 10 form an *inclusio* frame for the a-c-b sequence of v.8. Vv.7-10 are thereby set apart as a small unit within the wider setting of vv.6-12[a] (cp. Bright, *op. cit.*, 26).

159. To the best of my knowledge this possibility was not been considered in the study of chiasm and inversion. Cp. also examples 69-70 and further Joel 1:7, 12 גפן II תאנה (negative) - 2:22 תאנה II גפן (positive); Hag. 1:10 טל + שמים II יבול + ארץ (negative) - Zech. 8:12 ארץ II טל + שמים יבול + (positive).

160. For *'ṣ // 'bn* cp. 2 Sam. 5:11, and my remarks on the assumed doublet in *Textus* IV (1964) 121; Is. 60:17; Hab. 2:19. The same simple sequence of the nouns is present in Ex. 7:19; 1 Ki. 5:32; 2 Ki. 19:18; 22:6; Is. 37:19; Ez. 20:32; Zech. 5:4; 1 Chr. 22:14; for Ug. parallels see *'nt* III:19-20; IV:58-59 (CTA 3 III:19-20; IV:58-69); 1001 rev:13, and M. Dahood, *R-S Parallels*, 302; II, 44.

161. Cp. further Ez. 26:12; Eccl. 10:9; 1 Chr. 22:15; 2 Chr. 34:10 and my remarks on this last example in *Textus* I (1960) 182-184. The instance is not listed by M. Dahood in *R-S Parallels*, 100; II, 9. For a Ug. parallel cp. 52:66 (CTA 22:66).

162. For the sequence *yyn // škr* cp. example no. 61.

163. The retention of the adjectives *gdl // rb* in the order in which they are employed in Ez. 17:17 accompanied by an inversion of order of the

nouns *qhl // ḥyl*. Thus a distant chiastic relation between Ez. 17:17 and 38:15 is achieved.

164. Cp. Avishur, *op. cit.*, 44.

165. Ignoring the obvious distant chiasm and following the LXX, J. Hempel *(BH)* gratuitously adjusts the order of the components in this verse to Deut. 7:5 by transposing תגדעון and תשרפון.

166. On intentional inversion in quotations see M. Seidel, "Parallels in the Book of Isaiah and the Book of Psalms," *Sinai* 38 (1958) 149-172; 229-240; 272-280; 333-355 (Hebrew).

167. The term יום איד by itself is widely employed in biblical literature, e.g., 2 Sam. 22:19 = Ps. 18:19; Jer. 18:17; Ob. 12-13; Job 21:30.

168. פקדתם echoes ושלם of Deut. 32:35. Cp. further:

Jer. 25:12	והיה ... אפקד על מלך בבל
25:14	ושלמתי להם כפעלם
51:52	ופקדתי על פסיליה
51:54	כי אל גמלות יהוה שלם ישלם

Jer. 32:18 ומשלם עון אבות אל חיק בניהם is derived from Ex. 20:5; 34:7 פקד עון אבות על בנים (cp. Num. 14:17; Deut. 5:9).

1 Sam. 2:20 4QSam[a] = LXX	ישלם יהוה לך זרע מן האשה הזאת
2:21	כי פקד יהוה את חנה

169. Cp. Jer. 6:15; 8:12.

170. The sequence עת (אידם) יום of Deut. 32:35-36 is maintained in Ez. 7:7, 12 היום (הגיע) קרוב בא העת.

171. For single *'yd* cp. Jer. 48:16; 49:32; Job 18:12; 21:17; 30:12; 31:3, 23; Prov. 1:26, 27; 6:16; 17:5; 14:22.

172. The phenomenon of *inclusio* was discerned frequently in the Book of Psalms by M. Dahood in his commentary (*AB*, vol. I-III, index *s.v. inclusio*). The concept and the term *Ringkomposition* generated in the study of classical literature, especially the Greek epic. See W. A. A. van Otterlo, "De Ringkompositie als Opbouwprincipe in de epische Gedichten van Homerus," *Verhandl. der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel* 51, no. 1 (Amsterdam 1948) 1-95 (I am indebted to Dr. E. Tov for bringing this work to my attention); *idem*, "Untersuchung ueber Begriff, Anwendung und Enstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition," *Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel* 6, nos. 1-4 (Amsterdam 1943) 131-176 (with a bibliographical survey of the study of the *Ringkomposition*.

173. See S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, *op. cit.*, 27ff.

174. The term was introduced into the study of biblical literature by C. Kuhl, "Die Wiederaufnahme - ein literarkritisches Prinzip?," *ZAW* 64 (1952) 1-11, who thus rendered in German H. Wiener's English term 'resumptive repetition' (*The Composition of Judges II 11 to 1 Kings II 46* [London 1929] 2). The German term had been previously used in classical studies. Cp e.g., van Otterlo, "Untersuchungen." - The literary phenomenon thus defined already had been discerned in some specific cases by medieval Jewish commentators as will be shown in a separate publication.

175. בשתים was thus understood by medieval Jewish commentators, e.g., Rashi, Kimḥi, Levi ben Gershom, Isaiah of Trani. Similarly T^J. The passage containing the phrase is lacking in LXX, but was restored in O + L where ἐν ταῖς δύσιν appears to reflect the same interpretation. This is rejected by H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, *ICC* (Edinburgh 1912) 174, who renders the phrase 'on two conditions.' Cp. also S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text etc. of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 152-153; M. H. Segal, *Samuel* (Jerusalem 1956) 153 (Hebrew), *et al.* R. Kittel's emendation בש(נ)חים *(BH)* is altogether unwarranted, nor can A. B. Ehrlich's proposed reading ב(פל)שתים (*Randglossen* II, 233), or N. H. Tur-Sinai's reconstruction, suggested with some hesitation, בִּשְׁתָּ מהתחתן בי - 'you are ashamed...' (פשוטו של מקרא vol. II, 166) be recommended.

176. Cp., e.g., Gen. $4:2^b$ //2^b ; 3^b //4^a; 4^b//5^a. The inverted sequence obtains, e.g., in Ps. $29:10^a$//^{b}; 1 Sam. 14:25//26. An interesting example of a textual doublet which reflects this principle may be found in 2 Sam. 8:14 וישם באדום נצבים בכל אדום שם נצבים for which see S. Talmon, *Textus* I, 177.

177. See M. Held, "The *yqtl* - *qtl* Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic," *Studies and Essays in Honor of A. A. Neuman* (Leiden 1962) 281-290.

178. The term occurs again in the Book of Daniel 8:20 where the sequence 'Media and Persia' prevails (5:28; contrast 6:9, 13, 16: כדת מדי ופרס with Esth. 1:19). This fact, though, can hardly be construed to establish a special affinity of the appendix Esth. ch.10 with the Book of Daniel.

179. See the present author's "Wisdom in the Book of Esther," *VT* XIII (1963) 416-453.

180. For the problems concerning this appendix, see D. Daube, "The Last Chapter of Esther," *JQR* 31 (1946-47) 139-147, and the summary of the state of the question in H. Bardtke, "Neuere Arbeiten am Estherbuche, Eine Kritische Wuerdigung," *Ex Oriente Lux* 19 (1965-66) 519-549.

181. The Targums concur with the MT throughout.

182. Neither of the chiasms involved has attracted the attention of commentators.

183. The hexaplaric recension exhibits the inverted sequence.

184. S. Gevirtz, *Patterns*, 77-78, 95.

185. This arrangement which is based on the recognition of the underlying *inclusio* pattern differs considerably from the one proposed *int. alii.* by S. E. Loewenstamm, "On the Chiastic Structure in the Bible," in: *E. Auerbach Volume*, Publication of the Israel Bible Society, vol. I (1955) 27-30 (Hebrew).

186. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, *BKAT* II (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 1083.

187. The interdependence of Ezekiel's vision of the future temple, especially of 40:1 - 43:12, often has been noted. See most recently S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, *op. cit.*

188. For an analysis of the overall use of this formula in the Book of Jeremiah, *vide supra*, p. 68.

189. This addition usually is explained as a widening of the promise to include in it also the northern tribes.

190. See the list given in C. D. Ginsburg's edition (London 1926) *ad loc.*

191. This conclusion is buttressed by the fact that the *haftarah* for the second day of the New Year festival begins with Jer. 31:2.

192. *Pace* J. Bright, *Jeremiah AB*, 280.

193. *Ib.*

194. *Op. cit.*, 152.

195. P. Volz, *Jeremia*, 279.

196. P. Volz, *Der Text, etc.*, 194.

197. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 131.

198. A. W. Streane, *Jeremiah*, 186.

199. *Op. cit.*, 143.

200. H. Cornill, *Jeremia*, 329. He is followed by Giesebrecht, Duhm, Peake and others. See P. Volz, *Jeremia*, 238.

201. See commentaries *ad loc.*

202. H. Cornill, *Jeremia*, *loc.cit.*

203. P. Volz, *Der Text, etc.*, 227.

204. For some further examples of *inclusio* with inverted parallelism see Jer. 8:4-11; Ez. 12:25-28; 40:1ff.-43:12, and the discussion of this case in S. Talmon - M. Fishbane, *op. cit.*

205. See *Textus* I, 175, 177; IV, 115; *Scripta Hierosolymitana* VII, 175.

206. According to the Massoretic tradition, the word "is to be written but not read." It is not rendered in T^J and in the Luc. revision.

207. The LXX have no equivalent for MT: לדבר הזה. Ms B^+ and the Hexapl. revision add (with asterisk) τῷ ῥήματι τούτῳ. L: + καὶ περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου.

208. Cp., e.g., J. A. Montgomery, *The Books of Kings*, *ICC* (Edinburgh 1951) 375, 379.

209. It may be conjectured that in this instance the present second hemistich was accidentally transferred from its previous position after the present third. A restitution of the assumed original sequence would restore an *inclusio* pattern based on inverted parallels.

210. By translating περὶ ὑμῶν = עליכם, the LXX make Aaron and Moses the object of the statement, referring it back to v.2. Thus $v.27^b$ is not any more a mere repetition of $v.27^a$ in which God is the object.

211. Sam.: הם for MT: המה is of no consequence.

212. For a similar ellipsis of an expectable verb after the question cp. Is. 6:11; Ps. 6:4 and 90:13.

213. Cp. vv.17, 18.

214. Observe the chiastic structure and cp. v.23.

215. Cp. v.17, MT: לא יקרב להקריב לחם אלהיו, Sam.: לא יגש.

216. Against the Massoretic system which has a major divider after מקדשי קדשיכם.

217. On the vocalization הוא (α´) instead of היא (α) see S. Talmon, "The Three Scrolls of the Law that were found in the Temple Court," *Textus* II (1962) 14-17. This variation cannot serve as a criterion for deciding on the relative antiquity of the two parallels.

218. *Vide*, e.g., J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Buecher Samuelis* (Goettingen 1872) 141; Smith, *Samuel*, *ICC*, 242-243; Driver, *Samuel*, 218; Segal, *Samuel*, 218.

219. Further instances of partially preserved doublets may be found, e.g., in Ex. 23:2; 1 Kings 10:28; Ps. 10:9; 2 Chr. 1:17.

220. See Cross - Freedman, "2 Sam. 22 - Ps. 18," *ad loc.*

221. The word *'bn* is either a gloss or a variant reading for *qyr*. See S. Talmon, *Textus* IV, 121.

222. See F. M. Cross, Jr., *HThR*, 1964.

223. See M. Noth, *Das zweite Buch Moses*, *ATD* (Goettingen 1959) 154-155, 216ff.; U. Cassuto, *Exodus* (Jerusalem 1967) 304-305, 446.

224. These considerations apply to some degree also to inner-massoretic inversion variants in parallel traditions that stem from chronologically different linguistic strata. In a discussion of inversion variants in Kings - Chronicles or Historiographies - Psalms, etc., the factor of changing syntactical norms must be taken into account. Cp., e.g., A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, *BZAW* 16 (Berlin,1901); A. Hurwitz, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew (Jerusalem 1972, Hebrew)*, and the bibliography listed there; *idem*, "Diachronic Chiasm in Biblical Hebrew," in: *The Bible and the History of Israel* (Jerusalem, 1972) 248-255 (Hebrew).

225. Cp., e.g., Is. 37:32 MT: מירושלים מהר ציון; Is[a]: ~, possibly influenced by 2:3.

226. MT stands here in a chiastic relation to the preceding verse whereas Is[a] presents the same sequence in both instances.

227. Cp. further Is. 52:7 MT: רגלי מבשר משמיע שלום מבשר טוב משמיע ישועה
Is[a]: " " מבשר " משמיע " מש( )

228. It should be stressed that in contrast to Is[a] which altogether diverges from the MT in many instances, Is[b] may be considered a proto-massoretic manuscript which rarely differs from the MT, as is well known.

229. Cp. further Is. 63:9 MT: וינטלם וינשאם; Is[a]: ~.

230. Cp. 2 Kings 18:27 MT: ... העל אדניך.

231. Cp. further Is[a] 61:7; 63:17, *et al.*

232. Is[a] presents two readings of this phrase which are distinguished from each other only by some minor spelling variants.

233. Cp. Cross, *HThR* 1964.

234. J. Ziegler, ed., *Ieremias*, 44, n.1.

235. *Op. cit.*, 55-56; cp. further *idem*, *Isaias*, 24.

236. *Ieremias*, 44.

237. Ziegler, ed., *Isaias*, 72.

238. *Op. cit.*, 72-73, 89.

239. Unless one assumes the unlikely position that κακία renders here, and only here, משובה which in all other instances is translated ἁμαρτία, ἀποστροφή, etc.

240. φῶς is an erroneous translation of *'wr* II which refers here to some kind of herbage, as in 2 Kings 4:39. The Greek translator also had difficulties with *ṣh* which he somehow identified with *ṣhrym* - midday. Modern translations follow the LXX slavishly: RSV: 'sunshine'; NEB: 'summer sun'; ZB: 'Sonnenlichte'; SB: 'lumière.'

241. The expression may be compared with Prov. 19:12 וכטל על עשב and Deut. 32:1 כשעירים עלי דשא וכרביבים עלי עשב - 'like fine rain upon the grass and like showers on young plants' (NEB). There these idioms follow upon references to *mtr* and *tl*. טל אור(ות) should be understood as an elliptic expression signifying 'dew upon herbage' that falls at the end of the rain season or in the summer. Thus correctly RSV: 'dew of herbs.' Translations such as NEB: 'sparkling light'; ZB: 'Tau der Lichter'; SB: 'rosée lumineuse' are far off the mark.

242. An inscription in ancient Hebrew characters from Tell Arad - (1)בשלשת (2)ירח צח - published by Y. Aharoni - R. Amiran, *BIES* N.S. XXVII (1963) 229-230, makes it plausible that in Is. 18:4 reference is made to the name of the summer-harvest month. Cp. further Jer. 4:11 where the term *ṣh* is connected with the threshing season. - Tos. Ta'anit 1:7 (ed. Zuckermandel, 215 ll. 16-17; ed. Lieberman, 325, ll. 35-38) refers to the summer season by the term *ḥm* which follows there upon *qṣyr* and *qyṣ*.

243. Numerous variants in the biblical scrolls from Qumran were explained to have arisen in this manner, just as variants in Bible quotations in rabbinic literature often were taken to have resulted from citation by heart. See, e.g., H. L. Strack, *Prolegomena Critica in V.T.* (Leipzig 1873) 60, and the discussion of the matter in V. Aptowitzer, *Das Schriftwort in der Rabbinischen Literatur* (photographic reprint New York 1970) 21ff.

244. See W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der Juedischen Traditionaliteratur* I (Leipzig 1899) 136-137; II (Leipzig 1905) 144.

245. *Sifrē Bamidbar* 9:6 (ed. Friedmann, 17b, l. 13); 15:33 (*ib.*, 33b, l. 28); 17:9 (*ib.*, 49b, l. 7); also Bab. Tal. B.B. 119b; Jer. Tal. R.H. 58b *ad* Ps. 144:14; *Gen. Rabba* 33(1) *ad* Ps. 36:7, *et al.*

246. Num. 17:2 where El'azar is mentioned before Moses is considered

by R. Joshijah an inverted verse - הרי זה מקרא מסורס - (*Sifrē Bamidbar*, 49b l. 7). For further examples consult Bacher, *ib.*

247. See S. Talmon, *Textus* IV, 125ff.

248. Bacher renders *srs* by 'castriren = castrate' (*op. cit.* I, 136). The Hebrew term is better translated 'invertieren' or 'transponieren' (*op. cit.* II, 144). Cp. M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of Talmud Babli, etc.*, II (New York 1943); E. Ben Jehuda, *Thesaurus, etc.*, VIII (Jerusalem 1940); A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum* VI (New York 1955) *s.v. srs*. - The verb *srs* and the noun *srys* are not extant in biblical Hebrew. The biblical noun *srys* is an *Akk.* loanword - *ša rēši* - which designates predominantly officials at foreign courts. In this connotation the term is employed in an Aramaic inscription (Donner-Roellig no. 224 l.5), and should be rendered there: 'einer von meinen Beamten' rather than 'Eunuchen.'

249. See *supra*, examples 65, 69, 70 and note 159.

250. See J. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll* (Jerusalem 1957) 207 (Hebrew). Licht draws attention to the similar imagery in 1QH III, 30-33.

251. The phrase [כאשר ד]ברתה ביד מושה (1QH XVII, 12) refers not only to Ex. 34:7 MT: נצא ערן ופשע וחטאה, paraphrased in 1QH: [לשאת פשע] ערון וחטאה *(ib.)*, but also to the mention of Deut. 32:22 in the next line.

252. This interpretation of Qumran socio-historical ideology will be further developed elsewhere. For the present, see S. Talmon, "Qumran und das Alte Testament," *Frankfurter Universitaetsreden* Heft 12 (Frankfurt am Main 1972) 84-100.

253. These terms, and especially 'oral Torah,' merit renewed attention in the light of J. Neusner's recent investigations. See his "The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before A.D. 70, The Problems of Oral Transmission," *JJS* XXII (1971) 1-18.

254. The very term 'canon' in reference to the collection of the O.T. books requires further clarification which would do full justice to rabbinic pronouncements on this issue. A provocative, rather untraditional approach to the problem may be found in J. A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia 1972); *idem*, "Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon," *McCormick Quarterly* XXI (1968) 1-15 where recent discussions of the matter are listed.

255. The issue was dealt with by E. E. Urbach, "When did Prophecy Cease?," *Tarbiz* XVII (1946) 1-11 (Hebrew).

256. The question whether 11QPs^{a} should be considered a copy of the biblical Book of Psalms, as is maintained by most scholars and foremost by its editor J. A. Sanders, or whether it rather should be viewed as a liturgical collection of psalms, as reasoned by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Textus* V (1966), and S. Talmon, *ib.*, 11 ff., requires further analysis.

257. My thanks are due to Dr. E. Tov for some valuable comments and suggestions.

Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1972

J. A. Sanders

The spring of 1972 marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the discovery of the Qumran manuscripts. 1947 was the beginning of a period of more than fifteen years during which ancient manuscript materials have been recovered along the west littoral of the Jordan Fault as far north as the Wadi ed-Daliyeh and as far south as Masada. Publication of the manuscripts continues apace in widely scattered periodicals and titles.

The response to my "Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1967" (*JBL* 86 [1967] 431-44) was very gratifying and indicates the continued need, there expressed, for a readily available listing of the *loci* of the *editiones principes*, and in some instances the *editiones principales*, of the materials so far published. The bibliography by B. Jongeling (*A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958-1969* [1971]) brings the earlier work of William LaSor up to date and is very useful. Indeed, when it first appeared I thought I should not have to update my much leaner listing. But students working with me on the scrolls have made clear the continuing need of a simple list of where the photographs and responsible transcriptions have been published, or those available since the beginning.

The format here is basically that of the earlier list; the only change is that of reversing the order of Caves 4 and 11, so that now they appear in numerical order.

In the near future a good bit of material will have been published. J. T. Milik's 4Q Aramaic Enoch materials, *The Books of Enoch* (see below under I.A.c.2.), are in page proof at Oxford (though not in the *DJD* series). Milik has submitted articles on 4QMelch to *JJS* and on 4QMelch^{ar} to *RB*, both of which are scheduled to appear in forthcoming issues of those journals. Milik's definitive edition of all the Cave 4 materials assigned to him is also at the publisher's in Oxford and will probably constitute the next two volumes of the *DJD* series: these will include all of the Qumran Cave 4 materials we would call apocrypha or pseudepigrapha, that is, non-biblical