

Innocent Himbaza (ed.)

## **The Text of Leviticus**

**Proceedings of the Third International  
Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy  
Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015)**

**PEETERS**

## **THE TEXT OF LEVITICUS**

# ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Founded by Othmar Keel

Editorial Board: Susanne Bickel, Catherine Mittermayer, Mirko Novák,  
Thomas C. Römer and Christoph Uehlinger

Published on behalf of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the  
Bible+Orient Foundation

in cooperation with  
the Institute of Egyptology, University of Basel,  
the Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Near Eastern Archaeology section, University  
of Bern,  
the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg,  
the Institut romand des sciences bibliques, University of Lausanne,  
and the Department of Religious Studies, University of Zurich

## *Volume editor*

*Innocent Himbaza* (1965) is Titular Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament studies and Hebrew at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, and the curator of the Fribourg-based Dominique Barthélemy Institute devoted to research on the text of the HB/OT. His main research interests include textual criticism and the history and interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. Himbaza is the editor of the book of Leviticus for the Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ). Among his publications are *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte* (OBO 207, 2004); *L'écrit et l'esprit* (ed. with D. Böhler and Ph. Hugo; OBO 214, 2005); *Un carrefour dans l'histoire du texte* (ed. with A. Schenker; OBO 233, 2007); *Making the Biblical Text* (ed.; OBO 275, 2015); and *La Bible en face* (ed. with C. Locher; CRB 95, 2020).

# **The Text of Leviticus**

**Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the  
Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg  
(October 2015)**

edited by

Innocent Himbaza

Publications of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, 3

**Peeters  
Leuven - Paris - Bristol, CT  
2020**

*Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* publishes monographs, multi-author volumes and conference proceedings in the fields of Biblical Studies (Hebrew Bible and Septuagint), Ancient Near Eastern Studies and Egyptology broadly understood (including archaeology, history, iconography and religion). The editorial board and affiliated institutions reflect the series' high academic standards and interdisciplinary outlook. Manuscripts may be submitted via a member of the editorial board. They are examined by the board and subject to further peer review by internationally recognized scholars at the board's discretion. The series is committed to worldwide distribution, notably through open access publication (Gold or Green). Past volumes are archived at the digital repository of the University of Zurich ([www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)).

Senior editor: [Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch](mailto:Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch)



The open access publication of this book has been facilitated by the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-4344-5

eISBN 978-90-429-4345-2

D/2020/0602/91

© 2020, Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	VII
Abbreviations .....	IX
 <i>Innocent Himbaza</i>	
Introduction: Where Does the Text of Leviticus Stand? .....	1
 <i>Emanuel Tov</i>	
Textual Harmonization in Leviticus .....	13
 <i>Anna Angelini and Christophe Nihan</i>	
Unclean Birds in the Hebrew and Greek Versions of Leviticus and Deuteronomy .....	39
 <i>Innocent Himbaza</i>	
La Bénédiction d’Aaron en Lévitique 9,22 et le Pentateuque Samaritain .....	69
 <i>Mary-Gabrielle Roth-Mouthon</i>	
Le Lévitique dans le Pentateuque Samaritain : étude comparée des manuscrits 6 (C) de Sichem, CBL 751 (Dublin) et BCU L2057 (Fribourg) .....	83
 <i>Innocent Himbaza</i>	
The Edited Septuagint of Leviticus is Not the Septuagint: A Plea for a Paradigm Shift .....	107
 <i>Moshe A. Zipor</i>	
The Nature of the Septuagint Version of the Book of Leviticus .....	121
 <i>Giorgio Paximadi</i>	
Entre variantes et interprétations. Corruption textuelle ou exégèse dans le texte de la Septante du Lévitique ? .....	133
 <i>Viktor Golinets</i>	
Orthographical, Grammatical and Lexical Peculiarities in the Hebrew Texts of Leviticus: Considerations about Hebrew Bible Editing in the Light of the Linguistic Development of Hebrew .....	149
 <i>Esias E. Meyer</i>	
Leviticus 19:2 and Joshua 24:19: An Example of Literary Allusion? ....	179

*Gert J. Steyn*

The Text Form of the Leviticus Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels  
and the Acts of the Apostles ..... 205

*Michael Avioz*

The Book of Leviticus in Josephus' Writings ..... 227

*René Péter-Contesse*

Quelques problèmes de traduction dans le chapitre 11 du Lévitique ..... 243

Index ..... 255

List of Contributors ..... 271

Detailed Table of Contents ..... 273

## PREFACE

Ancient Jewish tradition attaches significant consideration to the book of Leviticus, as it is by far the most quoted in rabbinic literature such as the Mishna or the Talmud. In the Christian tradition, however, the situation reversed. Indeed, the book of Leviticus had been marginalized in studies and discussions by specialists. Nevertheless, for some decades now, scholars of both traditions have again become highly interested in Leviticus. The book is thoroughly studied for its textual, literary, historical and reception aspects, as shown by many recent publications.

It has often been said and written that the text of Leviticus is stable in comparison to many other books of the Hebrew Bible, that its Greek translation is literal, etc. Yet, the text of Leviticus continues to raise questions, not only regarding its content and textual witnesses, but also its interpretation, history and reception. The third international colloquium of the Institut Dominique Barthélemy, held in Fribourg in October 2015, aimed to bring together some specialists of the text of Leviticus in order to advance research on the content of its textual witnesses and on the aforementioned topics. Their contributions are collected in this volume. Some of the authors who could not attend the colloquium accepted to contribute to the publication, while others, who participated at the colloquium, could not publish their paper here.

The articles collected in his book reflect how wide the field of research is on such a biblical text. Discussions devoted to the text of Leviticus may be categorized as follows:

- 1) Leviticus as it appears in compared textual witnesses such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Masoretic Text, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint (Tov, Angelini and Nihan);
- 2) Leviticus as it appears in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Himbaza, Roth-Mouthon);
- 3) Leviticus as it appears in the Septuagint (Himbaza, Zipor, Paximadi);
- 4) Leviticus and considerations about Hebrew editing (Golinets);
- 5) Leviticus in relation to other books such as Joshua, Luke-Acts and Josephus (Meyer, Steyn, Avioz);
- 6) Leviticus in translation as explored in the French case study by Pétér-Contesse.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my colleagues of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute of Fribourg University: Philippe Lefebvre, Adrian Schenker, Yohanan Goldman, Philippe Hugo and especially Mary-Gabrielle Roth-Mouthon, who



contributed by proofreading many contributions. I also thank Prof. Christoph Uehlinger and the editorial board of *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* who accepted this book in their series. Marcia Bodenmann and Christoph Uehlinger took care of the volume's final layout and editing.

Fribourg, July 2020

Innocent Himbaza

## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>AoF</i>	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BFC	Bible en Français Courant
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BJ	Bible de Jérusalem
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BP	Bible de la Pléiade
BWANT	Beihefte zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAT	Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae lovanienses</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
G	Septuagint
<i>HA</i>	<i>Histoire des Animaux (Aristote)</i>
HALOT	The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HeBAI	Hebrew Bible and Ancien Israel
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HThKAT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JCPS	Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series

<i>JAJ</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSCS</i>	<i>Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJ Sup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSPS</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSSM	Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph
La	Vetus Latina
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LD	Lectio Divina
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
M	Masoretic Text
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
NAB	New American Bible
NBS	Nouvelle Bible Segond
NETS	A New English Translation of the Septuagint
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OTL	The Old Testament Library
<i>PEFQSt</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Statement</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
Q	Qumran
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie</i>
REB	Revised English Bible
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SBL.RBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
SBL.SCSS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
S	Peshitta (Syriac)
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SEC</i>	<i>Semitica et Classica</i>
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
Smr	Samaritan Pentateuch
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch

SJ	Studia Judaica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StSam	Studia Samaritana
T	Targum
T <sup>J</sup>	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
T <sup>N</sup>	Targum Neofiti
T <sup>O</sup>	Targum Onqelos
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
ThWAT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
TOB	Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible
TSAJ	Text and Studies in Ancien Judaism
UF	<i>Ugarit Forschungen</i>
V	Vulgate
VL	Vetus Latina
VTG.S	Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTS	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAR	<i>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>



## INTRODUCTION: WHERE DOES THE TEXT OF LEVITICUS STAND?

Innocent HIMBAZA

The contributions published in this volume discuss the book of Leviticus as it appears in textual witnesses, in its relation to the other books, and in its translation challenges. Before discussing all these topics, it seems necessary to provide an overall description of the text of Leviticus as reflected in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Aramaic witnesses. The overview given here is based on the research carried out within the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ) project. The major textual witnesses of Leviticus are the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), the Masoretic Text (M), the Samaritan Pentateuch (Smr), the Septuagint (G), the Vulgate (V), the Peshitta (S) and different Targums (T). Existing critical editions, translations, and recent commentaries, as well as those in progress, reflect the interest of Leviticus in scholarship. They provide good insights for further historical, literary and theological studies.

### 1. DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Recent publications have increased the number of the DSS manuscripts containing the text of Leviticus<sup>1</sup>. All the chapters of the book are represented in those manuscripts. Some new manuscripts were published or differently identified<sup>2</sup>. If one accepts to split the 4QLev<sup>b</sup> into two different manuscripts, as sug-

<sup>1</sup> Previous syntheses were given in E. Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judean Desert. Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002); P. W. Flint, "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus. Composition & Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler, with the assistance of S. Smith Bartel; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 323-341; A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*. Bd. 1. *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 61-62, 66-79, 537-539; E. Tov, *Revised List of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010); K. De Troyer, "From Leviticus to Joshua: The Old Greek Text of Two Septuagint Manuscripts from the Schøyen Collection," *JAJ* 2 (2011), 29-78; R. A. Kugler, K. S. Baek, *Leviticus at Qumran. Text and Interpretation* (VTS 173; The Text of the Bible at Qumran; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> H. Eshel, Y. Baruch, R. Porat, "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006), 55-60; M. Segal, E. Tov, W. B. Seales, C. S. Parker, P. Shor, Y. Porath with an Appendix by A. Yardeni, "An Early Leviticus Scroll from En-Gedi: Preliminary Publication," *Textus* 26 (2016), 29-58; T. Elgvin, K. Davis and M. Langlois (ed.), *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection* (Library of Second Temple Studies 71; London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 113-118, 159-167.

gested by Tigchelaar, the total number of all the published manuscripts of Leviticus is twenty-seven. They are in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. It has been observed that, compared to M, the Qumran manuscripts exhibit variants and some affinities with Smr and G, while those from Masada, Naḥal Arugot and En-Gedi reflect M. The character and the date of the DSS are still debated<sup>3</sup>. A recent study of Michael Langlois considers the Palaeo-Hebrew manuscripts as older than is actually asserted<sup>4</sup>. The following table provides a new synthesis, giving both name, approximate date (new suggestion in parentheses), and content of the DSS of Leviticus.

Manuscript	Approximate Date	Identified text of Leviticus
1QPaleoLev (1Q3) [1QPaleoLev-Num <sup>a</sup> + 1QpaleoLev <sup>b</sup> ?: 27,30-31 (?)]	150-75 BCE (3 <sup>rd</sup> c. BCE)	11:10-11 19:30-34 20:20-24 21:24 22:2-6 23:4-8 27:30-31(?)
2QpaleoLev (2Q5)	150-75 BCE (4 <sup>th</sup> -3 <sup>rd</sup> c. BCE)	11:22, 24-29
4QExod-Lev <sup>f</sup> (4Q17)	ca. 250 BCE	1:13-15, 17 2:1
4QLev-Num <sup>a</sup> (4Q23)	150-100 BCE	13:32-33 14:22-23, 25-34, 40-54 15:10-11, 19-24 16:15-29 18:16-18, 20-21 19:3-8 24:11-12 26:26, 28-33 27:5-22
4QLev <sup>b1</sup> (4Q24 <sup>a</sup> ) <sup>5</sup>	75-50 BCE	1:11-17 2:1-3, 5-16 3:1, 8-14

<sup>3</sup> Compare publications of DJD (for Leviticus, see 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18, 23, 36) and A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*. Bd. 1. *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

<sup>4</sup> M. Langlois, "Dead Sea Scrolls Palaeography and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 255-285.

<sup>5</sup> For the splitting of 4QLev<sup>b</sup>, see E. Tigchelaar, "Reconsidering 4Q24 (4QLeviticus<sup>b</sup>): Two Manuscripts and a New Fragment," *VT*, forthcoming.

4QLev <sup>b2</sup> (4Q24 <sup>b</sup> )	125-100 BCE	21:17-18, 20, 24 22:2-6, 8-28, 30-33 23:1-6, 8, 10-22, 24-25, 40 24:2-14, 16-17, 19-21, 23 25:28-29, 44-49, 51-52
4QLev <sup>c</sup> (4Q25)	30-1 BCE/ 50-68 CE <sup>6</sup>	1:1-5, 7 3:16-17 4:1-6, 12-14, 23-28 5:12-13 8:26-28
4QLev <sup>d</sup> (4Q26)	30 BCE–20 CE (50 BCE)	14:27-29, 33-36 15:20-24 17:2-11
4QLev <sup>e</sup> (4Q26 <sup>a</sup> )	30-1 BCE	3:2-8 19:34-37 20:1-4, 27 21: 1-4, 9-12, 21-24 22:4-6, 11-17
4QLev <sup>g</sup> (4Q26 <sup>b</sup> ) <sup>7</sup>	50-1 BCE	7:19-21, 23-26, 30-32 <sup>8</sup> (or 8:26)
4QLXXLev <sup>a</sup> (4Q119)	100 BCE	26:2-16
4Qpap cryptA Lev (4Q249 <sup>j</sup> )	190-150 BCE/ 150-100 BCE <sup>9</sup>	26,14-16
4Qpap cryptA Text Quot- ing Leviticus A (4Q249 <sup>k</sup> )	150-100 BCE	26:16-17
4Qpap cryptA Text Quot- ing Leviticus B (4Q249 <sup>l</sup> )	125-100 BCE	26:33-34
4QpapLXXLev <sup>b</sup> (4Q120)	100-1 BCE	1:11 2:3-5, 7-8 (?) 3:4, 7, 9-14 4:3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 18-19, 26-28, 30 5:6, 8-10, 16-19 6:1-5 [5:20-24]
4QpaptgLev	150 BCE	16:1-15, 18-21

<sup>6</sup> A. Lange, *Handbuch*, 70.

<sup>7</sup> “4QLev<sup>b</sup>” has not been used (cf. DJD 12, 193-204) in order to avoid confusion with 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> (4Q17).

<sup>8</sup> For this new content, see E. Tigchelaar, “4Q26b (4QLeviticus<sup>g</sup>) Frag. 2,” *Textus* 29 (2020), 53-56.

<sup>9</sup> A. Lange, *Handbuch*, 73.



4QRP <sup>c</sup> (4Q365)	50-1 BCE	11:1-2, 17-24, 32, 40-45 13:6-8, 15-18, 51-52 16:6-7 or 11-12 or 17-18 18:26-28 23:42-44 24:1-2 25:7-9 26:17-32 27:34(?)
4QRP <sup>d</sup> (4Q366)	50 BCE	24:20-22(?) 25:39-43
4QRP <sup>e</sup> (4Q367)	125-50 BCE	11:47 12:1-8 13:1 15:14-15 19:1-4, 9-15 20:13 27:30-34
6QpaleoLev (6Q2)	250-150 BCE (4 <sup>th</sup> -3 <sup>rd</sup> c. BCE)	8:12-13
11QLev <sup>b</sup> (11Q2)	ca. 50 CE	7:34-35 8:8 or 9 9:23-24 10:1-2 13:58-59 14:16-17 15:18-19 25:31-33
11QpaleoLev <sup>a</sup> (11Q1)	1-50 CE (2 <sup>nd</sup> c. BCE)	4:23-26, 31, 33-35? 6:12-13 8:10-11 10:4-7, 9 (or 14?), 15? 11:27-32 13:3-9, 33-43?, 39-40, 42-43 14:16-21, 53-55, 57 15:2-5 16:1-6, 34 17:1-5 18:27-30 19:1-4 20:1-6 21:6-12 22:20-27

		23:22-29 24:8-14 25:28-36 26:17-26 27:11-19
ArugLev	75-100 CE	23:38-44 24:16-19
EGLev	1 <sup>st</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> c. CE	1:1-17 2:1-11
MasLev <sup>a</sup> (Mas1a)	25-1 BCE	4:3-9
MasLev <sup>b</sup> (Mas1b)	10 BCE-10 CE	8:31, 33-34 9:1-10, 12-13, 22-24 10:1, 9-20 11:1-13, 15-21, 23-40
Mur/HevLev (former 4Q26 <sup>c</sup> or XLev <sup>c</sup> )	50-75 CE	26:3-9, 33-37
XLev <sup>a</sup> XLev <sup>b</sup> Xpaleo-Lev	Three unpublished manuscripts <sup>10</sup> .	

## 2. THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS IN TEXTUAL TRADITIONS

Scholars recognize that the Masoretic Text (M) of Leviticus is well preserved. It is represented by the Leningrad Codex (M<sup>L</sup>): EBP. I B 19a in the Russian National Library at St-Petersbourg, Russia. Some other manuscripts are collated against M<sup>L</sup>, such as Codex Sassoon 507, also known as the Damascus Pentateuch (M<sup>S5</sup>); EBP. II B 17 (M<sup>L17</sup>); and Oriental 4445 (M<sup>B</sup>). Even though there is an overall agreement in the Tiberian manuscripts, there are some cases where the vocalization and the punctuation of M<sup>L</sup> are considered erroneous<sup>11</sup>.

The Samaritan Pentateuch (Smr) was especially known for its harmonizing and “heretical” readings. However, the situation has changed; scholars now draw attention to its contribution to the understanding of the history of the Pentateuch. In fact, Samaritan studies are one of the current trends in biblical scholarship, with regard to the Pentateuch and the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Moreover, while the vocalization of the Hebrew text attracts scholars’ interest in textual criticism, the Samaritan oral tradition (as transcribed by Ben-

<sup>10</sup> Those manuscripts are listed in E. Tov, *Revised List of the Texts from the Judean Desert*, 109-110, 126

<sup>11</sup> A. Dotan (ed.), תורה נביאים וכתובים *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (A fully revised and re-typeset edition of the 1973 edition; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 1230.

Ḥayyim) is now considered one of the important aspects of Smr<sup>12</sup>. Indeed, there are cases where only the oral tradition specifies the retained reading in Smr. In this respect, the book of Leviticus benefits from the progress in current research. An edition of Smr was published in 2010 by Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin, and the book of Leviticus constitutes the first step of the new Samaritan Pentateuch Critical *Editio Maior* by Stefan Schorch<sup>13</sup>. The reference of the Tal/Florentin edition is the Ms. 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue (1204 AD), while that of Schorch's is the CBL 751 from Dublin (1225 AD). Both editions compare the consonantal text with its oral tradition. Among the manuscripts from the DSS, 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> is often labeled "Samaritan".

The Septuagint (G) Leviticus was published in the Göttingen critical edition by Wevers. It is based on different manuscripts. According to Wevers good witnesses to Leviticus are A, B, 121 along with *x* and *b*<sup>14</sup>. G of Leviticus is often considered close to the structure of M even though it contains many differences<sup>15</sup>. New manuscripts are known, such as Ms 2649 dated at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century or the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century C.E. It contains Lev 10:15-13:6; 23:20-30 and 25:30-40<sup>16</sup>. Regarding the two Greek manuscripts of Leviticus from Qumran (4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>; 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>), the question of the earliest form of G still remains. The form of their text does not correspond to the structure of M and they do not always match some theological positions found in the great codices. Thus, the debate should remain open. As is the case in Smr, G is also known for its harmonizing readings<sup>17</sup>. As a version, it raises the ques-

<sup>12</sup> Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans* [in Hebrew] (5 vols; Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957–1977); S. Schorch, *Die Vokale des Gesetzes. Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora*. Vol. 1: *Das Buch Genesis* (BZAW 339; Berlin – NewYork: De Gruyter, 2004).

<sup>13</sup> A. Tal and M. Florentin (ed.), *חמשה חומשי תורה. נוסח שומרון ונוסח המסורה. מבווא, הערות, נספחים*, *Pentateuch: The Samaritan version and the Masoretic version* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2010); S. Schorch (ed.), *Leviticus (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior, Vol. 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018)*.

<sup>14</sup> J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 71.

<sup>15</sup> P. Harlé, D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988), 24-25, 49; J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL.SCSS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), ix-xxv; S. Metso and E. Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 247-268; A. Voitiła, "Leviticus," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. Aitken; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 43-57.

<sup>16</sup> A. Rahlfs, *Supplement: Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (bearbeitet von D. Fränkel; Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum graecum, auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 1.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 273-274, 474; K. De Troyer, "From Leviticus to Joshua."

<sup>17</sup> E. Tov, "The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks," *Textus* 26 (2016), 1-27; E. Tov, "From Popular Jewish LXX-SP Texts to Separate Sectarian Texts: Insights from the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 19-40.

tion of its translation technique and its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Discrepancies in the Greek translation of Leviticus raise the question whether that book was translated by one or more persons.

The Vulgate (V) text of Leviticus was critically studied in the twentieth century, and new editions of the one-book edition continued to be published<sup>18</sup>. It is obvious that the Vetus Latina (La) influenced the translation of V. The material of La is found in the apparatus of Wevers' edition of the Septuagint<sup>19</sup>. Although V reflects the text of M, Jerome, its translator, changed its character since, as observed by scholars, V avoids repetitions and "retains the essential sense of the verse"<sup>20</sup>. This observation, however, raises a serious problem in Leviticus to the extent that one wonders whether V should be considered a textual witness for that book. In some cases, omissions of part of verses create different understandings.

The Peshitta (S) of Leviticus is known in the Leiden edition, mainly based on the Ambrosianus manuscript (Ms B.21). The *Vorlage* of S is close or identical to M. S does not provide any evidence of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*<sup>21</sup>. Lane explains the 52 variant readings found in Leviticus as "the result of scribal carelessness" or interpretations<sup>22</sup>. Some readings that are in agreement with G are often explained as the influence of G at a later stage of the development of the text of S. As is the case in other versions, the translator of S encountered difficulties in rendering sacrificial terminology and may have misunderstood some words, such as 'impure birds' (Lev 11:13-16).

The Text of Leviticus is known in different Targums (T): the Aramaic Targum from Qumran (pap4QtgLev), Onqelos, Palestinian Targum (Neofiti I and Fragment Targums), Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Samaritan Targum<sup>23</sup>. The Tar-

<sup>18</sup> F. A. Gasquet et al. (ed.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem* (18 vols; Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1926–1996) (the volume *Libros Exodi et Levitici* was published in 1929); R. Weber (ed.) *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (5th rev. ed. prepared by R. Gryson; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).

<sup>19</sup> See also P. Sabatier, *Biblorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae, seu Vetus Italica, et Caeterae quaecunque in Codicibus Mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quae cum Vulgata Latina, & cum Textu Graeco comparatur* (Tomus Primus; Remis: Reginaddum Florentain, 1743; repr. Turnhout: Brepols, 1987).

<sup>20</sup> R. Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament (1678)* (Nouvelle édition annotée et introduite par P. Gibert; Montrouge: Bayard, 2008), 400–402; A. Tal, *Genesis (Biblia Hebraica Quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato. Fascicle 1)* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015), 8\*.

<sup>21</sup> D. J. Lane, *The Peshitta of Leviticus* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 6; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 81; D. J. Lane, "The Reception of Leviticus: Peshitta Version," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, 299–322.

<sup>22</sup> D. J. Lane, ed. "Leviticus," in *The Old Testament in Syriac, According to the Peshitta Version 1/2, 2/1b, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua* (ed. D. J. Lane, A. P. Hayman, W. M. Van Vliet, J. H. Hospers, H. J. W. Drijvers and J. E. Erbes; The Peshitta Institute Leiden; Leiden: Brill 1991), X–XI.

<sup>23</sup> A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* (5 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1959–1973); A. Diez Macho, *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensis, IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum: Additur Targum Pseudo-*

gum from Qumran and Onqelos are characterized as literal but they are not identical. This may raise the question of the history of the Targum. Other Targums contain many exegetical and midrashic expansions without text-critical relevance. It is interesting to observe that G and T share only few literary interpretations, so that G is of a different nature.<sup>24</sup>

### 3. TEXTUAL DISCREPANCIES AND LITERARY EVOLUTION

Apart from the errors that occurred during the transmission history of the text of Leviticus, literary considerations may explain some textual discrepancies. Indeed, there are cases in Leviticus where different readings allow different interpretations, so that one cannot easily assert that they are mistaken readings. Such interpretations can be observed for instance in Lev 9 and 24. It seems that the tasks of the high priest and those of the ordinary priests have been adjusted in some witnesses.

In Lev 9:20, M reads וישמו (they will put), while Smr, G, and S read the singular וישם (he will put). According to M, the priests place the pieces of the sacrifice on the altar and then the high priest burn them. Contrary to this, Smr, G, and S assert that all these tasks are accomplished by the high priest himself. On the one hand, Smr, G, and S could have simply harmonized the verbs in the verse. In that case however, they created a different understanding, since placing the parts of sacrifices on the altar and burning them re the task of one person: the high priest. On the other hand, M may have changed the first verb in order to specify that placing the parts of sacrifices on the altar is not the task of the high priest, but that of the ordinary priests.

A reversed case occurs in Lev 24:3-4. Here M asserts that Aaron (the high priest) alone is in charge of preparing and kindling the lamps of the Menorah. However, according to Smr and G, this task is attributed to "Aaron and his sons," which means all of the priests. It is possible that the reading of Smr and G resulted from harmonization with Exod 27:20-21, where "Aaron and his sons" is read in all the witnesses. However, it is also possible that each witness

*jonatan ejusque hispanica versio*. 3: *Leviticus* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1980); M. L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols; AnBib76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980); A. Tal, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition. Part II: Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1981); M. L. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (2 vols; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986); M. McNamara, "Reception of the Hebrew Text of the Leviticus in the Targums," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 113; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269-298.

<sup>24</sup> R. Le Déaut, "La Septante, un Targum?," in *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique* (ed. R. Kuntzmann, J. Schlosser and R. Arnaldez; LD 119; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 147-195.

specifies “Aaron” or “Aron and his sons” for literary reasons<sup>25</sup>. Interestingly, 11QT<sup>a</sup> IX,13-14 asserts that the lamps are arranged by the priests, sons of Aaron, while Aaron himself is not mentioned for this task<sup>26</sup>. Thus, there is like a literary evolution and discussion dealing with who is in charge of the lamps (of the Menorah). Textual witnesses offer three possibilities: Aaron, i.e. the high priest, alone (= M), Aron and his sons (= Smr, G), the sons of Aaron, i.e. the ordinary priests (= 11QT<sup>a</sup>). Even though the last possibility is not in a “biblical” witness, it reflects the literary evolution and discussions which continue beyond the biblical text. Such discrepancies testify to different understandings of the biblical practices at different times.

### References

- Attridge H. W. et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).
- Baillet M., J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux. *Les “petites grottes” de Qumrân* (2 vols. DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962).
- Barthélemy D. and J. T. Milik. *Quman Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).
- Baumgarten J., *Qumran Cave 4. 13: The Damascus Document (4Q266–73)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
- Ben-Hayyim Z., *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans* [in Hebrew] (5 vols; Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957–1977).
- De Troyer K., “From Leviticus to Joshua: The Old Greek Text of Two Septuagint Manuscripts from the Schøyen Collection,” *JAJ* 2 (2011), 29-78.
- De Vaux R. and J. T. Milik. *Qumrân Grotte 4. 2/1. Archéologie. 2/2. Tefillin, mezuzot et targums (4Q 128–4Q 157)* (DJD 6; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977).
- Díez Macho A., *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum: Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque hispanica versio. 3: Leviticus* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1980).
- Dotan A. (ed.), *תורה וכתובים וכתובים נביאים וכתובים* *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (A fully revised and re-typeset edition of the 1973 edition; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001).

<sup>25</sup> See I. Himbaza, “Looking at the Samaritan Pentateuch from Qumran: Legal Material of Leviticus and Deuteronomy,” in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 199-216.

<sup>26</sup> Yigael Yadin observes that the author changed אהרן ובניו (Aaron and his sons) into הכהנים בני אהרן (the priests, sons of Aaron). See Y. Yadin (ed.), *The Temple Scroll. Volume Two: Text and Commentary* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society – The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem – The Shrine of the Book, 1983), 38; L. H. Schiffman, ed. by F. García Martínez, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord. Studies on the Temple Scroll* (STDJ 75; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008), 264.

- Elgvin T., K. Davis and M. Langlois (ed.), *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection* (Library of Second Temple Studies 71; London: Bloomsbury, 2016).
- Eshel H., Y. Baruch, R. Porat, "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006), 55-60.
- Flint P. W., "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus. Composition & Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler, with the assistance of S. Smith Bartel; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 323-341.
- García Martínez F. and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. *Qumran Cave 11. 2: 11Q2/18, 11Q20/31* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- Gasquet F. A. et al. (ed.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem* (18 vols; Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1926–1996).
- Harlé P., D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988).
- Himbaza I., "Looking at the Samaritan Pentateuch from Qumran: Legal Material of Leviticus and Deuteronomy," in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 199-216.
- Klein M. L., *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (2 vols; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986).
- Klein M. L., *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols; AnBib76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980).
- Kugler R. A., K. S. Baek, *Leviticus at Qumran. Text and Interpretation* (VTS 173; The Text of the Bible at Qumran; Leiden: Brill, 2017).
- Lane D. J., ed. "Leviticus," in *The Old Testament in Syriac, According to the Peshitta Version 1/2, 2/1b, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua* (ed. D. J. Lane, A. P. Hayman, W. M. Van Vliet, J. H. Hospers, H. J. W. Drijvers and J. E. Erbes; The Peshitta Institute Leiden; Leiden: Brill 1991).
- Lane D. J., *The Peshitta of Leviticus* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 6; Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- Lane D. J., "The Reception of Leviticus: Peshitta Version," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 299-322.
- Lange A., *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Bd. 1. Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Langlois M., "Dead Sea Scrolls Palaeography and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 255-285.
- Le Déaut R., "La Septante, un Targum?" in *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique* (ed. R. Kuntzmann, J. Schlosser and R. Arnaldez; LD 119; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 147-195.
- McNamara M., "Reception of the Hebrew Text of the Leviticus in the Targums," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 113; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269-298.
- Metso S. and E. Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 247-268.

- Pfann, S. J., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts*; P. S. Alexander et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).
- Rahlfs A., *Supplement: Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (bearbeitet von D. Fränkel; Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum graecum, auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 1.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).
- Sabatier P., *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae, seu Vetus Italica, et Caeterae quaecunq; in Codicibus Mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quae cum Vulgata Latina, & cum Textu Graeco comparatur* (Tomus Primus; Remis; Reginaddum Florentain, 1743; repr. Turnhout: Brepols, 1987).
- Schiffman L. H., *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord. Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008).
- Schorch S. (ed.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior, Vol. 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).
- Schorch S., *Die Vokale des Gesetzes. Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora. Vol. 1: Das Buch Genesis* (BZAW 339; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 2004).
- Segal M., E. Tov, W. B. Seales, C. S. Parker, P. Shor, Y. Porath with an Appendix by A. Yardeni, “An Early Leviticus Scroll from En-Gedi: Preliminary Publication,” *Textus* 26 (2016), 29-58
- Simon R., *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament (1678)* (Nouvelle édition annotée et introduite par P. Gibert; Montrouge: Bayard, 2008).
- Skehan P., E. Ulrich and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. 4. Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Sperber A., *The Bible in Aramaic* (5 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1959–1973).
- Tal A. and M. Florentin (ed.), *חמשה חומשי תורה. נוסח שומרון ונוסח המסורה. מבוא, המשה חומשי תורה. The Pentateuch: The Samaritan version and the Masoretic version* (Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2010) [in Hebrew].
- Tal A., *Genesis (Biblia Hebraica Quinta editione cum apparatus critico novis curis elaborato. Fascicle 1* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015).
- Tal A., *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition. Part II. Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1981).
- Tigchelaar E., “Reconsidering 4Q24 (4QLeviticus<sup>b</sup>): Two Manuscripts and a New Fragment,” *VT*, forthcoming.
- Tigchelaar E., “4Q26b (4QLeviticus<sup>s</sup>) Frag. 2,” *Textus* 29 (2020), 53-56.
- Tov E. (ed.), *The Texts from the Judean Desert. Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).
- Tov E., “From Popular Jewish LXX-SP Texts to Separate Sectarian Texts: Insights from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 19-40.
- Tov E., “The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks,” *Textus* 26 (2016), 1-27.
- Tov E., *Revised List of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010).



- Ulrich E., F. M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4. 10. The Prophets* (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Ulrich E., F. M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4. 8, Genesis to Numbers* (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Voitila A., "Leviticus," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. Aitken; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 43-57.
- Weber R. (ed.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (5th rev. ed. prepared by R. Gryson; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).
- Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL.SCSS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).
- Wevers J. W., *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Yadin Y. (ed.), *The Temple Scroll, Volume Two, Text and Commentary* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society – The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem – The Shrine of the Book, 1983).

# TEXTUAL HARMONIZATION IN LEVITICUS

Emanuel Tov

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the wake of my previous studies on textual harmonizations in the four other books of the Torah,<sup>1</sup> I now turn my attention to the book of Leviticus with great expectations as this book differs from the other Torah books. Leviticus contains many formulaic expressions, probably more than the other Torah books, and such formulations provide much occasion for harmonization if the wording of one verse differs slightly from that of another one. Realizing that this book was transmitted more conservatively than the other Scripture books, at least in the area of orthography,<sup>2</sup> it is intriguing to know how the different circles of tradents handled possible harmonizations.

The study of harmonization has become an increasingly more central issue in textual analysis since I have come to realize that in the Torah the textual witnesses can be divided binarily between a block of texts in which harmonization is a central textual feature and a block in which there is little harmonization.<sup>3</sup> The majority block consists in the first place of the LXX and

<sup>1</sup> E. Tov, "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran. Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 271-282; E. Tov, "Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs," in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Writings*, Vol. 3 (VTS 167; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 166-188; E. Tov, "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1-11," in *Collected Writings*, Vol. 3 (2015), 470-489. "The Septuagint of Numbers as a Harmonizing Text," in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz, 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.-24. Juli 2016* (ed. M. Meiser et al.; WUNT 405; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 181-201; "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1-24," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 22 (2017). <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v22/TC-2017-Tov.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> This assumption pertains to MT. The statistics of Andersen-Forbes and Barr show that the Torah and the book of Kings reflect the most defective orthography in MT and that they contain the greatest degree of internal consistency; in the Torah, this description applies especially to Exodus and Leviticus: F. I. Andersen and A. D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 312-318; J. Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1986; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 39-43.

<sup>3</sup> See E. Tov, "The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks," *Textus* 26 (2016), 1-27.

the SP group, but also of the liturgical texts such as 4QDeut<sup>n</sup><sup>4</sup> and many of the *tefillin*. In all these texts the central textual feature is harmonization. The second block consists of a single text only, MT, and it contains very little or no harmonization.

What is harmonization? Harmonization is recognized when a detail in source A is changed to align with another detail in source A or source B because they differ. Scribes adapted many elements in the text to other details in the same verse, the immediate or a similar context, the same book, and parallel sections elsewhere in Scripture. Some such changes were inserted unconsciously, but most were inserted because of a theological concern for perfection, especially in harmonizing pluses. In SP and LXX, harmonization is coupled with other secondary features such as various forms of adaptation to the context.

When focusing on characteristic textual features, the Torah is distinguished quite unexpectedly from the other biblical books by the occurrence of a large number of harmonizing changes, especially additions. These additions are found in differing numbers in the textual witnesses, most frequently in the LXX and secondarily in the SP group. MT also contains some harmonizing changes, but it reflects a purer text than the other witnesses.

The mentioning of the LXX as the main source of harmonizing pluses in all Scripture books and not merely in the textual witnesses of the Torah causes some surprise when viewed in light of previous discussions in which that feature was ascribed solely to the SP. However, the data are quite clear in this regard. By way of clarification, I add immediately that our analysis excludes the large editorial additions in the SP group in Exodus and Numbers because they are not harmonizing pluses. These large additions, sometimes involving as much as nine verses, are part of a special editorial reworking of the Torah not known from other books. This reworking is visible especially in Exodus 7–11 and the chapters in Exodus and Numbers that run parallel to Moses' speech in Deuteronomy 1–3. These changes involve duplications of other Torah verses and a few rearrangements based on the inclination of the SP group to improve the consistency of the divine message. Editorial changes are distinct from the small harmonizing alterations in SP. The principle and substance of the small harmonizing changes is shared with the LXX, while the editorial changes described above are characteristic merely of the SP group.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See the discussion by E. Eshel, "4QDeut<sup>n</sup>: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991), 117-154.

<sup>5</sup> The scribes of this group were especially attentive to what they considered to be discrepancies within and between stories in Scripture. Particular attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially that of God and Moses; it was duplicated from one context into another when the editor considered it lacking, differing, or incomplete. Ultimately, the editorial

Textual harmonization in small details is visible throughout the Torah in the LXX and SP,<sup>6</sup> mainly in the non-legal segments but to a small extent also in the phraseology used in the verbalization of the laws. On the other hand, the substance of the laws is only rarely harmonized within a specific pericope or between parallel law codes.<sup>7</sup> Textual harmonization features also in several liturgical Torah texts, such as 4QDeut<sup>n</sup> and many of the *tefillin*.

Before turning to the evidence itself, we address four arguments supporting the assumption that the *Vorlage* of the LXX, rather than the translation, inserted the harmonizations: (1) the translator's fidelity to his source; (2) the level at which the harmonization took place; (3) the frequent agreement of SP with the LXX; and (4) occasional agreement of the LXX with a Qumran scroll.

1. *The translator's fidelity.* If a translation was literal, by implication the harmonizations reflected in that translation were carried out in the *Vorlage*. The overall impression of the LXX of Leviticus is one of fidelity to the Hebrew parent text, but the translation technique needs to be investigated further.<sup>8</sup>

2. *The level at which the harmonization took place.* If all instances of harmonization were created by the same hand, the changes must have taken place at the Hebrew level and were not created by the translator. This suggestion is based on the fact that in some cases the two Greek texts – the text

changes derive from theological concerns reflecting the wish to create narrative structures that present the stories of the sacred Torah in the most perfect way possible.

In a way, editorial changes perfect the system of small-scale harmonizations at a higher literary level. The small-scale harmonizations to be analyzed below present attempts to make the text more congruous. The large-scale editorial intervention visible in the SP group reflects the next step on the ladder of perfection in the Torah. If my intuition is correct, the smaller harmonizations such as in the *Vorlage* of the LXX thus reflect a first step in the development of a free approach towards Scripture, while the editorial changes of the SP group reflect a second stage.

<sup>6</sup> The presence of harmonization in the LXX of the Torah was recognized long ago in scholarship, but it was usually ascribed to translators. See T. E. Toepler, *De Pentateuchi interpretationis alexandrinae indole critica et hermeneutica* (Halle: C. Schwetschke, 1830), 8-16; Z. Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1851), 58-63, 103-104, 163-164, 187-188, 221-223; Similar developments took place with special attention to harmonizations in Numbers: G. Dorival, *Les Nombres* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 4; Paris: Cerf, 1994), 42-43 (see also his summarizing methodological remark on p. 40); J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (SBL.SCSS 46; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998), xvii-xviii; M. Rösel, "Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri," in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à A. Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman and Chr. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25-40 (29-30).

<sup>7</sup> For an exceptional example of such a harmonization, see LXX-Deut 16:7 adapted to Exod 12:9 as discussed by D. A. Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period* (FAT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 127, 194-95.

<sup>8</sup> The Hebraisms in this translation are telling: see K. Huber, *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1916), 86-110; at the same time, variations in vocabulary and constructions are also recognizable: see J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. III 153; MSU XIX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 72-132.

that was changed by way of harmonization and the text to which the harmonized text was adapted – differ, rendering it impossible that the translator was influenced by the Greek context. Examples are provided below of differences in Hebrew *Vorlage*, vocabulary, and construction:<sup>9</sup>

*Vorlage* (the plus is based on a slightly different *Vorlage*)

10:15 MT SP LXX וּלְבָנֶיךָ; SP LXX + וּלְבַנְתֶּיךָ + (καὶ ταῖς θυγατράσι σου). Based on v. 14 MT SP, and not on the LXX because that translation reflects a different *Vorlage*, אַתָּה וּבְנֶיךָ וּבִיתְךָ (σὺ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ σου καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου).

22:18 MT SP בְּנֵי; LXX קָהֵל (יִשְׂרָאֵל) (συναγωγῆ Ἰσραήλ). Based on 16:17 MT SP קָהֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל. The LXX in 16:17 combines the two readings (συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ) and therefore the harmonization could not have taken place at the translational level.

*Vocabulary* (the wording of the plus differs from that of the source of the harmonization)

6:8 MT SP LXX הַמְזַבְּחָה; SP LXX + אֵשׁ + (κάρπωμα). Based on 2:2 (θυσία).

13:39b MT SP LXX בְּעוֹר; LXX + בְּשֵׁר + (τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 11 (τοῦ χρωτός).

13:43 MT SP עוֹר בְּשֵׁר; LXX בְּעוֹר בְּשֵׁר (τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 2 (χρωτός αὐτοῦ).

25:50 MT SP LXX שָׂכִיר; LXX + שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה + (ἔτος ἐξ ἔτους). Based on v. 53 (ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξ ἐνιαυτοῦ).

26:20 MT SP וְעַץ הָאֵרֶץ; SP LXX וְעַץ הַשָּׂדֶה (καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ ἀγροῦ). Based on v. 4 (καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων).

*Different construction* (the construction of the plus differs from that of the source of the harmonization)

10:6 MT SP LXX בְּנֵי; LXX + הַנּוֹחָרִים + (τοὺς καταλελειμμένους). Based on v. 12 (καταλειφθέντας).

25:25 MT SP LXX אַחֶיךָ; LXX + עִמָּךְ + (ὁ μετὰ σοῦ). Based on v. 39 (παρὰ σοί).

25:46 MT SP LXX לָרֶשֶׁת; LXX + וְהָיוּ לָכֶם + (καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν). Based on v. 45 (ἔστρωσαν ὑμῖν).

26:21 MT SP LXX וְאֵם; LXX + בְּאֵלָהּ + (μετὰ ταῦτα). Based on v. 23 (ἐπὶ τούτοις).

<sup>9</sup> For similar suggestions in the case of harmonizing pluses, see E. Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS,” *JSOT* 31 (1985), 3-29 (20-21).

While usually no judgment can be passed on the vocabulary of the two Greek texts because the Greek renderings use common LXX vocabulary, in the aforementioned cases a strong argument against inner-LXX harmonization may be made.

3. *Frequent agreement of SP with the LXX.* The fact that the LXX agrees with SP in many harmonizations (80 [group 2 below]) strengthens the assumption of a Hebrew background also for other harmonizations.

4. *Occasional agreement of the LXX with a Qumran scroll.* In several instances, the LXX agreed with a Qumran scroll and these very agreements support the idea that the LXX reflects a Hebrew text.<sup>10</sup>

Beyond the examples provided above, I believe that it is unlikely to assume that Greek translators, certainly literal ones, harmonized scriptural verses, especially when dealing with remote contexts. This is not the same as the influence of the translation of the Greek Torah on that of the later translators, especially felt in the vocabulary of the later books and in certain key passages such as the influence of Deuteronomy 32 on the Greek Isaiah.<sup>11</sup> It is therefore not likely that such harmonizations were inserted by ancient editors of the Greek manuscripts. Zecharias Frankel suggested that such ancient editors (*diaskeuastes*) inserted these harmonizations, and he provided a list of such examples.<sup>12</sup>

Turning now to the data themselves,<sup>13</sup> we record cases in which scribes adapted elements in the text to other details appearing either in the same verse or in the immediate or remote context. The decision regarding whether or not a certain detail reflects a harmonization to another verse is always subjective since it is never certain that this thought process indeed took place. Likewise, it is equally subjective to decide that the LXX and SP agree against MT because sometimes secondary developments took place independently in both sources, such as the change from singular to plural or vice versa. Thus, the agreement

<sup>10</sup> See 17:3; 22:24; 26:24.

<sup>11</sup> See my study "The Septuagint Translation of the Torah as a Source and Resource for the Post-Pentateuchal Translators," in *Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint* (LXX.H 3; ed. E. Bons and J. Joosten; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2016), 316-328.

<sup>12</sup> Frankel, *Einfluss*, 163-164.

<sup>13</sup> The analysis is based on a fresh examination of the data included in the critical editions (see n. 16), verse by verse. Most agreements between SP and the LXX were denoted in the CATSS database: E. Tov and F. H. Polak, *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (division of the CATSS database, directed by Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov), modules in the *Accordance*, Oaktree Software, Inc., and *BibleWorks* computer programs. For the LXX, the following tool was also helpful: F. H. Polak and G. Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint, Part I: Introduction; Part II: The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 4, 5; Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002). Thanks are due to Stefan Schorch who allowed me to consult his very rich edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, now published: Stefan Schorch in collaboration with Evelyn Burkhardt and Ramona Fändrich, *The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior*. Vol. 3: *Leviticus* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018).

between the SP and the LXX may sometimes be misleading. For example, in 12:4, the unusual plural form of MT for “blood” in בְּדָמֵי טְהָרָה is represented by the singular form in SP בְּדָם טְהָרָה and likewise by the singular ἐν αἵματι ἀκαθάρτου ἀνθρώπου in the LXX. At first sight, this could be a case of an agreement between SP and the LXX, but it is not because also elsewhere in the Pentateuch the LXX renders the rare occurrences of the plural form דָּמִים with the singular Greek αἷμα.<sup>14</sup>

Below, we list the harmonizations in Leviticus in the MT, LXX, and SP,<sup>15</sup> as recorded in their critical editions.<sup>16</sup> Harmonizations in individual manuscripts of these sources are not recorded. Harmonization is recognized in the following clusters in which the change/addition is found in witness(es) registered before the “≠” sign. The examples listed below provide a *subjective* recording of the harmonizing changes in Leviticus that is meant to be exhaustive for that book.

The data are listed according to the clustering of the textual witnesses. The largest group of examples (1.) includes harmonizations exclusive to LXX, while group (2.) contains similar data from the LXX and SP together. Far fewer harmonizations are exclusive to SP (3.) and even fewer to MT (groups 4 and 5).

I distinguish between harmonizations influenced by (x.1.) the immediate context, (x.2.) the remote context, and (x.3.) an addition or expansion of a subject or object on the basis of the context. In the case of additions based on remote contexts, one usually recognizes the idea or phrase that triggered the harmonizing change (1.1., exemplified below). I suggest that most harmonizations of groups (x.1.) and (x.2.) were conscious, while those of group (x.3.) could have been unconscious. The harmonizations of groups (x.1.) and (x.2.) reflect a certain conception, almost ideology, that intertextual links should be added in order to perfect the biblical stories. Harmonizations to remote contexts show how well the editor or scribe knew the biblical text.

I have not included other sources of differences between the various texts, such as non-harmonizing pluses or changes in the LXX (e.g., 5:5, 21; 26:41) and textual complications (e.g., in 15:3; 17:4; 23:41). The texts in 15:3 and 17:4 at first sight appear to represent pluses in the shared text of LXX SP, but actually they reflect textual omissions (*homoioteleuta*) in MT.

<sup>14</sup> Gen 4:10, 11; Exod 4:25, 26; Lev 12:5, 7; 20:18.

<sup>15</sup> In addition, the text of the Qumran scrolls is quoted when relevant.

<sup>16</sup> The following editions were used: *BHS*; A. Tal and M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Tel Aviv: Haim Rubim Tel Aviv University Press, 2010); J. W. Wevers, *Leviticus* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum, vol. 2.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

By definition, all harmonizing additions represent secondary developments. They were made in order to adapt one context to another one. However, the fullness of the wording is often artificial and, in some cases, the additions are clearly secondary, a feature that is more recognizable in Genesis and Deuteronomy than in Leviticus.<sup>17</sup>

Examples of harmonizations to remote verses show the scribe's expertise in the content of the Bible (underlined words have been added in SP or LXX):

6:22 MT – LXX ἅγια ἁγίων ἐστὶν κυρίου -- כל־זכר בכהנים יאכל אתה קדש קדשים הוא

27:28 MT והיה ולא יגאל כל־חרם קדש־קדשים הוא ליהוה

7:2 MT – LXX במקום אשר ישחטו את־העלה ישחטו את־האשם ואת־דמו יזרק על־המזבח סביב  
– ἐν τόπῳ, οὗ σφάζουσιν τὸ ὄλοκαύτωμα, σφάζουσιν τὸν κριὸν τῆς  
πλημμελείας ἔναντι κυρίου, καὶ τὸ αἷμα προσχέει ἐπὶ τὴν βᾶσιν τοῦ  
θυσιαστηρίου κύκλῳ

6:18 MT זאת תורת החטאת במקום אשר תשחט העלה תשחט החטאת לפני יהוה קדש קדשים  
הוא

10:9 MT יין ושכר אל־תשת אתה ובניך אתך בבאכם אל־אהל מועד (ולא תמתו חקת עולם  
(LXX Οἶνον καὶ σικερα οὐ πίεσθε, σὺ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ σου μετὰ σοῦ, ἡνίκα  
ἂν εἰσπορεύῃσθε εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, ἢ προσπορευομένων ὑμῶν  
πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον)

Exod 30:20 בבאם אל־אהל מועד ירחצו־מים ולא ימתו או בגשתם אל־המזבח (לשרת להקטיר  
אשה ליהוה)

This verse in the LXX of Lev 10:9 exemplifies the expertise of the scribe/editor who remembered the parallel verse in Exodus in which the approaching of the Tent of Meeting was mentioned together with the nearing of the altar with similar implications of danger.<sup>18</sup>

Some of the changes and pluses in the textual witnesses of Leviticus had halakhic implications and such instances have been analyzed by Zacharias Frankel and Leo Prijs in important studies on the LXX and by Andrew Teeter for all the textual witnesses in equally penetrating investigations.<sup>19</sup> In principle, harmonizing pluses could likewise have been based on legalistic interpretations and in some instances this may indeed have been the case. However, as a rule, it was the mere formal similarity between verses that led a scribe to adapt one verse to another one and not halakhic reasoning. For example, in Leviticus,

<sup>17</sup> See examples provided in the studies mentioned in n. 1.

<sup>18</sup> The words in the two Greek versions are identical but this does not necessarily point to borrowing at the Greek level since they serve as general LXX equivalents.

<sup>19</sup> Frankel, *Einfluss*; L. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948); Teeter, *Scribal Laws*.



some verses describe a cleaning ritual of two elements (11:25, 28, 40 *bis*): יכבס בגדיו וטמא עד-הערב (“he shall wash his clothes and remain unclean until evening”). Other verses contain a slightly expanded ritual consisting of three elements (15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 21, 22, 27; 17:15): יכבס בגדיו ורחץ במים וטמא עד-הערב (“he shall wash his clothes, bathe in water, and remain unclean until evening”). It was to be expected that some manuscripts with verses containing two elements would harmonistically add the third one, “and shall wash himself in water.” This is indeed the case in the LXX of 11:40b, but not in vv. 25, 28, 40a; it is also the case in the SP of v. 25, but not in vv. 28, 40a, 40b. The longer formula is based on the remote 15:5: וַאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יַגֵּעַ בְּמִשְׁכְּבוֹ יִכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד-הָעֶרֶב [JPS]). The harmonizing pluses thus have been added inconsistently and such inconsistency is the rule for this kind of content revision.

## 2. THE DATA

### 2.1. $LXX \neq MT SP$ (134 + 48 + 19 = 201 x)

#### 2.1.1. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (134 x)

1:10 MT SP LXX יקריבנו; LXX + וסמך את ידו על ראשו + (καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ). Based on vv. 3-4.

2:4 MT SP LXX תנור; LXX + קרבן ליהוה + (δῶρον κυρίου).<sup>20</sup> Based on 1:2.

2:12; 23:13 MT SP LXX לריח ניחח; LXX + ליהוה +. Based on 2:9.

2:13 MT SP LXX קרבנך תקריב; LXX + ליהוה אלהיכם + (κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν). Based on v. 9.

2:14b MT SP LXX כרמל; LXX + ליהוה (תקריב) +. Based on v. 14a ואם תקריב מנחת בכורים ליהוה.

3:1 MT SP LXX קרבנו; LXX + ליהוה +. Based on 2:16.

3:8 MT SP LXX בני אהרן; LXX + הכהנים +. Based on v. 2.

3:13 MT SP LXX לפני; LXX + יהוה פתח (אהל) + (κυρίου παρὰ τὰς θύρας). Based on v. 2 פתח אהל מועד 2.

4:2 MT SP LXX תחטא; LXX + לפני יהוה + (ἐναντι κυρίου). Based on v. 4 ושחט את הפר לפני יהוה.

<sup>20</sup> Thus Rahlfs with the main LXX manuscripts. Wevers assigns these readings to the apparatus.

- 4:7a MT SP LXX דם(ה); LXX + הפר + (τοῦ μόσχου). Based on v. 7b.
- 4:21 MT SP LXX את; LXX + (הפר) כל +. Based on v. 12.
- 4:22b MT SP LXX בשגגה; LXX + וחטא + (καὶ ἀμάρτη). Based on v. 22a; 5:15.
- 4:28 MT SP LXX חטא; pap4QLXXLev<sup>b</sup> LXX + בה + (ἐν αὐτῇ). Based on v. 23.
- 4:28b MT SP LXX נקבה; LXX + והביא + (οἴσει). Based on v. 28a.
- 4:29a MT SP LXX את; LXX + (החטאת) עז + (τὴν χίμαιραν). Based on v. 28.
- 5:5 MT SP LXX והתודה; LXX + את חטאתו + (τὴν ἀμαρτίαν). Based on 4:28.
- 5:13 MT SP LXX כמנחה; LXX + הסלת + (τῆς σεμιδάλεως). Based on v. 11.
- 5:21 MT SP LXX מעל; LXX + במצות + (τὰς ἐντολάς). Based on v. 17.
- 6:2 MT SP LXX בו; LXX + לא תכבה + (οὐ σβεσθήσεται). Based on v. 6.
- 6:11 MT SP אהרן; LXX בכהנים (τῶν ἱερέων). Based on v. 22 (ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν).
- 7:15 MT SP LXX שלמיו; LXX + לו יהיה + (αὐτῷ ἔσται). Based on v. 7.
- 7:25 MT SP האכלת (הנפש); LXX ההיא. Based on v. 21 (ונכרתה הנפש ההוא).
- 8:7 MT SP עליו; LXX וילבשם (καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτόν). Based on v. 13.
- 8:11 MT SP המזבח; LXX + ויקדשהו + (καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτό). Based on v. 15.
- 8:26 MT SP המצות ומסל המלאים; LXX ומסל (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανοῦ τῆς τελειώσεως). Based on v. 31.
- 10:6 MT SP LXX בניו; LXX + הנותרים + (τοὺς καταλειμμένους). Based on v. 12 (καταλειφθέντας). Slight difference in Greek.
- 10:12 MT SP בניו; LXX בני אהרן. Based on v. 16.
- 10:14 MT SP טהור (במקום); LXX קדש (במקום) (ἀγίω). Based on v. 13.
- 10:17 MT SP LXX לכם; LXX + לאכל + (φαγεῖν). Based on v. 13.
- 10:18 MT SP בקדש (תאכלו אתה); LXX במקום קדש (ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ). Based on v. 17 (מדוע לא אכלתם מן החטאת במקום הקדש).
- 11:3 MT SP LXX כל; LXX + בהמה + (κτῆνος). Based on v. 2.
- 11:26 MT SP בהם; LXX בנבלתם (τῶν θνησιμαίων αὐτῶν). Based on v. 24.
- 11:26 MT SP יטמא; LXX + עד הערב + (ἕως ἑσπέρας). Based on v. 25.
- 11:31 MT SP LXX השרץ; LXX + על הארץ + (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 29.
- 11:38 MT SP LXX על; LXX + כל (זרע) +. Based on v. 37 MT LXX.
- 11:41, 42 MT SP LXX הוא (שקץ); LXX + לכם +. Based on v. 38.
- 11:43 MT SP LXX השרץ; LXX + על הארץ + (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 42.
- 11:44b MT SP LXX אני; LXX + יהוה אלהיכם + (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν). Based on v. 44a.
- 13:4 MT SP LXX הפך; LXX + שער (לבן) + (τρίχα). Based on the context.

13:4 MT SP LXX לבן (הפך); LXX + והיא כהה + (αὐτὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀμαυρά). Based on v. 6 והנה כהה 6.

13:5 MT SP LXX הכהן; LXX + את הנגע + (τὴν ἀφήν). Based on v. 3.

13:13 MT SP LXX כל (בשרו); LXX + (עור (בשרו) + (τὸ δέρμα). Based on v. 11 בעור בשרו.

13:21 MT SP LXX עור(ה); LXX + הבשר + (τοῦ χρωτός). Based on v. 11.

13:22, 29 MT SP LXX נגע (הוא); LXX + צרעת + (λέπρα). Based on vv. 20, 27.

13:22, 27 MT SP LXX הוא; LXX + בשחין פרהה + (ἐν τῷ ἔλκει ἐξήνθησεν). Based on v. 20.

13:31 MT SP שחר (שער); LXX צהב (ξανθίζουσα). Based on v. 30.

13:33 MT SP LXX והתגלה; LXX + העור + (τὸ δέρμα). Based on v. 32.

13:34 MT SP ומראהו; LXX ומראה הנתק (καὶ ἡ ὄψις τοῦ θραύσματος). Based on v. 32.

13:39a MT SP (כהות (כהות); LXX בהרות בהרות (αὐγάσματα αὐγάζοντα). Based on v. 38.

13:39a MT SP LXX הוא; LXX + טהר הוא + (καθαρός ἐστὶν). Based on v. 39b.

13:39b MT SP LXX בעור; LXX + בשרו + (τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 11 (τοῦ χρωτός). Different Greek.

13:43 MT SP עור בשר; LXX בעור בשרו (τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 2 (χρωτός αὐτοῦ). Different Greek.

13:54 MT SP LXX והסגירו; LXX + הכהן את הנגע + (ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἀφήν). Based on v. 50.

13:55 MT SP LXX הוא; LXX + בבגד או + (ἐν τῷ ἱματίῳ ἢ). Based on v. 53.

13:55 MT SP בבגדתו או בגבתו; LXX בבגד בשתי או בערב (στίριται ἐν τῷ ἱματίῳ ἢ ἐν τῷ στήμονι ἢ ἐν τῇ κρόαῃ). Based on v. 53. Different Greek.

13:57 MT SP LXX עור; LXX + צרעת (פרחת) + (λέπρα). Based on v. 42.

14:17 MT SP LXX על (דם האשם); LXX + מקום (דם האשם) + (τὸν τόπον). Based on v. 28.

14:19 MT SP LXX על (המטהר); LXX + הטמא (המטהר) + (τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου).<sup>21</sup> Based on the context.

14:39 MT SP LXX וראה; LXX + את הבית + (τὴν οἰκίαν). Based on v. 38.

14:42 MT SP LXX אבנים; LXX + מקצעות + (ἀπεξυσμένους). Based on v. 43.

14:47 MT SP LXX בכבס את בגדיו; LXX + וטמא עד הערב + (καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἔως ἑσπέρας). Based on 15:5 וטמא עד־הערב 15:5.

<sup>21</sup> Thus Rahlfs with the main LXX manuscripts. Wevers assigns these readings to the apparatus.

- 14:49 MT SP LXX צפרים; LXX + חיות טהרות + (ζῶντα καθαρά). Based on v. 4.
- 15:3 MT SP LXX תהיה (טמאתו); LXX + תורת + (ὁ νόμος). Based on v. 32.
- 15:9 MT SP LXX יטמא; LXX + עד הערב + (ἕως ἑσπέρας). Based on v. 8.
- 15:11 MT SP LXX ורחץ; LXX + את בשרו + (τὸ σῶμα). Based on v. 13.
- 15:12 MT SP LXX במים; LXX + וטהר + (καὶ καθαρὸν ἔσται). Based on v. 13.
- 15:21, 27 MT SP LXX ורחץ; LXX + בשרו + (τὸ σῶμα [αὐτοῦ]). Based on v. 13.
- 16:10 MT SP LXX לעזוזל; LXX + לשלח אתו + (ὥστε ἀποστεῖλαι αὐτόν). Based on the context.
- 16:11 MT SP LXX לו; LXX + ולביתו + (καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ). Based on the context.
- 16:15 MT SP LXX לעם; LXX + לפני יהוה + (ἐναντι κυρίου). Based on v. 7.
- 16:20 MT SP LXX המזבח; LXX + ועל הכהנים יטהר + (καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερέων καθαριεῖ). Based on vv. 33, 30.
- 16:24 MT SP LXX העם ובעד העם; LXX + ובעד ביתו ובעד העם (καὶ περὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ). Based on v. 17.
- 16:29 MT SP LXX והיתה; LXX + זאת + (τοῦτο). Based on v. 34.
- 17:3, 8, 10 MT SP LXX מביית (ישראל); LXX + מבני (ישראל) (τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ). Based on v. 13.
- 17:3 MT SP LXX ישראל; LXX + ומן הגר הגר בתוככם + (ἢ τῶν προσηλύτων τῶν προσκαίμενων ἐν ὑμῖν).<sup>22</sup> Similarly 4QLev<sup>d</sup> (והגר[ה]גר בישראל). Based on vv. 10, 12.
- 17:8 MT SP LXX ואלהם תאמר; LXX + ואמרת אליהם (καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς). Based on v. 2.
- 17:11 MT SP LXX נפש; LXX + כל (הבשר) +. Based on v. 14.
- 17:16 MT SP LXX יכבס; LXX + בגדיו + (τὰ ἱμάτια). Based on v. 15.
- 17:16 MT SP LXX ורחץ; LXX + במים + (ὑδατι). Based on v. 15.
- 18:5; 19:12, 14, 28, 32, 37; 20:26; 22:3 MT SP LXX יהוה (אני); LXX + אלהיכם + (ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν). Based on 18:2; 19:2, 10, 25, 31; 20:24.
- 18:7 MT SP LXX תגלה; LXX + כי + (γάρ). Based on v. 10. Similarly vv. 12, 14, 17; 20:12; 21:21.
- 18:11 MT SP LXX אביך; LXX + לא תגלה + (οὐκ ἀποκαλύψεις). Based on v. 7.
- 18:23a MT SP LXX שכתך; LXX + לזרע + (εἰς σπερματισμόν). Based on v. 20 (σπέρματός σου).
- 18:23b MT SP LXX לפני; LXX + כל (בהמה) +. Based on v. 23a.

<sup>22</sup> Thus Rahlfs with the main LXX manuscripts. Wevers assigns these readings to the apparatus.

19:3 MT SP ואביו ואמו; 4QRP<sup>d</sup> LXX ואביו ואמו. Thus *passim*.

21:13 MT SP LXX אשה בתולה מעמיו; LXX אשה בתולה מעמיו (γυναῖκα παρθένον ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 14.

21:20 MT SP LXX או; LXX + ויש אשר יהיה בו + (ἄνθρωπος, ὃ ἂν ᾗ ἐν αὐτῷ). Based on vv. 9, 21.

22:24 MT SP LXX תקריבו; 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup> LXX + אלה + (αὐτά). Based on v. 22.

23:8 MT SP LXX מקרא קדש; LXX + יהיה לכם + (ἔσται ὑμῖν). Based on v. 21.

23:19 MT SP LXX השלמים; LXX + לחם הבכרים + (μετὰ τῶν ἄρτων τοῦ πρωτογενήματος). Based on v. 20.

23:22 MT SP LXX פאת; LXX + קציר (שדך) + (τοῦ θερισμοῦ). Based on the context.

23:24 MT SP LXX קדש; LXX + יהיה לכם + (ἔσται ὑμῖν). Based on v. 21.

23:28 MT SP LXX הוא; LXX + לכם + (ὑμῖν). Based on v. 27.

24:6 MT SP LXX שש; LXX + חלות האחת + (ἄρτους τὸ ἓν). Based on v. 5.

24:16b MT SP LXX (השם) שם; LXX + יהוה + (κυρίου). Based on v. 16a.

25:20 MT SP LXX ת(שביעִי); LXX + הזאת + (τούτῃ). Based on v. 13.

25:22 MT SP LXX יישן; LXX + נושן + (παλαιῶν). Based on 26:10.

25:25 MT SP LXX אחיך; LXX + עמך + (ὁ μετὰ σοῦ). Based on v. 39 (παρὰ σοί).

25:28 MT SP LXX שנת; LXX + הששית + (τοῦ ἔκτου).<sup>23</sup> Based on v. 21.

25:31 MT SP LXX גאלה; LXX + עולם + (διὰ παντός). Based on v. 32.

25:36 MT SP LXX מאלהיך; LXX + אני יהוה + (ἐγὼ κύριος). Based on 19:32.

25:41 MT SP LXX מעמך; LXX + ביבל + (τῇ ἀφέσει).<sup>24</sup> Based on v. 30.

25:46 MT SP LXX לרשת; LXX + והיו לכם + (καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν). Based on v. 45 (ἔστωσαν ὑμῖν). Different Greek.

25:50 MT SP LXX שכיר; LXX + שנה בשנה + (ἔτος ἐξ ἔτους). Based on v. 53 (ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξ ἐνιαυτοῦ). Different Greek.

26:21 MT SP LXX ואם; LXX + באלה + (μετὰ ταῦτα). Based on v. 23 (ἐπὶ τούτοις). Different Greek.

26:22 MT SP LXX השדה; LXX + ואכלה + (καὶ κατέδεεται). Based on v. 38.

26:24 MT SP בקרי; 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup> LXX בחמת קרי (θυμῶν πλαγίῳ). Based on v. 28.

26:39 MT SP איביכם; LXX איביהם (τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν). Based on v. 41.

<sup>23</sup> Thus Rahlfs with the main LXX manuscripts. Wevers assigns these readings to the apparatus.

<sup>24</sup> Thus Rahlfs with the main LXX manuscripts. Wevers assigns these readings to the apparatus.

27:7 MT SP LXX שקל; LXX + כסף + (ἀργυρίου). Based on vv. 3, 6.

27:27, 31 MT SP LXX עליו; LXX + והיה לו + (καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ). Based on v. 15.

### 2.1.2. Remote context (48 x)

1:14 MT SP LXX מן העוף עלה; LXX + תקריב + (προσφέρῃ). Based on 2:4.

2:16 MT SP LXX אשה; LXX + הוא + (ἐστίν). Based on 8:21.

3:2 MT SP LXX מזבח (ה); LXX + העלה + (τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων). Based on 4:7; Exod 30:28.

5:13 MT SP LXX לו; LXX + והנותרת + (τὸ δὲ καταλειφθῆν). Based on 6:9.

6:22 MT SP LXX קדש קדשים הוא; LXX + ליהוה +. Based on 27:28.

7:1 MT SP LXX תורת; LXX + איל (האשם) + (τοῦ κριοῦ). Based on 5:25; 19:21.

7:2 MT SP LXX את (ישחטו); LXX + איל (האשם) + (τὸν κριόν). Based on 5:25; 19:21.

7:2 MT SP LXX האשם; LXX + לפני יהוה + (ἔναντι κυρίου). Based on 6:18.

7:3 MT SP LXX ואת; LXX + כל (החלב) +. Based on 4:8.

7:12 MT SP LXX מצות ; LXX סלת (ἐκ σεμιδάλεως). Cf. 2:4.

7:21 MT SP LXX בכל; LXX + דבר (טמא) + (πράγματος). Based on 5:2.

7:21 MT SP LXX טמא; LXX + או (בטמאת) + (ἢ). Based on 5:2.

7:30 MT SP LXX החזה; LXX + ואת ירתת הכבד + (καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τοῦ ἥπατος). Based on 8:16.

9:4 MT SP LXX ומנחה; LXX וסלת (καὶ σεμίδαλιν). Based on 2:5.

9:7 MT SP LXX העם; LXX ביתך (τοῦ οἴκου σου). Based on 1:16.

9:19 MT SP LXX האליה; LXX + ואת החלב + (καὶ τὸ στέαρ). Based on 7:3.

9:19 MT SP LXX והמכסה; LXX + על הקרב + (ἐπὶ τῆς κοιλίας). Based on 3:3.

9:19 MT SP LXX והכלי(ו); LXX ושתי הכלית (καὶ τοὺς δύο νεφροὺς). Based on 7:4.

9:19 MT SP LXX והכלית; LXX + ואת החלב אשר עליהן + (καὶ τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶν). Based on 7:4.

10:9 MT SP LXX מועד; LXX + או בגשתכם אל המזבח + (ἢ προσπορευομένων ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον). Based on Exod 30:20, see above, p. 19.

11:4 MT SP LXX הפרסה; LXX + ושעני שסע + (καὶ ὄνυχιζόντων ὄνυχιστήρας). Based on Deut 14:6.

11:40b MT SP LXX בגדיו; LXX + ורחץ במים + (καὶ λούσεται ὕδατι). Based on 15:5. Same in SP in 11:25 (§ 2.3.2.). See p. 31.

12:2; 24:15 MT SP לאמר; LXX ואמרת אליהם (καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς). Based on 23:2.

12:6 MT SP LXX שנתו; LXX + תמים + (ἄμωμον). Based on 23:12. Same in 4:14 SP LXX (§ 2.2.1.).

14:48 MT SP LXX והנה; LXX + פשה + (διαχύσει). Based on 13:35.

16:1 MT SP LXX בקרבם; LXX + אש זרה + (πῦρ ἀλλότριον). Based on 10:1.

16:2 MT SP LXX ארון(ה); LXX + העדות + (τοῦ μαρτυρίου). Based on Exod 40:5 and *passim* in Exodus.

17:4 MT SP (והוא מקרב עמו); LXX הנפש (ἡ ψυχῆ). Based on 19:8 ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מעמיה.

17:6 MT SP LXX מזבח; LXX + סביב לפני + (κύκλω ἀπέναντι). Based on 1:11.

18:5, 26; 25:18 MT SP LXX ושמרתם את; LXX + כל (חקתי) +. Based on 19:37.

18:5, 26 MT SP LXX ואת; LXX + כל (משפטי) +. Based on 19:37.

18:5 MT SP LXX משפטי; LXX + ועשיתם אתם + (καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά). Based on 19:37; 20:22.

19:8 MT SP (ההיא) ההוא; LXX האכלת (αἰ ἔσθουσαι). Based on 17:10.

19:19 MT SP שדך; LXX כרמך (τὸν ἀμπελῶνά σου). Based on Deut 22:9.

19:23; 25:2 MT SP LXX הארץ; LXX + אשר יהוה אלהיכם נתן לכם + (ἦν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν). Based on 23:10, Exod 20:12.

21:5 MT SP LXX בראשם (קרח); LXX + למת + (νεκρῶ). Based on Deut 14:1 קרחה בין עיניכם למת.

22:18 MT SP בני; LXX קהל (συναγωγῆ Ἰσραήλ). Based on 16:17 MT SP קהל ישראל. The LXX in 16:17 combines the two readings (συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ) so that the harmonization could not have taken place at the translational level.

22:18 MT LXX SP (הגר הגר הגר); LXX + הגר אתכם + (τῶν προσκειμένων πρὸς αὐτούς). Based on 19:34.

22:21 MT SP LXX (ל)נדבה; LXX + או במועדיכם + (ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς ὑμῶν). Based on Num 15:3.

22:30 MT SP LXX ממנו (תותירו); LXX מבשרו (ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν). Based on 7:17 והנותר מבשר.

23:20 MT SP LXX לכהן; LXX + המקריב אתה לו יהיה + (τῷ προσφέροντι αὐτά, αὐτῷ ἔσται). Based on 7:9.

24:7 MT SP LXX לבנה זכה; LXX + מלח + (καὶ ἄλλα). Based on 2:13.

24:17, 21 MT SP LXX אדם; LXX + ומת + (καὶ ἀποθάνῃ). Based on Exod 21:12 מכה איש ומת מות יומת.

26:45 MT SP LXX (הוצאתי אתם מארץ) מצרים; LXX + מבית עבדים + (ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας). Based on Exod 20:2.

### 2.1.3. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (19 x)

1:15b MT SP LXX והקטיר; LXX + הכהן +. Similarly: 2:9b; 5:8b; 13:51, 54; 14:18, 19; 14:24; 22:4. Based on the respective contexts.

8:16 MT SP LXX ויקח; LXX + משה +. Based on v. 15. Similarly vv. 18, 19, 22, 24, 28; 10:16.

8:19 MT SP LXX וישחט; LXX + משה את האיל + (Μωσῆς τὸν κριόν). Based on vv. 18, 20.

10:1 MT SP LXX צוה; LXX + יהוה +. Based on the context. Similarly 8:35.

## 2.2. SP LXX ≠ MT (58 + 18 + 4 = 80 x)

### 2.2.1. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (58 x)

1:6 MT והפשיט; SP LXX והפשיטו (καὶ ἐκδείραντες). Based on v. 5.

1:6 MT ונתח; SP LXX ונתחו (μελισσοῦσιν). Based on v. 5.

1:7 MT והכהן; SP LXX הכהנים (οἱ ἱερεῖς). Based on v. 5.

1:9 MT ירחץ; SP LXX ירחצו (πλυνουῦσιν). Based on v. 8.

1:9 MT SP LXX עלה; SP LXX + הוא + (ἐστίν). Based on vv. 13, 17.

1:10 MT SP LXX קרבנו; SP LXX + ליהוה +. Based on v. 14.

1:12 MT ונתחו; SP LXX ונתח (διελοῦσιν). Based on v. 11. Change from singular to plural executed more consistently in LXX than in SP (note v. 11 in SP).

2:1 MT SP LXX ונתן עליה לב(ו)נה; SP LXX + מנחה היא + (θυσία ἐστίν). Based on v. 15.

2:11b MT תקטירו; SP LXX תקריבו (προσοίσατε). Based on v. 11a.

3:5 MT SP LXX אשר על האש; SP LXX + על המזבח + (אשר) + (ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου). Based on 1:8, 12.

3:8 MT דמו; SP LXX הדם (τὸ αἷμα). Based on v. 2.

3:13 MT SP LXX בני אהרן; SP LXX + הכהנים +. Based on v. 2.

3:16 MT SP LXX לריח ניחח; SP LXX + ליהוה +. Based on 2:9; 3:5.

4:14 MT SP LXX פך בן בקר; SP LXX + תמים + (ἄμωμον). Based on v. 3. Same in 12:6 LXX (§ 2.1.2).

4:17 MT SP LXX פרכת(ה); SP LXX + הקדש + (τοῦ ἁγίου). Based on v. 6.



4:18 MT SP LXX מזבח(ה)קרנות; SP LXX + קטרת הסמים + (τῶν θυμιαμάτων τῆς συνθέσεως). Based on v. 7.

4:27 MT SP LXX אחת; SP LXX + מכל +. Based on vv. 13, 22.

4:28 MT SP LXX תמימה נקבה; SP pap4QLXXLev<sup>b</sup> LXX תמימה נקבה (θήλειαν ἄμωμον). Based on v. 32.

4:29 MT SP LXX במקום את החטאת; SP LXX + אשר ישחטו את + (οὗ σφάζουσιν τὰ). Based on v. 24.

4:34 MT SP LXX מזבח(ה); SP LXX + העלה + (τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως). Based on v. 30.

5:6 MT SP LXX וכפר עליו הכהן; SP pap4QLXXLev<sup>b</sup> LXX + אשר חטא ונסלח לו + (ἧς ἤμαρτεν, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ). Based on v. 10.

6:11 MT SP LXX מאשי; SP LXX + יהוה +. Based on v. 12.

9:3 MT SP LXX זקני (τῆ γερουσίᾳ). Based on v. 1.

10:15 MT SP LXX ולבניך; SP LXX + ולבנתיך + (καὶ ταῖς θυγατράσι σου). Based on v. 14 MT SP (not LXX וביתך).

11:10 MT SP LXX וקשקשת; SP LXX + במים + (ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι). Based on v. 9.

11:16 MT SP LXX ואת השקה; SP LXX + למינו + (καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῷ). Based on v. 15.

11:36a MT SP LXX מעין; SP LXX + מים + (ὕδατων). Based on v. 36b (ὑδατος). Slightly different in Greek.

13:5, 17, 21, 26, 27, 36 (similarly) MT וראהו; SP LXX וראה (καὶ ὄψεται). Based on v. 3.

13:27 MT SP LXX וטמא אתו הכהן; SP LXX וטמא אתו הכהן (καὶ μιανεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεύς). Based on vv. 25, 30.

13:42 MT SP LXX בקרחת; 11QLev<sup>a</sup> SP LXX בקרחתו (ἐν τῷ φαλακρώματι αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 42b.

13:42 MT SP LXX בגבחה; SP LXX בגבחתו (ἐν τῷ ἀναφαλαντώματι αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 42b.

14:20 MT SP LXX והמזבחה; SP LXX + לפני יהוה + (ἐναντι κυρίου). Based on vv. 16, 18.

14:41 MT SP LXX יקצע; SP LXX יקצעו (καὶ ἀποξύσουσιν). Similarly vv. 42 (*bis*), 45 (*bis*). Based on context (plural verbs).

14:51 MT SP LXX ואת שני התולעת ואת האזוב ואת שני התולעת; SP LXX ואת שני התולעת ואת האזוב (καὶ τὸ κεκλωσμένον κόκκινον καὶ τὸν ὕσσωπον). Based on v. 49.

17:8 MT SP LXX יעלה עלה; 4QLev<sup>d</sup> SP LXX יעשה עלה (ποιήσῃ ὀλοκαύτωμα). Based on v. 9.

17:13 MT SP LXX בתוככם; SP LXX בתוככם (ἐν ὑμῖν). Based on v. 12. Many texts agree with LXX SP.

- 18:9 MT ערותו; SP LXX ערותה (ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς). Based on vv. 11, 15, 17, 18.
- 19:27b MT זקנך ... תשחית; SP LXX זקנכם ... תשחיתו (φθереῖτε ... τοῦ πάγωνος ὑμῶν). Based on v. 27a.
- 19:33a MT אתך; SP LXX אתכם (ὕμῖν). Based on v. 33b.
- 21:2 MT SP לאמיו ולאביו; LXX לאביו ולאמו. Thus *passim*. Cf. also 19:3 in § 2.1.1.
- 21:6b MT קדש; SP LXX קדשים (ἄγιοι). Based on v. 33b.
- 21:8 MT יהוה מקדשכם; 11QLev<sup>a</sup> SP יהוה מקדשם (κύριος ὁ ἀγιάζων αὐτούς). Based on v. 23.
- 21:18 MT SP אשר; SP LXX + יהיה + (ἦ). Based on v. 19 (ἐστίν). Different in Greek.
- 23:5 MT SP עשר בארבעה עשר; SP LXX + יום + (ἡμέρα). Based on v. 6. Cf. also Exod 12:18.
- 23:18b MT SP ואילים שנים; SP LXX + תמימים + (ἀμόμους). Based on v. 18a.
- 24:3 MT SP אהרן; SP LXX + ובניו + (καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 9.
- 25:21 MT התבואה; SP LXX תבואתה (τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς). Based on v. 22.
- 25:35b MT SP וחיי (עמד); SP LXX + אחיך + (ὁ ἀδελφός σου). Based on vv. 36, 39.
- 26:20 MT ועץ הארץ; SP LXX ועץ השדה (καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ ἀγροῦ). Based on v. 4 (καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων). Different in Greek.
- 27:26 MT SP אך; SP LXX + כל (בכור) +. Based on v. 28.

### 2.2.2. Remote context (18 x)

- 4:5 MT SP מלא את ידו; SP LXX + אשר מלא את ידו + (ὁ τετελειωμένος τὰς χεῖρας). Based on 16:32.
- 6:8 MT SP המזבח (ה); SP LXX + אשה + (κάρπωμα). Based on 2:2 (θυσία). Different in Greek.
- 7:3 MT SP הקרב את החלב המכסה את הקרב; SP LXX + ואת החלב אשר על הקרב + (καὶ πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνδοσθίων). Based on 4:8.
- 8:13 MT אבנט; SP LXX אבניטים (ζώνας). Based on Exod 28:40.
- 8:31 MT SP אהל מועד; SP LXX + במקום קדש + (ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ). Based on 6:9, 19.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Not Exod 29:31, as it is preferable to invoke a nearby verse. Differently Frankel, *Einfluss*, 163.

7:29 MT SP LXX ואל בני ישראל תדבר (Καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ λαλήσεις). Based on 9:3.

8:8b MT SP LXX ויתן אל על (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπί). Based on vv. 7, 8a, 9.

11:3 MT SP LXX וששעת שסע; SP LXX + (פרסת) + (δύο [χρηλῶν]). Based on Deut 14:6.

11:10 MT SP LXX וקשקשת; SP LXX + במים + (ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι). Based on v. 9; Deut 14:9.

14:10a MT SP LXX כבשים תמימם; SP LXX + בני שנה + (ἐνιαυσίους). Based on v. 10b; 12:6.

14:10 MT SP LXX ולג שמן אחד; SP LXX + (ἐλαίου μίαν). Based on 8:26.

16:4 MT SP LXX את במים; SP LXX + (בשרו) +. Based on 15:16.

20:7 MT SP LXX כּי; SP LXX + (אני יהוה) + (ἅγιος). Based on 19:2.

20:19 MT SP LXX אבך ... אמך; SP LXX אבך ... אבך (πατρός σου ... μητρός σου). Based on v. 17.

20:23 MT SP LXX הגוי (בחקת); SP LXX (τῶν ἐθνῶν) (בחקת) הגוים. Based on the context and 25:44.

20:27 MT SP LXX באבן; SP LXX באבנים (λίθοις). Based on Num 15:36.

22:5 MT SP LXX שרץ; 4QL<sup>e</sup> SP LXX + טמא + (ἀκαθάρτου). Based on 5:2.

22:29 MT SP LXX תזבחו; SP LXX (θύσετε αὐτό) תזבחו. Based on 19:5. Different in Greek.

24:4 MT SP LXX תמיד; SP LXX עד בקר (ἕως τὸ πρωί). Based on 6:2; cf. also 24:3.

### 2.2.3. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (4 x)

4:18 MT SP LXX יתן; SP LXX + הכהן +. Based on v. 7. Similarly 5:8b; 12:7.

9:21 MT SP LXX כּאשר צוה; SP LXX + יהוה +. Based on v. 10.

## 2.3. $SP \neq MT LXX$ ( $5 + 2 + 1 = 8 x$ )

### 2.3.1. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (5 x)

4:6b MT SP LXX שבע פעמים pap4QLXXLev<sup>b</sup> SP + באצבעו +. Based on v. 6a.

4:17 MT SP LXX וּהוּזָה; SP + מן הדם +. Based on v. 6.

4:30 MT SP LXX (ה)מזבח; SP + העלה +. Based on v. 7.

11:45 MT SP LXX אגני יהוה; SP + אלהיכם +. Based on 11:44.

14:52 MT LXX ובשני התולעת ובאזוב; SP ובשני התולעת ובאזוב. Based on vv. 4, 6.

### 2.3.2. Remote context (2 x)

11:25 MT SP LXX בגדיו; SP + ורחץ במים +. Based on 15:5. See also 11:40 in the LXX (§ 2.1.2.). However, in similar conditions (vv. 28, 40a, 40b), SP did not add these details.

20:2 MT LXX מבני ישראל; 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup> SP מבית ישראל. Based on 17:10; 22:18.

### 2.3.3. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (1 x)

14:37 MT SP LXX וראה; SP + הכהן +. Based on the context.

## 2.4. $MT\ SP \neq LXX$ ( $18 + 2 = 20$ x)

### 2.4.1. Repetition of details found elsewhere in the context (18 x)

5:2 MT SP LXX טמא; MT SP + והוא ממנו והוא טמא ואשם +. Based on vv. 3, 4.

7:12b MT SP LXX מררכת; MT SP + חלת בלולת +. Based on v. 7a.

7:18 MT SP LXX מבשר; MT SP + זבח שלמיו +. Based on vv. 15, 20.

11:29 MT SP LXX והצב; MT SP + למינ(ה)ו +. Based on v. 22.

13:20 MT SP LXX והכהן; MT SP + נגע (הצרעת הוא) +. Based on v. 25.

13:42 MT SP LXX צרעת; MT SP + פרחת +. Based on v. 25.

14:16 MT SP LXX והזה; MT SP + מן השמן +. Based on v. 27.

14:37 MT SP LXX והנגע; MT SP + והנה הנגע +. Based on v. 39.

14:45b MT SP LXX עפר; MT SP + הבית +. Based on v. 45a.

15:11 MT SP LXX שטף; MT SP + במים +. Based on v. 12.

15:13 MT SP LXX במים; MT SP + חיים +. Based on 14:52.

15:25 MT SP LXX גדתה; MT SP + (טמאה) תהיה +. Based on v. 26.

23:38 MT SP LXX ומלכד; MT SP + (נדבתיכם) כל +. Based on v. 41.

24:18a MT SP LXX ומכה; MT SP + (בהמה) נפש +. Based on v. 18b.

24:21 MT SP LXX init; MT SP + ומכה בהמה ישלמנה +. Based on v. 18.

25:47 MT SP LXX אחיך; MT SP + עמו +. Based on v. 39.

27:6 MT SP LXX ולנקבה; MT SP + ערכך +. Based on vv. 5, 7.

27:6b MT SP LXX שקלים; MT SP + כסף +. Based on v. 6a.

## 2.4.2. Remote context (2 x)

14:10 MT SP LXX וכבשה; MT SP + אחת +. Based on Num 6:14.

20:20 MT SP LXX גלה; MT SP + חטאם ישאו +. Based on Num :1917.

2.5.  $MT \neq SP$  LXX (5 x)

7:8 MT SP (יקריבו) LXX הקריב; MT + לכהן +. Based on v. 14.

14:20 MT SP LXX אתם; MT + הכהן +. Based on the context.

18:26 MT SP LXX שמרתם; MT + אתם +. Based on v. 5.

20:7 init MT SP LXX --; MT + והתקדשתם +. Based on 11:44.

22:31 MT SP LXX אתם; MT + אני יהוה +. Based on vv. 30, 32, 33.

## 3. SOME CONCLUSIONS

*Statistics.* The total number of the harmonizations may be summarized as follows for the three sources:

1.  $LXX \neq MT$  SP ( $134 + 48 + 19 = 201$ )
2.  $SP$  LXX  $\neq$  MT ( $58 + 18 + 4 = 80$ )
3.  $SP \neq MT$  LXX ( $5 + 2 + 1 = 8$ )
4.  $MT$  SP  $\neq$  LXX ( $18 + 2 = 20$ )
5.  $MT \neq SP$  LXX (5)

Unique harmonizations:

LXX: 201

SP: 8

MT: 5

The combined figures for each of the three sources are:

LXX:  $201 + 80 = 281$

SP:  $80 + 8 + 20 = 108$

MT:  $20 + 5 = 25$

One of the purposes of this study is to investigate the nature of the textual differences between the major textual sources in Leviticus. This study is limited to the three complete witnesses, MT, SP, and LXX. T, V, and S are too close to MT to provide independent evidence, while only fragmentary evidence

has been preserved for individual Qumran scrolls.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, some meaningful data on the harmonizations have been analyzed for the only pre-Samaritan scroll preserved for Leviticus, 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup>.<sup>27</sup> When comparing the stretches of text parallel to this fragmentary scroll with MT, SP, and LXX, it is noted that the scroll contains more cases of harmonization than these three texts.<sup>28</sup> This is also the case with the other pre-Samaritan scrolls when compared with the other books of the Torah.<sup>29</sup> Occasional harmonizations were also spotted in other scrolls in Leviticus without any clear pattern:

- 10:1 11QLev<sup>b</sup> [בני אהרן] שני (MT SP LXX --), for which cf. 16:1.  
 11:27 11QLev<sup>b</sup> גחון (MT SP LXX כפיו), for which cf. 11:42.  
 14:36 4QLev<sup>d</sup> נגע הצרעת (MT SP LXX הנגע), for which cf. vv. 32, 34.  
 14:49 4QLev-Num<sup>a</sup> לטהר (את הבית) (MT SP LXX להטא), for which cf. v. 48.

Although we did not list here in detail the other exponents of textual transmission, it is clear that textual harmonization, especially pluses, is by far the most frequent textual phenomenon in Leviticus in MT SP LXX. Formulated differently, while the main textual sources of Leviticus are in basic agreement in a rather stable textual transmission, they differ in the matter of harmonization and not in such phenomena as textual corruption, interchange of letters, small pluses or minuses, glosses, etc.

Quite surprisingly, the LXX rather than the SP includes by far the largest number of harmonizations in Leviticus, especially in pluses. Altogether, the LXX contains 281 instances of harmonization, followed by the SP with 108 and the MT with a mere twenty-five instances. In eighty instances, the LXX and the SP agree in common harmonization, indicating that they share a common tendency, often in the same details, but at the same time also differing much in other details. These two texts probably derived from the same source,

<sup>26</sup> For the data, see E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTS 134; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010). For the general background of the Qumran scrolls, see P. W. Flint, “The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 323-341.

<sup>27</sup> See my study “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP,” in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown* (ed. Sh. Tzoref and I. Young; Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts 20; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013), 59–88. Revised version: E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Vol. 3* (VTS 167; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 387-410.

<sup>28</sup> The numbers are not large: 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> 8 x (of which 4Q alone 2 x), SP 6 x, LXX 3 x, MT 4 x. see Tov, “The Samaritan Pentateuch,” 397.

<sup>29</sup> See the data in Tov, “The Samaritan Pentateuch.” Innocent Himbaza kindly allowed me to consult his study “Looking at the Samaritan Pentateuch from Qumran: Legal Material of Leviticus and Deuteronomy” before its publication.

as I attempted to show elsewhere.<sup>30</sup> Exactly the same picture reveals itself in the text of Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy,<sup>31</sup> as shown in Table 1:

Table 1: Combined figures of harmonizations in the Pentateuch

	LXX	SP	MT
Genesis 1–11	61	31	11
Genesis 12–50	198	120	36
Genesis (total)	259	151	47
Exodus 1–24	169	67	20
Leviticus	281	108	25
Numbers	224	103	44
Deuteronomy	134	93	54

These numbers do not constitute the combined number of harmonizations in these books, since many instances are shared by two sources. Among these harmonizations, it is important to recognize unique occurrences of harmonizations recorded in Table 2.

Table 2: Unique harmonizations

	LXX	SP	MT
Genesis 1–11	51	9	0
Genesis 12–50	145	31	0
Genesis	196	40	0
Exodus 1–24	139	18	2
Leviticus	201	8	5
Numbers	179	16	1
Deuteronomy	99	22	2

<sup>30</sup> E. Tov, “The Shared Tradition of the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch,” in *Die Septuaginta: Orte und Intentionen* (ed. S. Kreuzer et al.; WUNT 361; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 277–293.

<sup>31</sup> See the studies quoted in n. 1.

The following conclusions may be drawn:

- 1) In all of the Torah, the source that contains the largest number of harmonizations is the LXX. Possibly an equally large number was once contained in the pre-Samaritan scrolls, but at this point we only have fragmentary information for them (see n. 27). Other texts that were harmonizing to a great degree are the *tefillin* and the liturgical scrolls. The best example of this group is 4QDeut<sup>n</sup>, well analyzed by E. Eshel (see n. 4).
- 2) Within the Torah, Leviticus contains more harmonizations than the other books, as it is smaller in size than Genesis (the largest book in the Torah) but contains approximately the same number of instances.
- 3) The LXX stands out not only regarding the number of its harmonizations, but also in relation to their nature. The harmonizations in that source are more extensive than those in the SP and MT.

The harmonizing character of the LXX of Leviticus was recognized by Kyung-Rae Kim, who recognized these features in the whole LXX, and by M. Ziyor in a monographic study on the LXX of Leviticus.<sup>32</sup> Several other scholars have focused on harmonizations in the textual traditions of the Hebrew and translated Bible.<sup>33</sup> The popular and wide-spread distribution of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of the Torah is described in a separate study.<sup>34</sup>

### References

- Andersen F. I. and A. D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 312-318.
- Barr J., *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1986; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Dorival G., “Les phénomènes d’intertextualité dans le livre grec des *Nombres*,” in *Katà τοὺς Ο΄, Selon les Septante: Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Sep-*

<sup>32</sup> K.-R. Kim, “Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994); M. Ziyor, *Textual History of the Bible Online* (ed. A. Lange and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2015), I:2.4.1.3.4.3.

<sup>33</sup> See R. S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); M. Rösel, “Die Septuaginta und der Kult,” 29-30; idem, “Septuagint, Numbers,” section 2.4.1.4.5 in *Textual History of the Bible Online*, vol. 1 (ed. A. Lange and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2015); G. Dorival, *Nombres*, 42-43; idem, “Les phénomènes d’intertextualité dans le livre grec des *Nombres*,” in *Katà τοὺς Ο΄, Selon les Septante: Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Marguerite Harl* (ed. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 261-285. Rösel and Dorival discuss several examples of harmonization in LXX-Numbers, without statistics, and with the clear understanding that this was an inner-Septuagintal phenomenon.

<sup>34</sup> E. Tov, “From Popular Jewish LXX-SP Texts to Separate Sectarian Texts: Insights from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 19–40.



- tante en hommage à Marguerite Harl* (ed. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 261-285.
- Dorival G., *Les Nombres* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 4; Paris: Cerf, 1994).
- Eshel E., "4QDeut<sup>a</sup>: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991), 117-154.
- Flint P. W., "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 323-341.
- Frankel Z., *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1851).
- Hendel R. S., *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Huber K., *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1916).
- Kim K.-R., "Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994).
- Polak F. H. and G. Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint, Part I: Introduction; Part II: The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 4, 5; Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002).
- Prijs L., *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948).
- Rösel M., "Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri," in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à A. Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman and Chr. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25-40.
- Rösel M., "Septuagint, Numbers," section 2.4.1.4.5 in *Textual History of the Bible Online*, vol. 1 (ed. A. Lange and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2015).
- Tal A. and M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Tel Aviv: Haim Rubín Tel Aviv University Press, 2010).
- Teeter D. A., *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period* (FAT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).
- Toepler T. E., *De Pentateuchi interpretationis alexandrinae indole critica et hermeneutica* (Halle: C. Schwetschke, 1830), 8-16.
- Tov E. and F. H. Polak, *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (division of the CATSS database, directed by Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov), modules in the *Accordance*, Oaktree Software, Inc., and *BibleWorks* computer programs.
- Tov E., "From Popular Jewish LXX-SP Texts to Separate Sectarian Texts: Insights from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Michael Langlois; CBET 94; Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 19-40.
- Tov E., "Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs," in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Writings*, Vol. 3 (VTS 167; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 166-188.
- Tov E., "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran. Collected essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 271-282.

- Tov E., "The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks," *Textus* 26 (2016), 1-27.
- Tov E., "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11," in *Collected Writings*, Vol. 3 (2015), 470-489. "The Septuagint of Numbers as a Harmonizing Text," in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz, 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.–24. Juli 2016* (ed. Martin Meiser et al.; WUNT 405; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 181-201.
- Tov E., "Textual Harmonization in Exodus 1–24," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 22 (2017). <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v22/TC-2017-Tov.pdf>
- Tov E., "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS," *JSOT* 31 (1985), 3-29.
- Tov E., "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP," in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown* (ed. Sh. Tzoref and I. Young; Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts 20; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013), 59-88.
- Tov E., "The Septuagint Translation of the Torah as a Source and Resource for the Post-Pentateuchal Translators," in *Die Sprache der Septuaginta, The Language of the Septuagint, Handbuch zur Septuaginta, Handbook of the Septuagint*, LXX.H, Vol. 3 (ed. E. Bons and J. Joosten; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2016), 316-328.
- Tov E., "The Shared Tradition of the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *Die Septuaginta: Orte und Intentionen* (ed. S. Kreuzer et al.; WUNT 361; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 277-293.
- Tov E., *Textual Criticism ... Collected Writings, Volume 3* (2015), 387-410.
- Ulrich E., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTS 134; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010).
- Wevers J. W., *Leviticus, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum*, Vol. 2.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (SBL.SCSS 46; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998).
- Wevers J. W., *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. III 153, MSU XIX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).
- Zipor M., *Textual History of the Bible Online* (ed. A. Lange and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2015).



# UNCLEAN BIRDS IN THE HEBREW AND GREEK VERSIONS OF LEVITICUS AND DEUTERONOMY\*

Anna ANGELINI and Christophe NIHAN

## 1. THE LIST OF UNCLEAN BIRDS AND TEXTUAL FLUIDITY IN LEVITICUS

Leviticus is commonly regarded as one of the most stable scriptures that were transmitted during the Second Temple period. The comparison between the main textual forms that have been preserved, namely, MT, SP and LXX, as well as the fragments of several copies of Leviticus that were found in Qumran, suggests that this book was transmitted with few significant variants<sup>1</sup>. Additions and omissions of materials are limited in scope and usually comprise a few words<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, and with only one partial exception, the comparison between these textual forms provides no evidence for the rearrangement of Leviticus materials, a phenomenon well documented for other pentateuchal books like, e.g., Exodus or Numbers<sup>3</sup>. These and other observations have led

\* The present essay is part of a larger research on dietary norms and unclean animals in biblical and early Jewish traditions from the Second Temple period supported by the Swiss National Fund for Scientific Research (CRSII1\_160785). We are grateful to our colleague Giuseppina Lenzo (University of Lausanne) for her assistance with the Egyptian material. We would like also to thank Peter Altmann (University of Zurich) for his assistance with the revision and editing of this essay.

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the Qumran evidence pertaining to Leviticus, see, especially, P. W. Flint, "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 323-41; as well as S. Metso, "Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus", in *Editing the Bible, Assessing the Task Past and Present* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and J. H. Newman; SBL.RBS 69; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 67-79. Cf. also C. Nihan, "Supplementing Leviticus in the Second Temple Period: The Case of the Wood Offering in 4Q365 23," in *Supplementation in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. S. Olyan and J. Wright; Brown Judaic Studies 361; Providence, RI: Brown University, 2017), 183-204. For the Greek text of Leviticus, see below.

<sup>2</sup> The most substantial addition is arguably represented by the plus preserved at Lev 17:4 in SP, LXX and 4QLev<sup>d</sup>. See on this the recent and detailed discussion by D. A. Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period* (FAT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 76-94. One significant example of omission is preserved 4QLev<sup>b</sup>, where the portion of text corresponding to Lev 3:2-7 appears to be missing; however, this omission may simply reflect a scribal error caused by the similarity between vv. 2 and 8, as it is often assumed.

<sup>3</sup> The partial exception concerns fr. I of 11QpaleoLev, where, in the passage corresponding to Lev 18:27, the reference to the "disgusting things" (תועבה) committed by "the men of the land" is expanded with a clause referring to their expulsion by Yhwh from the land which is borrowed from Lev 20:23-24. In this instance, however, a distinctive sign (antisigma) was placed at the end of the clause borrowed from Lev 20. It appears, therefore, that the scribe who introduced this sign

scholars to conclude that the text of Leviticus transmitted by these ancient versions, while not yet standardized, was nevertheless characterized by what Sarianna Metso aptly terms “a modest number of predictable variants within [a] single edition”<sup>4</sup>.

While this assessment is arguably correct as a general rule, there are nevertheless some instances where the textual evidence appears to be more complex and points to a greater degree of fluidity in the transmission of the Leviticus materials. One such instance concerns the list of unclean birds in Lev 11:13-19 and its parallel in Deut 14:12-18, which evinces some significant differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions. Strikingly, this specific instance has received little attention so far, although it has some important implications for the textual history of Leviticus. In particular, as we will show, the case of the unclean birds casts additional light on the transmission of Leviticus in the Second Temple period, especially in comparison with Deuteronomy, while at the same time challenging some of the standard assumptions regarding the text of Leviticus. The main body of the essay will describe the difference between the unclean birds listed in the Hebrew and Greek versions of both Leviticus and Deuteronomy and evaluate their implications. First, however, some remarks regarding the manuscript evidence and the state of the discussion are in order.

## 2. A FIRST APPROACH TO THE LIST OF UNCLEAN BIRDS IN LEVITICUS 11 AND DEUTERONOMY 14

The main witnesses for the Hebrew text of Lev 11:13-19 and Deut 14:12-18 are represented by MT and SP. In addition, fragments including portions of the lists of Lev 11 and Deut 14 are preserved in two fragments from mss belonging to the Reworked Pentateuch composition, 4Q365 and 4Q366. 4Q365 fr. 15a-b preserves a few letters from the end of the bird list in the Leviticus version, but

was well aware of the highly unusual character of this sort of textual rearrangement in the case of Leviticus. So this exception may arguably be viewed, in fact, as confirming the general rule that the rearrangement of materials was normally avoided in the transmission of this book.

A further, more complex case for rearrangement of Leviticus materials is presented by two of the so-called “Reworked Pentateuch” manuscripts, 4Q366 and 4Q367 (= 4QRP D and E). In three of these fragments (4Q366 2, 4Q367 2 and 3), the text of Leviticus has been rearranged in ways otherwise unattested in other Second Temple versions of this book. However, due to the highly fragmentary nature of these two mss, it is difficult to provide a cogent explanation for this phenomenon. Additionally, the genre of these mss remains disputed and unclear. According to M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Jerusalem: Exploration Society – Israel Museum, 2000), 391-399 (395, 399), 4Q367 would represent an excerpted text of Leviticus; but see the cautionary note of E. Tov, “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch(?),” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010), 73-91 (85).

<sup>4</sup> Metso, “Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls,” 70.

the text is simply too fragmentary to allow for any significant conclusion regarding the transmission of this list<sup>5</sup>. 4Q366 fr. 5 preserves five lines of text that correspond to a portion of Deut 14, from the end of v. 13 up to v. 21. The names and the order of the birds listed in this fragment appear to be consistent with the Hebrew version otherwise preserved in MT and SP, although the wording shows a few minor disagreements with both versions<sup>6</sup>. Otherwise, the passages corresponding to Lev 11:13-19 and Deut 14:12-18 are not attested in the extant fragments of Leviticus and Deuteronomy that were found among the Dead Sea scrolls<sup>7</sup>. Finally, among the other texts found in the Judean desert, one fragment of a Masada scroll (Mas1b) preserves a text corresponding to Lev 8:31-11:40<sup>8</sup>. Unfortunately, in this fragment the portion that concerns unclean birds (Mas 1b IV:18-24) is very poorly preserved, and only a few words are legible; like the rest of the scroll, however, the extant text of Lev 11:13-19 appears to be virtually identical with MT's version.

This situation regarding the Hebrew versions of the lists of unclean birds stands in contrast with the evidence provided by the LXX of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, where – as already mentioned – the transmission of the list of birds evinces a significantly greater degree of fluidity. For Leviticus, our analysis is primarily based on the comparison between the Alexandrinus (A), the Vaticanus (B) and ms 121. Following the study by J. Wevers in 1986, these manuscripts are considered to be among the best witnesses for the extant Greek text of Leviticus<sup>9</sup>. Admittedly, the relationship between the oldest uncials (ie A and B) and the Old Greek (OG) of Leviticus remains a complex issue. The comparison with the fragments of the two Greek mss of Leviticus from Cave 4 (4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> and 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>) arguably provides some support for the

<sup>5</sup> See *DJD* 13, p. 284-285. 4Q365 fr. 15a-b corresponds to Lev 11:17-25 (although the extant text only goes up to v. 23). As far as the bird list is concerned, the only words preserved are השלך וזאת, which corresponds to the second bird listed in Lev 11:17.

<sup>6</sup> See *DJD* 13, 342-343. The first word of line 2, [ל]מינור, may correspond to the end of Deut 14:15; in this case, 4Q366's version agrees with MT rather than with SP, where the last bird mentioned in v. 15, the גז, is not followed by the phrase למינור. The following words of line 2, which correspond to the beginning of v. 16, preserve the reading וזאת הכוס, which agrees with SP and the majority of Masoretic mss, whereas a minority of Masoretic mss preserves here an asyndetic construction (זאת הכוס). Finally, the beginning of line preserves the reading והאנפה למינו וזאת תהדוכיפ, corresponding to Deut 14:18. This reading agrees with SP against MT in having the third bird listed in v. 18 (תהדוכי) introduced by וזאת, but disagrees with both MT and SP in reading למינו, instead of למינה, after אנפה. This reading is grammatically incorrect (since אנפה is clearly feminine) and may simply reflect a scribal mistake.

<sup>7</sup> Note, however, that 4Q45 (= 4QpaleoDeut<sup>c</sup>) fr. 21 preserves a few letters corresponding to the end of Deut 14:19. See *DJD* 9, 141.

<sup>8</sup> For the edition, see S. Talmon, Y. Yadin, *Masada VI. Hebrew Fragments from Masada: The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society – The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 40-50.

<sup>9</sup> J. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 59-71.

view that the Greek text of Leviticus transmitted by the uncials may in fact already have been significantly revised<sup>10</sup>. In the case of the birds of Lev 11, however, B's reading finds the support of the recently published Greek manuscript of Leviticus from the Schøyen collection (MS 2649)<sup>11</sup>. With only one exception, to which we will return below, the list preserved by the two texts is strictly identical. This observation implies, in turn, that the list preserved by B largely goes back to a pre-uncial version of this list, which is still reflected in MS 2649, and which de facto represents one of the earliest attainable stages (if not the earliest stage) of the Greek version of Lev 11:13-19. For the rest, in the absence of additional evidence, we can only speculate about what earlier forms of this chapter in Greek may have looked like.

The case of the bird list in Deuteronomy presents us with similar methodological issues since the list is not preserved in the main papyri that contain portions of the Greek translation of Deuteronomy, like p963, p848 and others. Accordingly, we have similarly retained mss A and B as the main basis for our comparison. These manuscripts are generally considered good witnesses for the Greek text of Deuteronomy<sup>12</sup>; additionally, they provide the advantage that the comparison between the Greek version of the bird list in Leviticus and Deuteronomy is conducted on the basis of the same manuscripts.

For the sake of convenience, the list of unclean birds preserved in the Hebrew and Greek versions represented by MT, SP and LXX (A and B) is synoptically presented in the following table<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> In the case of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>, see the recent discussion by I. Himbaza, "What are the consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> contains earliest formulation [*sic*] of the Septuagint?", *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen. 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014* (ed. S. Kreuzer et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 294-308.

<sup>11</sup> For the edition, see K. de Troyer, "MS 2649: Leviticus," in *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen): Essays and Texts in Honour of Martin Schøyen* (ed. D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina XL; Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2010), 7-68 and pls. 1-16. MS 2649 is dated by D. Fraenkel to the second century CE: see A. Rahlfs and D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*. Bd. I, 1: *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (VTG.S; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 273-274. For a general presentation of the manuscript and its main features, see de Troyer, "MS 2649," 7-10.

<sup>12</sup> See J. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

<sup>13</sup> For the edition of the Vaticanus, see A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, *Exodus and Leviticus. The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, 1,2* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909); id., *Numbers and Deuteronomy. The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, 1,3* (Cambridge: University Press, 1911). For the Alexandrinus, see F. G. Kenyon, *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D. V-VIII) in reduced photographic facsimile* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1909). For the text of Lev 11:13-19 and Deut 14:12-18 in other Greek mss, we have used the critical edition by J. Wevers, *Leviticus* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 2,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); id., *Deuteronomium* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 3,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

Leviticus	No	MT/SP	LXX A	LXX B + MS 2649	Other G mss	Deuteronomy	No	MT/SP	LXX A	LXX B	Other G mss
11:13	1	נשר	ἀετός	ἀετός		14:12	1	נשר	ἀετός	ἀετός	
	2	פרס	γρῦψ + 121	γρῦψ			2	פרס	γρῦψ	γρῦψ	
	3	ענייה	ἀλαιοστός	ἀλαιοστός			3	ענייה	ἀλαιοστός	ἀλαιοστός	
14	4	דח	γρῦψ + 121	γρῦψ	b, G and other mss: ἰκτίς	13	4	MT: דח SP: דח	γρῦψ	γρῦψ	late mss + ἰξός before γρῦψ
	5	דח + לעינו	ἰκτίς + καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ	ἰκτίς + καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ	b, G and other mss: γρῦψ		5	דח	ἰκτίς + καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ	ἰκτίς + καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ	
							5bis	דח + לעינו	∅	∅	
15	6	ערב + לעינו	∅	∅	also missing in 121 and other mss	14	6	ערב + לעינו	∅	∅	missing in b, 121 and other mss
16	7	בת יענה	στρουθός	στρουθός		15	7	בת יענה	στρουθός	στρουθός	
	8	החבס	γλαυξ	γλαυξ			8	החבס	γλαυξ	γλαυξ	
	9	שוק + לעינו	λάρος	λάρος	G: καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ, but asterisk in Hex		9	שוק + לעינו	λάρος	λάρος	
	10	ג + לעינו SP: minus לעינו	∅	יערס + καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ	A supported by other mss		10	ג + לעינו SP minus לעינו	יערס + καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ	ἀροδιός supralinear correction to ἐροδιός	B is supported by n, z* and other mss



17		11	כוס	נוכתיקוראָז	נוכתיקוראָז		16	11	כוס SP + ל"ש as in Lev	ָרוּדִיּוֹס	כֹּוּנוּס	
	12	ל"ך	קאטארראַקטיש	קאטארראַקטיש				12	קישׁׁ	כֹּוּנוּס	יִבִּיס	
	13	קישׁׁ	יִבִּיס	יִבִּיס				13	קישׁׁ	יִבִּיס	קאטארראַקטיש	
	14	קישׁׁ	פורפוריִון	פורפוריִון			17	14	קאק	קאטארראַקטיש	יִבִּיראָז + קאָ ראַ ִוּמאָ אַנטִפֿ	
	15	קאק	פּעלעקאַן	פּעלעקאַן				15	קאק	ִבִּיראָז	ִבִּיראָז	
	16	קאק	כֹּוּנוּס	כֹּוּנוּס		SP: קאק (as in Deut 14)		16	ל"ך missing in SP at this place	פורפוריִון	נוכתיקוראָז	
19	16bis	∅	גלאַז	גלאַז		MS 2649: ָרוּדִיּוֹס (also B corr.)						
	17	קישׁׁ	ָרוּדִיּוֹס	ָרוּדִיּוֹס			18	17	קישׁׁ	נוכתיקוראָז	פּעלעקאַן	
	18	קאק + ל"ך	ָרוּדִיּוֹס + ָרוּדִיּוֹס + קאָ ראַ ִוּמאָ אַנטִפֿ	ָרוּדִיּוֹס + ָרוּדִיּוֹס + קאָ ראַ ִוּמאָ אַנטִפֿ		MT + SP: only occurrence without קא		18	קאק + ל"ך	פּעלעקאַן	ָרוּדִיּוֹס + קאָ ראַ ִוּמאָ אַנטִפֿ	
	19	קישׁׁ SP: קישׁׁ	ִבִּיראָז	ִבִּיראָז				19	קישׁׁ SP: קישׁׁ	ָרוּדִיּוֹס + קאָ ראַ ִוּמאָ אַנטִפֿ	פורפוריִון	B is supported by n, z* and other mss
	20	קישׁׁ	נוכתיקוראָז	נוכתיקוראָז				20	קישׁׁ	נוכתיקוראָז	נוכתיקוראָז	

The comparison between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the list of unclean birds shows that the differences between these versions are mainly of two orders.

The first difference concerns the raven, which is listed as bird no 6 in MT and SP of both Leviticus and Deuteronomy, but which is consistently missing from the Greek text of these books represented by A and B (with MS 2649), as well as from several other Greek mss<sup>14</sup>. Most likely, therefore, the raven was omitted from the OG of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that the phrase *καὶ πάντα κόρακα καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ* in Deut 14:14 is missing from the text of the LXX in the *Hexapla*<sup>15</sup>. The absence of the raven evidently implies a difference in the number of birds listed as unclean, although the Greek tradition is inconsistent on this point. Greek Deuteronomy logically has only 19 birds, instead of the 20 listed in MT and SP. Ms B of Leviticus reaches the same number of 20 birds as MT and SP by reproducing one bird, the *γλαύξ* (a generic term for owls, see below), twice in the list (no 7 and no 16). However, MS 2649 (Schøyen) differs from B here in that it only mentions the *γλαύξ* once (as no 7), and therefore preserves the same number of 19 birds as Greek Deuteronomy, albeit in a different order. This observation strongly suggests that Greek Leviticus initially mentioned only 19 birds, like Greek Deuteronomy, and that the text of ms B reflects a later stage in which the *γλαύξ* appears twice in order to reach the number of 20 birds found in the Hebrew tradition despite the absence of the raven. Finally, ms A of Leviticus also reproduces the *γλαύξ* twice, but contrary to ms B it does not mention the hawk, *ἔραξ* (which elsewhere in the Greek usually renders the Hebrew term *רָב*), and thus ends up with a list of 19 birds.

The second difference between the Hebrew and Greek versions of Lev 11 and Deut 14 concerns the order of the birds listed. In the MT and SP of Lev 11, all 20 birds are listed in the same order. The MT of Deut 14 has a very similar order, except for one bird, *רָב*, which is listed as no 16 instead of no 12. (The identification of several of these birds raises several issues, to which we will briefly return below; for the time being, we reference them with their Hebrew names only.) Interestingly, however, SP in Deut 14 places the *רָב* as no 12 instead of no 16, and thus has exactly the same order as the list preserved in Lev 11. In the Greek mss of Lev 11, the order of the birds is likewise fairly stable, and appears to correspond to the order appearing in the Hebrew tradi-

<sup>14</sup> For Leviticus this concerns almost all mss of group *n*, and mss of group *t*, 29-72, 442, 550, 44, 121-318, 68, 319. See Wevers, *Leviticus*, 127. For Deuteronomy this includes mss of group *of* and *b*, 125, 75, 130-321, 121, 55, 319, and some Coptic versions. In a few mss the raven occupies a different position: see Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 195.

<sup>15</sup> See F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta, Tomus 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1875 [repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1964]), 294.

tion preserved in MT and SP. In the case of the Greek mss of Deuteronomy, however, the situation is distinct. The order of the birds follows the order found in the Greek text of Leviticus up to bird no 8, the *λάρος* (“seagull”, translating the Hebrew term *הקש*). But afterward the Greek text of Deuteronomy enumerates the following birds (nos 9-18) in an order completely different from the one we find in the Greek text of Leviticus. The only exception concerns the bird designated as *הלעז* in Hebrew and rendered with *νυκτερίς*, “bat”, in Greek, which is consistently mentioned in all witnesses as the *last* bird in the list and which, incidentally, is also the most anomalous in terms of zoological classification<sup>16</sup>. In addition, one must note that the order of birds 9-18 is not consistent within the Greek tradition of Deuteronomy itself. In particular, mss A and B of Deuteronomy differ regarding the position of some birds, such as especially the hawk (*ἰεραξ*) and the water hen (*πορφυρίων*).

These differences between the Hebrew and Greek traditions regarding the number of unclean birds and the order in which they are listed are significant in several regards, not the least because the Greek versions of Leviticus and, especially, of Deuteronomy are generally regarded as among the most literal translations within the LXX<sup>17</sup>. It is rather surprising, therefore, that this topic has received very little attention overall. To the best of our knowledge, the only comprehensive study of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the list of unclean birds in Leviticus and Deuteronomy was published by R. K. Yerkes almost one century ago, in 1923<sup>18</sup>. Unfortunately, Yerkes’ study has largely gone unnoticed<sup>19</sup>, and no further study of this topic

<sup>16</sup> The status of the bat is already anomalous in ancient classifications. Aristotle places the bat in a separate category of “ambiguous” animals (*HA* 511 a 31, *PA* 697 b 1-12). Its nocturnal behavior accounts for a proximity with other nocturnal raptors, such as the *glaux* (*HA* 488 a 25). On this, see A. Zucker, *Les classes zoologiques en Grèce ancienne. D’Homère (VIII<sup>e</sup> av. J.-C.) à Élien (III<sup>e</sup> ap. J.-C.)* (Aix en Provence: Presses Universitaires de Provence, 2005), 282-283. For more details on the cultural values of the bat in antiquity, see C. Tommasi, “‘Esser vorresti uccello? Siam lí: sei pipistrello’. Note sull’ambiguo statuto dei chiroterteri nella cultura greco-romana,” in *Monstra. Costruzione e percezione delle entità ibride e mostruose nel Mediterraneo antico* (ed. I. Baglioni; Roma: Quasar, 2013), 251-259.

<sup>17</sup> On the state of discussion concerning free and literal renderings in the Greek translation of Leviticus, see recently A. Voitila, “Leviticus,” in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. Aitken; London: T&T Clark, 2015), 43-57. Compare also the recent study by I. Himbaza, “Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?,” *JSCS* 49 (2016), 22-33. Usually the Greek translation of Leviticus is considered more literal in the legal portions than in the narrative ones. On the high literalism of the LXX of Deuteronomy see L. Perkins, “Deuteronomy,” in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, 68-85, with additional bibliography.

<sup>18</sup> R. K. Yerkes, “The Unclean Animals of Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14,” *JQR* 14/1 (1923-1924), 1-29.

<sup>19</sup> One significant exception concerns W. Houston, *Purity and Monotheism: Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 140; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 47-48; see also C. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of Leviticus* (FAT 2, 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 289-290. However, these authors largely follow Yerkes’ reconstruction of the Greek evidence.

has been undertaken since then<sup>20</sup>. Instead, the main commentaries and monographs on Lev 11 usually discuss the list of unclean birds primarily on the basis of the MT and pay little or not attention to the Greek tradition itself<sup>21</sup>.

Yerkes' study was, in fact, quite remarkable for its time, not least for the way in which it combined zoological and text-critical observations. In particular, Yerkes already argued that the differences that can be observed within the Greek versions of the list of unclean birds were not due to the carelessness of the Greek translators but point to the complexities involved in the formation and transmission of this list in the Second Temple period<sup>22</sup>. There are, however, two major flaws in this study, which typically reflect the scholarship of his time. First, Yerkes followed E. Lagarde in assuming the existence of a Lucianic (L) version of the Pentateuch, which he regarded as the earliest witness for the list of unclean birds in the Greek tradition<sup>23</sup>. However, the idea of a Lucianic version of the Pentateuch has been abandoned, and it significantly biased Yerkes' reconstruction of the textual history of the list of unclean birds<sup>24</sup>. Second, and even more importantly, Yerkes merely compared the unclean birds in the Hebrew and the Greek on a term-by-term basis, without attempting to describe the general logic of the Greek translations in Lev 11 and Deut 14. It is clear, however, that a proper assessment of the differences between the He-

<sup>20</sup> The problem of the differences between the list of unclean birds preserved in the Greek text of Lev 11 and Deut 14 is briefly mentioned by C. J. den Hertog, "Erwägungen zur relativen Chronologie der Bücher Levitikus und Deuteronomium innerhalb der Pentateuchübersetzung," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*. Bd. 2 (ed. S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch; BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 216-228 (225-226). However, this author merely provides a very brief discussion of the issues at stake. See further below.

<sup>21</sup> In general, commentators only resort to the LXX of Lev 11:13-19 and Deut 14:12-18 in order to cast additional light on difficult Hebrew names without taking into account the fluidity evinced by the Greek tradition and its implications for the analysis of the list of unclean birds and its transmission. For an illustration of this approach, compare, e.g., J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1991), 662-664; or the recent commentary by T. Hieke, *Leviticus 1-15* (HThKAT; Freiburg et al.: Herder, 2014), 410-412 and 424. Even J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL.SCSS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 147-149 and *passim*, does not mention Yerkes' study and the issues it raises for the analysis of the Greek text of Lev 11:13-19.

<sup>22</sup> A different view is taken by den Hertog, "Erwägungen," 225-226, who instead considers the differences entirely due to the work of the Greek translators. However, den Hertog does not discuss the relevant evidence, which suggests that the Greek translators had a Hebrew *Vorlage* which differed from the text transmitted by MT and SP. See further below, especially § 4.

<sup>23</sup> See Yerkes, "Unclean Animals," 7-8. On Lagarde's and Rahlfs' hypothesis of a "Lucianic" recension of the Bible, see the summary by B. Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," in id., *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 1-42.

<sup>24</sup> See on this, e.g., O. Munnich in *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (ed. M. Harl, G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1988), 168-171; and, more recently, N. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden et al.: Brill, 2000), 223-273.

brew and Greek versions of the list of unclean birds in Leviticus and Deuteronomy must necessarily begin with a description of the main features of their translation: namely, the degree of literalness, the techniques used by the Greek translators, as well as the main trends in the Greek translation of Lev 11 and Deut 14.

### 3. BIRD NAMES AND TAXONOMY IN THE HEBREW TRADITION OF LEVITICUS AND DEUTERONOMY

Before we can turn to this question, however, an even more basic issue needs to be addressed: namely, the identification of the unclean birds in the Hebrew versions of Lev 11 and Deut 14. Such identification, however, raises a number of methodological problems, which are not always sufficiently considered in the relevant scholarly literature. The whole issue would admittedly require an essay in itself<sup>25</sup>. In the context of the present study, we will limit ourselves to some brief remarks on ancient Israelite faunal taxonomy. (1) First, scholarly identifications of the birds mentioned in Lev 11 and Deut 14 are often based on modern descriptions of Palestinian fauna, without considering the fact that such descriptions do not necessarily match the realities of that region in earlier periods<sup>26</sup>. (2) Second, and more importantly, ancient systems of animal classification differ in several respects from modern (i.e., Linnean) zoology, especially as regards the criteria used as well as the fact that ancient classifications are usually less systematic than modern ones<sup>27</sup>. Accordingly, we should not expect that the division of animals (including birds) into species would consistently follow the divisions established in modern zoology<sup>28</sup>. This observation means, in turn, that attempts to identify every single species of birds mentioned in the Hebrew Bible with current zoological species are necessarily

<sup>25</sup> The present authors aim to explore this issue more systematically in a forthcoming essay.

<sup>26</sup> This approach is typically exemplified in some earlier monographs on the animals mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, such as G. Bare, *Plants and Animals of the Bible* (London: United Bible Society, 1969), or G. Cansdale, *Animals of Bible Land* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970). It is also found in several commentaries, which are often themselves based on such monographs: compare, e.g., J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992), 159-163.

<sup>27</sup> Namely, although ancient societies were engaged in processes of classification of fauna and flora into different level taxa, these classificatory systems did not match the seven Linnaean taxa (i.e., kingdom; phylum; class; order; family; genus; species). In this regard, the most relevant parallels for studying the way in which ancient taxonomy worked are offered by folk biology: see on this, especially, A. Guasparri, "Etnobiologia e mondo antico: una prospettiva di ricerca," *Annali On-Line di Lettere – Ferrara, Speciale I* (2007), 69-90.

<sup>28</sup> For a similar remark, see, e.g., H.-P. Müller, "Die Funktion divinatorischen Redens und die Tierbezeichnungen der Inschrift von Tell Deir 'Alla", in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Alla Reevaluated* (ed. J. Hoftizer and G. van der Kooij; Leiden et al., 1991), 185-205 (189-195).

problematic<sup>29</sup>. (3) Third, and lastly, in the case of the birds, specifically, the problem is further complicated by the fact that most of the birds listed in Lev 11 and Deut 14 are either seldom or never mentioned outside of these two texts. In such cases, the identity of these birds may only be established by resorting to Semitic cognates, when such cognates are attested, and/or to etymology. Both approaches may be helpful, to an extent, but they also raise significant methodological issues that cannot be ignored. In the case of cognate words, a basic problem is that we cannot be certain that the same terms, in two or more Semitic languages, must necessarily have exactly the same zoological referent, especially if we take into account the fact that animal classifications could significantly vary from one ancient Near Eastern society to another. Etymological explanations, on the other hand, raise other issues, especially because they presuppose that the name of a given animal derives from (or at least is closely associated to) a prominent feature (such as its color, its cry or its dietary habit) which was considered to be the defining trait of this animal by the local population (“folk etymologies”). This may well be true in some cases but, again, the systematic use of this criterion is problematic, especially when it is used in isolation from other criteria<sup>30</sup>.

On the basis of these brief remarks, it should already be clear that attempts to ascribe a specific zoological referent to all the birds mentioned in the list of Lev 11 and Deut 14 must be viewed with significant caution. In several instances, we must in fact admit that the identification of a given species is no longer possible in light of the available evidence. What seems to be possible,

<sup>29</sup> This approach is frequently reflected in earlier studies: see, e.g., Aharoni, “On some animals,” or J. Feliks, *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel Aviv: Sinai, 1962). In the case of birds, specifically, see also the approach exemplified by the study of G. R. Driver, “Birds in the Old Testament (I. Birds in Law; II. Birds in life),” *PEQ* 87 (1955), 5-20 and 129-140, which remains one of the main references for bird nomenclature in the Hebrew Bible. For an approach that raises similar methodological difficulties, compare also A. J. Tamulénas, “Översättningen av fågellistorna i Lev 11:13-19 och Deut 14:11-18,” *SEÅ* 57 (1992), 28-59.

<sup>30</sup> The resort to folk etymologies was common in earlier studies of biblical animals, especially in the case of birds: see, e.g., Aharoni, “On Some Animals”, and Driver, “Birds”, which repeatedly use this criterion in their identification of biblical birds. The same approach is still found in several recent studies, compare, e.g., P. Riede, “‘Denn wie der Mensch jedes Tier nennen würde, so sollte es heissen’. Hebräische Tiernamen und was sie uns verraten,” in *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel* (OBO 187; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 165-212. However, the relevance of this approach has been recently criticized by some authors: see, especially, L. Kogan, “Semitic Etymology in a Biblical Hebrew Lexicon: The Limits of Usefulness,” in *Biblical Lexicology: Hebrew and Greek. Semantic – Exegesis – Translation* (ed. E. Bons et al.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 83-102. While Kogan’s critical remarks are justified, he fails nonetheless to consider the comparative evidence provided by other ancient cultures, especially in the Greek and Latin traditions, which tends to demonstrate that folk etymologies did play a role in the naming of animals. See on this the remarks by A. Guasparri, “A Taxonomic Perspective in Etymology: The Case of Gr. ἐχίνοϛ,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111 (2006), 120-128; and compare also id., “Etnobiologia e mondo antico”.

however, is to analyze the general logic that underlies the list of unclean birds in these two texts. The translation of this list into Greek, for its part, raises yet other methodological issues, which will be addressed in the next section of this essay.

The first part of the list up to the raven (= Lev 11:13-14 // Deut 14:12-13) includes five names of large raptors and birds of prey (corresponding to the order of the *accipitriformes* in modern zoology). In most instances, their identification can be established using the combined evidence provided by other biblical attestations, the presence of Semitic parallels, and etymology. The נֶשֶׁר (no 1) is attested in several other biblical passages and primarily refers to the vulture, rather than the eagle<sup>31</sup>. However, it must be noted that the distinction between these two birds was not always clear in antiquity<sup>32</sup>, and in some cases the נֶשֶׁר may also refer to an eagle or, more generally, any great bird of prey<sup>33</sup>. The term לָאָה (no 3) has a parallel in Ugaritic (*d'iy* I) where it is sometimes mentioned alongside the term *nšr*<sup>34</sup>; additionally, in some passages of the HB the verb לָאָה is used to describe the action of the נֶשֶׁר gliding in the air<sup>35</sup> and swooping on its prey<sup>36</sup>. Although a more specific identification seems impossible, the term לָאָה arguably refers to a raptor bird comparable to the נֶשֶׁר: the LXX interprets it as the vulture, but other species like the harrier or the milan (cf. Vulg. *milvus*) could also be considered<sup>37</sup>. The corresponding form attested in Deut 14:13 MT (רָאֵה) presumably reflects a scribal confusion (*daleth/*

<sup>31</sup> This point was already made by several studies: see, especially, O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob: Eine Deutung von Ijob 38-41 vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Bildkunst* (FRLANT 121; Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 69-70; T. Kronholm, art. נֶשֶׁר *nešer*, *ThWAT* 5 (1986), 680-689 (= *TDOT* 10 [1999], 77-85); P. Riede, "Register. Tiernamen und Tierbezeichnungen," in id., *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel* (OBO 187; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 339-348 (339-340); most recently A. Graupner, "Gibt es Geier mit bunten Federn? Anmerkungen zur Bedeutung des Lexems נֶשֶׁר," in *Text - Textgeschichte – Textwirkung. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Siegfried Kreuzer* (AOAT 419; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2014), 125-130. This interpretation is also consistent with the Semitic cognates of this term, like Ugaritic *nšr*; see K. Reiter, "Falknerei in Ugarit," *UF* 22 (1990), 271-278 (278).

<sup>32</sup> As noted, e.g., by Kronholm, art. נֶשֶׁר, 79. For references to ancient authors, see further below notes 64 and 65.

<sup>33</sup> For this conclusion, see already Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung*, 69 n. 234; Kronholm, art. נֶשֶׁר, 79. On the polysemy of this term in West-Semitic languages, see further the relevant remarks by Müller, "Die Funktion divinatorischen Redens," 196. *Contra* Graupner, "Gibt es Geier," it is therefore unnecessary to ascribe a single zoological referent to the Hebrew term נֶשֶׁר. The same remark applies to Tamulénas, "Översättningen," 37, who thinks for his part of the griffon (*Gryps fulvus*).

<sup>34</sup> See the references in G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One: The Near and Middle East 67; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 259.

<sup>35</sup> Jer 48:40; 49:22. See further Ps 18:11.

<sup>36</sup> Deut 28:49.

<sup>37</sup> E.g., Tamulénas, "Översättningen," 40.

*resh*)<sup>38</sup>. The term איה (no 5) is found once more in Job 28:7, where it is paralleled with עיט, a term denoting the eagle and, more generally, large birds of prey<sup>39</sup>. Job 28:7 implies, in addition, that the איה, like the עיט, is renowned for its vision. The fact that in Lev 11:14 the mention of איה is followed by the clause למינו (“according to its kind”), this term may refer to a category of raptor birds (rather than a single species), presumably various types of *falconides* like the buzzard or the harrier<sup>40</sup>. The form דיה, which is found after איה in the MT version of Deuteronomy, presumably reflects again a scribal confusion that was introduced at some stage in the text. The two remaining terms, פרס (no 2) and עזניה (no 3), are more difficult to identify. The term פרס is generally taken to refer to a bird smashing its prey, like the ossifrage (or bearded vulture)<sup>41</sup>; however, this identification is exclusively based on the etymology (*PRS* > “to divide, break”) and remains therefore hypothetical. The עזניה, for its part, is never mentioned outside of Lev 11 and Deut 14 and can no longer be identified with any certainty<sup>42</sup>. The relationship of this bird to other large birds of prey can only be inferred from its inclusion among the first five birds.

The ערב introduces the second part of the list in the Hebrew versions. Its identification with the raven is unproblematic<sup>43</sup>, but as noted above its presence in the list raises specific text-critical issues to which we will return below. The identification of the following birds (nos 7-15) raises considerable difficulties, and in some cases is actually impossible. For instance, there is very little basis for identifying the genus to which terms like שחר (no 9), תנשמת (no 14) or תחמס (no 8) refer, since these terms are not mentioned elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and have no clear Semitic parallels<sup>44</sup>. Arguably the main feature that characterizes the birds listed here is that several of them are mentioned elsewhere

<sup>38</sup> Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 290 n. 101; in the SP version of Deut 14:13 the form has been corrected to דאה, as in Lev 11:14.

<sup>39</sup> See, e.g., Kronholm, art. נָשָׂר, 80.

<sup>40</sup> For this idea, see already the detailed discussion by Driver, “Birds I,” 11.

<sup>41</sup> See, e.g., Aharoni, “On Some Animals,” 471; Driver, “Birds I,” 9-10; Feliks, *Animal World*, 68-71; Kronholm, art. נָשָׂר, 80; Tamulénas, “Översättningen,” 38.

<sup>42</sup> Aharoni, Driver, and others assumed that the name עזניה would derive from ‘NZ, “goat” (with a metathesis) and would therefore refer to a bird feeding on goats, like the black vulture. See Aharoni, “On Some Animals,” 471; Driver, “Birds I,” 10; Feliks, *Animal World*, 68-71; and compare also Tamulénas, “Översättningen,” 38-40. The whole etymology is, however, too speculative to be accepted.

<sup>43</sup> Specifically, the Hebrew text of both Lev 11:15 and Deut 14:14 apparently has in view different types of raven; see further on this R. Whitekettle, “The Raven as Kind and Kinds of Ravens: A Study in the Zoological Nomenclature of Leviticus 11,2-23,” *ZAW* 117 (2005), 509-528.

<sup>44</sup> Driver, “Birds I,” 12-16, resorts to various folk etymologies, most of which are, however, problematic and unconvincing: for instance, תחמס would mean the “robber” (based on Aram. *HMS* “robbed”) and would be “appropriate to the owl, which lives by preying on small rodents and birds” (*ibid.*, 13). However, even he must admit that such etymologies are of limited assistance for identifying what type of owl, specifically, would be intended here. On the idea that a number, at least, of the birds comprised in this list would be owls, see below.



as inhabiting ruins and desolated places. This is clear, in particular, for the *בת היענה* (no 7), which opens this sub-list and is mentioned elsewhere as a bird typically living within ruins<sup>45</sup>. The same observation applies to the *כוס* (no 10)<sup>46</sup>, the *ינשוף* (no 13)<sup>47</sup>, and the *קאת* (no 15)<sup>48</sup>. Based on this evidence, Driver's idea that at least a portion of the birds listed here refer to various kinds of owls and similar small raptors living in inhabited places is arguably correct<sup>49</sup>. On the other hand, the mention of the *נץ* (no 9), which refers to various types of hawks (cf. the mention *למינהו*)<sup>50</sup>, suggests the need for some qualification of this view. Apparently, this portion of the list could also include other small raptors, which do not necessarily reside in ruins.

Finally, nos 16-20 appear to comprise a third series of birds distinct from the previous ones. Again, few among these birds can be identified with certainty. The main exception concerns the term *חסידה* (no 17): it is mentioned in several biblical passages as a migratory bird<sup>51</sup>, endowed with large wings<sup>52</sup>, and nesting in trees<sup>53</sup>. These features suggest that it should be identified with the stork, as per the rabbinic tradition<sup>54</sup> (alternatively, the LXX identifies it with the heron). Also, the ancient versions consistently translated the last bird *עטלף* (no 20), as the "bat"<sup>55</sup>. This identification is partly supported by one pas-

<sup>45</sup> See Isa 13:21; 34:11; 43:20; Jer 50:39; Job 30:29. Following the LXX, the *בת היענה* has often been identified with the ostrich. This identification may in fact have a precedent in Lam 4:3, where the *יענים* (reading with the Qere: see U. Berges, *Klagelieder* [HThKAT; Freiburg *et al.*: Herder, 2002], p. 231), presumably a masculine form of *יענה*, are denounced for their cruelty toward their progeny; since this was a commonplace about ostriches in antiquity, which is also reflected in Job 39:14, it is likely that the term *יענים* denotes ostriches here. Therefore, this identification is probably somewhat older than the LXX. On the other hand, it is unlikely to be original: ostriches do not typically reside among ruins and desolated places, so that the identification of the *בת היענה* with the ostrich cannot account for the fact that the HB consistently presents this trait as one of the predominant features of this bird. Additionally, Job 39:13 apparently points to the existence of another term for ostriches (*רניים*). Note that the *y'nh* is also mentioned in the Deir 'Alla inscription, Combination I:8, but this occurrence provides little help for the identification of this bird.

<sup>46</sup> Ps 102:7.

<sup>47</sup> Isa 34:11.

<sup>48</sup> Isa 34:11; Zeph 2:14 and Ps 102:7.

<sup>49</sup> Driver, "Birds I," 12-16; and compare already Aharoni, "On Some Animals," 469-471, although his idea that the 14 or 15 types of owls identified in Palestine by modern ornithology would be consistently referenced in the lists of Lev 11, Deut 14 and some other texts is particularly implausible.

<sup>50</sup> On the identification of the *נץ* with the hawk see, e.g., P. Maiberger, art. "Falke," *NBL I* (1991), 656; Driver, "Birds I," 13-14; HALOT, 714. Compare also with Ugaritic *ny*: del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *Dictionary*, 646.

<sup>51</sup> Jer 8:7.

<sup>52</sup> Zech 5:9; Job 39:13.

<sup>53</sup> Ps 104:7.

<sup>54</sup> See, e.g., *b. Hul.* 63a. For additional ancient and modern references, see Tamulénas, "Översättningen," 53.

<sup>55</sup> LXX: *νυκτερίς*; Vulgate: *vespertilio*, etc. On the identification of *עטלף* with the bat see, e.g., HALOT, 814; Driver, "Birds I," 18.

sage in Isaiah (Isa 2:20), where עטלף is paralleled with the term חפר referring to a small rodent such as the mole or the shrew<sup>56</sup>. The term דוכיפת has often been compared with the term *qwqwpt* in Demotic, whose identification with the hoopoe was suggested by M. Vieyra in 1981<sup>57</sup>. The רהם (or רחמה, in Deut 14:17) is attested in the Deir 'Alla inscription (as *rḥmn*) where it is mentioned shortly after the *nšr*<sup>58</sup>. It is usually identified as a vulture or an eagle, although the reason why it was not mentioned earlier in the list remains unclear. Finally, the identification of אנפה remains very problematic, if not impossible<sup>59</sup>. In the LXX of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, it is mainly rendered with *χαρδριός*, a legendary bird whose identification is similarly unclear, and which may be a fantastic bird<sup>60</sup>.

Overall, it is difficult to understand the logic of this final section, as well as the main features shared by the birds listed here. Driver argued that some or even most of them were fishing birds<sup>61</sup>; yet apart from the case of the stork (no

<sup>56</sup> Additionally, the Hebrew term עטלף has often been explained as consisting of עטה, "to cover (oneself), plus ל inserted: 'attaf > \*'altaf > 'āṭallēf (after metathesis; compare, e.g., HALOT, 814; Riedke, "Hebräische Tiernamen," 176). While possible, this sort of etymological reconstruction remains speculative.

<sup>57</sup> M. Vieyra, "A propos d'un oiseau hittite et de la lecture du nom d'un oiseau biblique," *RA* 75/2 (1981), 176-179. See further the Chicago Demotic Dictionary, Q (04.1), p. 89, s.v. *qpp.t*. ([www.oi.uchicago.edu/OI/DEPT/PUB/SRC/CDD/CDD.htm](http://www.oi.uchicago.edu/OI/DEPT/PUB/SRC/CDD/CDD.htm)). The form *ḥwḥwpt* appears in the Demotic Magical papyrus of London and Leiden (F. L. Griffith and H. Thompson, *The Demotic Magical papyrus of London and Leiden* (London: Grevel, 1904), col. III, 34; IV 9, as well as in a mythological text known as "the myth of the Sun's eye": M. Spiegelberg, *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge* (Strassburg: Strassburger Druckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1917), 12-35, col. XII 7. Its vocalization is reconstructed through the Coptic *koukoupḥat*. See on this W. D'Arcy Thompson, "On Some Greco-Egyptian Bird and Beast Names," in *Studies Presented to F. L. Griffith* (ed. S. Glanville and N. Macdonald Griffith; London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1932), 249-253 (252); C. Wolterman, "On the names of birds and hieroglyphic sign-list G22, G35 and H3," *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 32 (1991-1992), 119-130 (125).

<sup>58</sup> Deir 'Alla Combination I:8 (*rḥ[m]n*). The reconstruction follows A. Lemaire, "Les inscriptions de Deir 'Alla et la littérature araméenne antique," *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 129/2 (1985), 270-285. On the pair *nšr/rḥmn* in the Deir 'Alla inscription, see also the comments by Müller, "Die Funktion divinatorischen Redens," 195-196.

<sup>59</sup> The *'nph* is also mentioned in the Deir 'Alla inscription, Combination I:8. Here also, however, this occurrence provides little help for the identification of this bird.

<sup>60</sup> Aristotle describes the *χαρδριός* (literally, "birds of ravines", from *χάραδρα*, "gully" or "wadi") as a bird which nests in the rocks, emits shrieks that are painful to hear, and shows itself more during the night than during the day (*HA* 614 b 35). He also mentions the *χαρδριός* in a list of water birds (*HA* 593 b 15; similarly *Ar.*, *Av.* 1141). Although some authors think that the name could refer to the plover, it is impossible to identify with certainty the species which the Greek term *χαρδριός* denotes. Other ancient authors attributed to this bird the capacity to cure jaundice, the bird catching this disease through its eyes (Plut., *Mor.* 681 c; Ael., *NA* 17, 13, but compare Hipp., *Int.* 37). It became a symbol of Christ in the Greek Physiologos (Phys. Gr. 3, ed. Offermans 1966), and in later times its extraordinary qualities prevailed over its zoological features. However, the characteristics of the *χαρδριός* mentioned by Aristotle (see above) are sufficient to justify its presence in the list of unclean birds.

<sup>61</sup> Driver, "Birds I," 16-19.

17), there is very little basis for this suggestion. Based on the partial identification discussed above, our impression is, rather, that the final section comprises those birds that could not be included in the first two categories (large and small birds of prey, nos 1-5 and 6-15 respectively). As such, this section would represent an appendix of sorts to the list of unclean birds in Lev 11 and Deut 14; one may note, in this regard, that the appending of anomalous cases at the end of lists is a common scribal practice in the ancient Near East. In addition, it is also possible that this final section includes birds characterized by the presence of anomalous features such as a very long beak (in the case of the stork), a prominent crest (for the hoopoe) or the body of a mouse (in the case of the bat).

#### 4. THE CHARACTER OF THE GREEK TRANSLATION AND ITS CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE HEBREW LIST

The Greek translation of the list of unclean birds in Leviticus and Deuteronomy raises specific methodological issues that need to be addressed before proceeding to a comparison with the Hebrew tradition represented by MT and SP. These issues are predominantly related to the specific lexicon of the list, which presented considerable difficulties for the translators. To begin with, the list of birds – like the taxonomy of fauna and flora in general – involves highly specialized terminology, including several terms that were presumably already unclear for the Greek translator. Moreover, the translators had to translate the Hebrew taxonomy into the categories of the Greek culture<sup>62</sup>. In this context, a strictly literal translation of the birds listed in Leviticus and Deuteronomy was in many cases impossible, because the Greek translator no longer understood the Hebrew referent and/or because he was unable to render it in Greek. Nevertheless, whenever this was possible the Greek translators appear to have sought the closest *functional equivalent* for the Hebrew birds in Greek.

This point is already clear when we analyze the translation of the first birds mentioned in the list. The fact that the first five birds comprise large birds of prey, as noted above, was correctly recognized by the translators, and it is evidently this observation which guided their rendering of these terms. When the Hebrew referent was clear for them, the translators arguably chose the closest equivalent in Greek. The translation of the first term in the list, נֶשֶׁר, with ἀετός provides a fitting illustration of this point. Contrary to a common assumption

<sup>62</sup> The fact that the Palestinian fauna effectively differed in several respects from the Greek and Egyptian fauna arguably presented the Greek translators with a first basic difficulty. Moreover, ancient Greek faunal taxonomy is based on different classifications than ancient Hebrew and, more generally, Semitic taxonomies.

among biblical scholars, ἀετός in Greek does not simply mean “eagle”<sup>63</sup>; it is a generic term which includes different species<sup>64</sup> and can be applied to various kinds of birds of prey<sup>65</sup>. As such, ἀετός provides an apt translation for the Hebrew נֶשֶׁר which, as noted above, can also denote various large birds of prey and was presumably listed first for this reason. A similar strategy can be observed in the translation of דָּאָה with γύψ, “vulture”<sup>66</sup>, as well as of אֵיָה with ἰκτίς, “milan”<sup>67</sup>. When the Hebrew referent was no longer clear, the translators seem to have opted for a functional equivalent, which remained within the logic of this class of large birds of prey: thus, עֲזוּיָה is translated with ἀλιαετός, literally “sea-eagle”<sup>68</sup>; and פֶּרֶס with γρύψ, “griffin”. The presence in this section of γρύψ, “griffin”, to render the Hebrew פֶּרֶס should not surprise, since the γρύψ is classified by some Greek lexicographers as a particular kind of γύψ, “vulture”; presumably, this observation accounts for the apparent confusion between these two terms in the Greek mss. Furthermore, in Egyptian iconography the representation of the griffin with the head of a vulture is well attested<sup>69</sup>. The γρύψ is classified among the exotic birds by the late-Hellenistic writer Claudius Aelianus<sup>70</sup>, and it could well be that the Greek translators interpreted it here as an exotic bird associated with Egypt. Finally, the fact that the griffin is often represented in Greek iconography with the paws of a lion could also suggest that the γρύψ was retained because it had the potential to preserve the basic meaning of the root *PRS*, denoting this bird as “the smasher”.

In effect, the etymological reading of Hebrew roots seems to be the main strategy that the Greek translators adopted for many of the following birds, whenever they could no longer identify a given bird with certainty. Consider,

<sup>63</sup> Compare, e.g., the contrary assessments by Kronholm, art. נֶשֶׁר, 80 (but contrast his more nuanced view on p. 85), as well as by Graupner, “Gibt es Geier,” 130 (“Zum Adler wird der Geier erst in der Septuaginta”).

<sup>64</sup> Aristotle, *HA* 592 b 6-8; 618 b 18; 620 a 16ff.

<sup>65</sup> See on this, e.g., W. G. Arnott, *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z* (London – New York: Routledge, 2007), 2-4. In the Greek tradition, the eagle constitutes the paradigm of the overall category of large raptors: see on this the relevant remarks by H. Normand, *Les rapaces dans le monde grec et romain. Catégorisation, représentations culturelles et pratiques* (Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2015), 129-186.

<sup>66</sup> Γύψ is another generic name, which covers various species of large raptors (Arist., *HA* 592 a 29-b 8). The general feature highlighted by ancient authors is the fact that they feed on carrion: this undoubtedly influenced the negative representation of this bird in the majority of ancient sources (see Normand, *Les rapaces*, 309-342).

<sup>67</sup> ἰκτίς (or ἰκτίς or ἰκτίνος) seems to be the name for a species of milan, although which species exactly is unknown (Arnott, *Birds*, 76-78). Its size was smaller than the size of the largest raptors (*HA* 592 b 4).

<sup>68</sup> A rare name, although the bird is accurately described by Aristotle as sharp-sighted as well as a powerful hunter of other sea birds (Arist., *HA* 593 b 23-24, 619 a 3-8, 620 a 1-14).

<sup>69</sup> P. Vernus and J. Yoyotte, *Le Bestiaire des pharaons* (Paris: Viénot, 2005), 662-663.

<sup>70</sup> Ael., *NA* 4, 27, who relies on Ctesias of Cnidus (*FrGrHist* 688 F 45). For more details on γρύψ see A. Angelini, art. “Gryps”, in *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint*, vol. 1 (ed. E. Bons and J. Joosten; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

for instance, the case of the term גָּלַשׁ which, in the Greek translations of Leviticus, is consistently rendered with καταρράκτης, literally “the diver.” The καταρράκτης, in Greek, refers to a species of sea-bird, perhaps the cormorant, which feeds itself by diving in the water: the decision to render גָּלַשׁ with καταρράκτης appears, therefore, to be based on a literal reading of the Hebrew verb גָּלַשׁ, “to throw”<sup>71</sup>. A similar observation applies to the translation of several other birds in the Greek text of Leviticus. Κύκνος, or “swan,” is in Greek traditions the bird of love, associated to Aphrodite and endowed with a song capable of inducing piety (a commonplace in ancient literature)<sup>72</sup>: this is presumably the reason why it was chosen to render the Hebrew term קָנָה in Lev 11:18, understood as deriving from the root *RHM*, “piety”, “compassion”<sup>73</sup>. Similarly, the term תְּנִינִים in Lev 11:18 is rendered in Greek with πορφύριον, “purple gallinule” or “water heron”, a bird very common in Egypt which owes its Greek name to its red crest (πόρφυρα meaning “red”)<sup>74</sup>. Here, however, the Greek translators appear to exploit the second meaning of the verb πορφύρω, namely, “to raise, lift up” or “to blow”, in order to translate the Hebrew תְּנִינִים, understood as deriving from the root *NŠM*, “to breathe, hiss”, or “to snort”<sup>75</sup>. Other cases are less clear, but may similarly point to the use of etymology in the Greek translation. For instance, the decision to render the term חָפְזִים with λάρος, “seagull,” suggests that the Greek translators have interpreted the Hebrew root with the meaning “to consume, devour” (cf. חָפְזִים)<sup>76</sup>, since the λάρος, in the Greek tradition, is typically a bird characterized by its greed and voraciousness<sup>77</sup>.

At this point of the discussion, however, we are faced with the problem mentioned above that the order of the birds in the second part of the list differs significantly between the Greek versions of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, and even between the main witnesses to the Greek text of Deuteronomy itself. The difficulties begin with the term גַּי, “hawk”. This term is appropriately translated

<sup>71</sup> For the description of this sea bird see Arist, *HA* 509 a 4-5; 615 a 26-31. However the adjective (“plunger”) can apply descriptively to any bird: according to Hesychius, Sophocles applied the term to a kind of eagle (Soph. fr. 377, 714 Radt). Lycophron (169) calls καταρρακτήη a kind of hawk (κίρκου καταρρακτήηρος).

<sup>72</sup> A selection of sources on this topic is provided by Arnott, *Birds*, 123-124.

<sup>73</sup> A similar etymology is reflected in part of the rabbinic tradition, see especially *b. Hul.* 63a.

<sup>74</sup> This bird is described by Arist. *HA* 595 a 12 (see also Athen. 9, 388 c, Plin. *NH* 10, 129). Aristophanes mentions it alongside the pelican (*Av.* 881-882). The fact that it is named from the color of its skin is confirmed by Dionysius Periegeta (*Ixeut.* 1,29). The special color of the πορφύριον is noted by Diodorus Siculus, who places it among the exotic birds from Syria (*D.S.* 2, 53, 2).

<sup>75</sup> See P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1977), s.v.

<sup>76</sup> Lev 26:16 and Deut 28:22.

<sup>77</sup> See Ar., *Av.* 567, *Eq.* 956 and *Nu.* 591. Suidas (λ 127) reports a proverbial saying: <Λάρος κεχηγός> ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρρακτικῶν καὶ κλεπτῶν (“A gull with an open mouth: said of rapacious and stealers”).

ed with ἱεραξ<sup>78</sup> in the LXX of Leviticus and in the LXX of Deuteronomy attested by ms A; but it can hardly be translated with ἐρωδιός (“heron”)<sup>79</sup>, as it appears in the LXX of Deuteronomy attested by ms B. Equally problematic is the fact that in ms A of Deuteronomy ἐρωδιός (written ἄρωδιός) renders כּוּס. As we have seen, the term כּוּס in Hebrew apparently designates a small raptor associated with the desert and ruins along with the תּאָק (e.g., in Ps 102:7); therefore, the translation of כּוּס with νυκτίκοραξ<sup>80</sup>, a type of owl, in Lev 11:17, makes good sense, but not its translation with ἐρωδιός in ms A of Deut 14. Instead, ἐρωδιός should obviously translate הַיָּדוּשׁ (stork or heron), as it is the case in Lev 11:19. Similarly, it is unlikely that the Hebrew term תּאָק, which in the Greek tradition is usually rendered with πελεκάν<sup>81</sup>, was translated either with καταρράκτης (as in ms A of Deuteronomy) – which, for the etymological reasons noted above, was used to translate the Hebrew גַּלְשׁ – or with νυκτίκοραξ (as in ms B). Many more examples of this sort could be given<sup>82</sup>, but they all point to the same conclusion. Namely, and contrary to what is the case with the Greek versions of Lev 11, the Greek versions of Deut 14 translate a list of birds which, starting with no 9 (the hawk), is *no longer identical* with the order preserved in the Hebrew tradition represented by MT and SP.

This proposition has several implications for the text-critical history of Lev 11 and Deut 14 in the Second Temple, which will be addressed in the next section of this essay. Before that, however, a few conclusions are in order with regard to the nature of the Greek translation of these two texts.

1) Overall, the choices made by the translators of Leviticus and Deuteronomy to render the list of unclean birds confirm that, while a strictly literal translation was not possible in many cases, the translators nevertheless aimed toward a close equivalence between the Hebrew and Greek lists of birds. In

<sup>78</sup> A generic term which includes diurnal raptors of medium size, such as hawk, sparrow hawk, buzzard, and more generally birds of prey of a smaller size than eagles and vultures. See on this Normand, *Les rapaces*, 377-402.

<sup>79</sup> The commonest name for “heron”. Aristotle and Callimachus distinguish three predominant types (Arist., *HA* 609 b 21-8; 616 b 33- 617 a 8, Call., fr. 425 Pfeiffer).

<sup>80</sup> A nocturnal raptor which could be identified with the eagle owl or to the long-eared owl (Arist., *HA* 509 a 211; 597 b 21-25; 619 b 18-21). Although the dance of the νυκτίκοραξ mentioned by Aristotle (597 b 21-25) could also suggest an identification with the black-crowned night heron, the majority of the ancient tradition saw in this bird a type of owl (cf. the sources collected by Arnott, *Birds*, 152-153).

<sup>81</sup> See Isa 34:11; Ps 102:7.

<sup>82</sup> For instance, תּוֹשֵׁט (no 13 in Deuteronomy) should correspond to πορφυρίον, as noted above, but not to ἴβις (which renders הַיָּשׁוּן in Leviticus LXX), as in ms A of Deuteronomy, or to καταρράκτης (which, as noted above, should correspond to גַּלְשׁ), in ms B. Likewise, for the reasons already noted, הַחֶמְסַד should be translated with κύκνος, as in Leviticus LXX, but is unlikely to correspond to either πορφυρίον (as in ms A of Deuteronomy) or to νυκτίκοραξ (as in ms B). Finally, since the term דּוּכִיפַת arguably denotes the hoopoe (see above, note 56), it should be rendered in Greek with ἔποψ, as in Leviticus LXX, not with χαρადριός (as in ms A of Deuteronomy) or with πορφυρίον (as in ms B).

this respect, the translation of these lists appears to be consistent with the general character of the translation of Leviticus and Deuteronomy<sup>83</sup>. When able to identify the zoological referent denoted by the Hebrew term, the translators generally used the most faithful correspondent in Greek, as can be seen especially from the first series of five birds. When they were no longer able to identify this zoological referent, the translators resorted to etymology primarily, which can be regarded as the closest equivalent to literalism when literalism was not possible<sup>84</sup>.

2) At the same time, however, the fact that the Greek translators were unable to identify several of the birds listed left them with a significant margin of freedom. As a result, the etymological technique led them to partly substitute the series of small raptors with aquatic birds, such as the seagull, the swan or the cormorant. Undoubtedly, the introduction of such aquatic birds fit more adequately into the ornithological panorama surrounding the translators, who were working in Egypt. For the same reason, the Greek translators introduced a few exotic birds that were consistent with the Egyptian context, such as the ibis and the griffon, both of which translate Hebrew terms (פֶּרֶס and יְנִישׁוּף respectively) whose meaning was presumably lost to them<sup>85</sup>.

3) Finally, the fact that the terms used to translate the names of the birds in the LXX of Lev 11:13-19 and Deut 14:12-18 are strictly identical suggests that these two translations were not produced independently from each other. The hypothesis of a common source used by the translators, while possible, remains difficult to demonstrate; it seems more likely that one of the two translations was based on the other. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to determine the chronological priority of the Greek versions of Leviticus and Deuteronomy on the basis of this material alone, and more evidence would need to be considered in order to answer this question satisfactorily. The fact that the Greek translation of Deuteronomy, contrary to Leviticus LXX, preserves a sequence of birds which, starting with bird no 9 (the hawk), does not correspond to the order attested by the Hebrew versions is significant, but it does not necessarily say much about the relative chronology of these translations. More likely, it corresponds to the fact that the books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy underwent different transmissions in the Second Temple period. It is to this issue that we now turn.

<sup>83</sup> On the high degree of literalism that characterizes the translation of Leviticus and Deuteronomy in the LXX, see above note 17.

<sup>84</sup> On this issue, see already J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 44-49; as well as S. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979), 69-87 (84-85).

<sup>85</sup> On the "exoticism" of the Greek translator in the list of unclean animals and on the presence of the ibis, see the relevant study of J. Aitken, "Why Is the Giraffe Kosher? Exoticism in Dietary Laws of the Second Temple Period," *BN* 164 (2015), 21-34.

## 5. EVALUATING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LXX AND MT AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LISTS OF UNCLEAN BIRDS

Having discussed the overall logic of the arrangement of unclean birds in the Hebrew and Greek versions, as well as the general character of the Greek translations, we are now in a position to address the question of the significance of the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek for the textual history of Lev 11 and Deut 14.

In general, and with the significant exception of Yerkes' study, scholars have usually paid little attention to these differences, focusing instead on the remarkable correspondence between the list of unclean birds in the MT and other Hebrew versions of Lev 11 and of Deut 14. Many scholars, in addition, have assumed that MT would preserve the earliest form of these two chapters. J. Milgrom, for instance, declared that the author of Deut 14 had "the entire MT of Lev 11" before him, and basically copied the list of unclean birds from his source<sup>86</sup>. In this model, therefore, the form reflected by Lev 11 MT must necessarily be original, and the possibility that either Lev 11 LXX and/or Deut 14 LXX would occasionally preserve an earlier stage in the transmission of these chapters is excluded *ex hypothesi*. The evidence discussed so far suggests, however, that the case of unclean birds is actually more complex, and provides us with a window into the transmission of this list in both Leviticus and Deuteronomy, which was presumably more fluid than most scholars have acknowledged. Specifically, two basic aspects of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions of Lev 11 and Deut 14 require more in-depth discussion: first, the consistent absence of the raven in the main Greek witnesses; and second, the distinctive order of the list of unclean birds preserved by Deut 14 LXX.

1) As already mentioned, the fact that the raven is consistently missing from all the main Greek witnesses of both Lev 11 and Deut 14, combined with the observation that the phrase *καὶ πάντα κόρακα καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῷ* is missing from the LXX in Origen's *Hexapla*, makes it very likely that the raven did *not* figure among the unclean birds in the LXX of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Some commentators, like J. Wevers, have suggested that the absence of the raven in the Greek tradition would reflect a case of *homoioteleuton*, insofar as the raven is preceded by the mention *למינה* at the end of the previous verse (Lev 11:14 // Deut 14:13) and is followed again by a similar formula, *למינו* (Lev 11:15 // Deut 14:14)<sup>87</sup>; the eye of the translator would therefore have jumped

<sup>86</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 704. For a detailed critique of this position, see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 284-288.

<sup>87</sup> See Wevers, *Leviticus Septuaginta*, 127. With more details, see also id., *Deuteronomium Septuaginta*, 195.



from למינה to למינו, which would explain the absence of the raven in the Greek text. There are, however, some difficulties with this solution. To begin with, since the raven is missing from the LXX of *both* Leviticus and Deuteronomy, we should assume that the translators of these books made exactly the same mistake at the same place, which seems rather unlikely. Furthermore, if the inclusion of the raven in the list of unclean birds was already well attested when the Greek translation of Leviticus and Deuteronomy took place, this omission should have been corrected fairly soon in the transmission of the LXX. Instead, it is only in later mss that we see the raven eventually mentioned. Even more striking is the fact that the raven appears at different places: for instance, in ms 127 of Leviticus, it figures at the end of the list, just before the bat (νυκτερίς)<sup>88</sup>. It seems more likely, therefore, that the absence of the raven in the Old Greek of both Leviticus and Deuteronomy indicates that the raven is a late addition to the list of unclean birds, which was not yet included in the Hebrew base-text that the Greek translators of both Leviticus and Deuteronomy had before them. The reason why the raven was not included initially in the list of unclean birds, and was only added later, would require a longer discussion than can be provided here. We may, however, remark that the raven appears to be valued positively in some passages of the HB, such as especially the story of 1 Kgs 17 (where Elijah is fed by ravens<sup>89</sup>), or the non-Priestly account of the Flood in Gen 8<sup>90</sup>, and may not always have been viewed as an unclean bird. In any event, the case of the raven is a clear indication that the list of unclean birds preserved in the Hebrew tradition preserved by MT and SP does *not* represent the original form of this list but, rather, a later stage in its transmission and development.

2) The same conclusion applies, in our view, with regard to the differences in the order of birds between the Hebrew and Greek traditions of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. As the previous discussion has made clear, the Greek translations of Deuteronomy reflected by mss A and B preserve a sequence of unclean birds which, for birds 9 to 18, cannot correspond to the sequence reflected in the Hebrew text of Deut 14 preserved by MT and SP. While it could be surmised, in principle, that the Greek translator of Deuteronomy would have freely rearranged the order of birds in the second part of the list, this solution is rather implausible. To begin with, this explanation is inconsistent with the fact that, like the translation of Leviticus, the Greek translation of Deuteronomy is

<sup>88</sup> See above, note 14, and Wevers, *Deuteronomy*, 195.

<sup>89</sup> 1 Kgs 17:5, 7.

<sup>90</sup> It has sometimes been argued that Gen 8:6-12 would juxtapose the raven, as an unclean bird, to the dove, as a clean bird. This view actually goes back to the rabbinic tradition but may arguably retroject a later conception on this text. See, e.g., the comments by C. Westermann, *Genesis. Teilbd. 1: Genesis 1-11* (BKAT I,1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 600.

generally characterized by its fairly literal character. Additionally, the fact that the translation of the first eight birds (except for the raven) corresponds exactly to the order preserved in both MT and SP suggests that the Greek translator of Deut 14 was similarly concerned to render its Hebrew *Vorlage* as faithfully as possible. The most likely conclusion, therefore, is that the LXX of Deuteronomy corresponds to *a stage in the transmission of the list of unclean birds when this list had not yet been stabilized but was still in a state of flux* – at least as concerns a portion of the birds mentioned (namely, nos 9-18). This conclusion can also account for the differences that can be observed between the main witnesses to the Greek text of Deuteronomy: apparently, there was not one, but *several* alternative arrangements for the list of unclean birds, which are still partly reflected in mss A and B of Deuteronomy. Finally, the conclusion reached here regarding the partial fluidity of the list of unclean birds at the time of the Greek translation of Deuteronomy is consistent with the observation that even in the MT the order of birds is not entirely stable, since the שֶׁלֶךְ is mentioned later in Deut 14 (where it figures as bird no 16) than in Lev 11 (where it figures as bird no 12). In effect, it is only in the tradition reflected by SP that the order of birds is strictly identical in both Leviticus and Deuteronomy (more on this below).

In his 1923 study Yerkes reached a similar conclusion, albeit with a different line of reasoning. But he went further in assuming that the fact that only the order of the first eight birds was stable in all the witnesses to Lev 11 and Deut 14 indicated that the following birds (nos 9-18) had been added later<sup>91</sup>, and this conclusion was adopted by the few scholars, like W. Houston, who took note of Yerkes' study<sup>92</sup>. In our view, however, this inference stretches the evidence and is rather dubious. First, Yerkes' hypothesis does not account for the case of the bat, which is not among the first eight birds but is similarly stable in all the witnesses to Lev 11 and Deut 14 (where it is always mentioned as the last bird in the list). Second, the hypothesis also fails to account for the fact that, as noted above, the Greek terms used for unclean birds in the LXX of both Leviticus and Deuteronomy are strictly identical. This observation strongly suggests, in fact, that the Greek translators of Leviticus and Deuteronomy already had before them the full list of 19 unclean birds (minus the raven) when they undertook their translation of this list, even though the order in which these 19 birds were arranged was still partly fluid. In short, the comparison between the Hebrew and Greek traditions informs us about the transmission of the list of unclean birds in the Second Temple period, but it is unlikely that it provides us with a basis to reconstruct earlier stages in the composition of this list.

<sup>91</sup> Yerkes, "Unclean Animals," 23-26.

<sup>92</sup> Houston, *Purity and Monotheism*, 47-48.

## 6. CONCLUSION: THE LIST OF UNCLEAN BIRDS AND THE TRANSMISSION OF LEVITICUS AND DEUTERONOMY IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

So what are we to conclude from the evidence presented here concerning the transmission of the list of unclean birds in Leviticus and Deuteronomy? Two conclusions, in particular, emerge from the previous discussion.

1) First, the evidence surveyed here highlights the fact that *the list of unclean birds has undergone distinct transmissions in Leviticus and Deuteronomy*. In the case of Leviticus, the differences between the Greek and Hebrew witnesses are limited, and the list appears to have been copied without any major changes from the third century (i.e., the time when the Pentateuch was translated in Greek) onward. The only significant exception concerns the case of the raven which, as argued above, was apparently absent from the Hebrew text used by the Greek translator. The Greek tradition of Leviticus was itself subject to some changes, but these likewise remain limited<sup>93</sup>. By contrast, the transmission of the list in the Greek and Hebrew mss of Deuteronomy was significantly more fluid, especially as regards the order of the birds. As argued above, the first Greek translations of Deuteronomy were based on a Hebrew tradition in which a standard sequence had only been established for the first eight birds, but not for the following ones. Furthermore, the differences that can be observed *within the Greek tradition of Deuteronomy itself* suggest that there was presumably not one, but *several* arrangements for the second part of the list of unclean birds (nos 9-18). The basic contrast between Leviticus and Deuteronomy with regard to the transmission of the *same list* in these two books corroborates the view that Leviticus achieved a greater stability prior to other books of the Pentateuch; presumably, this greater stability should be related to the function of this book as authoritative scripture for cult and rituals, as Sarianna Metso and Eugene Ulrich have recently argued<sup>94</sup>. Nevertheless, it

<sup>93</sup> Arguably the main difference between the Greek witnesses themselves concerns the fact that the  $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\zeta$  is mentioned twice in mss A and B of Leviticus (as bird no 7 and 19), whereas it is merely mentioned once in MS 2649 (from the Schøyen collection), which is likely to preserve an earlier stage of Leviticus LXX here. Additional differences include: (a) the difference in the order of the terms  $\gamma\rho\upsilon\nu\psi$  and  $\gamma\upsilon\psi$  in mss A and B of Leviticus, which is arguably linked to the lexical and semantic similarity of these two terms in Greek; and (b) the curious omission of the  $\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\zeta$  in ms A and other Greek mss, which may be due in this case to a textual accident.

<sup>94</sup> S. Metso and E. Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 247-68 (267): "The Hebrew text tradition of Leviticus had basically achieved a uniform state, to judge from the extant sources, by the second half of the Second Temple period. Especially since this contrasts with the pluriform state of Exodus and Numbers, which display two or more literary editions, it is plausible to assume that the Jerusalem priesthood had kept a watchful eye on the text of Leviticus. From that perspective, however, the rationale would not have been textual concern for a 'standard text' of the scriptural book, but practical concern for

is important to remark that even the Leviticus version of the list of unclean birds was not yet identical with the MT but could still be revised at places, as the later inclusion of the raven, in particular, would indicate.

2) Second, while the order of the birds was significantly more fluid in the transmission of Deuteronomy, the evidence discussed here indicates that the list of Deuteronomy was gradually aligned, at a certain stage of the transmission of this book, with the order preserved in the list of Leviticus. This alignment is already reflected in the form of Deuteronomy preserved by the MT, where the order of birds is already virtually identical with the order in Leviticus except for the case of the  $\gamma\lambda\psi$  which appears in different places in Lev 11 and Deut 14 (see above). However, it is in the Samaritan tradition that this alignment is fully carried out, since in SP the order of the birds in the list of Deut 14 is now *strictly identical* with the list of Lev 11. These remarks imply that the conformity between the Leviticus and Deuteronomy versions of the list of unclean birds that characterizes the Hebrew tradition does *not* point to the antiquity of this textual form, as Milgrom and others incorrectly assumed, but represents, on the contrary, the *conclusion* of a complex process of transmission in the course of which the Deuteronomy version of the list was gradually aligned with the Leviticus one. While the textual process reflected here cannot be dated precisely in the absence of other witnesses (as noted above, with the exception of 4Q366 fr. 5 the list is missing from the mss of Deuteronomy in Qumran), it is clear that it postdates the first translations of Deuteronomy in Greek and presumably goes back to the second or first century BCE. Apparently, this development represents a *further* stage in the growing textual and ritual authority of Leviticus in the Second Temple period. In the end, only *one* version of the list of unclean birds was retained, and this version corresponds to the one transmitted in Leviticus.

### References

- Aitken J., "Why Is the Giraffe Kosher? Exoticism in Dietary Laws of the Second Temple Period," *BN* 164 (2015), 21-34.
- Angelini A., art. "Gryps," in *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint, vol. I* (ed. E. Bons and J. Joosten; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).
- Angelini A. and C. Nihan, "Introduction: Comparing Animal Lexica in Ancient Cultures," *AoF* 46 (2019), 53-60.
- Arnott W. G., *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z* (London – New York: Routledge, 2007).
- Bare G., *Plants and Animals of the Bible* (London: United Bible Society, 1969).

clear uniform instructions for correct procedures in the traditional sacred rituals that were practiced in the temple and beyond".

- Barr J., *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
- Berges U., *Klagelieder* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br. et al.: Herder, 2002).
- Brock S., "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979), 69-87.
- Brooke A. E. and N. McLean, *Exodus and Leviticus. The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, 1,2* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909).
- Brooke A. E. and N. McLean, *Numbers and Deuteronomy. The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, 1,3* (Cambridge: University Press, 1911).
- Cansdale G., *Animals of Bible Land* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970).
- Chantraine P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1977).
- D'Arcy Thompson W., "On some Greco-Egyptian Bird and Beast Names," in *Studies Presented to F. L. Griffith* (ed. S. Glanville and N. Macdonald Griffith; London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1932), 249-253.
- De Troyer K., "MS 2649: Leviticus," in *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen): Essays and Texts in Honour of Martin Schøyen* (ed. D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina XL; Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2010), 7-68.
- Del Olmo Lete G. and J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One: The Near and Middle East 67; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003).
- Den Hertog C. J., "Erwägungen zur relativen Chronologie der Bücher Levitikus und Deuteronomium innerhalb der Pentateuchübersetzung," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*. Bd. 2 (ed. S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch; BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 216-228.
- Driver G. R., "Birds in the Old Testament (I. Birds in Law; II. Birds in life)," *PEQ* 87 (1955), 5-20, 129-140.
- Feliks J., *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel Aviv: Sinai, 1962).
- Fernández Marcos N., *Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden et al.: Brill, 2000).
- Field F., *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta, Tomus 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1875 [repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1964]).
- Flint P. W., "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 323-341.
- Graupner A., "Gibt es Geier mit bunten Federn? Anmerkungen zur Bedeutung des Lexems גִּישׁוֹר," in *Text – Textgeschichte – Textwirkung. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Siegfried Kreuzer* (AOAT 419; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2014), 125-130.
- Griffith F. L. and H. Thompson, *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden* (London: Grevel, 1904).

- Guasparri A., “A Taxonomic Perspective in Etymology: The Case of Gr. ἐχῆνος,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111 (2006), 120-128.
- Guasparri A., “Etnobiologia e mondo antico: una prospettiva di ricerca,” *Annali On-Line di Lettere – Ferrara*, Speciale I (2007), 69-90.
- Harl, M., G. Dorival and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).
- Hartley J. E., *Leviticus* (WBC 4: Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992).
- Hieke T., *Leviticus 1-15* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br. et al.: Herder, 2014).
- Himbaza I., “Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?,” *JSCS* 49 (2016), 22-33.
- Himbaza I., “What are the consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> contains earliest formulation [*sic*] of the Septuagint?,” *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen. 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014* (ed. S. Kreuzer et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 294-308.
- Houston W., *Purity and Monotheism: Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 140; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- Keel O., *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob: Eine Deutung von Ijob 38-41 vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Bildkunst* (FRLANT 121; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).
- Kenyon F. G., *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D. V-VIII) in reduced photographic facsimile* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1909).
- Kogan L., “Semitic Etymology in a Biblical Hebrew Lexicon: The Limits of Usefulness,” in *Biblical Lexicology: Hebrew and Greek. Semantic – Exegesis – Translation* (ed. E. Bons et al.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 83-102.
- Kronholm T., art. אֶשֶׁר nešer, *ThWAT* 5 (1986), 680-689 (= *TDOT* 10 [1999], 77-85).
- Lemaire A., “Les inscriptions de Deir ‘Alla et la littérature araméenne antique,” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 129/2 (1985), 270-285.
- Maiberger P., art. “Falke,” *NBL* I (1991), 656.
- Metso S. and E. Ulrich, “The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 247-68.
- Metso S., “Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus,” in *Editing the Bible, Assessing the Task Past and Present* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and J. H. Newman; SBL.RBS 69; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 67-79.
- Metzger B., “The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible,” in id., *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 1-42.
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1991).
- Müller H.-P., “Die Funktion divinatorischen Redens und die Tierbezeichnungen der Inschrift von Tell Deir ‘Alla,” in *The Balaam Text from Deir ‘Alla Reevaluated* (ed. J. Hoftizer and G. van der Kooij; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 185-205.
- Nihan C., *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of Leviticus* (FAT 2, 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

- Nihan C., "Supplementing Leviticus in the Second Temple Period: The Case of the Wood Offering in 4Q365 23," in *Supplementation in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. S. Olyan and J. Wright; Brown Judaic Studies 361; Providence, RI: Brown University, 2017), 183-204.
- Normand H., *Les rapaces dans le monde grec et romain. Catégorisation, représentations culturelles et pratiques* (Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2015).
- Perkins L., "Deuteronomy," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. Aitken; London: T&T Clark, 2015), 68-85.
- Rahlfs A. and D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*. Bd. I, 1. *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (VTG.S; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).
- Reiter K., "Falkneri in Ugarit," *UF* 22 (1990), 271-278.
- Riede P., "'Denn wie der Mensch jedes Tier nennen würde, so sollte es heissen'. Hebräische Tiernamen und was sie uns verraten," in *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel* (OBO 187; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 165-212.
- Riede P., "Register. Tiernamen und Tierbezeichnungen," in id., *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel* (OBO 187; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 339-348.
- Segal M., "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Jerusalem: Exploration Society – Israel Museum, 2000), 391-399.
- Spiegelberg M., *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge* (Strassburg: Strassburger Druckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1917).
- Tamulénas A. J., "Översättningen av fågellistorna i Lev 11:13-19 och Deut 14:11-18,, *SEÅ* 57 (1992), 28-59.
- Teeter D. A., *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period* (FAT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 76-94.
- Tommasi C., "'Esser vorresti uccello? Siam lí: sei pipistrello'. Note sull'ambiguo statuto dei chiroterri nella cultura greco-romana," in *Monstra. Costruzione e percezione delle entità ibride e mostruose nel Mediterraneo antico* (ed. I. Baglioni; Roma: Quasar, 2013), 251-259.
- Tov E., "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch(?)," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010), 73-91.
- Vernus P. and J. Yoyotte, *Le bestiaire des pharaons* (Paris: Viénot, 2005).
- Vieyra M., "A propos d'un oiseau hittite et de la lecture du nom d'un oiseau biblique," *RA* 75/2 (1981), 176-179.
- Voitila A., "Leviticus," *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. Aitken; London: T&T Clark, 2015), 43-57.
- Westermann C., *Genesis*. Teilbd. 1: *Genesis 1-11* (BKAT I/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974).
- Wevers J., *Leviticus* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 2,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

- Wevers J., *Deuteronomium* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 3,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).
- Wevers J., *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).
- Wevers J., *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL.SCSS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).
- Whitekettle R., "The Raven as Kind and Kinds of Ravens: A Study in the Zoological Nomenclature of Leviticus 11,2-23," *ZAW* 117 (2005), 509-528.
- Wolterman C., "On the names of birds and hieroglyphic sign-list G22, G35 and H3," *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 32 (1991-1992), 119-130.
- Yadin Y., *Masada VI. Hebrew Fragments from Masada; The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society – The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 40-50.
- Yerkes R. K., "The Unclean Animals of Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14," *JQR* 14/1 (1923-1924) 1-29.
- Zucker A., *Les classes zoologiques en Grèce ancienne. D'Homère (VIII<sup>e</sup> av. J.-C.) à Élien (III<sup>e</sup> ap. J.-C.)* (Aix en Provence: Presses Universitaires de Provence, 2005).





# LA BÉNÉDICTION D'AARON EN LÉVITIQUE 9,22 ET LE PENTATEUQUE SAMARITAIN

Innocent HIMBAZA

## 1. LA PROBLÉMATIQUE : LEVER LA MAIN OU LEVER LES MAINS ?

Le passage de Lv 9,22 évoque la bénédiction du peuple par Aaron, après qu'il ait offert des sacrifices. Dans ce passage, la posture du bénisseur attire particulièrement l'attention, puisque les témoins textuels ne s'accordent pas. En effet, selon la lecture de l'un ou l'autre témoin, il est possible de comprendre qu'Aaron a levé une seule main (יד), ou qu'il a levé les deux mains (ידי). La différence textuelle est très petite, puisqu'il s'agit de choisir entre une lecture avec ou sans le deuxième *yod*. En revanche, l'intérêt pour cette question est grand, dans la mesure où ce verset contribue à la compréhension de la posture du prêtre lorsqu'il bénit le peuple.

Les divergences de lecture entre les témoins textuels laissent penser soit que la posture du bénisseur a évolué dans le temps, soit qu'elle a variée selon les milieux. Différents écrits de la tradition rabbinique évoquent la bénédiction des prêtres dans la posture des deux mains levées, si bien que la question de la posture du bénisseur ne semble pas se poser<sup>1</sup>. Le fait de lever les deux mains pour bénir est la pratique standard. Il n'est donc pas surprenant que cette question ne soit pratiquement pas discutée dans la recherche récente<sup>2</sup>. En revanche, toutes les voix de l'histoire du texte ne sont pas unanimes, puisque le Pentateuque Samaritain laisse entendre qu'Aaron n'a levé qu'une main. Il faut donc revoir cette question de près.

Ces quelques lignes clarifient le volet textuel biblique, alors que l'histoire de la posture du bénisseur et d'autres gestes de la main ou des mains, notamment la comparaison entre la Bible et son monde ambiant, dépasse le cadre de

<sup>1</sup> Voir Targum Pseudo-Jonathan de Nb 6,23 ; Mishna *Sotah* 7,6 ; Sifré Nombres 121 ; Midrash *Nombres Rabba* IX,4. Quelques éléments de détail sont discutés, notamment le fait de savoir si à partir de Lv 9,22 on peut dire que Aaron tend les mains vers le ciel ou vers le peuple. Voir J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York *et al.*: Doubleday, 1991), 586-587.

<sup>2</sup> Par exemple les Old Testament Abstracts (OTS) ne signalent aucune étude particulière de cette question (aussi bien en Lev 9,22 qu'en Ps 134,2) depuis ces vingt-cinq dernières années (contrôlés depuis l'année 1990). De plus, très peu de commentaires s'arrêtent sur l'état textuel de ces passages.

cette étude<sup>3</sup>. Dans cet article, les abréviations des témoins textuels suivent le système de la Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ).

## 2. LES TÉMOINS TEXTUELS

M

וַיִּשָּׂא אֶהָרֶן אֶת־יָדוֹ [יָדָיו] אֶל־הָעָם וַיְבָרֶכֶם

Aaron leva sa main (*ketiv*) [ses mains (*qere*)] vers le peuple et il les bénit...

Smr

וַיִּשָּׂא אֶהָרֶן אֶת יָדוֹ עַל הָעָם וַיְבָרֶכֶם

Aaron leva sa main sur le peuple et il les bénit...<sup>4</sup>

G

καὶ ἐξάρσας Ἀαρὼν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς·  
(manum<sup>Lat</sup>cod 100 : manuscrit de Lyon, 7<sup>e</sup> s.).

Aaron leva les mains (la main : La) sur le peuple et il les bénit...

S

וַיִּשָּׂא אֶהָרֶן אֶת־יָדָיו עַל הָעָם וַיְבָרֶכֶם

Aaron leva ses mains sur le peuple et il les bénit...

V

et tendens manum contra populum benedixit eis

Aaron leva la main sur le peuple et il le bénit...

T<sup>O</sup>

וַאֲרִים אֶהָרֶן יָת־יְדוּהִי לְעַמָּא וַיְבָרֶכֶם

Aaron leva ses mains vers le peuple et il les bénit...

T<sup>N</sup>

וּזְקַף אֶהָרֶן יָת־יְדוּהִי בְצִלוֹ עַל עַמָּה וּבְרַךְ יִתְהוֹן

Aaron leva ses mains dans la prière sur le peuple et il les bénit...

<sup>3</sup> Voir notamment A. Zgoll, *Die Kunst des Betens. Form und Funktion, Theologie und Psychagogik in babylonisch-assyrischen Handerhebungsgebeten zu Ishtar* (AOAT 308; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003); T. Ornan, *The Triumph of the Symbol. Pictorial Representation of Deities in Mesopotamia and the Biblical Image Ban* (OBO 213; Fribourg: Academic Press – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 227-284.

<sup>4</sup> Les manuscrits samaritains lisent la forme défective ידו (sa main) sans variante. Par un court cryptogramme vertical dans lequel on lit יהוה יברכך « que YHWH te bénisse », le Pentateuque samaritain de Fribourg, BCU L 2057, fol. 132r, rappelle qu'Aaron a récité la bénédiction des prêtres (Nb 6,24).

T<sup>J</sup>

ופרס אהרן ית ידוי לקבל עמא ובריכינון

Aaron leva ses mains devant le peuple et il les bénit...

## 3. LES TÉMOINS TEXTUELS REFLÈTENT-ILS DES PRATIQUES DIFFÉRENTES ?

Les deux lectures de la tradition massorétique, d'une part M<sup>ketiv</sup> (ידו), pouvant signifier soit un duel défectif « ses mains » soit un singulier « sa main », et d'autre part M<sup>qere</sup> (ידי), signifiant le duel plein « ses mains », sont bien attestées par les témoins textuels. Rappelons que pour une meilleure appréciation de M<sup>ketiv</sup>, on ne doit pas prendre en considération la vocalisation qui l'accompagne, puisqu'en réalité, il s'agit de la vocalisation de M<sup>qere</sup>. La vocalisation du *ketiv* n'a donc pas été précisée par la tradition massorétique, telle qu'elle est reflétée dans le manuscrit de Leningrad (B19<sup>A</sup>)<sup>5</sup>.

Il est évident que la lecture ידו de Smr est un singulier et non un duel défectif. Cette affirmation peut être vérifiée de deux manières. Premièrement, en comparant les occurrences de ידו et ידי dans le reste du Pentateuque, on se rend compte d'une part que les scribes de Smr ne confondent jamais les deux graphies en les prenant l'une pour l'autre. Il n'y a donc pas d'écriture défective pour ce lemme. D'autre part les mêmes scribes se sont abstenus d'harmoniser ces deux expressions, alors que Smr est connu pour être harmonisant. On doit en conclure qu'en Smr, ces deux graphies existent telles quelles et qu'elles n'ont pas le même sens. Deuxièmement, selon la tradition orale telle que transmise par Ze'ev Ben-Ḥayyim, l'occurrence de Lv 9,22 en Smr se prononce *yēdu* (sa main), alors que ידיי est toujours prononcé *yēdo* (ses mains), comme c'est le cas notamment en Lv 16,21<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> On sait que dans certains autres manuscrits la question se présente autrement, mais ceci est un autre sujet.

<sup>6</sup> Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritan*. Vol. IV: *The Words of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1977), 455, 463. Cette observation pose alors la question de quelques passages qui ne semblent pas suivre la même règle. En Gn 27,16 et 46,4, le texte de Ben-Ḥayyim lit *yēdu* (sa main). Pour Gn 27,16, cette lecture est en accord avec certains manuscrits samaritains comme le CBL 751 de Dublin ou le BCU L 2057 de Fribourg, alors que le manuscrit 6 (C) de Sichem, utilisé par la BHQ, contient ידיי (ses mains). Les trois manuscrits s'accordent également pour lire ידיי en Gn 46,4, alors qu'ici l'édition de Sadaqa lit ידו en accord avec Ben-Ḥayyim. Voir A. Sadaqa (éd.), *חומשי תורה Jewish Version, Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch, ספר בראשית Genesis* (Tel Aviv, 1964), 64. En Lv 21,10, la situation est inversée. Ici le texte de Ben-Ḥayyim lit *yēdo* (ses mains), alors que les trois manuscrits cités, ainsi que l'édition de Sadaqa, contiennent ידו (sa main). La nouvelle *editio maior* du Pentateuque Samaritain du Lévitique, publiée par Schorch, ne mentionne pas de variante pour ce lemme. Voir S. Schorch (éd.), *Leviticus (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior III; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), 179*. Il reste dès lors possible que la personne enregistrée par Ben-Ḥayyim s'est basée sur un manuscrit différent non

De leur côté, les versions s'accordent avec l'une ou l'autre lecture de M ou de Smr. Les Targums (T<sup>O</sup>, T<sup>N</sup>, T<sup>J</sup>) et la Peshitta (S) s'accordent avec M<sup>qere</sup>, alors que la tradition latine (La et V) a lu le singulier en accord avec Smr et M<sup>ktiv</sup>. Dans son commentaire, Watts pense que le singulier de V pourrait s'expliquer par la pratique usuelle de lever une seule main dans la tradition chrétienne<sup>7</sup>. Je pense cependant que V a simplement été influencée par La, ce qui n'est pas rare en Lévitique<sup>8</sup>. Or, si La a lu le singulier, alors qu'elle traduit la Septante (G), il faut poser la question de sa *Vorlage* grecque. En effet, la lecture actuelle de G lit le pluriel en accord avec M<sup>qere</sup>. Il est dès lors probable que le témoignage de La, contenu notamment dans le célèbre manuscrit de Lyon, reflète une lecture grecque ancienne qui n'a pas été transmise jusqu'à nous. Il ne serait même pas surprenant que le singulier (sa main) représente au fond la lecture la plus ancienne de G, si celui-ci a été ultérieurement corrigé pour correspondre à M<sup>9</sup>. Smr a donc un allié de poids qui ne dépend pas de lui. Concernant la pratique chrétienne évoquée par Watts, cet article montrera, preuves à l'appui (cf. points 6 et 7), que bénir en levant une seule main est une posture bien connue à l'époque préchrétienne.

Le fait que Smr ait conservé le singulier יד (sa main) et qu'il n'ait pas harmonisé sa lecture de Lv 9,22 avec les autres occurrences, comme Ex 32,19 ou Lv 16,21, montre qu'il comprenait différemment ces deux autres passages dans lesquels il s'accorde pourtant bien avec M<sup>qere</sup>. La lecture de Smr, qui a été transmise sans variante dans sa tradition manuscrite, laisse également penser

recensé par Schorch, ou bien elle s'est trompée dans certaines de ses lectures. La question se pose notamment pour la lecture *âqqât ulâm* (חַקַּת עוֹלָם) en Lv 7,36 alors que tous les manuscrits samaritains recensés lisent חַק עוֹלָם.

<sup>7</sup> J. W. Watts, *Leviticus 1-10* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 499.

<sup>8</sup> Dans mes travaux préparatoires de l'édition du Lévitique dans la BHQ, j'ai souvent observé que plusieurs lectures particulières de V correspondaient à celle de La. Cela laisse penser que La a largement influencé V, bien que V soit sensée avoir traduit M.

<sup>9</sup> Plusieurs études récentes montrent que le texte édité du Lévitique de G ne représente pas toujours la formulation la plus ancienne de G. Voir notamment E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans; Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1999), 165-183; E. Tov, « The Greek Biblical Texts from The Judean Desert », *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (éd. S. McKendrick, O. A. O'Sullivan, London: British Library – Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 97-122 (= E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran, Collected Essays* [TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 339-364); T. A. W. Van der Louw, « Translation and Writing in 4QLXXLev<sup>A</sup> », *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (éd. T. Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 383-397; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VTS 169; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015), 152-154; K. H. Jobes, M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Second Edition; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 181-199; I. Himbaza, « What are the Consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>A</sup> contains earliest formulation of the Septuagint ? », *Die Septuaginta – Orte un Intentionen*. (éd. S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, M. Sigmund in Verbindung mit M. Karrer, W. Kraus; WUNT 361; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 294-308; I. Himbaza, « Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique ? », *JSCS* 49 (2016), 22-33.

qu'elle n'est pas le produit d'une erreur de scribe. Smr a donc probablement conservé la lecture la plus ancienne en Lev 9,22, puisqu'il faut penser que ses scribes n'auraient pas eu de raison de s'opposer à la pratique de lever les deux mains pour la bénédiction. M<sup>qere</sup> (c'est-à-dire la forme pleine du duel) reflète donc une tentative de ramener Aaron à la conformité d'une pratique devenue standard, alors que la lecture de Smr, La et V, correspondant au M<sup>ktiv</sup>, reflète vraisemblablement le texte le plus ancien.

Les observations faites au sujet du geste l'élévation de la main ou des mains dans le cadre de la bénédiction concernent également celui de l'imposition de la main ou des mains sur la tête d'une personne (Dt 34,9) ou de l'animal à sacrifier (Lv 1,4 ; 3,2 ; 4,15 ; 24,14 ; etc.). Pour cette pratique également, les témoins textuels reflètent une certaine hésitation, qui fait penser soit à une pratique variée soit à une évolution<sup>10</sup>. Dans le cas de Dt 34,9, Moïse impose « ses mains » à Josué selon M, alors que Smr dit que Moïse impose « sa main ». Carmel McCarthy explique la lecture de Smr comme une harmonisation des textes, pour que le geste accompli (Nb 27,23 ; Dt 34,9) corresponde à l'ordre donné (Nb 27,18)<sup>11</sup>.

#### 4. LA MASSORAH DE LV 9,22

Les indications de la Massorah de ce verset contribuent grandement à résoudre la question textuelle qu'il pose. Alors qu'il n'y a pas d'annotations de la Massorah magna pour ce lemme dans le ms. M<sup>L</sup> (B19a, fol 61v) la Massorah parva du même manuscrit en contient deux, dans deux colonnes différentes :

1) ידיו ק̄ : « le *qere* est ידיו (ses mains) ».

2) ה̄ ח̄ : « cinq fois dans une écriture défective ». Les cinq occurrences sont Ex 32,19 (Moïse jette les tables de ses mains) ; Lv 9,22 (Aaron lève ses mains [?]) ; 16,21 (Aaron impose ses deux mains) ; Ez 43,26 (ils rempliront les mains de l'autel : ils le consacreront) ; Job 5,18 (les mains de Dieu guérissent). Le

<sup>10</sup> Voir Philon d'Alexandrie, *De Specialibus Legibus* I,198, 202-204; Mishna *Menahot* 9,8; A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1, Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana*. Vol. IV: *Números* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1974), 30\*; R. Péter, « L'imposition des mains dans l'Ancien Testament », *VT* 27 (1977), 48-55; P. Harlé, D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988), 86, 91; J. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 150-153; R. Péter-Contesse, *Lévitique 1-16* (CAT IIIa; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1993), 42; R. Péter-Contesse, « Le sacerdoce », *The Book of Leviticus. Composition and Reception* (éd. R. Rendtorff, R. A. Kugler; VTS 113; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 189-206, spéc. 199-206; T. Hieke, *Leviticus. Erster Teilband: 1-15. Übersetzt und ausgelegt* (HThKAT; Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2014), 370.

<sup>11</sup> C. McCarthy, אלה הדברים *Deuteronomy* (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 169\*.

manuscrit d'Alep indique les même cinq références défectives dans sa Massorah magna d'Ez 43,26<sup>12</sup>, alors que la Massorah parva de ce même passage indique simplement ק ידיי : le *qere* est ידיי (ses mains).

D'une part, la première indication de la Massorah parva propose une lecture alternative, celle qu'il faut retenir. D'autre part la deuxième indication entend protéger le lemme, puisqu'elle signale le nombre d'occurrences qu'il a dans la Bible hébraïque. C'est comme si cette deuxième note invitait le lecteur à accepter l'apparente étrangeté de la forme textuelle du *ketiv*. Cela dit que la massorah parva du manuscrit M<sup>L</sup> a reçu deux traditions de lecture et donc deux manières de comprendre ce cas et qu'elle a tenu à les conserver toutes les deux<sup>13</sup>. Cependant, on peut dire que la deuxième Massorah parva transmet la tradition selon laquelle le lemme est défectif, ce qui laisse penser qu'il est compris comme un duel et non un singulier. C'est ici que la question se pose : à l'origine le lemme dans sa forme consonantique (ידי) représentait-il un duel défectif ou un singulier ? La combinaison du témoignage des témoins textuels et de la Massorah parva convergent vers l'idée que le lemme n'est pas limité à la question du *qere* ou du *ketiv* pour le même mot compris comme le duel, mais qu'à l'origine le *ketiv* reflétait le singulier, alors que le *qere* reflète le duel.

Le cas de Lv 16,21, qui contient également une double indication de la Massorah parva, comme en Lv 9,22, est néanmoins dans une situation différente. En effet, le lemme (ידי : *ketiv*, ידיי : *qere*) est précédé par le mot שתי (deux) qui implique que le mot suivant est nécessairement dans une forme plurielle (le duel pour le lemme). A ce sujet, il est intéressant d'observer que les principaux manuscrits de G que Rahlfs et Wevers suivent, comme A, B, F, M, V, ainsi que la majorité des minuscules, ne contiennent pas l'équivalent de שתי (deux). Préciser que les mains sont « deux » est rare aussi bien en hébreu qu'en grec. Or, les autres occurrences de cette précision dans M (Dt 9,15.17) sont également présentes dans les principaux témoins de G. Il n'est donc pas impossible que le terme שתי (deux) de Lv 16,21 ait été ajouté ultérieurement dans la tradition hébraïque pour éviter toute confusion de lecture de la forme consonantique : ידי (= M<sup>ketiv</sup>).

On doit dès lors considérer que la lecture de M<sup>ketiv</sup> en Lv 16,21 a un sens duel, mais qu'elle est dans une forme défective. Or, contrairement à Lv 9,22, la

<sup>12</sup> Voir également les listes de C. D. Ginsburg, *The Massorah Translated into English with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Volume IV of the Entire Work* (Vienna: Carl Frome, 1897-1905), Letter Yod § 94; A. Dotan, N. Reich (éd.), *Masora Thesaurus, A Complete Alphabetical Collection of the Masora Notes in the Leningrad Codex* (Tel Aviv University: Accordance Bible Software, 2013 [hébreu]), § יָדַי. Dans la BHS, Weil note une Massorah parva pour chacun de ces passages : ידיי ק ידיי חס (le *qere* est ידיי, une des cinq occurrences en écriture défective).

<sup>13</sup> Sur la question de la diversité des sources du manuscrit M<sup>L</sup>, voir I. Himbaza, « La diversité des sources du manuscrit de Leningrad B 19a », *Semitica* 59 (2017), 355-368.

lecture de Smr en Lv 16,21 s'accorde avec M<sup>gere</sup>, c'est-à-dire dans une forme pleine. La conclusion évidente me semble celle-ci : aussi bien en Lv 9,22 qu'en 16,21, l'orthographe du texte de Smr est harmonisée avec le sens de la phrase. Cela confirme un singulier en 9,22 et un duel en 16,21.

M<sup>ktiv</sup>, Smr et La reflètent donc la lecture la plus ancienne de Lv 9,22, alors que M<sup>gere</sup> et les autres versions reflètent une correction ultérieure<sup>14</sup>.

##### 5. UNE OCCURRENCE PARALLÈLE EN DEHORS DU PENTATEUQUE : PS 134,2

La particularité du passage de Lv 9,22 est que l'expression נשא יד / נשא ידים (lever la main / lever les mains), pour évoquer la bénédiction, est très rare dans la Bible hébraïque. Le passage le plus explicite où cette expression est utilisée dans le contexte de la bénédiction, se trouve en Ps 134,2 : שְׁאוּ יְיָ יְדֵיכֶם קִדְשׁ רַבְרָבוֹ (levez vos mains vers le sanctuaire et bénissez le Seigneur). Cependant, ici aussi la graphie de M (ידכ) est déficiente. Seule la vocalisation *şere* du י indique qu'il faut lire le substantif au duel. Parmi les témoins textuels hébreux, seul, le manuscrit 11QPs<sup>a</sup> (col. XXVIII) donne une graphie pleine (ידיכ). Notons que l'expression יְדֵיכֶם du Ps 134,2 est la seule occurrence de la Bible hébraïque où le י est vocalisé *şere* sans qu'il soit suivi d'un י. Dans toutes les autres occurrences, dont la forme consonantique est ידכ, le י est vocalisé *she-wa*, désignant le substantif comme un singulier avec un suffixe au pluriel : « votre main ». D'une part, la plupart des commentateurs ne s'attardent pas sur cette forme particulière de ידכ. Ils évoquent simplement le geste d'adoration les mains levées, souvent en référence au Ps 28,2<sup>15</sup>. D'autre part, les commentateurs qui traitent cette question textuelle voient une erreur dans la forme consonantique du TM. Bernhard Duhm signale un problème pour la lecture du Ps 134,2, puisqu'il note « ידכ inkorrekt für ידיכ »<sup>16</sup>. Pour Mitchell Dahood, suivi par Léopold Sabourin, la lecture déficiente pourrait refléter un « Northern spelling », un « dialecte du nord »<sup>17</sup>. Je ne suivrai cependant pas ces explica-

<sup>14</sup> Un autre élément concerne la préposition qui suit le lemme étudié ici. Selon M et T<sup>N</sup>, la préposition est על (vers), alors que selon Smr, G, V, S, T<sup>O</sup> et T<sup>J</sup>, la préposition est על (sur). Cette différence est bien connue dans le Lévitique et ailleurs dans la Bible hébraïque (voir Lv 8,8 ; 14,51.53 ; 18,18). Cependant, si l'on considère que l'expression נשא יד על « lever la main sur » comporte une connotation négative (Ez 44,12), on peut penser que la formulation qui s'en éloigne est le fruit d'une correction ultérieure. De ce point de vue également, Smr et la plupart des versions refléteraient la forme la plus ancienne de la préposition, alors que M reflète une correction littéraire.

<sup>15</sup> F.-L. Hossfeld, E. Zenger, *Psalmen 101–150. Übersetzt und ausgelegt* (HThKAT; Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2008), 655-657.

<sup>16</sup> Voir B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1922), 448.

<sup>17</sup> Voir M. Dahood, *Psalms III 101-150, Introduction, Translation, and Notes with Appendix, The Grammar of the Psalter* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 255; L. Sabourin, *Le livre*



tions. De mon point de vue, à l'origine cette forme consonantique devait simplement se comprendre comme un singulier avec un suffixe au pluriel : « votre main ». De ce point de vue, ce qui semble étrange, c'est la vocalisation massorétique *šere* sous le  $\eta$  alors qu'il n'est pas suivi d'un  $\nu$ . De ce point de vue également, la lecture la plus ancienne du Ps 134,2 devait se comprendre comme « votre main ». C'est dans un deuxième temps qu'une tradition de la vocalisation a fixé le pluriel « vos mains »<sup>18</sup>. Nous aurions donc ici un deuxième témoignage selon lequel la bénédiction peut se faire par une seule main levée. La position de Smr trouve un soutien en dehors du Pentateuque.

## 6. L'ICONOGRAPHIE ATTESTE LES DEUX POSTURES

Interpréter les données iconographiques relatives à la posture de la bénédiction n'est pas simple. Le geste de lever la main ou les mains peut avoir plusieurs significations comme bénir, prier, faire un vœu ou encore il peut s'agir d'un geste de salutation. La question est donc complexe, puisque l'iconographie de différentes époques montre le geste d'une seule main ou deux mains levées. En se rapportant aux images couvrant une large zone géographique et des contextes politico-religieux assyriens, babyloniens et égyptiens, on voit clairement que certains adorateurs lèvent une seule main alors que d'autres lèvent les deux mains<sup>19</sup>. On retiendra donc que l'iconographie de ces régions atteste les deux pratiques. Elle ne permet pas de privilégier une posture de bénédiction au détriment d'une autre.

Pour illustrer le Ps 134,2, Hossfeld et Zenger montrent la stèle de Memphis (12<sup>e</sup> s. av. J.-C.) où l'offrant lève les deux mains, les pommes tournées vers l'avant<sup>20</sup>. Cette illustration correspond à la lecture actuelle de M. Or, en discu-

*des Psaumes traduit et interprété* (Recherches, nouvelle série 18; Montréal: Éditions Bellarmin – Paris: Cerf, 1988), 563.

<sup>18</sup> Le cas du Ps 134,2 n'a pas été étudié dans le volume de la Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament sur les Psaumes. Voir D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 4. Psaumes* (OBO 50/4, Fribourg: Academic Press – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).

<sup>19</sup> Voir O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World. Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 308-323; O. Keel, C. Uehlinger, *Göttinnen, Götter, Göttersymbole. Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen* (Freiburg: Bibel+Orient Museum – Academic Press, 2012), 166-174, 240-243, 266-269, 283-285, 395-398, etc.; T. Ornan, *The Triumph of the Symbol*, 227-284; R. P. Bonfiglio, *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies* (OBO 280; Fribourg: Academic Press – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 275-276; A. Wagner, « Gebet und Gesang », in *Die Welt der Hebräischen Bibel. Umfeld – Inhalte – Grundthemen* (éd. W. Dietrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2017), 284-298.

<sup>20</sup> F.-L. Hossfeld, E. Zenger, *Psalmen 101–150*, 656.

tant la forme textuelle de ce verset et en lisant le singulier « sa main », ils auraient également pu l'illustrer par une image montrant une seule main levée, comme on en trouve dans l'iconographie.

On doit donc constater que l'iconographie soutient les postures reflétées par M<sup>ketiv</sup>, Smr et La d'un côté, et M<sup>qere</sup> et les autres versions de l'autre. On doit dès lors conclure que l'iconographie ne pourrait servir de référence pour exclure l'une des deux postures du bénisseur en Lv 9,22 ou Ps 134,2. Au contraire, l'iconographie montre qu'on doit également compter avec la posture d'une seule main, attestée par Smr en Lv 9,22.

## 7. LES MANUSCRITS DE LA MER MORTE ATTESTENT LES DEUX POSTURES

Les manuscrits non bibliques de Qumran reflètent également les deux pratiques : la bénédiction avec une seule main ou avec les deux mains levées.

### 1) 4QJubilés<sup>g</sup> (4Q222) fl.3-5 (= Jubilés 25,11)

...<sup>3</sup> אז נשאה] פניה השמימה ותפרוש אצבעות] <sup>4</sup> [ני] יהא ותפתח פיה ותברך את  
 {ע} {אל עליון ק} ונה שמים וארץ ותתן לן] <sup>5</sup> [תן] דות ותהלה.

... Alors, elle (Rébecca) leva sa face vers le ciel et elle étendit les doigts de ses mains, elle ouvrit sa bouche et elle bénit le Dieu Très-Haut qui acquiert les cieux et la terre et elle lui donna louanges et exaltation.

Selon ce texte, Rébecca a étendu ses deux mains pour bénir Dieu en reconnaissance pour son fils Jacob. L'expression « le Dieu Très-Haut qui acquiert les cieux et la terre » reprend la bénédiction prononcée par Melchisédeq en Gn 14,19.

### 2) 1QRègle de la Communauté (1QS) 6,4-6 (= 4Q258 2,9)

...<sup>4</sup> והיה כיא יערוכו השולחן לאכול או התירוש <sup>5</sup> לשתות הכוהן ישלח ידו לרשונה  
 להברך בראשית הלחם {או התירוש לשתות הכוהן ישלח ידו לרשונה} <sup>6</sup> להברך בראשית  
 הלחם {והתירוש}

... Et lorsqu'ils prépareront la table pour manger ou pour boire du vin, le prêtre étendra d'abord sa main pour bénir en premier lieu le pain {ou pour boire du vin, le prêtre étendra d'abord sa main pour bénir en premier lieu le pain} et le vin.

Selon ce texte (dont une partie a visiblement été répétée par erreur), au moment du repas, le prêtre bénira le pain avant tout le monde et le geste qu'il accomplira est d'étendre une seule main. Il faut néanmoins reconnaître que la formulation de ce texte est complexe. En effet, le geste de bénédiction et celui d'étendre la main pour prendre le pain semblent se confondre ou se prolonger l'un dans l'autre<sup>21</sup>.

### 3) 1QRègle de la Congrégation (1QSa) II, 17-21 (= La Règle annexe de la communauté)

וְ[אם לשול]חן יחד יועד[ו או לשתות הת]ירוּש וערוך השולחן<sup>18</sup> היחד [ומסוך ה]תירוּש  
 לשות[ אל ישלה ]איש את ידו ברשת<sup>19</sup> הלחם ו[התירוּש] לפני הכהן. כִּיאֵן הוא  
 מ[ברך את רשית הלחם<sup>20</sup> והתירוּש] ושלח [ידו בלחם לפנים. ואח[ר יש]לח משיח  
 ישראל ידיו<sup>21</sup> בלחם.

Et [lorsqu'ils] se rassem[bleront pour la ta]ble de la communauté [ou pour boire le v]in, la table de la communauté étant préparée et [le] vin [versé] pour boire, que personne [n'étende] sa main sur les prémices du pain et [du vin] avant le prêtre. Car [c'est lui qui] bénit les prémices du pain et le vi[n]. Il étend] sa main sur le pain avant eux. Ensu[ite] le messie d'Israël [éte]ndra ses mains sur le pain.

Ce troisième texte, qui reprend et développe le précédent, est intéressant, puisqu'il montre que les deux gestes de bénédiction coexistent. En revanche, ils sont réglementés en fonction du rang de la personne qui bénit. Lors des repas des temps messianiques, le messie-prêtre bénira le pain en premier et il étendra une seule main, alors que le messie d'Israël (messie-roi) bénira également le pain, mais après le messie-prêtre, et il étendra des deux mains. Ici, les postures d'une main ou de deux mains étendues pour la bénédiction reflètent la hiérarchie des bénisseurs<sup>22</sup>. Cette nouvelle manière de montrer la hiérarchie, notamment au travers de la posture de bénédiction, est un développement ultérieur qui ne permet pas d'identifier la posture la plus ancienne. Ces deux gestes montrent en revanche, que la posture de bénédiction avec une seule main levée existe bel et bien, qu'elle est préchrétienne et que Smr est l'un de ses témoins en Lv 9,22.

<sup>21</sup> Voir J. Joosten, « Post-biblical Hebrew as a controlling factor in the Arbitration between variant readings », *Philology and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (éd. I. Himbaza, J. Joosten; FAT II 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 31-43.

<sup>22</sup> E. Puech, « Préséance sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa ii 11-22) », *RevQ* 16/63 (1994), 351-365; E. Puech, « La préséance du messie prêtre en 1QSa II 11-22 » *RevQ* 30/111 (2018), 85-89.

## 8. CONCLUSION

Cette contribution a essayé de montrer que la question textuelle de la posture d'Aaron pour bénédiction en Lv 9,22 peut être résolue en tenant compte à la fois des données textuelles et des considérations littéraires. Il s'agissait de déterminer quelle forme textuelle a été modifiée en faveur de l'autre et pourquoi.

En Lv 9,22, les données textuelles et massorétiques attestent les deux postures de la bénédiction avec une main ou les deux mains levées.

L'iconographie ancienne ainsi que d'autres textes, comme le Ps 134,2, et IQSa, attestent également les deux possibilités. A priori, en se basant sur ces données, on ne peut pas exclure l'une des deux postures.

En revanche, les données textuelles tendent à montrer que dans l'évolution textuelle, c'est la posture d'une main levée qui a été corrigée en faveur de celle des deux mains, et non l'inverse. Cette correction textuelle s'explique probablement par la volonté d'harmoniser la posture du bénisseur. Cette volonté d'harmonisation a dû elle-même se baser sur des considérations littéraires.

La tradition textuelle de Smr, basée sur un texte pourtant harmonisant, a néanmoins considéré que l'occurrence de Lv 9,22 devait se lire différemment de celle Lv 16,21, parce que cette première était comprise comme un singulier alors que la deuxième est clairement un duel plein.

La lecture יָדְ (sa main) au singulier (= M-*ketiv*, Smr, La, V) est donc vraisemblablement la plus ancienne en Lv 9,22. L'étude du Ps 134,2, montre que la compréhension de la forme consonantique יָדְ comme « votre main » est également la plus ancienne. Là aussi, la posture d'une seule main levée a été corrigée en celle des deux mains. Cela explique également pourquoi les passages où il est question de la posture de bénédiction avec une seule main levée sont devenus problématiques dans l'histoire de la transmission du texte.

*Références*

- Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. Tome 4: *Psaumes* (OBO 50/4; Fribourg: Academic Press – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).
- Ben-Ḥayyim Z., *Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritan*. Vol, IV: *The Words of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1977).
- Bonfiglio R. P., *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies* (OBO 280; Fribourg: Academic Press – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).
- Dahood M., *Psalms III 101–150, Introduction, Translation, and Notes with Appendix, The Grammar of the Psalter* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970).

- Díez Macho A., *Neophyti I, Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana*. Vol. IV: *Números* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1974).
- Dotan A. et N. Reich (éd.), *Masora Thesaurus, A Complete Alphabetical Collection of the Masora Notes in the Leningrad Codex* (Tel Aviv University: Accordance Bible Software, 2013).
- Duhm B., *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1922).
- Ginsburg C. D., *The Massorah Translated into English with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Volume IV of the Entire Work* (Vienna: Carl Frome, 1897-1905).
- Harlé P. et D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988)
- Hieke T., *Levitikus. Erster Teilband: 1–15. Übersetzt und ausgelegt* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2014).
- Himbaza I., « La diversité des sources du manuscrit de Leningrad B 19a », *Semítica* 59 (2017), 355-368.
- Himbaza I., « Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique ? », *JSCS* 49 (2016), 22-33.
- Himbaza I., « What are the Consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> contains earliest formulation of the Septuagint ? », *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen* (éd. S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, M. Sigismund in Verbindung mit M. Karrer, W. Kraus; WUNT 361; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 294-308.
- Hossfeld F.-L. et E. Zenger, *Psalmen 101–150. Übersetzt und ausgelegt* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br. – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2008).
- Jobes K. H. et M. Silva, *Invitation to Septuagint* (Second Edition; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015).
- Joosten J., « Post-biblical Hebrew as a controlling factor in the arbitration between variant readings », *Philology and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (éd. I. Himbaza, J. Joosten; FAT II 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 31-43.
- Keel O. et C. Uehlinger, *Göttinnen, Götter, Göttersymbole. Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen* (Freiburg: Bibel+Orient Museum – Academic Press, 2012).
- Keel O., *The Symbolism of the Biblical World. Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997).
- McCarthy C., *אלה ה' דברים Deuteronomy* (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus 1-16, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1991).
- Ornan T., *The Triumph of the Symbol. Pictorial Representation of Deities in Mesopotamia and the Biblical Image Ban* (OBO 213; Fribourg: Academic Press – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).
- Péter R., « L'imposition des mains dans l'Ancien Testament », *VT* 27 (1977), 48-55.
- Péter-Contesse R., « Le sacerdoce », *The Book of Leviticus. Composition and Reception* (éd. R. Rendtorff, R. A. Kugler; VTS 113; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 189-206.
- Péter-Contesse R., *Lévitique 1–16* (CAT IIIa; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1993).

- Puech E., « La préséance du messie prêtre en 1QSa II 11-22 » *RevQ* 30/111 (2018), 85-89.
- Puech E., « Préséance sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa ii 11-22) », *RevQ* 16/63 (1994), 351-365.
- Sabourin L., *Le livre des Psaumes traduit et interprété* (Recherches, n.s. 18; Montréal: Éditions Bellarmin – Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988).
- Sadaqa A. (éd.), *חומשי תורה Jewish Version, Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch, ספר בראשית Genesis* (Tel Aviv, 1964).
- Schorch S. (éd.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior III; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).
- Tov E., « The Greek Biblical Texts from The Judean Desert », *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (éd. S. McKendrick, O. A. O'Sullivan; London: British Library – Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 97-122
- Tov E., *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran, Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
- Ulrich E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans; Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1999).
- Ulrich E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VTS 169; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015).
- Van der Louw T. A. W., « Translation and Writing in 4QLXXLev<sup>A</sup> », *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (éd. T. Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 383-397.
- Wagner A., « Gebet und Gesang », *Die Welt der Hebräischen Bibel. Umfeld – Inhalte – Grundthemen* (éd. W. Dietrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2017), 284-298.
- Watts J. W., *Leviticus 1-10* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 2013).
- Zgoll A., *Die Kunst des Betens. Form und Funktion, Theologie und Psychagogik in babylonisch-assyrischen Handerhebungsgebeten zu Ischtar* (AOAT 308; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003).



# LE LÉVITIQUE DANS LE PENTATEUQUE SAMARITAIN : ÉTUDE COMPARÉE DES MANUSCRITS 6 (C) DE SICHEM, CBL 751 (DUBLIN) ET BCU L2057 (FRIBOURG)

Mary-Gabrielle ROTH-MOUTHON

## I. INTRODUCTION

Les études samaritaines suscitent un intérêt grandissant depuis une trentaine d'années. Les chercheurs reconnaissent leur importance pour les études bibliques, historiques et linguistiques.<sup>1</sup> Le nombre de publications à leur sujet montre leur actualité.<sup>2</sup>

Sur le plan textuel, les études samaritaines actuelles mettent en avant principalement deux manuscrits du Pentateuque Samaritain (PS) :

Le premier est le Ms 6 (C) de Sichem. Il s'agit d'un manuscrit triglotte, datant de 1204 et écrit par le scribe et grand prêtre Phines b. Eleazar b. Natanael b. Eleazar comme l'indique le colophon en cryptogramme (*tašqil*) à partir d'Ex 15. Son lieu d'origine n'est pas indiqué, mais son écriture laisse penser à la ville de Damas. Le manuscrit contient le texte de Gn 12,4-Dt 31,14a et Dt 32,30-33,1a et a été édité par Abraham Tal.<sup>3</sup> Cette édition a été reprise par la suite par le programme informatique biblique *Accordance*. Elle est également

<sup>1</sup> Voir la préface de József Zsengellér dans *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans: Studies on Bible, History and Linguistics* (éd. J. Zsengellér; StSam 6; SJ 66, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), vii.

<sup>2</sup> Deux nouveaux volumes de la série « Studia Samaritana » ont été publiés en 2018 (vol. 10: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*, éd. M. Kartveit et G.N. Knoppers; vol. 11: *The Samaritans in Historical, Cultural and Linguistic Perspectives*, éd. J. Dusek) ; deux autres volumes sont déjà prévus pour 2020 et 2021. Notons outre le projet d'une édition du Pentateuque Samaritain mené par Stefan Schorch à l'Université de Halle-Wittenberg – dont le premier livre a été publié en 2018: S. Schorch (éd.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018) – également celui d'une traduction française du Pentateuque Samaritain sous la responsabilité de David Hamidovic à l'Université de Lausanne. A ceux-ci s'ajoutent l'étude du manuscrit BCU L2057 de Fribourg et l'édition de celui-ci sous la direction d'Innocent Himbaza à l'Université de Fribourg.

<sup>3</sup> Dans son introduction (vi), Tal explique qu'il a rassemblé plusieurs fragments, ayant probablement fait partie du Ms 6 (C), pour son édition : le fragment 178 de la Bibliothèque de Saint Pétersbourg (Gn 1,24-2,18) ; le fragment Sam c2 de la Bibliothèque Bodléienne (Gn 4,1-12,4a) ; un folio à la Bibliothèque Kahle (Dt 31,14b-30) ; le folio 26 du ms Or. 5036 de la British Library (Dt 32,1-29) ; un fragment dans la collection Garrett de la Bibliothèque universitaire de Princeton (Dt 33,1b-34,12). A. Tal, *The Samaritan Pentateuch. Edited according to the Ms 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8; Tel-Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School, 1994 [introduction en hébreu et anglais]) ; et A. Tal et M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch – The Samaritan version and the Masoretic version* (Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2010 [en hébreu]).



utilisée dans le projet de la BHQ.<sup>4</sup> Dans cette contribution, ce manuscrit sera désigné par l'abréviation S (Sichem).

Le deuxième est le Chester Beatty Library (CBL) 751. Il s'agit d'un manuscrit unilingue, datant de 1225 et écrit par le scribe Abi Berakhatah b. Ab Zehuta comme l'indique le *tašqil* à partir de Dt 1. Ce scribe est, comme le précise Crown, issu de la diaspora côtière – d'ailleurs son écriture atteste cette origine.<sup>5</sup> Dans la dernière partie du codex, il manque quelques folios (Dt 28,36-30,9 et Dt 32,36-fin) qui ont été remplacés ultérieurement. Ce manuscrit est utilisé par Stefan Schorch pour son édition critique.<sup>6</sup> Dans cette contribution, ce manuscrit sera désigné par l'abréviation D (Dublin).

Les deux manuscrits seront comparés au manuscrit de Fribourg (BCU L2057) qui n'est pas connu, puisqu'il n'a jamais été collationné.<sup>7</sup> Cela explique l'intérêt que la recherche lui porte.<sup>8</sup> Le manuscrit date de 1495 et a été écrit par le scribe Jacob b. Joseph b. Meshalma b. Joseph, prêtre à Damas.<sup>9</sup> Le travail accompli par celui-ci témoigne d'un scribe soigneux et méticuleux. Son savoir-faire est aussi mis en évidence par le nombre (douze !) <sup>10</sup> et par la quali-

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Tal (éd.), *Genesis* (BHQ 1; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015), 6\*-7\* ; C. McCarthy (éd.), *Deuteronomy* (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 6\*-7\*.

<sup>5</sup> Crown le considère comme le plus important scribe de son époque. Il est également connu sous les noms de Abu'l Barakhat b. Abu'l Sarur b. Abu'l Faraj et Abi Berakhatah b. Ab Sasson. Le CBL 751 est sa 50<sup>e</sup> torah, le dernier manuscrit connu à son nom. Cf. A. Crown, *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts* (TSAJ 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 14, 406, 478.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. S. Schorch, « A Critical editio maior of the Samaritan Pentateuch: State of Research, Principles, and Problems », *HeBAI* 2 (2013), 100-120; S. Schorch (éd.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).

<sup>7</sup> Himbaza offre un premier regard comparatif dans un article paru en 2017: I. Himbaza, « Le Pentateuque samaritain de Fribourg (Suisse) : un premier regard comparatif avec les manuscrits de Dublin et de Sichem », *SEC X* (2017), 111-121.

<sup>8</sup> Il apparaît dans l'édition de von Gall sous **o** (gotique). Mais von Gall n'a pas collationné le manuscrit, puisqu'il n'y avait pas accès. Il a repris les informations de spécialistes qui ont eu l'occasion de l'examiner lors de sa mise en vente au Caire 1902 (et à New York, selon Gottheil). Voir A. F. von Gall (Hg.), *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914-1918, repr. 1966); A. E. Cowley, « An Alleged Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch », *JQR* 16 (1904), 483-484, et « A Supposed Early Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch », *PEFQS* 36 (1904), 394-396; R. Gottheil, « The Dating of Their Manuscripts by the Samaritans », *JBL* 25 (1906), 29-48. Ensuite, on perd la trace du manuscrit jusqu'à sa réapparition en 2000 dans une collection privée. Cf. I. Himbaza et A. Schenker, « Le Pentateuque samaritain de la Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire de Fribourg (Suisse) L 2057 », *ThZ* 2/57 (2001), 221-222.

<sup>9</sup> Dans le *tašqil* situé au début du Deutéronome, il se présente **דמן כהני האבן** (des prêtres de la pierre). Son statut de prêtre est confirmé par le *tašqil* d'Ex 15,22-16,1 : **מכתב יעקב כהנה** (écrit de Jacob le prêtre). Dans le ms Barb. Or. 1, dont il a écrit la fin du Deutéronome (en 1482), il se présente comme **כהנה הלוי בדמשק** (prêtre lévite à Damas). Dans le ms BZ 22 (de 1484) – que nous n'avons pas pu consulter –, le même scribe se présenterait comme **מבני אפרם בן כהני גרר** (des fils d'Ephraïm fils des prêtres de Guerar). Cf. notamment R. Pummer, « The Samaritans in Damascus », in *Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies Presented to Professor Abraham Tal* (éd. M. Bar-Asher et M. Florentin; Jerusalem : The Bialik Institute, 2005), 53\*-76\* (64\*, n. 79), qui cite I. Ben-Zvi (*Sepher Hashomronim* [Jerusalem: Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi, 1970], 289, n° 22 [hébreu]).

<sup>10</sup> L'article de Himbaza et Schenker (*Pentateuque samaritain*, 223-225) évoque onze *tašqilim* (et en cite dix), mais il s'agit bien de douze.

té des *tašqilim* (trois des douze sont en forme circulaire). Malgré le contraste entre le contenu et le matériel utilisé<sup>11</sup>, il ne fait aucun doute qu'il s'agit d'un manuscrit « luxueux ». Actuellement, il lui manque en tout cinq folios. Le premier folio (Gn 1,1-11) a probablement été détruit, vu l'état du deuxième. Les quatre autres sont issus du livre du Lévitique et forment deux double folios (f. 129 [Lv 7,28-8,13] et f. 138 [Lv 13,55b-14,14] ; f. 153-154 [Lv 24,7-25,31a]).<sup>12</sup> Dans cette contribution, ce manuscrit sera désigné par l'abréviation F (Fribourg).

Le but visé ici est la comparaison textuelle de ces trois manuscrits. Elle tentera de relever les rapprochements et/ou les différences entre eux et permettra d'évaluer le manuscrit de Fribourg. Cette étude se limitera au livre du Lévitique. Elle donnera donc d'une part une vue assez large d'un livre complet (malgré les deux double-folios qui manquent), mais d'autre part elle est limitée parce qu'elle n'aborde pas tout le Pentateuque Samaritain.

## 2. ÉTUDE DU LÉVITIQUE

### 2.1. Tableau comparatif des manuscrits F, S, D et de la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim

Le tableau comparatif énumère dans les trois premières colonnes les variantes textuelles existant entre F, S et D. La quatrième colonne indique la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim.<sup>13</sup> Tout à droite, se trouvent des numéros qui donnent les informations suivantes :

- 1 : F = S ≠ D
- 2 : F = D ≠ S
- 3 : F ≠ S = D
- 4 : F ≠ S ≠ D

<sup>11</sup> On trouve divers types de parchemin, avec des épaisseurs très variables. Certaines déformations du parchemin utilisé sont originales et sa qualité n'est pas excellente dès le départ (cf. A. Giovannini, *Rapport de restauration. Pentateuque samaritain 1495-1496 BCU L 2057* [non publié], p. 2-3). Très probablement, le scribe n'avait pas d'autre matériel à disposition et recevait son support fur à mesure.

<sup>12</sup> Le rapport de restauration du manuscrit (Giovannini, *Rapport*, 5-6) permet de constater qu'il s'agit une fois d'un double folio formant l'extérieur d'un carnet (f. 129 et 138), une autre fois d'un double folio formant l'intérieur d'un carnet (f. 153 et 154). Les deux ont donc pu être extraits sans difficulté et être vendus séparément. Ce qui est certain, c'est qu'en 1902, lors de la mise en vente, le manuscrit était complet (265 folios), comme l'attestent les articles de Cowley et Gottheil (cf. n. 9).

<sup>13</sup> Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*. Vol. 4: *The Words of the Pentateuch* (The Academy of the Hebrew Language: Texts and Studies X; Jerusalem: Keterpress Enterprises, 1977).

– : F + voc. = S = D

Dans la colonne de S, la lecture placée entre crochets correspond à l'édition de Tal et Florentin, lorsqu'elle est différente du manuscrit.

Dans le tableau suivant, la vocalisation partielle de F est prise en considération lorsqu'un signe de vocalisation (*damma* [˘] pour « o/ou » et *kasra* [˘] pour « i/e ») est placé là où S et/ou D contiennent une *mater lectionis* (י ou ם). Ces cas ne sont pas considérés comme des variantes textuelles.<sup>14</sup>

Un astérisque [\*] signale que le signe de vocalisation devrait se trouver au-dessus de la consonne – mais la typographie disponible ne permettait pas de le placer correctement.

Afin de simplifier la comparaison, les signes samaritains de F [˘], [˘], [˘]<sup>15</sup> et [˘]<sup>16</sup> seront ajoutés à la transcription en caractère carrés.

Lv	Ms F	Ms S	Ms D	Ben-Ḥayyim	
1,2	ומן	ומן	או מן	<i>wman</i>	1
1,3	לרצונו	לרצונו	לרצונו	<i>alrāṣūnu</i>	2
1,10	או מן <sup>17</sup>	או מן	או מן	<i>ū man</i>	–
1,17	יבדיל	יבדיל	יבדל	<i>yabdəl</i>	1
2,7	תעשה	[אעשה] תעשה <sup>18</sup>	תעשה	<i>tīyyāši</i>	–
2,13	מנחתך (2x)	מנחתך	מנחתך	<i>mānā'ūtək</i>	4
3,1	או	הוא	הוא	<i>ū</i>	3
3,15	היותרת	[היותרת] היותרת	היותרת	<i>ayyūtārət</i>	2
3,17	לדורתכם	לדרתיכם	לדרתיכם	<i>aldūrūtīkimma</i>	3

<sup>14</sup> En revanche, les points et traits supralinéaires utilisés en D, probablement pour signaler la présence d'une voyelle (sans préciser laquelle), ne sont pas pris en compte.

<sup>15</sup> La signe fatha [˘] correspond à « a ». Il peut parfois aussi avoir la fonction de signe d'alerte : pour différencier des mots ou pour marquer le redoublement d'une consonne.

<sup>16</sup> Le signe [˘] apparaît sur les consonnes. Il semblerait que par ce point le scribe, ou une main ultérieure, signale au lecteur qu'il connaît une version textuelle avec et une autre sans la consonne. Il peut aussi être placé sur un י quand celui-ci a la valeur d'une consonne [bb] (et non d'une voyelle [o/ou]) ou aussi sur פ pour qu'il soit prononcé [bb] – mais le scribe ne le fait pas systématiquement.

<sup>17</sup> En F, la ligne commence par ומן. La lettre ם a été ajoutée en marge et un point placé après le ן. L'écriture du ם ressemble à celle du scribe. Il serait possible qu'il ait lui-même fait la correction (cf. Lv 13,31). En S, la lettre ם a été insérée entre les lignes et le point de séparation se trouve au-dessus du י (au lieu d'être placé entre י et ם).

<sup>18</sup> L'édition de Schorch met dans son appareil critique qu'une main ultérieure aurait corrigé le texte (celle-ci aurait donc effacé la partie supérieure de la lettre ם pour en faire un ת) : voir Schorch, *Leviticus*, 7. L'édition de Tal et Florentin lit תעשה – sans commentaire. Mais selon notre lecture de S (photos numériques en couleur), il y a effectivement à l'origine un ם.

4,7	מזבח (1°)	המזבח	המזבח	<i>mazba</i>	3
4,8	ירם	ירים	ירים	<i>yārām</i>	–
4,18	מזבח (1°)	המזבח	המזבח	<i>mazba</i>	3
4,22	תעשינה	תעשיהן	תעשיהן	<i>tīyyāšīyyinna</i>	3
4,27	תעשינה	תעשיהן	תעשיהן	<i>tīyyāšīyyinna</i>	3
4,35	אשי	אשה	אשי	<i>ēši</i>	2
5,2	ונפש	או נפש	או נפש	<i>ū nāfāš</i>	3
5,4	או נפש	או נפש	ונפש	<i>ū nāfāš</i>	1
5,8	יבדיל	יבדיל	יבדל	<i>yabdāl</i>	1
5,12	אשי	אשה	אשי	<i>ēši</i>	2
5,17	תעשינה	תעשיהן	תעשיהן	<i>tīyyāšīyyinna</i>	3
5,23	הפקיד	הפקיד	הפקד	<i>afqəd</i>	1
5,24	וחמישתי	וחמישתי	וחמישתי	<i>wēmīšātu</i>	2
6,11	לדורתכם	לדורתכם	לדרתיכם	<i>aldūrūtīkimma</i>	1
6,14	תקריב	[תקריב] 19	תקריב	<i>taqrāb</i>	–
6,20	יזה * 20 (2°)	יזה	תזה	<i>yazzi</i>	1
6,20	תכבס	יכבס	יכבס	<i>yikkābbās</i>	3
7,19	הבשר (2°)	בשר	בשר	<i>bāšār</i>	3
<i>Folio manquant : Lv 7,28-8,13</i>					
8,14	ויגש	ויגיש	ויגש	<i>wyaggāš</i>	1
8,14	ויסמכו	ויסמכו	ויסמך	<i>wyismāku</i>	1
8,16	ויקטיר	ויקטיר	ויקטר	<i>wyāqtār</i>	1
8,18	ויגש	ויגיש	ויגש	<i>wyaggāš</i>	1
8,20	ויקטר	ויקטיר	ויקטר	<i>wyāqtār</i>	1
8,21	ויקטר	ויקטיר	ויקטר	<i>wyāqtār</i>	1
8,22	ויקרָב	ויקריב	ויקריב	<i>wyaqrāb</i>	–
8,23	הימנית (3x)	הימנית	הימנית	<i>ayyammīnət</i>	3
8,24	ויקרָב	ויקריב	ויקריב	<i>wyaqrāb</i>	–
8,24	הימנית (3x)	הימנית	הימנית	<i>ayyammīnət</i>	3

<sup>19</sup> Dans le manuscrit, la lettre ך de la 3<sup>e</sup> pers. pl. semble avoir été effacé volontairement.

<sup>20</sup> Un astérisque [\*] signale que le signe de vocalisation devrait se trouver au-dessus de la consonne – mais la typographie disponible ne permettait pas de le placer correctement.

8,28	ויקטר	ויקטיר	ויקטר	<i>wyāqtər</i>	1
9,5	לפני <sup>21</sup>	לפני	אל כני	<i>al fāni</i>	1
9,12	וימצאו	וימצאו	וימצאו	<i>wyāmšiyyu</i>	–
9,13	ויקטר	ויקטיר	ויקטר	<i>wyāqtər</i>	1
9,15	ויקרָב	ויקריב	ויקריב	<i>wyaqrəb</i>	–
9,16	ויקרָב	ויקריב	ויקריב	<i>wyaqrəb</i>	1
9,17	ויקרָב	ויקריב	ויקריב	<i>wyaqrəb</i>	1
9,23	* ויראה	ויראה	וירא	<i>wyirrā'i</i>	1
10,1	ויקריבו	ויקריבו	ויקריבו	<i>wyaqrību</i>	2
10,4	ושאו	שאו	שאו	<i>šā'u</i>	3
10,6	השריפה	השרפה	השרפה	<i>aššērīfa</i>	3
10,7	תמותון	תמותון	תמותו	<i>tēmūton</i>	1
10,9	לדרותיכם <sup>22</sup>	לדרותיכם	לדרתיכם	<i>aldūrūtikimma</i>	4
10,10	ולהבדיל	להבדיל	ולהבדיל	<i>wlābdəl</i>	1
10,15	* הביאו	יביאו	יביאו	<i>yībīyyu</i>	3
11,3	מעלה	מעלת	מעלות	<i>māllot</i>	2
11,4	וממפריסי	וממפריסי	וממפריסי	<i>wmimmāfrīsi</i>	–
11,4	* מעלה	מעלה	מעלי <sup>23</sup>	<i>mālli</i>	1
11,5	* מעלה	מעלה	מעלי <sup>24</sup>	<i>mālli</i>	1
11,16	התחמוס	התחמוס	התחמוס	<i>attāmos</i>	2
11,19	החסדה	החסידה	החסידה	<i>ā:sīda</i>	–
11,19	הדוגיפת	הדגיפת	הדגיפת	<i>addūgīfāt</i>	3
11,20	וכל	וכל	כל	<i>wkal</i>	1
11,28	והנשא	והנשא	והנשא	<i>wannūša</i>	3
11,30	והלטאה	והלטהא	והלטהא	<i>willāṭā</i>	1
11,30	והחמוט	והחמט	והמט	<i>wā:moṭ</i>	4

<sup>21</sup> Le scribe a laissé un espace vide au début de la ligne – ce qu'il ne fait pas habituellement – avant de la commencer par le mot לפני. Connaisait-il deux traditions textuelles et aurait-il laissé cet espace pour que le texte puisse être modifié ultérieurement ?

<sup>22</sup> Le second signe de vocalisation est une erreur. Le scribe aurait dû utiliser le signe *damma* ['] et non *kasra* [˘], comme par exemple en Lv 3,17 ou 17,17.

<sup>23</sup> Malgré la tâche qui le couvre, le י – avec un point au-dessus – est encore lisible.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. note précédente.

11,40	* והנשא	והנשא	והנשא	wannūša	3
11,44	נפשותיכם	נפשותיכם	נפשותיכם	naḥšūtīkimma	3
12,5	* שבועים	שבועים	שבועים	šibbuwwā'əm	2
12,6	ובן	ובן	או <sup>25</sup> בן	wban	1
13,6	'מספחת	מספחת	המספחת	amsab 'bēt	1
13,11	יסגורנו	יסגורנו	יסגורנו	yasgīrinnu	–
13,12	ועד	ועד	עד	wad	1
13,25	הפך <sup>26</sup>	הפכה	הפך	ēfika	2
13,31	או <sup>27</sup> כי	וכי	או כי	wkī	2
13,42	וכי	וכי	או <sup>28</sup> כי	wkī	1
<i>Folio manquant : Lv 13,55b-14,14</i>					
14,16	הימנית	הימנית	הימנית	ayyammīnət	3
14,17	הימנית (3x)	הימנית	הימנית	ayyammīnət	3
14,25	הימנית (3x)	הימנית	הימנית	ayyammīnət	3
14,27	הימנית	הימנית	הימנית	ayyammīnət	3
14,28	הימנית (3x)	הימנית	הימנית	ayyammīnət	3
14,40	והשליכו	והשלכו	והשליכו	wāšlīku	2
14,50	ושחט	ושחטו	ושחט	wšāṭ	2
15,3	זב	זוב	זב	zāb	2
15,10	והנשא	והנשא	והנשא	wannūša	2
15,13	הזב	[הזב] הזהב	הזב	azzāb	2
15,19	זבה (1°)	זבה	זובה	zābā	1
15,24	ותהי	ותהיה	ותהי	wtēyyi	2
15,24	ישכב (2°)	[ישכב] תשכב	ישכב	yīškāb	2

<sup>25</sup> Les lettres וּא semblent avoir été tracées par une main ultérieure. Comme elles s'insèrent dans un espace libre du texte, il pourrait s'agir soit d'une réécriture de lettres effacées soit d'une correction.

<sup>26</sup> Une barre oblique supérieure est placée à la fin du mot – de même en D, bien que celle-ci soit à peine visible.

<sup>27</sup> Le v. 31 commence à la ligne par וכי. La lettre א a été ajoutée en marge et un point placé après le ו. L'écriture du א ressemble à celle du scribe. Il serait possible qu'il ait lui-même fait la correction.

<sup>28</sup> Il semblerait qu'une main ultérieure ait ajouté la lettre א dans l'espace libre précédent וכי et un point après le ו. Il est intéressant d'observer le même type d'intervention dans les deux manuscrits F (Lv 13,31) et D (Lv 13,42).

15,27	וכל	כל	כל	<i>wkal</i>	3
15,33	והדוה	והדבה	והדוה	<i>waddābā</i>	2
16,7	השעירים	השערים	השעירים	<i>aššīrām</i>	2
16,8	לעזאזל	לעזאזל	לעזאזל	<i>lēzāzəl</i>	1
16,10	לעזאזל (2x)	לעזאזל	לעזאזל	<i>lēzāzəl</i>	1
16,12	חפניו	חופניו	חפניו	<i>ūfāno</i>	2
16,22	עונותם	עונותם	עונותם	<i>ūnūtīmma</i>	1
16,26	לעזאזל	לעזאזל	לעזאזל	<i>lēzāzəl</i>	1
16,29	לחקת	לחקת	לחקות <sup>29</sup>	<i>lāqqāt</i>	1
16,29	נפשותיכם	נפשתיכם	נפשתיכם	<i>naḥšūtīkimma</i>	3
16,31	נפשותיכם	נפשתיכם	נפשתיכם	<i>naḥšūtīkimma</i>	3
16,31	חקת	חקת	חקות	<i>āqqāt</i>	2
16,33	העם <sup>30</sup>	עם	עם <sup>31</sup>	<i>‘ām</i>	3
16,34	לחקת	לחקת	לחקות	<i>lāqqāt</i>	2
17,4	* יביאו	הביאו	הביאו	<i>t̄biyyu</i>	3
17,4	עמיו	עמיו	עמיו <sup>32</sup>	<i>‘ammu</i>	–
17,5	והביאום	והביאום	והבאום	<i>wībiyyumma</i>	1
17,5	אל יהוה (1°)	ליהוה	ליהוה	<i>alšēmā</i>	3
17,7	חקת	חקת	חקות	<i>āqqāt</i>	2
17,7	לדורתם	לדורתים	לדרותם	<i>aldūrūtīmma</i>	4
17,9	הביאנו	הביאנו	יביאנו	<i>yībiyyinu</i>	1
17,11	נפשותיכם	נפשתיכם	נפשתיכם	<i>naḥšūtīkimma</i>	3
18,3	ובחקותיהם	ובחקתייהם	ובחקתייהם	<i>wbaqqūtīyyimma</i>	3
18,4	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	<i>aqqūti</i>	2
18,5	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	<i>aqqūti</i>	2
18,10	ערתין	ערתין	ערתן	<i>irbātān</i>	1

<sup>29</sup> La lettre ו a été presque entièrement effacée, probablement par une main ultérieure. Nous trouvons le même procédé en Lv 16,31.34 ; 17,7 ; 23,21.31.41 ; 24,3. L'édition de Schorch (*Leviticus*) écrit le ו dans toutes ces occurrences : לחקות (Lv 16,29.34), חקות (Lv 16,42 ; 23,31.41 ; 24,3), חקות (Lv 17,7 ; 23,21).

<sup>30</sup> La ligne commence par le mot עם. L'article ה a été ajouté en marge. L'écriture du ה ressemble à celle du scribe. Il est possible qu'il ait fait lui-même la correction. Cf. Lv 13,13.

<sup>31</sup> L'article ה semble avoir été effacé volontairement dans le manuscrit.

<sup>32</sup> Le י a été partiellement effacé, on le devine sous le point [ ] entre מ et ו.

18,11	אחֹתך	אחותך	אחותך	'ā'ūtāk	–
18,18	אחֹתה	אחותה	אחותה	'ā'ūta	–
18,20	לזרעה	לזרע	לזרע	alzēra	3
18,25	ואפקד	ואפקיד	ואפקד	wafqəd	1
18,25	ישביה	יושביה	ישביה	yūšēbiyya	1
18,26	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	aqqūti	2
18,29	התועבות	התועבת	התועבות	attuwwēbot	2
18,30	התועבות	התועבת	התועבות	attuwwēbot	2
19,3	את	ואת	ואת	wit	3
19,3	שבתותי	שבתתי	שבתתי	šabbēūtī	3
19,12	אלהיך	אלהך	אלהיך	ēluwwāk	2
19,13	לא (3°)	ולא	לא	lā	2
19,16	ולא (2°)	לא	ולא	wlā	2
19,18	תטור	תטור	תהטר	tiṭṭor	1
19,20	* הפשה	חפשי	חפשי	ifši	3
19,24	חלולים	חלולים	חללים	illūlām	1
19,25 <sup>33</sup>	להאסיף	להאסיף	להסיף	līsaf	1
19,30	שבתותי	שבתתי	שבתתי	šabbēūtī	3
19,31	הידעונים	הידענים	הידעונים	wyiddū:nəm	2
19,36	מוזני	מאזני	מאזני	mūzāni	3
19,36	ואבני	אבני	אבני	ābāni	3
19,37	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	aqqūti	2
20,4	יעלמו	יעלימו	יעלמו	yāllīmu	1
20,8	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	aqqūti	2
20,14	ואתהן	ואתיהן	ואתהן	u'ūtīyyinna	2
20,20	עררים	ערירים	עררים	ērīrām	2
20,21	עררים	ערירים	עררים	ērīrām	2
20,22	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	aqqūti	2

<sup>33</sup> La comparaison des manuscrits samaritains étudiés ici tend à montrer que la lecture de F et S est vraisemblablement la plus ancienne, alors que celle de D serait une correction en direction de la tradition suivie par M.



20,25	להטור	לטהור	לטהור	<i>laṭṭā'or</i>	3
20,25	נפשותיכם	נפשתיכם	נפשתיכם	<i>naḥšūtīkimma</i>	3
21,3	ולאחלו	ולאחולו	ולאחולו	<i>wlā'ūtu</i>	–
21,5	ולא (1°)	לא	ולא	<i>wlā</i>	2
21,6	מקריבים	מקריבים	מקריבים	<i>maqrībəm</i>	3
21,17	לדורתם	לדרותם	לדרותם	<i>aldūrūtīmma</i>	3
21,18	חרום	ערום	חרום <sup>34</sup>	<i>'ārom</i>	2
22,2	מקלשים	מקדשים	מקדישים	<i>maqdišəm</i>	2
22,3	לדורתיכם <sup>35</sup>	לדרתיכם	לדרתיכם	<i>aldūrūtīkimma</i>	3
22,16	והשיאו	[והשיאו] והשיאו	והשיאו	<i>wāššiyyu</i>	2
22,19	בכשבים ובעזים <sup>36</sup>	ובכשבים ובעזים	בכשבים ובעזים	<i>wbēzəm bakkišbəm</i>	2
22,19	בכשבים	ובכשבים	בכשבים	<i>bakkišbəm</i>	2
22,25	משחתים	משחיתים	משחיתים <sup>37</sup>	<i>māššātəm</i>	3
22,30	לא	ולא	לא	<i>lā</i>	2
23,12	הניפכם	הנפכם	הנפכם	<i>īneḥkimma</i>	3
23,13	עשרונים	עשרנים	עשרנים	<i>išrūnəm</i>	3
23,13	ונסכיו	ונסכיו	ונסכו	<i>wnisko</i>	1
23,14	הביאכם	[הביאכם] <sup>38</sup>	הבאכם	<i>tbiyyākīmma</i>	4
23,15	הביאכם	הביאכם	הבאכם	<i>tbiyyākīmma</i>	1
23,17	עשרונים	עשרנים	עשרנים	<i>išrūnəm</i>	3
23,17	תהינה	תהינה	תהינה	<i>tāyyinna</i>	1
23,21	עבדה	עבידה	עבדה	<i>ēbīda</i>	1
23,21	חקת	חקת	חקות	<i>āqqāt</i>	2
23,21	לדרותיכם	לדרתיכם	לדרתיכם	<i>aldūrūtīkimma</i>	3
23,22	ובקצרכם	ובקצרכם	ובקצרכם	<i>wafqāšerkīmma</i>	–

<sup>34</sup> La première lettre du mot n'est pas lisible dans le manuscrit (photos numériques en noir-blanc) : il y a une tache à cet endroit. L'édition de Schorch (*Leviticus*, 181) lit חרום.

<sup>35</sup> La vocalisation *damma* a été visiblement placée par erreur entre *n* et *y* au lieu de *r* et le *n*.

<sup>36</sup> En F, on voit que la lettre *κ* qui précédait le mot ובעזים et le point après le *ו* ont été effacés. Avant cette intervention – par une main ultérieure ? – on lisait donc באר בעזים. Il est intéressant de voir en D le même procédé, mais auquel s'ajoute l'effacement de la conjonction או avant בכשבים.

<sup>37</sup> Il semblerait qu'on ait tenté d'effacer le premier *y*, mais il est encore lisible.

<sup>38</sup> La lettre *y* a été insérée dans l'espace libre entre *κ* et *κ*.

23,27	נפשותיכם	נפשתים	נפשתים	<i>naḥšūtīkimma</i>	3
23,31	חקת	חקת	חקות	<i>āqqāt</i>	2
23,40	וכפות	כפות	כפות	<i>kabbot</i>	3
23,41	חקת	חקת	חקות	<i>āqqāt</i>	2
23,41	לדרתיכם	לדורתים	לדרתים	<i>aldūrūtīkimma</i>	4
24,2	לעלות	להעלות	להעלות	<i>lā:lot</i>	3
24,3	יעריך	יעריך	יערך	<i>yārrək</i>	1
24,3	חקת	חקת	חקות	<i>āqqāt</i>	2
<i>Double folio manquant : Lv 24,7-25,31a</i>					
25,41	אבותי	אבותיו	אבותי	<i>ābūto</i>	1
25,45	תקנאוהו	תקנהו	תקנהו	<i>tiqnā'ē'u</i>	3
25,47	ותושב	ולתושב <sup>39</sup>	ותושב	<i>wtūšāb</i>	2
26,2	שבתותי	שבתתי	שבתתי	<i>šabbētūti</i>	3
26,5	בציר	בציר	בצר	<i>bāṣar</i>	1
26,16	השפחת	השפחת	השפפת	<i>aššā'fēt</i>	1
26,16	'מכליות	מכליות	מכלות	<i>amkalliyot</i>	1
26,16	ומדיבות	ומדיבות	ומדיבת	<i>wmādībot</i>	1
26,18	חטאותיכם	חטאתים	חטאתים	<i>ēṭā'ūtīkimma</i>	3
26,19	ונתתי את	ונתתי	ונתתי את	<i>wnātātī it</i>	2
26,20	לחכם	כוחכם	כחכם	<i>kuwwākīmma</i>	1
26,22	והכרתה	והכריתה	והכריתה	<i>wākriṭa</i>	–
26,22	דרככם	דרכים	דרככם	<i>dirkīkimma</i>	1
26,25	על	אל	אל	<i>al</i>	3
26,25	אויב	אויב	אויב	<i>uyyāb</i>	3
26,30	במתכם	במתים	במתים	<i>bāmātīkimma</i>	–
26,31	ניחיתם	ניחחכם	ניחחכם	<i>niyyā'īkimma</i>	3
26,32	הישבים	היושבים	הישבים	<i>ayyūšēbām</i>	1
26,33	והרקתי	והרקתי	והרקתי	<i>wārēqāti</i>	3
26,40	אבתם	אבותם	אבותם	<i>ābūtīmma</i>	–
26,40	עמי	עמי [עמי]	עמי	<i>immi</i>	2

<sup>39</sup> La lettre ל a été ajoutée au-dessus du mot.

26,40	קרי	קרי	בקרי	<i>qēri</i>	1
26,43	חקותי	חקתי	חקותי	<i>aqūti</i>	2
26,44	געלתם	געלתים	געלתים	<i>gā'eltimma</i>	–
27,8	יערכנו	יערכנו	יערכנו	<i>yārrīkinmu</i>	–
27,15	המקדש	המקדיש	המקדיש	<i>ammaqdāš</i>	–
27,21	ביוביל	ביובל	ביובל	<i>abyūbəl</i>	3
27,21	חרם	החרם	החרם	<i>ā:rām</i>	3
27,31	וחמישתי	וחמישתי	חמישתי	<i>ēmīšātu</i>	1

## 2.2. Observations statistiques

En résumé, ce tableau nous donne les informations suivantes :

- 1 : F = S ≠ D dans 59 cas sur 193 = 30.6 %
- 2 : F = D ≠ S dans 56 cas sur 193 = 29 %
- 3 : F ≠ (S = D) dans 71 cas sur 193 = 36.8 %
- 4 : F ≠ S ≠ D dans 7 cas sur 193 = 3.6 %

Le pourcentage des variantes propres à F (catégories 3 et 4) est le plus élevé : 40.4%. Mais si nous regardons les informations plus en détail, nous pouvons constater que dans 43 cas<sup>40</sup> (sur les 78 cas des catégories 3 et 4) les variantes propres à F consistent en une *mater lectionis* absente en S et D. Sur ce point, il est intéressant d'observer que F confirme la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim.<sup>41</sup> Par exemple, lorsque, dans le livre du Lévitique, il est question de l'oreille droite, du doigt droit, de la main droite ou du pied droit (Lv 8,23-24 ; 14,16-17.25.27-8), le scribe de F écrit הימינית à chaque fois avec trois י (cf. S et D : הימנית). Cette orthographe explicite bien la prononciation telle qu'elle se trouve dans la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim : *ayyammīnət*.

<sup>40</sup> Lv 3,17 ; 8,23(3x).24(3x) ; 10,6 ; 11,19.28.30.40.44 ; 14,16.17(3x).25(3x).27.28(3x) ; 16, 29.31 ; 17,11 ; 18,3 ; 19,3.30 ; 20,25 ; 21,6.17 ; 23,12.13.14.17.21.27 ; 26,2.18.31 ; 27,21.

<sup>41</sup> En Lv 23,12 (F הניפכם, S et D הנפכם – *īnefkimma*), la *mater lectionis* en F paraît à première vue inattendue par rapport à la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim. Mais le י en F indique plus clairement qu'il s'agit d'un infinitif *Afel* (*Ifel*) que l'orthographe en S et D. Cf. R. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch* (StSam 1; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969), 335, qui cite comme exemple un infinitif *Afel/Ifel* avec suffixe הניפכם – orthographié comme en F.

En 23,14 (F הביאכם, S הבאיכם, D הבאכם – *ībiyyākimma*), F et S ont les deux une *mater lectionis*, mais en S, le scribe ayant écrit dans un premier temps הבאכם, il (ou une main ultérieure) a ajouté le י là où il y avait de l'espace, c'est-à-dire entre א et כ.

Dans 4 cas (sur les 78 cas), la variante de F consiste en une vocalisation qui ne remplace pas une *mater lectionis* en S et D. En principe, nous avons seulement tenu compte de la vocalisation quand le texte consonantique était différent. Dans ces 4 cas, la vocalisation s'ajoute à une différence consonantique. Par exemple, en Lv 2,13(2x), F a מנחתך, tandis que S a מנחתך et D מנחתך. La différence consonantique consiste en la présence du ך en F et S, absent en D. Mais en F, il y a aussi la vocalisation damma (« o/ou ») entre ן et ן qui ne remplace pas de *mater lectionis* qui serait présente en S et D. Si nous consultons la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim (*mānā'ūtāk*), nous constatons que la vocalisation de F précise la prononciation. Le même cas de figure se trouve en Lv 23,41 (F לדרתכם, S לדורתכם, D לדרתכם – *aldūrūtīkimma*). En Lv 17,7, le même cas de figure apparaît lorsque l'on compare F et S, tandis que la comparaison entre F et D montre une différence consonantique (présence d'une *mater lectionis* en F [et S] absente en D) et une vocalisation en F pour une *mater lectionis* en D (F לדורתם, S לדורתם, D לדורתם – *aldūrūtīmma*).

Dans 11 cas (sur les 78), les variantes de F d'une part et celles de S et D d'autre part ne diffèrent probablement pas dans leur prononciation. Le texte consonantique est différent, mais la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim laisse penser que lorsque le texte est lu à haute voix, les différences ne sont pas audibles. Parmi ces 11 cas, 3 cas consistent en une différence orthographique de la terminaison verbale. Nous trouvons ces 3 cas en Lv 4,22.27 ; 5,17 (F תעשינה, S et D תעשיה – *tiyyāšīyyinna*). Pour la 3<sup>e</sup> personne pl. f. inacc., il existe trois terminaisons équivalentes : -נה, -הן, et -הין. Les trois se prononcent de manière identique : *-inna*.<sup>42</sup> Deux autres cas (sur les 10) consistent en une différence orthographique : Lv 19,20 (F הפשה, S et D הפשי – *ifši*)<sup>43</sup> et Lv 19,36<sup>44</sup> (F מוזני, S et D מוזני – *mūzāni*). Dans 5 autres cas, la différence consiste en la présence voire absence d'une gutturale (א, ה et ח), probablement pas, ou à peine audible à l'orale : Lv 18,20 (F לזרעה, S et D לזרע – *alzēra*) ; Lv 20,25 (F להטהור, S et D לטהור – *laṭṭā'or*) ; Lv 24,2 (F לעלות, S et D להעלות – *lā:lot*) ; Lv 25,45 (F תקנאהו, S et D תקנהו – *tiqnā'ē'u*)<sup>45</sup> ; Lv 26,33 (F והרחקתי, S et D והרקתי – *wārēqāti*). Ces cas nécessiteraient une analyse plus approfondie pour clarifier s'il s'agit de différences orthographiques ou textuelles. En Lv 3,1, nous avons deux mots différents et donc une variante textuelle : F או, S et D הוא – *ū*. Selon la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim, les deux mots se prononcent pareillement.<sup>46</sup> Plus de détail sur ce cas se trouvent sous 2.3.1.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Macuch, *Grammatik*, 262-264.

<sup>43</sup> La vocalisation *kasra* (« i/e ») sur la lettre ה indique qu'il faut lire *ifši*. Cf. ך pour ה dans Macuch, *Grammatik*, 36.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. observations sous 2.3.5.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. observations sous 2.3.7. : il s'agit dans ce cas d'une différence orthographique.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. p.ex. Lv 3,6 : זכר או נקבה – *zākār ū nāqāba*.

Nous pouvons donc constater que sur ces 11 cas de différence consonantique, mais ne différant probablement pas dans leur prononciation, 6 cas<sup>47</sup> apparaissent comme des différences orthographiques, 4 cas restent à analyser en détail et le dernier cas est clairement une différence textuelle.

Dans 3 cas (sur les 78), la lecture de F relève d'une erreur évidente du scribe : Lv 10,9 (F לדורתיכם, S לדורותיכם, D לדרתיתכם – *aldūrūtīkimma*)<sup>48</sup>, Lv 22,3 (F לדורתיכם, S et D לדרתיתכם – *aldūrūtīkimma*)<sup>49</sup> et Lv 26,25 (F אויב, S et D אויב – *uyyāb*)<sup>50</sup>. De telles erreurs, peu fréquentes dans le Lévitique, se trouvent aussi en S et D.

Dans 6 cas (sur les 78), les variantes que propose F correspondent à la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim : Lv 4,7.18 (F מזבח [dans les deux versets la première occurrence], S et D המזבח – *mazba*), 15,27 (F וכל, S et D כל – *wkal*), 16,33 (F העם, S et D עם – *'ām*)<sup>51</sup>, 22,25 (F משחיתים, S et D משחיתים – *māšāttām*)<sup>52</sup> et 27,21 (F חרם, S et D החרם – *ā:raṁ*).

Dans les 11 cas qui restent (sur les 78), les variantes en F ne correspondent pas à la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim. Sur ces 11 cas, 4 cas consistent en la présence voire absence de la conjonction ו- : Lv 10,4 (F ושאו, D et S שאו – *šā'u*), 19,3 (F את, S et D ואת – *wit*), 19,36 (F וְאֵבְנֵי, S et D אבני – *ābāni*) et 23,40 (F וכפות, S et D כפות – *kabbot*).<sup>53</sup> Dans 3 cas, il s'agit de conjonctions différentes : Lv 5,2 (F ונפש, S et D או נפש – *ū nāfās*), 17,5 (F אֵל יְהוָה, S et D ליהוה – *alšēmā*)<sup>54</sup> et 26,25 (F על, S et D אל – *al*).<sup>55</sup> Dans un cas, la variante en F consiste en la présence de l'article : Lv 7,19 (F הבשר [deuxième occurrence], S et D בשר – *bāšār*). Dans 2 cas, le temps verbal diffère : Lv 10,15 (F הביאו, S et

<sup>47</sup> Nous comptons Lv 25,45 parmi les différences orthographiques suite aux observations faites sous 2.3.7.

<sup>48</sup> La deuxième vocalisation devrait être un *damma* (« o/u ») comme la première. Mais le scribe de F s'est trompé et a placé un *kasra* (« e/i »).

<sup>49</sup> Au lieu de placer la vocalisation entre ו et ת, le scribe de F l'a placée entre ת et י.

<sup>50</sup> Le scribe de F a inversé ו et י.

<sup>51</sup> La différence est difficilement audible : העם *'ām* (cf. la transcription chez Ben-Ḥayyim en Lv 4,3 ; 9,7.15.22.23.24 ; 10,3 ; 16,24) et עם *'am* (cf. Lv 20,2.4).

<sup>52</sup> En lisant la variante en S et D (משחיתים), on aurait tendance à y voir la forme d'un participe ifel au pluriel. Mais cette forme, présente en Gn 19,13 (F, S et D משחיתים), se prononce *māšītām* (cf. Macuch, *Grammatik*, 306, 404 n. 130). Tal et Florentin, *Pentateuch*, 699, précisent dans les annexes qu'il s'agit d'un nom au pluriel.

<sup>53</sup> Le point sur le ו dans les deux derniers cas indique que le scribe (ou une main ultérieure) connaissait la variante sans l'article, mais n'a pas tranché entre les deux variantes.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. observations sous 2.4.4.

<sup>55</sup> Dans les deux derniers cas, les différences sont à peine audibles : 17,5 אֵל יְהוָה *al šēmā* et ליהוה *alšēmā* ; 26,25 על *al* et אל *al*.

D יביאו – *yībiyyu*) et 17,4 (F יביאו, S et D הביאו – *ībiyyu*).<sup>56</sup> Et dans un autre cas, c'est la conjugaison verbale qui diffère : Lv 6,20 (F תכבס, S et D יכבס – *yikkābbās*).<sup>57</sup>

Si nous résumons les observations ci-dessus, nous pouvons donc affirmer que sur les 78 cas de variantes propres à F, 56 cas ne sont pas des variantes textuelles, 4 cas nécessiterait une analyse plus approfondie pour clarifier leur statut et dans 18 cas, il s'agit effectivement de variantes textuelles. Dans 6 cas (sur ces 18), les variantes de F correspondent à la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim et dans 11 cas, c'est les variantes de S et D qui correspondent à la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim. Dans un cas (Lv 3,1), la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim correspond à la variante de F et à celle de S et D.

Ces observations permettent de constater que, si l'on prend en considération la tradition orale telle que l'a transcrite Ben-Ḥayyim, il y a très peu de différences entre les manuscrits samaritains étudiés – moins que le suggèrent à premier abord les statistiques.

D'ailleurs les statistiques du livre du Lévitique ne permettent pas de rapprocher F plus de S ou de D, même si le nombre de variantes que F partage avec S est un peu plus élevé comparé à D. Elles ne permettent donc non plus d'établir une éventuelle filiation de F avec l'un des deux manuscrits ou de déceler une tradition textuelle commune.

### 2.3. Observations textuelles de quelques variantes

#### 2.3.1. Lv 3,1

F :

ואם זבה שלמים קרבנו אם מן הבקר אן מקריב אם זכר אם נקבה תמים יקריבנו לפני יהוה:

S et D (et M) :

ואם זבה שלמים קרבנו אם מן הבקר הוא מקריב אם זכר אם נקבה תמים יקריבנו לפני יהוה:

NBS :

Si son présent est un sacrifice de paix, s'il présente un animal pris sur le gros bétail, il présentera devant le SEIGNEUR un mâle ou une femelle sans défaut.

Dans S et D (et M), la phrase ne nécessite pas le pronom personnel הוא puisqu'il peut être considéré comme inclus dans le part. high. m. sg. מקריב.

<sup>56</sup> Il est intéressant de noter qu'en Lv 17,9 le temps verbal en F ne correspond non plus à la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim, mais dans ce cas, S donne la même variante que F (F et S הביאו, D יביאו – *yībiyyinu*).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. observation sous 2.3.2.

Mais comme le sujet n'est pas nommé dans la première partie de la phrase (il est contenu dans le pronom possessif « son » offrande), le pronom personnel explicite le sujet de la phrase entière (le même que celui de la phrase précédente [2,16] : הכהן « le prêtre »).<sup>58</sup> La variante que présente F – avec la conjonction או au lieu du pronom personnel הוא – semble incompréhensible voire une erreur. Mais si l'on tient compte de la ponctuation<sup>59</sup>, la traduction pourrait être la suivante : « Si son présent (est) un sacrifice de paix, s'il est du grand bétail, ou s'il présente mâle ou femelle, sans défaut il (le) présentera devant YHWH. » Même si cette lecture est moins évidente que celle avec la conjonction הוא, elle ne peut pas être considérée comme erreur puisque d'une part la ponctuation a été placée en fonction et que d'autre part il existe au moins deux manuscrits (les deux antérieurs à F) qui ont cette variante<sup>60</sup> – et qui ne peuvent pas être considérés comme *Vorlage* de F. La tradition orale transcrite par Ben-Ḥayyim ne donne pas plus d'information, car או et הוא se prononcent les deux *ū* – mais il est fort probable que le texte lu par le prêtre avait la variante qu'attestent S et D.

### 2.3.2. Lv 6,20

F :

כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש ואשר יזה מדמה על הבגד אשר יזה עליו תכבס במקום קדוש:

S et D :

כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש ואשר יזה מדמה על הבגד אשר יזה עליו יכבס במקום קדוש:

M :

כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש ואשר יזה מדמה על הבגד אשר יזה עליו תכבס במקום קדוש:

NBS :

Tout ce qui entrera en contact avec sa viande sera consacré. Si un vêtement est aspergé de son sang, tu laveras dans un lieu sacré l'endroit qui en aura été aspergé.

La variante que propose F est attestée par de nombreux manuscrits samaritains.<sup>61</sup> Comme le texte n'a pas de vocalisation, la forme verbale est ambiguë.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Lv 3,7 (... אם כשב הוא מקריב) et 21,8 (... וקדשתו כי את לחם אלהיך הוא מקריב) où le participe *הוא* est également explicité par le pronom personnel *הוא*.

<sup>59</sup> En F nous avons "ואם זבח שלמים קרבנו ׀ אם מן הבקר ׀ או מקריב אם זכר ׀ אם נקבה תמים יקריבנו לפני יהוה" Cela signifie que *הבקר* *אם* fait partie de *ואם זבח שלמים קרבנו* et qu'avec *או* commence la deuxième partie de la phrase. Tandis qu'en S, nous avons des signes de ponctuation après *קרבנו* (deux points horizontaux), *מקריב* et *יהוה* (deux points verticaux), et en D après *קרבנו*, *מקריב*, *נקבה* et *יהוה* (deux points obliques partout).

<sup>60</sup> Il s'agit des manuscrits CUL Add. 1846 (avant 1149) que j'ai pu consulter et Sassoon Ms 30 (fin 14<sup>e</sup> / début 15<sup>e</sup> siècle) comme l'indique von Gall (*Pentateuch*, 209) dans son appareil critique.

<sup>61</sup> P. ex. CUL Add. 1846 (avant 1149), Barb. Or. 1 (1226), CBL 752 (1339). Von Gall (*Pentateuch*, 216) cite dans son appareil critique 11 mss attestant la variante *תכבס* (aucun des trois mss

Il pourrait s'agir, dans le contexte précis, soit de la 2<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. m. inacc. pi. (« tu laveras ») soit de la 3<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. f. inacc. ni. (« elle sera lavée »). Dans le deuxième cas, la question se pose, quel serait le sujet féminin du verbe. L'habit [בגד] est masculin. On le trouve au féminin en Ez 42,14 et Prov 6,27, mais il s'agit de cas exceptionnels.<sup>62</sup> De plus, le suffixe de la préposition « sur » est masculin : עליו – « ce qui giclera sur lui [l'habit] ». Le sang [דם] est également masculin. La transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim, *yikkâbbâs*, indique comment interpréter la variante en S et D : selon elle, la forme verbale serait une 3<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. m. inacc. nif. « il [l'habit sur lequel a giclé du sang] sera lavé ». En M, le verbe est conjugué à la 2<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. inacc. pi. « tu laveras ». Étonnamment, le suffixe de la préposition qui précède le verbe est féminin : עָלֶיהָ. L'argument le plus fréquent est que l'habit [בגד] peut être féminin.<sup>63</sup> Mais dans notre cas, cette explication n'est pas satisfaisante puisque la tradition samaritaine lit à cet endroit un suffixe masculin : עליו. En Lv 13,58<sup>64</sup>, le verbe תכבס est lu *tikkâbbâs*, selon la transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim. Il s'agirait donc de la 3<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. f. nif. : « elle sera lavée ». La même question se pose : quel en est le sujet ? Tous les noms qui précèdent le verbe sont masculins : שתי, (habit), בגד (tissu), ערב (tricot), כל כלי העור (tout objet de peau). La tache (הנגע) qu'il faut effacer, est, elle aussi, un nom masculin. Nous sommes donc confrontés à la même difficulté qu'en Lv 6,20. Un pronom démonstratif (« ça, cela ») comme sujet implicite peut-il être féminin ? Il reste que la tradition samaritaine connaît en Lv 6,20 deux traditions textuelles. S'il n'y avait pas cette deuxième occurrence en Lv 13,58, on aurait tendance à penser que l'une lirait une forme active à la 2<sup>e</sup> pers. m. et que l'autre lirait une forme passive à la 3<sup>e</sup> pers. m. Mais ne s'agirait-il pas plutôt de deux formes passives à la 3<sup>e</sup> pers., l'une m. et l'autre f. ? Le débat reste ouvert.<sup>65</sup>

nommés précédemment y est cité). La récente édition de Schorch, qui cite 12 mss attestant la variante תכבס, lit en CUL Add. 1846 un ו (donc וכבס), mais selon notre propre lecture du ms, nous avons un ה. Voir Schorch, *Leviticus*, 38.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. R. Péter-Contesse, *Lévitique 1–16* (CAT IIIa; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1993), 106.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-6. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York [etc.]: Doubleday), 404, et I. Himbaza, « Textual readings and challenge of biblical philology. Some cases in Isaiah and Leviticus », in *Philology and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute held at Fribourg on 10-11 October, 2013* (éd. I. Himbaza et J. Joosten; FAT II 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 117-140.

<sup>64</sup> M : וְהַבְּגָד אֲשֶׁר עָלֶיהָ אֵשׁ תִּכְבַּס וְכָל כְּלֵי הָעוֹר אֲשֶׁר עָלֵיהֶם הַנֶּגַע וְכַבַּסְתָּ שְׁנֵית וְיָסְרָהּ. TOB : Le vêtement, le tissu ou le tricot, ou tout objet de cuir, que tu laves et d'où disparaît la tache, se lave une seconde fois et devient pur.

<sup>65</sup> D'ailleurs cette question de forme active ou passive est également soulevée par d'autres témoins textuels. Cf. Himbaza, « Textual readings », 13-16.



## 2.3.3. Lv 8,14

F et S :

ויגיש / ויגיש את פר החטאת ויסמכו אהרן ובניו את ידיהם על ראש פר החטאת וישחט:

D (et M) :

ויגיש את פר החטאת ויסמך אהרן ובניו את ידיהם על ראש פר החטאת וישחט:

NBS :

Il fit approcher le taureau du sacrifice pour le péché ; Aaron et ses fils posèrent les mains sur la tête du taureau du sacrifice pour le péché.

La tradition samaritaine connaît les deux variantes textuelles : le singulier et le pluriel.<sup>66</sup> La transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim donne le pluriel. Le texte massorétique a le singulier, tandis que d'autres témoins textuels connaissent l'une comme l'autre variante : la Septante et les Targoum (Onq., Neof., Ps.-J.) ont le singulier ; la Vulgate, la Peshitta et le Targoum samaritain le pluriel. Comme le verbe précède le sujet, « Aaron et ses fils », le singulier et le pluriel sont grammaticalement possibles, même si le pluriel semble plus cohérent. Le pluriel pourrait donc être une adaptation, tandis que deux anciens manuscrits samaritains<sup>67</sup> (au moins) témoigneraient d'une connaissance de la tradition textuelle suivie par M.

## 2.3.4. Lv 17,5

F :

... והביאום אל יהוה אל פתח אהל מועד אל הכהן ...

S et D :

... והביאום ליהוה אל פתח אהל מועד אל הכהן ...

NBS :

... [ils] les amèneront au SEIGNEUR, à l'entrée de la tente de la Rencontre, devant le prêtre ...

La variante de F semble être un cas isolé – la récente édition de Schorch ne donne aucune variante et aucun manuscrit collationné par von Gall ne l'atteste. D'ailleurs, le Lévitique ne connaît pas la formulation אל יהוה.<sup>68</sup> Dans la tradition orale, telle qu'elle est transcrite par Ben-Ḥayyim, la différence entre la prononciation de אל יהוה et celle de ליהוה est minime. Elle consiste en une pause ou l'absence de pause entre les deux mots : *al šēmā* et *alšēmā*. Le scribe de F

<sup>66</sup> Dans l'édition de Schorch (*Leviticus*, 53), la grande majorité des mss atteste le pluriel. Von Gall (*Pentateuch*, 219) donne le singulier, en se référant à un seul manuscrit (CUL Add. 714, 13<sup>e</sup> siècle), et met la variante avec le pluriel, attestée par 19 manuscrits, dans l'apparat critique.

<sup>67</sup> D et CUL Add. 714 datent les deux de la première partie 13<sup>e</sup> siècle.

<sup>68</sup> En revanche, la formulation apparaît dans la Genèse, l'Exode, les Nombres et le Deutéronome.

peut avoir été influencé par l'ensemble de la formulation : Les fils d'Israël amèneront leurs sacrifices « à YHWH (אל יהוה), à l'entrée de la tente de la Rencontre (אל פתח אהל מועד), au prêtre (אל הכהן) ».

### 2.3.5. Lv 19,36

F :

מוזני צדק אבני צדק איפת צדק והין צדק יהיה לכם ...

S et D :

מאזני צדק אבני צדק איפת צדק והין צדק יהיה לכם ...

NBS :

Vous aurez des balances justes, des poids justes, un épha juste et un hîn juste.

La racine du mot מאזנים « balances » – seule occurrence dans le Pentateuque – serait soit אָזן pi. « peser » ou alors יָזַן « peser » qu'on retrouverait dans l'arabe *wazana*.<sup>69</sup> En araméen judéen, ce mot s'écrit sans א, מוֹזְנִיָּא ou מוֹדְנִיָּא, et en QIs<sup>a</sup> il apparaît également sans א, מ[ו]זניים.<sup>70</sup> L'orthographe en F<sup>71</sup> pourrait donc s'expliquer par une influence de l'araméen. Mais il pourrait aussi s'agir d'un procédé propre à la tradition samaritaine. Les gutturales n'étant pas prononcées, elles peuvent disparaître, se substituer mutuellement ou être remplacées par une semi-consonne.<sup>72</sup> Dans notre cas, la « tradition orthographique » que suit F aurait remplacé la gutturale א par la semi-consonne ו, permettant ainsi de discerner plus facilement la prononciation du mot. Il ne s'agit donc pas d'une variante textuelle.

### 2.3.6. Lv 21,18

F et D :

כי כל איש אשר יהיה בו מום לא יקרב איש עור או פסח או חרום או שרוע:

S<sup>73</sup> :

כי כל איש אשר יהיה בו מום לא יקרב איש עור או פסח או ערום או שרוע:

<sup>69</sup> Cf. W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Berlin: Springer, 1962), 21, 393 : le duel s'expliquerait par le fait que la balance a deux plateaux; Koehler et Baumgartner, *Lexicon*, 404.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. L. Koehler et W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1: א – ע (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 539.

<sup>71</sup> L'édition de Schorch (*Leviticus*, 166) cite deux mss partageant l'orthographe de F : CBL 752 (1339) et Leiden UL Or. 6 (1350). Par contre, elle ne s'accorde pas avec von Gall (*Pentateuch*, 245) sur la lecture du ms BL Cotton Claudius B. VIII qui, selon ce dernier, aurait également מוֹזְנִיָּא.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Macuch, *Grammatik*, 33.

<sup>73</sup> En D, la première lettre du mot n'est pas lisible.

TOB :

En effet, quiconque a une infirmité ne doit pas s'approcher, que ce soit un aveugle ou un boiteux, un homme au nez aplati ou aux membres difformes.

Ce passage évoque les défauts physiques empêchant un lévite de desservir l'autel. La racine חרם signifie « (trans)percer, fendre », que Gesenius complète par « ayant les oreilles, les yeux, la cloison nasale percés » – donc une défiguration quelconque. Cependant, les dictionnaires de Gesenius ainsi que Koehler-Baumgartner traduisent le participe passif חרום uniquement par « [ayant] un nez fendu », tandis que Clines traduit « fendu, mutilé », peut-être en lien avec le nez.<sup>74</sup> La transcription orale de Ben-Ḥayyim *'ārom* correspond aux deux variantes. Dans le contexte de ce verset, la variante ערום de S ne peut ni renvoyer à ערום « nu, vêtu légèrement » ni à ערום « rusé, intelligent », parce que ces sens ne s'intègrent pas dans le contexte du verset.<sup>75</sup> Elle s'explique plutôt par le fait que, dans la tradition samaritaine, les gutturales ne sont pas clairement distinguées et que, par conséquent, elles peuvent se substituer l'une à l'autre.<sup>76</sup> La mutation de ה en ע n'est pas rare.<sup>77</sup> Pour ce cas, la tradition samaritaine connaît les deux orthographes.<sup>78</sup>

### 2.3.7. Lv 25,45

F :

... וגם מבני התושבים הגרים עמכם מהם תקנאהו ...

S et D :

... וגם מבני התושבים הגרים עמכם מהם תקנהו ...

M :

... וגם מבני התושבים הגרים עמכם מהם תקנו ...

NBS :

Vous pourrez aussi les acheter aux fils des résidents temporaires qui séjournent en immigrés chez vous...

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 260; Koehler et Baumgartner, *Lexicon*, 354; D. J. A. Clines (éd.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Vol. III: ט-צ (Sheffield : Academic Press, 1996), 318.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 618; Koehler et Baumgartner, *Lexicon*, 882-883.

<sup>76</sup> E. Robertson, « Notes and Extracts from the Semitic Mss. in the John Rylands Library. III. Samaritan Pentateuch Mss. with a description of two Codices », *BJRL* 21 (1937), 244-272 (261, n. 2, 4); Macuch, *Grammatik*, 28.

<sup>77</sup> Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew. Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press – Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 41.

<sup>78</sup> L'édition de Schorch (*Leviticus*, 181) cite dans son apparat critique 9 mss attestant la variante ערום.

Le verbe en F est le même qu'en S et D, le verbe קנה « acquérir, acheter ». Il ne peut pas s'agir du verbe קנא « être jaloux », dont le sens ne s'intègre pas dans le contexte du verset. La présence du ך en F peut s'expliquer soit par l'utilisation de la forme araméenne du verbe קנה, c'est-à-dire קנא,<sup>79</sup> soit par le fait que dans la tradition samaritaine des gutturales superflues peuvent être placées dans un mot.<sup>80</sup> Dans notre cas, la gutturale ך servirait de *mater lectionis*<sup>81</sup> puisque la transcription orale de Ben-Hayyim lit ici *tiqnā'ē'u*. La prononciation correspond à la variante de F et à celle de S et D et ne permet donc pas de différencier les deux orthographe,<sup>82</sup> mais elle donne une information sur la morphologie du verbe : le ך final forme avec le ה un suffixe de la 3<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. masc. et le verbe doit être interprété comme une 2<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. m. inacc. « tu l'achèteras ». <sup>83</sup> La tradition samaritaine se distingue donc ici de la tradition massorétique qui elle lit תקנו « vous achèterez », une 2<sup>e</sup> pers. pl. masc. inacc.<sup>84</sup>

### 3. CONCLUSION

Dans cette étude, nous avons constaté que les statistiques du tableau comparatif donnent l'impression d'une plus grande divergence entre les manuscrits qu'elle ne l'est réellement. Le pourcentage assez élevé de variantes propres à F est avant tout dû au choix d'orthographe du scribe (ou de la tradition qu'il suit). Il a pris la liberté de : a) mettre un signe de vocalisation quand S et/ou D mettent une *mater lectionis*, b) ajouter une *mater lectionis*, absente en S et/ou D, pour clarifier la prononciation d'un mot. La différence consonantique est parfois aussi dû à la faiblesse des gutturales qui ne sont pas prononcées dans la tradition samaritaine : elles peuvent changer de place, se substituer l'une à l'autre ou même être omises, et parfois, elles peuvent être ajoutées. L'étude a permis

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 717. Cf. aussi Ben-Hayyim, *Grammar*, 159.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Macuch, *Grammatik*, 38-41.

<sup>81</sup> Macuch évoque la tendance à l'écriture pleine dans la tradition samaritaine, mais sans sans que celle-ci soit appliquée de manière conséquente. Voir Macuch, *Grammatik*, 40, et les exemples (38-40).

<sup>82</sup> On ne trouve pas de manuscrits ayant l'orthographe de F dans l'apparat critique de von Gall (*Pentateuch*, 256) – seulement deux manuscrits ayant תקנא –, mais elle apparaît dans le manuscrit CBL 752 (datant de 1339) que nous avons pu consulter.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Macuch, *Grammatik*, 243.245.

<sup>84</sup> L'utilisation du 2<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. inacc. peut s'expliquer par le verset précédent auquel il se réfère : « ... c'est parmi elles [les nations] que tu l'achèteras, serviteur ou servante » (v. 44). « ... c'est parmi eux [des fils] que tu l'achèteras... » (v. 45). Mais au v. 44, nous trouvons la même différence qu'au v. 45 : תקנהו pour la tradition samaritaine (que F, S et D attestent) et תקנו pour la massorétique. Dans le contexte, l'utilisation de la 2<sup>e</sup> pers. sg. est plus fréquente que celle de la 2<sup>e</sup> pers. pl. Si l'on veut voir aux vv. 44-45 une harmonisation, alors la question se pose, pourquoi ne pas aussi adapter la forme verbale dans la première partie du v. 46 qui est au pluriel dans les deux traditions.

de mettre en évidence que la majorité de ces différences, perceptibles dans le texte écrit, ne sont pas audibles. Elle a aussi permis de réaliser que dans ses choix d'orthographe, le scribe a mis l'accent sur la « lisibilité » du texte. Le manuscrit de Fribourg est donc particulièrement intéressant par rapport à la tradition orale.

Finalement, ces observations montrent que la tradition samaritaine, comme l'a remarqué Ben-Ḥayyim, ne considère pas son contenu comme étant défini par la tradition écrite, mais par la tradition orale.<sup>85</sup> Celle-ci est transmise de génération en génération, jusqu'à aujourd'hui, principalement par la lecture de la Torah samaritaine.<sup>86</sup>

Peut-on, à partir du Lévitique, dire qu'un manuscrit est meilleur qu'un autre ? Les trois manuscrits consultés dans le cadre de cette étude sont bons, même si chacun contient des points faibles (textes manquants, lettres peu ou pas lisibles, erreurs etc.). F, qui date d'une époque plus tardive que S et D, a l'avantage de pouvoir s'appuyer sur un système de vocalisation, même si celui-ci n'est pas unifié. Cela lui permet de préciser la prononciation du texte non seulement par l'orthographe, mais aussi par une vocalisation partielle. Les observations faites à son sujet montrent son importance pour les études samaritaines.

### Références

- Ben-Ḥayyim Z., *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew. Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press – Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000).
- Ben-Ḥayyim Z., *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritan, vol. 4: The Words of the Pentateuch* (The Academy of the Hebrew Language: Texts and Studies X; Jerusalem: Keterpress Enterprises, 1977).
- Ben-Zvi I., *Sepher Hashomronim* (Jerusalem: Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi, <sup>2</sup>1970 [en hébreu]).
- Clines D. J. A. (éd.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Vol. III: ַ–ֿ (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- Cowley A. E., « An Alleged Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch », *JQR* 16 (1904), 483-484
- Cowley A. E., « A Supposed Early Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch », *PEFQS* 36 (1904), 394-396.

<sup>85</sup> Ben-Ḥayyim dans sa préface à l'édition du Pentateuque Samaritain de A. et R. Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Versions of the Pentateuch with Particular Stress on the Difference between Both Texts* (Tel Aviv – Jerusalem: Ruven Mas, 1961-1965 [en hébreu]) ; cf. S. Schorch, *Die Vokale des Gesetzes. Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora, Vol. 1 : Das Buch Genesis* (BZAW 339; Berlin – NewYork: De Gruyter, 2004), 29.

<sup>86</sup> Schorch, *Vokale des Gesetzes*, 28-29.

- Crown A., *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts* (TSAJ 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).
- Gesenius W., *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Berlin: Springer, <sup>15</sup>1962).
- Giovannini A., « Rapport de restauration. Pentateuque samaritain 1495-1496 BCU L 2057 » [non publié].
- Gottheil R., « The Dating of Their Manuscripts by the Samaritans », *JBL* 25 (1906), 29-48.
- Himbaza I., « Le Pentateuque samaritain de Fribourg (Suisse) : un premier regard comparatif avec les manuscrits de Dublin et de Sichem », *SEC X* (2017), 111-121.
- Himbaza I. et A. Schenker, « Le Pentateuque samaritain de la Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire de Fribourg (Suisse) L 2057 », *ThZ* 57/2 (2001), 221-222.
- Himbaza I., « Textual readings and challenge of biblical philology. Some cases in Isaiah and Leviticus, » in *Philology and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute held at Fribourg on 10-11 October, 2013* (éd. I. Himbaza et J. Joosten; FAT II 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 117-140.
- Koehler L. et W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Vol. 1: א-ט (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Macuch R., *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch* (StSam 1; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969).
- McCarthy C. (éd.), *Deuteronomy* (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus 1–6. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York [etc.]: Doubleday).
- Péter-Contesse R., *Lévitique 1–16* (CAT IIIa; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1993).
- Pummer R., « The Samaritans in Damascus », in M. Bar-Asher et M. Florentin (éd.), *Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies: Presented to Professor Abraham Tal* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2005), 54\*-76\*.
- Robertson E., « Notes and Extracts from the Semitic Mss. in the John Rylands Library. III. Samaritan Pentateuch Mss. with a description of Two Codices », *BJRL* 21 (1937), 244-272.
- Sadaqa A. et R., *Jewish and Samaritan Versions of the Pentateuch with Particular Stress on the Difference between Both Texts* (Tel Aviv – Jerusalem: Ruven Mas, 1961-1965 [en hébreu]).
- Schorch S., *Die Vokale des Gesetzes. Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora*. Vol. 1: *Das Buch Genesis* (BZAW 339; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 2004).
- Schorch S., « A Critical editio maior of the Samaritan Pentateuch: State of Research, Principles, and Problems », *HeBAI* 2 (2013), 100-120.
- Schorch S. (éd.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).
- Tal A. (éd.), *Genesis* (BHQ 1; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015).
- Tal A. et M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch – The Samaritan version and the Masoretic version* (Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubín Tel Aviv University Press, 2010 [en hébreu]).

- Tal A., *The Samaritan Pentateuch. Edited according the Ms 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 7, Tel-Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School, 1994 [en hébreu]).
- Von Gall A. F. (Hg.), *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914-1918, repr. 1966).
- Zsengellér J. (éd.), *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans: Studies on Bible, History and Linguistics* (StSam 6; SJ 66; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011).

# THE EDITED SEPTUAGINT OF LEVITICUS IS NOT THE SEPTUAGINT: A PLEA FOR A PARADIGM SHIFT

Innocent HIMBAZA

## 1. THE PLACE OF THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF LEVITICUS DISCOVERED AT QUMRAN

Greek manuscripts discovered in the Judean Desert should have a greater impact on Septuagint studies than scholarship has shown until now.

Since the discovery of the Greek manuscript of the Twelve Prophets at Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr), we now know that different recensions of the Septuagint aimed to bring the Greek text into conformity with the Hebrew proto-masoretic text. We also know that this phenomenon is dated in the first century BCE<sup>1</sup>. In my opinion, this manuscript leads to the conclusion that the proto-masoretic text came to be in existence around the end of the second century or at the very beginning of the first century BCE. With the Kaige group, we know, by the Dominique Barthélemy's studies among others, that the type of recension attributed to Theodotion is earlier than the recension of Aquila. The Greek manuscript of Naḥal Ḥever is then of paramount importance to understand the history of the text and of the textual reception of the Greek Old Testament. According to Barthélemy, knowing this was a "découverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante"<sup>2</sup>.

However, it seems to me that other Greek manuscripts from Qumran, especially those of the Pentateuch in general and those of the book of Leviticus in particular, which are often earlier than the manuscript from Naḥal Ḥever, have not yet been fully appreciated<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> P. J. Parsons, "The Scripts and Their Date," in *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8ḤevXIIgr)*, *The Seiyāl collection I* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 19-26; E. Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judean Desert. Indices and An Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 436.

<sup>2</sup> D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953), 18-29 [= D. Barthélemy, *Études d'histoire du texte*, 38-50]; D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien* (VTS X; Leiden: Brill, 1963). For the official edition of this manuscript in the DJD series, see Tov (ed.), *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8ḤevXIIgr)*.

<sup>3</sup> For recent discussions on the original Greek text of Leviticus, see K. De Troyer, "From Leviticus to Joshua: The Old Greek Text in Light of Two Septuagint Manuscripts from the Schøyen Collection," *JAJ* 2 (2011), 29-78; A. Voitila, "Leviticus," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. Aitken; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 43-57.



The Greek manuscripts of the Pentateuch discovered at Qumran are 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>: 4Q119 = Ra 801 (Lev 26:2-16); 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>: 4Q120 = Ra 802 (Lev 2-5); 4QLXXNum 121 = Ra 803 (Nb 3:30-4:14); 7QpapLXXExod: 7Q1 = Ra 805 (Ex 28:4-7); 4QLXXDeut: 4Q122 = Ra 819 (Dt 11:4). The former XQLev<sup>c</sup> or 4Q26<sup>c</sup> is now known as Mur/HevLev (Lev 26:3-9.33-37)<sup>4</sup>.

On the literary and textual level, the posthumous editions of Alfred Rahlfs and the edition of Göttingen by John William Wevers generally consider the Greek manuscripts from Qumran to give evidence of stylistic revisions of the earlier form of the Septuagint. Those manuscripts may reflect a later textual layer compared to that of the great codices such as A, B, F, G, and Papyri such as 809, 859, 931. And this judgment is shared with some later publications<sup>5</sup>.

If a particular Greek manuscript from the Judean Desert can indeed reflect a later layer of the Septuagint, this view should not be applied to the entire group of the Greek manuscripts. In my opinion, this is exactly the paradigm that should be shifted. And in that case, there are substantial consequences.

In this contribution, I would like to restrict myself to the two Greek manuscripts of Leviticus discovered at Qumran. The first one is 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> (= 4Q119 = Ra 801), and is dated to the end of the second century or the beginning of the first century BCE. It contains the text of Lev 26:2-16. The second manuscript is 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> (= 4Q120 = R 802), and is dated to the first century BCE. It contains Lev 1:11–5:25 (6:5 according to an alternative division).

Particular readings of the two Greek manuscripts of Leviticus raise two questions. First, what is the “Septuagint” of Leviticus? Second, what is the Greek text of Leviticus to be edited and why? With those two questions restricted to Leviticus, one should raise a third global one concerning the policy of the edition of the G. This last question points out the necessary choice between two alternate approaches. The first approach is to edit one reference manuscript while variant readings from other manuscripts are collated in a critical apparatus. The second approach is to edit an eclectic text which combines the best readings of different manuscripts, albeit their literary layers.

Firstly, the study of the Greek textual witnesses shows that the Hebrew text underlying the Greek text of the two manuscripts from Qumran was close to

<sup>4</sup> T. Elgvin, K. Davis and M. Langlois (ed.), *Gleanings from the Caves. Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen collection* (LSTS (JSPS) 71; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 159-167. For a different explanation of its variant reading in Lev 26:6, see I. Himbaza, “Leviticus 26:6 in the Mur/HevLev Manuscript,” *RevQ* 31 (2019), 145-152.

<sup>5</sup> See M. Harl, G. Dorival and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiation au Christianisme ancien; Paris: Cerf – Éditions du CNRS, 1994), 120. This book refers especially to the manuscript of the book of Numbers; J. W. Wevers, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” *BIOSCS* 38 (2005), 1-24; N. Petersen, “An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts From Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> in the Light of Previous Studies,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19 (2009), 481-510.

the protomasoretic text. Indeed, as has been observed, the Hebrew text of Leviticus may have achieved stability early in the history of its transmission<sup>6</sup>. Secondly, the two Greek manuscripts of Leviticus are close one each other. Yet, since there are some textual and stylistic differences between them on the one hand, and the great codices and Papyri on the other hand, one wonders what the Septuagint of Leviticus is<sup>7</sup>. Thirdly the textual content of the Greek manuscript of Leviticus is not expanded since those manuscripts are fragmentary<sup>8</sup>. On the one hand, their weakness lies in the fact that they cannot be compared with each other, since each one is the only representative of the text it contains. On the other hand, however, the fact that they have been characterized in the same way constitutes an advantage, since they broaden the spectrum of the textual comparison with other Greek texts such as those of the edited Septuagint.

In the last two decades, some scholars, such as Ulrich, Tov, van der Louw and Himbaza questioned the earlier evaluation of the extant Greek manuscripts of Leviticus<sup>9</sup>. These scholars now consider those Qumran manuscripts as containing the earliest formulation of the Greek text of Leviticus, while the text

<sup>6</sup> Sarianna Metso and Eugene Ulrich suggest the second half of the Second Temple period. See S. Metso and E. Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus. Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 247-268 (267).

<sup>7</sup> I. Himbaza, "Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?," *JSCS* 49 (2016), 22-33.

<sup>8</sup> For the edition of those texts, see P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4, IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 161-186; R. A. Kugler and K. S. Baek, *Leviticus at Qumran. Text and Interpretation* (VTS 173; The Text of the Bible at Qumran; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016), 10-18, 36-37, 40-41, 44.

<sup>9</sup> E. Ulrich, *The Septuagint Manuscript from Qumran: a Reappraisal of Their Value* (SCS 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 49-80; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1999), 165-183; E. Tov, "The Greek Biblical Texts from The Judean Desert," in *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. S. McKendrick, O. A. O'Sullivan; London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 97-122 [= E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran, Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 339-364]; T. A. W. Van der Louw, "Translation and Writing in 4QLXXLev<sup>A</sup>," in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 383-397; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VTS 169; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015), 152-154; I. Himbaza, "What are the Consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> contains earliest formulation of the Septuagint?," in *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen* (ed. S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, M. Sigismund in Verbindung mit M. Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 361; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 294-308; Himbaza, "Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?." See also global presentations of A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Bd. 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 108-110; E. L. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory, Canon, Language, Text* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012), 157-158; K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Second Edition; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 181-199.

reflected in the great codices reflects a later formulation and correction in order to bring it into conformity with the protomasoretic text.

## 2. PARTICULAR READINGS OF MANUSCRIPTS 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> AND 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>

Elsewhere, I have discussed the particular readings of manuscripts 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> (4Q119) and 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> (4Q120), in dialogue with publications of other scholars<sup>10</sup>. I explained my opinion according to which many particular readings of the Greek manuscripts of Leviticus from Qumran are the earliest formulation of the Septuagint we know. Thus, in this contribution, I will not discuss again all the particular readings. Of course, I accept the principle that all the cases do not confirm my opinion, since they are difficult to evaluate. That is why I will take some examples of textual and stylistic differences between Qumran texts and the great codices. Each case is analysed on its own before I look for an overall literary coherence.

The following table shows significant cases in bold, reflecting the priority of the Greek manuscripts from Qumran in comparison with the great Codices. In my opinion, other textual or stylistic differences are not determinative.

### 2.1. 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> versus G-ed

Case Number	Reference	M	4QLXXLev <sup>a</sup>	G-ed Rahlfs and Wevers
1	Lev 26:3-4	מְצוֹתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ וְעִשְׂתֶּם אֹתָם: 4 וְנָתַתִּי	εντ[ολας μου φυλασσησθε 4 και δωσω]	ἐντολάς μου φυλάσσησθε και ποιήσητε αὐτάς, 4 και δώσω
2	<b>Lev 26:4</b>	גְּשִׁמֵּיכֶם	<b>[τον νετον τ]ηι γηι υμων</b>	<b>τὸν ὑετὸν ὑμῖν</b>
3	<b>Lev 26:4</b>	וְעֵץ הַשֵּׁהַי וְיָתוּן :פְּרִיָו	<b>τον ξυλινον καρ [</b>	<b>καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων ἀποδώσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν·</b>
4	<b>Lev 26:5</b>	לְיָשׁ	<b>αμητος</b>	<b>ἀλοητὸς</b>
5	Lev 26:6	וְהָרַב לְאִתְעָבָר :בְּאַרְצְכֶם: (at the end of v. 6).	και πολεμος ου διελευσεται δια της γης υμων (α	και πόλεμος οὐ διελεύσεται διὰ τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν (at

<sup>10</sup> Himbaza, “What are the consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> contains early formulation of the Septuagint?”; Himbaza, “Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?”.

			la fin du verset 6)	the end of v. 5 or at the beginning of v. 6 <sup>11</sup> ).
6	Lev 26:6	מִקְרִיד	[ο] εκφοβων υμας	ὕμᾱς ὁ ἐκφοβῶν
7	Lev 26:8	מִקְמָה	πεντε υμων	ἐξ ὑμῶν πέντε
8	<b>Lev 26:9</b>	וְהָקִימְתִי אֶת־ בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם	<b>[και εσται μο]υ η διαθηκη εν υμιν</b>	<b>καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν.</b>
9	Lev 26:10	מִפְּגִי הַדָּשׁ תִּזְיִאוּ:	[εξοισετ]ε μετα των νεων	ἐκ προσώπου νέων ἐξοίσετε
10	<b>Lev 26:11</b>	תִּגְעַל נַפְשִׁי	<b>βδελυξομαι</b>	<b>βδελύζεται ἡ ψυχή μου</b>
11	Lev 26:12	וְהִתְלַחֲתִי בְּתוֹכְכֶם וְהִייתִי לְכֶם לְאֱלֹהִים	και εσομ[αι]	καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός,
12	<b>Lev 26:12</b>	לִי לְעָם:	<b>μοι εθνος</b>	<b>μου λαός.</b>
13	Lev 26:13	מִטְּבַלְעֵי	τον ζυγον το[υ δεσμου]	τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ ζυγοῦ
14	Lev 26:14	הַמְצִיחַתְּךָ	προσταγματα μου	τὰ προστάγματά μου ταῦτα,
15	Lev 26:15	מִשְׁפָּטִי	[προστα]γμιασι μου	κρίμασίν μου
16	Lev 26:15	אֲפָרְאֶה	α[λλα ωστε διασκεδασαι ?]	ὥστε

## 2.2. 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> versus G-ed

Case Number	Reference	M	4Q papLXXLev <sup>b</sup>	G-ed Rahlfs	G-ed Wevers
1	Lev 2:4	תָּבֹר	εν κλιβαν]ωι	ἐν κλιβάνω, δῶρον κυρίω	ἐν κλιβάνω
2	<b>Lev 2:5</b>	בְּלוֹלָה	<b>πεφυραμ]ενης</b>	<b>πεφυραμένη</b>	
3	<b>Lev 3:4</b>	עַל	<b>απο</b>	<b>ἐπὶ</b>	

<sup>11</sup> Manuscripts A and corrections of B contain the same sentence twice, at the end of v. 5 (Wevers) or at the beginning of v. 6 (Rahlfs) and at the end of v. 6. The French translation of the Bible d'Alexandrie keeps the two occurrences. See P. Harlé and D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique: Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, introduction et notes* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988), 205.

4	Lev 3:11	חֶסֶם	οσμ εν  ευωδίας	ὄσμη εὐωδίας	
5	Lev 3:12	יְהוָה	Ι αω	κυρίου	
6	Lev 3:14	לַיהוָה	Τω[ι Ιαω	κυρίω, [τω κυριω Mss]	
7	Lev 4:4	וַהֲבִיא	και εισαξ[ει	καὶ προσάξει	
8	Lev 4:6	שְׁבַע פְּעָמִים	επτακις τωι] δακτυλοι = Smr : שב פעמים באצבעו	ἑπτάκις	ἑπτάκις τῷ δακτύλῳ
9	Lev 4:7	הַעֲלֶה	της[ καρ]π[ω]σεως	τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων,	
10	Lev 4:18	אֲשֶׁר	των τ [	τῶν πρὸς	Τοῦ ὄντος πρὸς
11	Lev 4:27	יְהוָה	Ιαω	κυρίου	
12	Lev 4:27	לֹא־ תַעֲשֶׂה	ου ποιηθησεται	ἢ οὐ ποιηθήσεται,	
13	Lev 4:27	וְאִשֶׁם	πλημελησησι	πλημμελήση,	
14	Lev 4:28	תַעֲשֶׂה	Χι]μαιρον	χίμαιραν	
15	Lev 5:9	חַטָּאת	αμαρτιας	ἁμαρτίας	ἁμαρτία <sup>12</sup>
16	Lev 5:10	וְכִפֹּר עָלָיו	και ἐξι]λάσεται[αι	και ἐξιλάσεται	Και ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ <sup>13</sup>
17	Lev 5:18	דָּע	]δηι	ἦδει	
18	Lev 5:21 (6:2)	בַּיהוָה	εις τ[ον Ιαω	τὴς ἐντολᾶς κυρίου	
19	Lev 5:21 (6:2)	עָשָׂה	ηδικη]κεν	ἠδίκησέν	

In order to elucidate my point of view, I briefly discuss some cases from both manuscripts dealing with textual and stylistic differences.

<sup>12</sup> Later, Wevers apologized and wrote that one should read ἁμαρτίας in agreement with Rahlfs. The lemma refers to the sin offering (purification offering) not to the sin itself. Wevers, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” 7.

<sup>13</sup> Wevers would now read the same text as Rahlfs. He accepted the short reading. Wevers, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” 7.

– 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>: Lev 26:9; 26:12

In Lev 26:9, the two Greek texts are really different only on the stylistic level, since they seem to come from the same Hebrew text. 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> reads: [καὶ ἐστὶ μο]σ ἡ διαθήκη ἐν ὑμῖν (and my covenant will be in you) while G-ed reads: καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν (and I will establish my covenant with you). The common Hebrew Vorlage which corresponds to M is: וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם (and I will establish my covenant with you). Parallel or close texts in M and G-ed are found in Gen 6:18; 9:9.11; 17:7.19.21; Exod 6:4 and Lev 26:11, while a very literal Hebrew retroversion of the reading of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> would be כּחַם בְּרִיתִי בְּכֶם (cf. Gen 17:13). It is difficult to imagine that the version of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> may have corrected the literal version known in G-ed, because it does not improve the style of this later. Thus, compared to the version of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>, that of G-ed is the latest.

In Lev 26:12, the textual variant is ideological, since the word λαός of G-ed was used in a second step in order to designate the people of Israel, while the word ἔθνος was used for other nations. Therefore, it is more logical to think that the word ἔθνος used to designate the people of Israel in 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> was used prior to the word λαός used in G-ed. A correction in the opposite direction is unlikely, especially if the Hebrew original word is עַם, as is certainly the case in this verse.

– 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>: Lev 3:12; 4:27 and 4:6

In Lev 3:12 and 4:27, the reading Ιαω of 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>, instead of κύριος of G-ed is intriguing. In any case, it is difficult to introduce the word Ιαω in a textual tradition which may have already adopted the word κύριος. As is the case for ἔθνος and λαός, the use of κύριος is also ideological, since it aimed to replace the tetragrammaton יהוה, while Ιαω is a transliteration of the same name<sup>14</sup>. One should recall however that, although this case is the most well known in 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>, one should not neglect the other variant readings in the same manuscript.

In Lev 4:6, the reading επτακις τωι] δακτυλωι (seven times with the finger) of 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> refers explicitly to the finger, while M does not contain that word. However, this reading is in agreement with the Samaritan Pentateuch (Smr) שבע פעמים באצבעו. It seems unlikely that a revision may have introduced such a word if it was not contained in M. Contrary to this, it is likely that an omission of a word may have occurred in a second step, if the aim was to bring the Greek text close to the Hebrew of M. As a consequence of this obser-

<sup>14</sup> The way the name of God appears in the Dead Sea scrolls is still debated. See G. M. Eidsvåg, "The Paleo-Hebrew Tetragram in 8HevXIIgr," *JSCS* 46 (2013), 86-100.

vation, it should be noted that the earliest formulation of G was closer to the Samaritan Pentateuch than G-ed shows it, at least in the Rahlfs' edition.

The current global picture of G-ed as being literal, close to M, ideological, and representing a standardized text is far from the real profile of the Greek translator. In my opinion, we should revise this evaluation in order to recover the real profile of the translator of Leviticus. The two Greek manuscripts from Qumran, 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> and 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>, which contain the earliest formulation of the Septuagint of Leviticus, are the best candidates to reflect the profile of the translator of that book. The translation technique was free and the translator avoided semitisms. The terminology he chose was less ideological and less standardized. This does not exclude any ideological approach in his translation, since in Lev 3:11 he clearly avoided, on ideological grounds we may suppose, the notion that God should receive "bread". The other aspect of the translation I pointed out is that it was closer to the Samaritan Pentateuch than the actual edited Septuagint (Rahlfs). Thus, the literal aspect, the word by word technique of translation of the edited Septuagint<sup>15</sup> are the result of a later recension. Therefore, although the two Greek manuscripts of Leviticus from Qumran are fragmentary, they allow us to recover the closest and the earliest text of the Septuagint, as well as the earliest profile of the translator.

### 3. THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN, THE EDITIONS OF RAHLFS AND WEVERS AND THE QUESTION OF ECLECTICISM

The two recent editions of G, that of Rahlfs and that of Wevers, are eclectic. In a general way, the principle of eclectic editions is to choose the best readings from the best manuscripts and where it is possible from the earliest manuscripts. In the case of the two editions, the evaluation of the manuscripts and the application of the principle of eclecticism sometimes led them to choose readings from different manuscripts, including manuscripts with different literary layers.

For instance, in Lev 4:6, Wevers preferred the reading *ἐπτάκις τῷ δακτύλῳ* (seven times with his finger) of 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> against *ἐπτάκις* (seven times) in the edition of Rahlfs, knowing that this latter reading is in agreement with M. After the publication of his edition, Wevers conceded that he would prefer further readings from Qumran against the great codices such as in Lev 5:9.10 and 26:5.

<sup>15</sup> See a nuanced point in Metso and Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," 247-268.

In the case of Lev 26:5, Wevers recognized that the reading of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> ἄμητος (harvest) represents the original Greek<sup>16</sup>. He would now choose it, against ἄλοητος (threshing) which nevertheless better renders the Hebrew תִּשְׁׁ found in M. When the Greek translator used the word ἄμητος, he made an approximate translation. Thus, coming back to this translation would mean choosing a bad translation even though it is the earliest version. In such a case limited to the philological aspect in Greek, the choice of a different word would not be so damaging. However, an ideological case would be otherwise more problematic.

Let us take the example of Lev 26:12 concerning the words λαός and ἔθνος. In his *Notes*<sup>17</sup>, Wevers has recognized that now he would read ἔθνος, since it represents the earliest reading. However, in a more recent publication, he expressed a doubt and he preferred to avoid changing the choice of Rahlfs (Ziegler may have told him: “in a case of doubt don’t change Rahlfs”)<sup>18</sup>.

Let us recall that this reading is ideological, since the word λαός was progressively restricted to the people of Israel while the word ἔθνος was used for the other nations. Thus, if an editor chooses the lemma ἔθνος, which represents the earliest reading, he would surely come back to the state of the text before its ideological standardization. Such an approach would however lead to a deadlock. Indeed, some specific words reflect an overall literary and ideological coherence which corresponds to a single text. If one introduces ἔθνος in the text of the codices, one should as well restore the earlier style which was used together with it. The problem is that we have only some small scraps of that style, since the text is fragmentary.

To come back to the case of Lev 26:9 in 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> which is stylistically different from the text of the codices, what would one do for an edition of G? Would one choose the earliest free style of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> in this verse and continue with a literal style of the codices in the other verses where 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> is lacking?

It seems to me that one should avoid taking a word, a verbal form, a preposition or a complete phrase from a given manuscript and integrating it in a text reflecting a different literary style, even when this word, verbal form, preposition or phrase is earlier.

In my opinion, mixing styles and terminologies from different manuscripts, such as those from Qumran on the one hand and the great codices on the other hand, should be avoided since they in fact represent different texts. One should not edit ἔθνος in an edition of G, even though one knows that there is a case in

<sup>16</sup> Wevers, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” 3.

<sup>17</sup> J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SCS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 443.

<sup>18</sup> Wevers, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” 4.



Lev 26:12, where ἔθνος is earlier than the λαός of the codices. We do not know to which extent the word ἔθνος was distributed in the earliest Greek text of Leviticus or in the whole Pentateuch before it was replaced by λαός.

The Greek manuscripts of Leviticus studied in this contribution witness that literary and stylistic corrections were made to bring the Greek text into conformity with the protomasoretic Hebrew text. The revision went from the less literal, less standardized and less ideological texts, reflected in the Greek texts from Qumran, to the texts closer to the Protomasoretic and reflecting late standardisations. The Greek great codices represent this second step.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

1) Recent studies on the two Greek manuscripts of Leviticus from Qumran, 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> and 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>, should lead scholars, and this is my plea, to accept that they reflect the earliest formulation of the text of G we know.

2) The edited Septuagint of Leviticus is not the Septuagint. This conclusion leads accordingly to the second one, that a profile of the translator of Leviticus, based only on the edited Greek text, is not an accurate profile.

3) If we agree that the Greek manuscripts from Qumran are the earliest representative of the Septuagint of Leviticus currently known, another question is raised in the immediate aftermath: What text then is to be edited? Unfortunately fragments from Qumran do not allow us to edit a text within the literary layer they reflect. Thus, in my opinion, one should continue downstream until one finds the earliest text which can be edited as a whole.

4) Although the edited Greek text of Leviticus is not the earliest text of the Septuagint, it nevertheless represents the actual text to be edited. This text can be compared and improved on the basis of similar manuscripts. A corrupted reading can of course be corrected on the basis of an earlier manuscript, since an obvious corruption attests the earlier reading which is not corrupted.

5) In order to produce an edition however, one should not integrate particular readings from earlier texts such as those of the two Greek manuscripts from Qumran, since they reflect a different literary layer, and so to say a different text. Such readings should find their place in the apparatus.

6) In order to draw up the profile of the Greek translator, one should not use the complete and current edited text but the earliest one even though it is fragmentary. This means that the complete profile of the translator of the book of Leviticus is not yet recovered.

7) A distinction should be made between, on the one hand, the establishment of an edition based on a complete text, and on the other hand the search for the earliest readings of the Greek textual tradition. This second aspect

would not aim to produce an edition unless enough coherent data are found. Thus, over time, with the progress of research, it will be possible to go upstream in the direction of the archetype and change reference texts to be used for an edition of the Septuagint. Having written this, I agree with Dominique Barthélemy whose suggestion is to distinguish between Reconstructive Textual Criticism (RTC), which would lead to an edition, a text to be read, and Genetic Textual Analysis (GTA), which would look for the earliest readings but would not necessary lead to establishing an edition<sup>19</sup>.

### References

- Barthélemy D., “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” *RB* 60 (1953), 18-29.
- Barthélemy D., *Les devanciers d’Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d’une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l’influence du rabbinat palestinien* (VTS X; Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ezéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO 50/3; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).
- Barthélemy D., *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament. An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* (Textual Criticism and the Translator 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012).
- De Troyer K., “From Leviticus to Joshua: The Old Greek Text in Light of Two Septuagint Manuscripts from the Schøyen Collection,” *JAJ* 2 (2011), 29-78.
- Eidsvåg G. M., “The Paleo-Hebrew Tetragram in 8HevXIIgr,” *JSCS* 46 (2013), 86-100.
- Elgvin T., K. Davis and M. Langlois (ed.), *Gleanings from the Caves. Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen collection* (LSTS (JSPS) 71; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 159-167.
- Gallagher E. L., *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory, Canon, Language, Text* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012), 157-158.
- Harl M., G. Dorival and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiation au Christianisme ancien; Paris: Cerf – Éditions du CNRS, 1994).
- Harlé P. and D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, introduction et notes* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988).

<sup>19</sup> D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ezéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO 50/3; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) [= D. Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament. An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* (Textual Criticism and the Translator 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012)].

- Himbaza I., "Leviticus 26:6 in the Mur/HevLev Manuscript," *RevQ* 31 (2019), 145-152.
- Himbaza I., "Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?," *JSCS* 49 (2016), 22-33.
- Himbaza I., "What are the Consequences if 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> contains earliest formulation of the Septuagint?," in *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen* (ed. S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, M. Sigismund in Verbindung mit M. Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 361; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 294-308.
- Jobes K. H. and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Second Edition; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 181-199.
- Kugler R. A. and K. S. Baek, *Leviticus at Qumran. Text and Interpretation* (VTS 173; The Text of the Bible at Qumran; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016).
- Lange A., *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Bd. 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Metso S. and E. Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus. Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTS 93; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003), 247-268.
- Parsons P. J., "The Scripts and Their Date," in *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr), The Seiyâl collection I* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 19-26.
- Petersen N., "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts From Qumran: 4QLXXNum And 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> in the Light of Previous Studies," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19 (2009), 481-510.
- Skehan P. W., E. Ulrich and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 161-186.
- Tov E. (ed), *The Texts from the Judean Desert. Indices and An Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).
- Tov E., "The Greek Biblical Texts from The Judean Desert", in *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. S. McKendrick, O. A. O'Sullivan; London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 97-122.
- Tov E., *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran, Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
- Ulrich E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VTS 169; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015), 152-154.
- Ulrich E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans; Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill Academic Publishers, 1999), 165-183.
- Ulrich E., *The Septuagint Manuscript from Qumran: a Reappraisal of Their Value* (SCS 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 49-80.
- Van der Louw T. A. W., "Translation and Writing in 4QLXXLev<sup>A</sup>," in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 383-397.
- Voitila A., "Leviticus," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. Aitken; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 43-57.

Wevers J. W., "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 38 (2005), 1-24.

Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SCS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).



# THE NATURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS<sup>1</sup>

Moshe A. ZIPOR

## 1. BACKGROUND

In contrast with the current tradition of naming the five parts of the Pentateuch by their opening words, namely “In the Beginning”, “Names”, “And He Called” etc.,<sup>2</sup> under another system, both in Jewish and non-Jewish literature the five Volumes bear a title which signifies their main contents. Most LXX manuscripts use the name Λευιτικόν, although Βιβλίον Λευιτικόν is also used. Among scores of manuscripts, Ms B is considered the best manuscript, but needs to be emended occasionally. The best editions of GL are Rahlfs<sup>3</sup> and the Göttingen edition,<sup>4</sup> on which see Wevers, *Text History*<sup>5</sup> and *Notes*.<sup>6</sup> Additional comments in Zipor, “The Greek Version”.<sup>7</sup>

Although we cannot know for certain how the Greek translation of Leviticus (hereinafter: “GL”) and those of the books of the Pentateuch in general came about,<sup>8</sup> including the question of this having been team work or that of a single translator, one may nevertheless assume the following:

The translator of Leviticus would have had at his disposal the translation tradition of other works, the synagogal tradition of oral reading, and probably a written translation of parts of the Pentateuch.

GL contains the same type of Greek as the other Torah translations. The translation is moderately literal, seeking to retain the sentence structure, word

<sup>1</sup> An elaborated version of the entry M. Zipor, “Leviticus, LXX,” in *The Textual History of the Bible*, Vol. 1: E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew Bible* 2.4.1.3 (in press).

<sup>2</sup> בראשית, שמות, ויקרא – respectively.

<sup>3</sup> A. Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta* I-II, Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

<sup>4</sup> J. W. Wevers, *Leviticus* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gotttingensis editum, II,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

<sup>5</sup> J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

<sup>6</sup> J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SCS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).

<sup>7</sup> M. A. Zipor, “The Greek Version of Leviticus,” *Biblica* 79 (1998), 551-562.

<sup>8</sup> The different narratives in the various works starting from the Letter of Aristeas up to rabbinical literature are no more than the legendary attire of a translation that was canonised and accepted in Jewish, followed by Christian circles. This is also evidenced by the attribution of the Torah Greek translation project to “seventy elders” or “seventy-two” – a typological number (cf e.g. Num 11:16, 24-25) certainly not an historical fact.

order, and word choice of the Hebrew text in a fashion usually described as Hebraistic, as would have been acceptable to those living in the cultural milieu in which the translation was produced – the characterisation of this as “Greek words with a Hebrew meaning” is appropriate here.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. STANDARD EQUIVALENTS

Certain standard equivalents developed, such as κύριος (lord, master) for the Tetragrammaton followed by V *dominus* and S מריא, reflecting its pronunciation in daily life in Jewish circles as אדני (“master”),<sup>10</sup> it is the only divine name occurring in Leviticus. אלהים is naturally rendered ó θεός. Similarly, תורה is νόμος. GL uses the Aramaic equivalents σάββατα and πάσχα for שבת and פסח (no connection with the verb פסח – whatever this may mean). Several stereotyped equivalents are also used in the other books of the Pentateuch, e.g. ברית (“covenant, alliance”) is rendered διαθήκη, and such is the usage of this Greek word in NT as well.<sup>11</sup> גר is rendered προσήλυτος (“he who approaches”), the sole equivalent in GL. GL strictly keeps παροικός only for תושב, in its entire semantic range.<sup>12</sup> נפש is translated stereotypically as ψυχή even when used as “someone” (2:1; 4:2 etc.), or as “a dead body” (e.g. 21:1; 22:4).

In the Septuagint אדם is normally rendered ἄνθρωπος (and similarly איש, unless it refers to a male and is rendered ἀνήρ), even when used as “someone,” while איש איש is rendered ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος (17:2, 8).<sup>13</sup> פנים is currently rendered πρόσωπον even when part of the colloquialism נשא פנים (“favour”); thus in 19:15 לא תשא פני דל - GL οὐ λήμψη πρόσωπον πτωχοῦ (lit.: “you shall not accept (lift up?) the face of a pauper”). זרע (“semen”) is rendered customarily as σπέρμα, also when used as “offspring” (20:2; 22:4 etc.). Κοίτη (“bed”) is the equivalent of משכב e.g. 15:4, 5 (the root שכב denotes “to lie down”, with its wide semantic range); in 20:13 (in plur.) it denotes sexual intercourse (also in non-biblical Greek). Hebrew זרע שכבת (“ejaculation of semen”) in 15:17 and in 19:20 (“sexual intercourse”) is rendered as κοίτη σπέρματος (“laying of semen”).

<sup>9</sup> E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version* (VTS 72; Leiden: Brill 1999), 249.

<sup>10</sup> See bPesahim 50a: “The Holy One, blessed be He, said, ‘I (my name) am (is) not pronounced as written – I am written with *yod he* (YHWH) but pronounced *alef dalet* (ADNY).’”

<sup>11</sup> In Common Greek: “will”, “testimony”.

<sup>12</sup> In other Pentateuch books παροικός (“he who dwells with”) is also used for גר, probably in line with the context. It is also sometimes used for תושב.

Adherence to the stereotypical equivalent may on occasion go quite far, see Exod 23:9: “You know the ψυχή of the προσήλυτος, because you were yourselves προσήλυτοι in the land of Egypt”.

<sup>13</sup> However in 19:3, 11 the translation is functional: ἐκάστος – “any individual”.

Combinations of root and conjugated forms, extremely common in scripture, are rendered by GL as two words with the same stem – sometimes in the verbal form and the noun in the dative. Thus for example ‘מות יומת’ (20:2 etc.) is translated as θανάτω θανατούσθω (literally: ‘shall be made dead by killing’). The translation sometimes uses two verbs: דרש דרש (10:16) is rendered as ζητῶν ἐξεζήτησεν (evidently reading דרש דרש).<sup>14</sup> The effort to achieve word-for-word translation is evident.<sup>15</sup>

The following is quite intriguing: The Greek word νόμφη means bride, with derivatives indicating groom, wedding, best man etc., being therefore the normal Greek translation of “כֵּלֶה”. In OT the term “כֵּלֶה” is also used for “son’s wife”; however, wherever this is the intended interpretation of “כֵּלֶה” (e.g. Gen 11:31; Lev 18:15, 20:12), it is translated by νόμφη, and the same usage is also found later in the New Testament, even though “daughter-in-law” is *not* one of the meanings of the Greek term. It transpires that among the Jews of Alexandria the word νόμφη served in everyday language for both of the different meanings of the Hebrew term “כֵּלֶה”, which is how it crept into the translation; this said, a reader not conversant with the cultural milieu of Egyptian Jewry would find the XII for Gen 38:11,24 referring to Judah’s νόμφη odd – and the same goes for Naomi and her two νόμφαι (Ruth 1:7).

GL usually presents a moderate literal translation, but there are exceptions. For example, בית אביה, 22:13 is idiomatically translated as τὸν οἶκον τὸν πατρικόν, “her paternal home”. The idiom מלא את ידו (21:10, meaning “appointed”; lit.: “fill in his hand”) is rendered τετελειωμένου (“accomplished”; other Greek words of the same stem are used for מילואים, תמים etc.), ignoring the word יד. At 8:33, however, for ימלא את ידכם GL has τελειώσει τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν. That is how the Hebrew idiom is rendered in Exod 29:29 etc. It is never used for the verb מלא or the adjective מלא.<sup>16</sup>

### 3. GL AS EXEGETE

It is almost a commonplace that translation is also a form of exegesis. This goes beyond the choice of the appropriate target language word to represent the word in the source language, because sometimes the translator diverges to a slight or great extent from the original text in order to make the sense clearer. Translations are generally classified along a scale that ranges from the (overly)

<sup>14</sup> Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 249

<sup>15</sup> In contrast with modern translations attempting to render such expressions in a roundabout manner, e.g. “He shall surely put to death.”

<sup>16</sup> Hatch and Redpath Concordance (p. 1343) is wrong in bringing such cases under מלא rather than under יד מלא.



literal, which tries to maintain a word-for-word correspondence, a fixed rendering of a particular word or phrase, and even the source word order, at one extreme; to those that are so free as to be paraphrases.

GL can be classed as a moderately literal translation. The translator does not hew to strict consistency, however, and sometimes deviates from this principle.

There are standard words that GL does not trouble to render in Greek exactly the same way each time they appear, but chooses one possibility from the basket of available options; in other cases, though, it does hold to a strictly consistent word choice.

#### 4. RARE HEBREW WORDS

Frequently the translator has to cope with unique or rare words, such as the names of animals in Chapter 11. In some cases, their identification posed a difficulty for the talmudic sages, too. We do not know which of the words used by GL accord with some exegetical tradition and which are simply guesses. It is possible that study groups in the community were not meticulous about specific identifications and were content with “a kind of bird,” “a kind of vermin,” and so on. The same applies to the blemishes that disqualify members of the priestly caste from serving at the altar (21:17-21) and those that render animals unfit as sacrifices (22:22-14), some of them *hapax legomenoi*. Some of GL’s solutions accord with those in the rabbinic literature. Others are inventive. For example, it turns קרן (22:22) into γλωσσότμητον (“severed tongue”), evidently under the influence of Exod. 11:7 “not a dog will sharpen (יהרץ) its tongue.”

The matter is different when it comes to terms related to the sacrificial altar. These are not unique words. They are usually rendered the same way as in other books of the Bible, using words that are not necessarily associated with the Hebrew verb derived from the same root. Some of the Hebrew words have a standard or almost standard equivalent in the LXX, including GL. Thus, קרבן is rendered by δῶρον (not connected with the verb הקריב קרב, which is rendered προσφέρω). δῶρον is also used for חם (only when referring to God, 21:6) and אֶשָׁה שְׁלָמִים is σωτήρια. מנחה as an offering (as distinct from a secular donation) is κάρπωμα (“fruit-offering”). חטאת (“sin”) is ἁμαρτία, and the offering for expiation of the sin, *περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*.<sup>17</sup> Similarly שם אשם as both “guilt” and “guilt offering” is translated indiscriminately by πλημμελεία, “error” or

<sup>17</sup> See D. Büchner, “A Cultic Term (ἁμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century B.C.E. until New Testament,” *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 1-17.

περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (“<offer> for the sin”), e.g. 7:1 [6:25]. הָלַע is ὀλοκάρπωσις and ὀλοκαύτωμα (“burnt-offering”).<sup>18</sup>

## 5. CONTEXTUAL RENDERINGS

Several words or phrases are rendered in differing manners, depending on their contexts. Thus, the phrase פָּרַעַת־שָׂרָא (“uncover” + “head”)<sup>19</sup> in the context of the priests’ mourning customs is translated in 10:6; 21:10 as ἀποκιδάρωω (“removal of the κίδαρις, ‘head covering’ of the Priests”). However in 13:45, in connection with the leper, it is rendered as ἀκάλυπτος (“uncovered”).<sup>20</sup> The latter translation may reflect customs practised in the translator’s environment.

Of particular interest is the treatment of פֶּהַח (“edge”) appearing six times in Leviticus. Unlike Exod-LXX, which always uses κλίτος (“edge”, “border”), GL uses differing and unusual equivalents: 19:9 הַפֶּהַח (“the edge of your field”) / τὸν θερισμὸν ὑμῶν τοῦ ἀγροῦ (“the harvest of your field”). The translator does not reflect the meaning “edge”, “border” for פֶּהַח – note the translation in the parallel passage 23:22: τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ θερισμοῦ τοῦ ἀγροῦ σου (“the remainder of the harvest of your field”).<sup>21</sup> In v. 27a it is rendered by an enigmatic noun σισόη,<sup>22</sup> and in v. 27b and 21.5 it is rendered contextually: “the appearance (of your beard)”.

Each of the three occurrences of כְּלָאִים in 19:19 is rendered differently: (a) ἑτεροζύγω (“with a different species”) with reference to the breeding of one’s cattle; (b) διάφορον (“different”, “mixed”) with reference to a vineyard (MT: “your field”), cf. the parallel in Dt. 22:9 MT and LXX (with the same rendering of כְּלָאִים);<sup>23</sup> (c) as ἐκ δύο ὑφασμένον (“woven-of-two”) κίβδηλον (“false”)

<sup>18</sup> See S. Daniel, *Vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Études et commentaires 61; Paris: Klincksieck, 1966); P. Harlé and D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 3; Paris: Cerf, 1988); Wevers, *Notes*, 484-87; D. Büchner, “Some Reflections on Writing a Commentary on the Septuagint of Leviticus,” in *Translation is Required: The Septuagint – Retrospect and Project* (ed. R. Hiebert and J. V. Hiebert; SCS 56; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2010), 107-117.

<sup>19</sup> The exact significance of the root פָּרַע, especially in connection with “the head”, is disputed.

<sup>20</sup> Similarly in Num 5:18 referring to the deviant woman.

<sup>21</sup> Some scholars contend that the LXX interpretation reflects rabbinic halacha: Z. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Joh. Ambr. Barth, 1851 [repr. Westmead 1972]), 153; L. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948 [repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1987]), 105-106. However it seems that the translator avoided the exact rendering of פֶּהַח.

<sup>22</sup> A hapax with unknown meaning. See LSJ *sub voce*; Wevers, *Notes*, 306-307; Frankel, *Einfluss*, 151-152 suggests that it is a corrupted form of מַצְצָה (lock) of the head; cf. Ezek 8:3.

<sup>23</sup> Similarly in Deut 22:9; see below.

referring to a garment of כלאים,<sup>24</sup> undoubtedly under the influence of Deut 22:11 (נטעש, LXX κίβδηλον).

At 23:11 MT reads: “On the day after the שבת the priest shall raise it up.” Notwithstanding the stereotypic rendering of *σάββατα* here GL renders: “the day after *the first*,” which fits the Pharisees’ *halacha*, meaning “the day after the first day of Passover” – in contrast with the Sadducees, who take it literally as the day after Saturday (see bMenachot 65a).<sup>25</sup> At verses 15-16 MT has: “And from the day after the שבת...you shall count off seven whole שבועות, you shall count until the day after the seventh שבת.” GL “seven whole *weeks*...until the day after the seventh *week*.” Cf. Deut 16:9-10.<sup>26</sup>

In 21:12 the same word שִׁמְרָה appears twice, but rendered differently: וְשִׁמְרָה נֶאֱמַר לֹא שִׁמְרָה גַּם לֹא שִׁמְרָה GL ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται; and וְשִׁמְרָה נֶאֱמַר לֹא שִׁמְרָה גַּם לֹא שִׁמְרָה GL καὶ οὐ βεβηλώσει τὸ ἡγιασμένον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ. Is it only for the sake of variety? Does the translator interpret each occurrence differently?<sup>27</sup>

## 6. UNIQUE EXPRESSIONS

In the translation of rare expressions, GL was probably guided either by an exegetical tradition or by context. Thus, אֵלִים, found only twice in the Pentateuch, is contextually rendered by χειροποίητα (“artifices”) in 26:1 and by εἰδῶλα in 19:4 (“silhouettes”; see also Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1:25-26).<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, there are words with more than a single Greek equivalent, and used indiscriminately, e.g. אֱלֹהִים is usually rendered λαός, but also ἔθνος.

<sup>24</sup> The exact meaning and etymology of נטעש is unclear.

<sup>25</sup> Similarly Philo, *Spec. Leg.* II 162. See Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel 1841), 190-191; id., *Einfluss*, 137-138; P. Harlé and D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique*, 189.

<sup>26</sup> At the beginning of verse 15, however, GL renders “the day after the *σάββατα*”, possibly indicating that the *halachic*-compatible rendering was inserted later as a correction, albeit less than rigorously.

<sup>27</sup> GL is translated variously; Lancelot Lee Brenton (1844): “He shall not go forth out of the *sanctuary* and he shall not profane the *sanctuary* of his god.” Harlé-Pralon (*La Bible d’Alexandrie*): “Il ne sortira pas de *l’espace saint* et il ne profanera pas *l’espace sanctifié* de son Dieu.” Büchner (*NETS*): “He shall not *depart* from the *holy things* and he shall not profane *what is consecrated* belonging to his God.” Wevers (*Notes*, 338) conjectures that the plural ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων refers to the two sections of the sanctuary. By contrast, the second שִׁמְרָה in 21:12 is rendered in the singular – τὸ ἡγιασμένον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ – referring to only one of its courts (though it is not clear which). Wevers notes that this resembles the rendering in 20:3b<sub>1</sub>, where שִׁמְרָה מִקְדָּשׁ (למען שמא את) is the plural τὰ ἅγια μου. As for 20:3 he concludes, “The translator may well have read שִׁמְרָה as a passive participle.” (Does this comment refer to 21:12 or 20:3?)

<sup>28</sup> אֱלֹהִים, 26:30 and תְּרִים, Gen 31:19 are translated by the same equivalent.

## 7. TEXT CRITICAL VALUE

GL reflects numerous readings (variants) in minor details deviating from MT: (a) pluses and minuses; (b) different word order; (c) different words. Some of these involve an adaptation to parallel passages. It is no easy task to determine whether a deviation from MT in the LXX reflects a Hebrew variant or the translator's style or exegesis. For example, in case of differences in grammatical categories such as sing/pl and different pronoun forms. However, some such variants are supported by other ancient witnesses, including Hebrew texts such as SamP and biblical or non-biblical DSS. For example 20:17 MT "he shall bear his iniquity"; GL V S "they shall bear iniquity", applying to "a man and his sister". In cases of harmonization scholars differ as to whether they should be attributed to the Greek translator or his *Vorlage*. When the harmonization refers to a remote location, it is more likely that it was already present in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

GL 19:19 "your vineyard" (as against MT "your field") certainly reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage*, rather than a halakhic interpretation;<sup>29</sup> see כרמך in the parallel passage Dt 22:9;<sup>30</sup> also cf. MMT (4Q396) where in this law of prohibited mixture both words appear.<sup>31</sup>

## 8. DIFFERENT VOCALIZATION

Sometimes GL reflects a different vocalization. Thus in 20:6 MT אתו מקרב עמו, GL αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς (probably: אַתָּה מִקְרַב עַמָּה), originally עַמָּה אַתָּה, transformed to a later customary spelling עמו ואתו. Similarly 22:28 אתו ואת בנו, referring to the prohibition to slaughter a bull or lamb together with its offspring on the same day; GL αὐτὴν καὶ τὰ παῖδια αὐτῆς referring to a female, a

<sup>29</sup> Thus Frankel, *Einfluss*, 156.

<sup>30</sup> The functionally parallel words שדה and כרם are often interchangeable; cf. Judg. 9:27: וַיִּצְאוּ הַשְּׂדֵה וַיִּבְצְרוּ אֶת-כַּרְמֵיהֶם וַיִּדְרְכוּ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ הַלְלוּלִים (for הַלְלוּלִים see Lev. 19:24).

<sup>31</sup> MMT combines readings both of Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:9-11: "And concerning [מתו] בְּלֹאִים ('mate') לְרֵבֵעָה, and concerning his clothes [it is written that they should not] be שְׁעֵטָנִי and he must not [בְּרֵמִי בְּלֹאִים]." *ibid.*

Given that the prohibition on mixing animal species here refers to breeding rather than plowing, it is clearly a restatement of Lev 19:19 rather than of the parallel in Deut 22:10. Similarly at 4Q418 f. 103: "With your own cargo do not mix with which is [thy associate's?], lest it form בְּלֹאִים like a mule, and lest you become as בְּעַמֵּר וּבְכַשְׁתִּים [לֹבֵשׁ שְׁעֵטָנִי] and lest thy toil be like זֹרַע בְּלֹאִים אשר הזרע והמלאה חור/ש/ בשור ובח/מ/ר יחדו" (cf. Deut 22: 9-11 and Lev 19:19, where referring to mixed mating, the product of which is the fruitless mule). See *DSS XXXIV*, pp. 329-334 (underlined: words reading both in Lev and Deut; **bold + italic**: expression appearing only in Deut).

cow or a ewe (compatible with the *halacha*),<sup>32</sup> rather than to a male. Here again an ancient reading בנה ואת אלה was vocalized by GL as a feminine suffix, whereas the pre-MT vocalization בנה ואת אלה was later written as אתו, בנו.

## 9. ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURE OF PHRASE

In several references the Hebrew phrase is probably reconstructed in GL. In 20:25 תרמש האדמה ובכל אשר תרמש האדמה (“the earth” is the subject and the predicate is תרמש), GL ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς (≈ תרמש האדמה).

## 10. HARMONIZATION?

19:6 באש ישרף, GL ἐὰν καταλειφθῆ ἕως ἡμέρας τρίτης, ἐν πυρὶ κατακαυθήσεται (≈ ואם יותר ביום השלישי וואם יתר ביום השלישי; Cf. Exod. 29:34 וְשָׂרַפְתָּ ... וְיָתַר בְּאֵשׁ אֶת־הַנּוֹתָר בְּאֵשׁ).

19:8 וְנִכְרְתָהּ הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַזֹּאת מֵעַמְּיָהּ, GL καὶ ἐξολεθρευθήσονται αἱ ψυχαὶ αἱ ἔσθουσαι ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῶν (≈ ונכרתו הנפשות האוכלות מקרב עמם; cf. 18:29 וְנִכְרְתוּ הַנֶּפֶשׁוֹת עִמָּם הַעֲרִיבִים מִקְרֵב עַמָּם).

21:3 וְאֵשׁ לֹא תִּנְתְּנָהּ לְאִישׁ, GL μὴ ἐκδεδομένη ἀνδρὶ (≈ וְאֵשׁ לֹא תִּנְתְּנָהּ לְאִישׁ; cf. Deut. 22:16).

At 16:1 GL would perhaps seem to act as an exegete. For בקרבתם לפני יהוה (“when they drew near before the Lord”) GL has ἐν τῷ προσάγειν αὐτοὺς πῦρ ἀλλότριον ἔναντι κυρίου (= בהקריבם אש זרה לפני יהוה, “in their bringing strange fire before the Lord”; cf. Lev 10:1-2).<sup>33</sup>

GL often reflects harmonizing readings also found in the SamP or Qumran scrolls. See the frequent alternation in MT, Sam, Qumran and GL between “who sanctifies *you*” (i.e. the congregation) and “...*them*” (i.e. the Priests) in chapters 20-22, e.g. 21:8 MT מקדשכם, SamP, 11QLev (similarly GL) מקדשם.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> *Sifra, Emor 8 e.a.l.*

<sup>33</sup> Indeed, one may well ask whether this was the wording encountered by the translator, or that was how he had already found the Hebrew text in his possession – more of this later.

<sup>34</sup> K. A. Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) and the Text of the Hebrew,” *CBQ* 48 (1986), 171-207 (182).

## 11. PLUSES AND MINUSES

GL has numerous, mainly minor, pluses frequently in the Tetragrammaton to which θεός is added. At 21:9 MT “(she profanes) her father”; GL: τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς, is seemingly an interpretation.<sup>35</sup> Cf. 4QLev<sup>e</sup> (*DJD* 12, 199): “the house [of her father she profanes]”; MT 18:21; 21:6. In some cases a small addition may have halachic ramifications. At 21:31 MT: “And he shall take a woman in her virginity”; GL + “*from his people.*” This plus could indicate that a Priest may only take a wife from his own stock – the daughter of a Priestly family, as understood by Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1:110.<sup>36</sup>

Note the chiasmic structure in GL (the second יממ does not appear at MT):

γυναῖκα	אשה
παρθένον	בתולה
ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ	...
λήμψεται	יק
(χήραν καὶ ἐκβεβλημένην ...	...אלמנה וגרושה)
οὐ λήμψεται,	לא יק
ἀλλ' ἦ)	(כי אם)
παρθένον	בתולה
ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ	יממ
λήμψεται	יק
γυναῖκα	אשה

A significant plus is attested in GL 17:3-4:<sup>37</sup>

Ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος

**τῶν υἱῶν** Ἰσραηλ **ἢ τῶν προσηλύτων τῶν προσκειμένων ἐν ὑμῖν**, ὃς ἂν σφάξῃ μόσχον ἢ πρόβατον ἢ αἶγα

ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ καὶ ὃς ἂν σφάξῃ ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου μὴ ἐνέγκῃ

ὥστε ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ εἰς **ὀλοκαύτωμα ἢ σωτήριον** κυρίῳ **δεκτὸν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, καὶ ὃς ἂν σφάξῃ**

<sup>35</sup> See Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 15.

<sup>36</sup> For the pluses of GL, see Wevers, *Notes*, 260-261; Büchner, “Some Reflections,” 155-161.

<sup>37</sup> See in largo: E. Eshel, “4QLev<sup>d</sup>: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and *miqsat ma'ase ha-torah*,” *DSD* 2 (1995), 1-13. In order to highlight the differences between GL, MT, SamP and 4QLev<sup>d</sup>, we have taken the following steps: (1) In each of the aforesaid witnesses we have arranged the lines in a manner corresponding to the lines in the Qumran Fragment (including lacunas and presumed insertions for completion). (2) Words varying between different witnesses are printed in **bold** characters. (3) Wherever one witness lacks words found in another witness, a blank space was left.

ἔξω καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου μὴ ἐνέγκῃ αὐτὸ  
ὥστε μὴ προσενέγκαι δῶρον κυρίῳ ἀπέναντι τῆς σκηνῆς  
κυρίου, καὶ λογισθήσεται τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ αἷμα· αἷμα ἐξέχεεν

MT:

איש איש  
מבית ישראל  
אשר ישחט שור או כשב או עז  
במחנה או אשר ישחט מחוץ למחנה, ואל פתח אהל מועד לא הביאו  
להקריב קרבן ליהוה לפני משכן  
יהוה, דם יחשב לאיש ההוא דם שפך

SamP:

איש איש  
מבית ישראל  
אשר ישחט שור או כשב או עז  
במחנה או אשר ישחט מחוץ למחנה, ואל פתח אהל מועד לא הביאו  
לעשות אתו עלה או שלמים ליהוה לרצונכם לריח ניחה וישחטהו  
בחוץ ואל פתח אהל מועד לא הביאו להקריב קרבן ליהוה לפני משכן  
יהוה, דם יחשב לאיש ההוא דם שפך

Cf. 4QLev<sup>d</sup> frag. 6:

איש איש....  
[מבית ישראל והגר ה]גר בישראל אשר יש[חט שור או כשב או עז]  
[במחנה או אשר ישחט] מחוץ למחנה, ואל פת[ח אהל מועד לא הביאו]  
[לעשות אתו עלה] או שלמים ליהוה לרצונכם לרי[ח ניחה וישחטהו]  
[בחוץ ואל פתח אהל מו]עד לוא יביאנו להקריבו ק[רבן ליהוה לפני משכן]  
[יהוה, דם יחשב לאיש ה]הו[א] דם שפך

As for the additional ἢ τῶν προσηλύτων τῶν προσκειμένων ἐν ὑμῖν in GL cf. vv.10, 13.

GL attests to a few minuses, e.g. 21:7, the second occurrence of “they shall not take” is absent. In 22:31 “I am the Lord” is absent, as in 4QLev<sup>b</sup> (*DJD* 12, 182).

## 12. WORD ORDER

Some word pairs are reversed in GL. E.g., the usual MT order “father... mother,” is reversed only 4 times, in which GL maintains the usual order by way of harmonization: 19:3 (supported by 4Q367 [*DJD* 13, 348], V T<sup>N</sup> S), 21:9 and 21:19 (as well as Ezek 16:45). In 21:19 MT has יד (או שבר) רגל (או שבר), GL χειρὸς...ποδὸς. Also when there is no fixed order of word pairs, as in 21:18, MT עור או פסח (“blind or lame”), GL (and S) reverses.

## 13. CONCLUSION

I should like to readdress the question concerning wordings found in the standard version of the Torah differing from those reflected in translation, especially one involving a certain wording or idiomatic phrase that appears in the Hebrew text – but in a different place. I particularly refer to cases such as 16:1 or 20:25. Was the alteration created by the translator, who for practical or thematic reasons, preferred to deviate here from the text at hand and replace it with a different text (as maintained by leading scholars, most notably Wevers) or had he already found the “deviant” version in the Hebrew text?

I would reintroduce my premise:<sup>38</sup> A translator is faced simultaneously with many difficult problems – lexical, grammatical and practical. It would be unlikely to assume that at that point the translator would have found the time to search for a Hebrew wording differing from the one in front of him in other places in the Hebrew text, let alone other Torah books. Contrary to what is maintained by several scholars, in my opinion, these alterations should not be attributed to the translator. He simply translates what is in front of him, the “deviations” from the standard version already being in place, in the text he is working on. These deviations could have been the work of a copyist, who was working mechanically, while his mind was engaged in other matters. That is how various copying mistakes occur, including decoding and “misreading” errors. Similarly, a copyist could consciously or unconsciously use words from the original text, but in other places. Thus, many alterations found in Septuagint are also found in the Hebrew DSS texts of Qumran. Therefore, in such cases we should look upon GL as a *version* and not just a *translation*.

*References*

- Büchner D., “A Cultic Term (ἀμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century B.C.E. until New Testament,” *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 1-17.  
 Büchner D., “Some Reflections on Writing a Commentary on the Septuagint of Leviticus,” in: *Translation is Required: The Septuagint – Retrospect and Project* (ed. R. Hiebert and J. V. Hiebert; SCS 56; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2010), 107-117.

<sup>38</sup> Elaborately discussed in “The Use of the Septuagint as a Textual Witness – Further Considerations,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. B. Taylor; SCS; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2001), 553-581. Cf. R. Hanhart, “The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influence,” in *Septuaginta, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (ed. G. I. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 339-379 (342-343).



- Daniel S., *Vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Études et commentaires 61; Paris: Klincksieck, 1966).
- Eshel E., "4QLev<sup>d</sup>: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and *miqsat ma'ase ha-torah*," *DSD* 2 (1995), 1-13.
- Frankel Z., *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841).
- Frankel Z., *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig, 1851 [repr. Westmead 1972]), 153.
- Hanhart R., "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influence" in *Septuaginta, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (ed. G. I. Brooke and B. Lindars, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 339-379.
- Mathews K. A., "The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) and the Text of the Hebrew," *CBQ* 48 (1986), 171-207.
- Prijs L., *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948 [repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1987]).
- Rahlfs A. (ed.), *Septuaginta I-II*, Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935
- Tov E., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version* (VTS 72; Leiden: Brill 1999).
- Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SCS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).
- Wevers J. W., *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers J. W., *Leviticus* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum II,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Zipor M. A., "The Greek Version of Leviticus," *Biblica* 79 (1998), 551-562.
- Zipor M., "Leviticus, LXX," in *The Textual History of the Bible*, Vol. 1: E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew Bible* (in press).
- Zipor M., "The Use of the Septuagint as a Textual Witness – Further Considerations," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. B. Taylor; SCS; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2001), 553-581.

ENTRE VARIANTES ET INTERPRÉTATIONS.  
CORRUPTION TEXTUELLE OU EXÉGÈSE  
DANS LE TEXTE DE LA SEPTANTE DU LÉVITIQUE ?

Giorgio PAXIMADI

Cette contribution dérive d'un travail en cours sur le Lévitique. Il vise à comparer le texte massorétique (M) et la Septante (G), sur le plan textuel, exégétique et théologique. Ces deux formes textuelles sont examinées parce qu'elles sont les plus importantes dans la tradition judéo-chrétienne. Pour autant, cela ne signifie pas nier la valeur d'autres formes dans lesquelles le texte a été transmis, comme le Pentateuque samaritain (Smr) ou la Peshitta (S), qui jouent un rôle important dans la tradition. En faisant cela, je suis conscient de l'exhortation du Père Jean Dominique Barthélemy, qui a souligné que la Bible chrétienne doit être une édition dans laquelle M et G sont disposés de manière synoptique. Une telle présentation permettrait d'éviter de tomber dans l'absolutisation d'une certaine forme de texte, ce qui conduirait nécessairement à un rétrécissement de la tradition.

La traduction grecque reflète des préoccupations théologiques, ou une conception halachique différente de celle supposée par le texte hébreu. Toutefois, dans certains cas, il est difficile de savoir si la divergence entre G et M est due à une différence entre la *Vorlage* de G et M, ou à une action consciente de l'interprétation du traducteur de G, basée sur une préoccupation théologique ou une conception différente de la règle ou du rite. Dans certains cas, cette interprétation du traducteur peut être confondue avec une corruption textuelle. Nous allons examiner certains de ces cas en les comparant avec ceux dont l'interprétation est évidente, soit au niveau de la *Vorlage* soit à celui de la traduction. Ces cas seront traités en premier dans les paragraphes 1 et 2.

Le texte de référence est celui du manuscrit B (Vat. Gr. 1209) tel que publié par Brooke et Mc Lean et par Swete<sup>1</sup>, et maintenant disponible en ligne<sup>2</sup>. J'opère ce choix car il me semble intéressant de prendre en considération une forme textuelle d'un manuscrit reconnu plutôt que de prendre comme point de départ une édition éclectique, par sa nature toujours hypothétique. Évidemment, je prends aussi en compte l'édition critique de Göttingen<sup>3</sup>, tout en discu-

<sup>1</sup> A. E. Brooke et N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek. According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. I: *The Ochtateuch*, Part II: *Exodus and Leviticus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909); H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek. According to the Septuagint*. Vol I: *Genesis–IV Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909).

<sup>2</sup> [http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.gr.1209](http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209) URL consulté le 6/10/2015.

<sup>3</sup> J. W. Wevers (éd.), *Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

tant ses variantes. Comme le travail sur lequel se base cette contribution est en cours, les résultats présentés ici ont encore un caractère provisoire.

## 1. INTERPRÉTATIONS DÉJÀ PRÉSENTES DANS LA VORLAGE

### 1.1. *Lv 1,5*

M

וְשָׂטֵט אֶת־כַּנּוֹ הַבָּקָר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְהִקְרִיבוּ בְנֵי אֶהֱרָן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת־הַדָּם וַיַּקְרִי אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ  
סָבִיב אֶשְׂרֶתֶח אֶהֱל מוֹעֵד:

On égorge cet animal devant le SEIGNEUR ; alors les prêtres, fils d'Aaron, présentent le sang, puis aspergent de ce sang le pourtour de l'autel qui se trouve à l'entrée de la tente de la rencontre. (TOB)

G

καὶ σφάζουσι τὸν μόσχον ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ προσοίσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ααρων οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ αἷμα καὶ προσχεοῦσιν τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κύκλῳ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν τῆς σκιπηῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου

Kaì σφάζουσι (*et ils égorgeront*) – Le pluriel, harmonisé avec les autres pluriels du contexte, reflète probablement la préoccupation suivante : dans M, l'immolation de la victime est attribuée à l'offrant et non pas au prêtre ; pourtant cela fait partie du point de vue caractéristique de la tradition sacerdotale (P), selon laquelle l'immolation n'est pas le moment central du sacrifice<sup>4</sup>. G (*et Smr.*) contient la même lecture dans les v. 6 et 9, où même le nombre du nom est modifié, 11 (*pas Smr.*), 12 et 13; le changement, probablement en raison de considérations théologiques, est attesté dans les diverses traditions textuelles, et était probablement déjà dans la *Vorlage* de G.

### 1.2. *Lv 4,12*

M

וְהוֹצִיא אֶת־כָּל־הַבֶּפֶר אֶל־מַחֲוֵיץ לַמַּחֲנֶה אֶל־מְקוֹם טְהוֹר אֶל־שֵׁפֶךְ הַדָּשָׁן וְשָׂרַף אֹתוֹ עַל־עֲצִים בְּאֵשׁ  
עַל־שֵׁפֶךְ הַדָּשָׁן יִשְׂרָף: פ

en un mot, tout le reste du taureau, il le fait porter hors du camp, dans un endroit pur, là où l'on déverse les cendres grasses, et il le brûle sur un feu de

<sup>4</sup> Cfr. A. Marx, *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l'Ancien Testament. Formes et fonctions du culte sacrificiel à Yhwh* (VTS 105; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005), 109-110.

bûches ; c'est à l'endroit où l'on déverse les cendres grasses qu'il est brûlé (TOB).

G

καὶ ἐξοίσουσιν ὅλον τὸν μόσχον ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς εἰς τόπον καθαρὸν οὗ ἔκχεουσιν τὴν σποδιάν καὶ κατακαύσουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ξύλων ἐν πυρὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκχύσεως τῆς σποδιᾶς καθήσεται

Ἐξοίσουσιν...κατακαύσουσιν (*Ils porteront...ils brûleront*) – Le pluriel lu par G et Smr est une correction théologique claire : vraisemblablement G et Smr ont été offensés par le fait qu'un tel acte soit accompli par le grand prêtre lui-même. Le M doit être compris soit dans le sens que l'acte est accompli sous sa supervision, soit dans le sens que le rituel dérive d'une période où le « prêtre-oint » n'était pas encore cette figure inaccessible typique du culte postexilique. La particularité de la terminologie (תִּשְׁמְרֵהוּ – vv. 4,3.5.16) pourrait indiquer la préservation d'un élément archaïque. Dans ce cas, le changement est évidemment dans la *Vorlage*.

## 2. CHANGEMENTS REFLÉTANT UNE INTERPRÉTATION DE G

### 2.1. Lv 1,15

M

וְהִקְרִיבוּ הַכֹּהֵן אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וּמָלַק אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְנִמְצָח לְמוֹ עַל קִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ :  
le prêtre le présente à l'autel ; il en arrache la tête et la fait fumer à l'autel ; puis il fait gicler le sang sur la paroi de l'autel (TOB)

G

καὶ προσοίσει αὐτὸ ὁ ἱερεὺς πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἀποκνίσει τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ στραγγιεῖ τὸ αἷμα πρὸς τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου

Πρὸς τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (*à la base de l'autel*) – M porte עַל קִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (sur la paroi de l'autel). Dans M l'expression se retrouve uniquement ici et dans Lv 5,9, où elle est toutefois correctement traduite avec ἐπὶ τὸν τοῖχον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. Le mot βάσις est généralement utilisé pour traduire l'hébreu בַּסָּף (7 occurrences sur 8 en Lv). C'est seulement ici que la traduction est différente. Il faut aussi prendre en considération 7,2 : dans ce verset, M porte וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְנִמְצָח לְמוֹ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (et il répandra son sang sur l'autel tout autour), que G traduit en précisant : καὶ τὸ αἷμα προσχεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου

κύκλω. Cette lecture se retrouve également dans 11QTemple 34,8; 52,21 et dans le G de Dt 12,27, mais à propos de l'holocauste. Selon Dion et Milgrom<sup>5</sup> elle reflète la préoccupation, exprimée explicitement dans la Mishna, *Zébahim* 3,32a, que ce sang ne soit versé sur la rampe qui montait à l'autel plutôt que sur la base du même autel, sous peine de nullité du sacrifice. Dans le cas de Lv 1,15, la présence de קיר n'aurait pas évité le risque de verser le sang sur la rampe qui montait à l'autel, entraînant ainsi l'invalidité du sacrifice. Au contraire, en 5,9 la présence de בָּאֵיִם/דִּוְדִּי dans le même verset aurait forcé le traducteur à rendre littéralement קיר par τοῖχος. Himbaza<sup>6</sup> note, cependant, que dans de nombreux textes concernant le sacrifice הֶעֱלָה et le sacrifice שֶׁלֶמֶת (Ex 29,16; Lv 1,5,11; 3,2,8,13; 17,6 etc.) l'expression עַל-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סְבִיב est traduite régulièrement avec ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κύκλω, donc cette préoccupation ne semble pas être présente. Pour Himbaza, le désir de G est de faire la distinction entre le rite du sang dans le cas de l'holocauste du volatile et celui du sacrifice תֹּאֲרָה de 5,9. Pour 7,2 l'explication de l'insertion devrait être trouvée ailleurs, et plus précisément dans une assimilation à d'autres cas où le sang sacrificiel manipulé par le prêtre est toujours mis « sur la base de l'autel » (עַל-יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ - παρὰ / ἐπὶ / πρὸς τὴν βᾶσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου)<sup>7</sup>. Pour Dt 12:27, la même insertion de G, qui traduit יהוה על-מִזְבֵּחַ יהוה par πρὸς τὴν βᾶσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου, serait expliquée par une assimilation à textes tels que Es 29,12 et Lv 4,7. Une explication similaire s'appliquerait aux deux cas de 11QTemple<sup>8</sup>. Il est difficile dans ce cas de déterminer si le changement était déjà présent dans la *Vorlage* ou s'il est le fruit du travail du traducteur grec.

## 2.2. Lv 5,8

### M

וְהָיָה אֲתָם אֶל-הַכֹּהֵן וְהִקְרִיב אֶת-אֲשֶׁר לַחֲטָאתָ רִאשׁוֹנָה וּמִלֶּקֶד אֶת-רִאשׁוֹ מִמּוֹל עֶרְפוֹ וְלֹא יִבְדִּיל:  
les prêtres, fils d'Aaron, disposent les quartiers – la tête et la graisse y compris – sur les bûches placées sur le feu de l'autel (TOB)

<sup>5</sup> Voir P. E. Dion, « Early Evidence for the Ritual Significance of the 'Base of the Altar' », JBL 106 (1987), 487-490 (489); J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3; New York, NY: Doubleday 1991), 169.

<sup>6</sup> Voir I. Himbaza, « The Rite of the Blood on the Altar and the Hierarchy of sacrifices: Qumran Texts, Septuagint and Mishnah as Witnesses to a Law in Evolution », in *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (éd. K. De Troyer et A. Lange; CBET 61; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 17-26 (22-23).

<sup>7</sup> Voir J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 80.

<sup>8</sup> Voir C. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*. (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 89\*.



l'huile de l'onction. Le renversement observé en Lv 8,10-11 entre M et G implique clairement deux conceptions théologiques différentes. Dans un cas (M), la sainteté investit avant tout le tabernacle et ses objets sacrés et seulement après l'autel. Dans l'autre cas (G), la consécration est faite par degrés : à partir des objets moins sacrés vers ceux qui le sont davantage<sup>9</sup>. Étant donnés les parallèles avec Ex 40,9-10 (où G ne signale pas des variantes par rapport à M), la lecture de G ne peut pas être considérée comme preuve d'une *Vorlage* différente mais plutôt comme une correction théologique<sup>10</sup>.

#### 2.4. Lv 9,22

M

וַיִּשָׂא אֶרְחוֹ וְאֶת־יָדָיו [יָדָיו] אֶל־הָעָם וַיְבָרֶכֶם וַיֵּרֶד מֵעֲשֹׂת הַחֲטָאֹת וְהַעֲלָה וְהִשָּׁלְמִים

Elevant alors les mains au-dessus du peuple, Aaron le bénit ; puis il redescendit, ayant terminé d'offrir le sacrifice pour le péché, l'holocauste et les sacrifices de paix. (TOB)

G

καὶ ἐξάρας Ααρων τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς καὶ κατέβη ποιήσας τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ τὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου

Tὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ τὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου (*les holocaustes et les sacrifices de salut*) – Vu qu'au chapitre 9, il était question de deux holocaustes (v. 2 et 3) et de deux victimes pour le sacrifice מִלְמִשָּׁ (v. 4), G traduit au pluriel, là où M porte probablement deux singuliers collectifs. La même attention n'est pas réservée au sacrifice חֲטָאֹת, qui reste au singulier, malgré le fait que les victimes sont également au nombre de deux (v. 2 et 3). Wevers propose que cela soit fait parce que les chapitres 1 et 3 présentent différents types d'holocaustes et de sacrifices מִלְמִשָּׁ tandis que le sacrifice חֲטָאֹת n'a qu'un seul type<sup>11</sup>. En traduisant au pluriel, G tenterait de créer un parallèle avec ces textes. Cette motivation me semble peu convaincante. On peut en effet remarquer que la célébration du sacrifice חֲטָאֹת du même Aaron, dont on parle en 9,8-11, se termine par la combustion des restes de la victime, qui, tout en étant offerte en faveur du prêtre lui-même, ne peut pas être consommée par lui (4,11; 6,23). Le v. 11 présente Aaron comme l'exécuteur de cette loi, et c'est seulement après cela

<sup>9</sup> Pour cette conception de la sainteté, voir P. P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness. A Key to the Priestly Conception of The World* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 101-105 et 110-111. Voir aussi M. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 158-165; A. Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: Hirzel 1880), 265-266.

<sup>10</sup> Voir R. Péter-Contesse, *Lévitique 1-16* (CAT IIIa; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1993), 141.

<sup>11</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 127.

que les autres sacrifices peuvent commencer. Je pense qu'on peut avancer l'hypothèse que nous sommes devant une interprétation subtile de G : le premier sacrifice תאֲזִיחַ, celui du « veau », doit être complètement accompli avant les autres rites. Voilà pourquoi G présente au singulier le sacrifice תאֲזִיחַ du v. 22: c'est seulement celui en faveur du peuple, tandis que les autres sacrifices sont correctement au pluriel, parce qu'on parle à la fois de ceux d'Aaron et de ceux du peuple.

### 3. VARIANTES QUI PEUVENT DISSIMULER UNE INTERVENTION INTERPRÉTATIVE

#### 3.1. Lv 8,31

M

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל-אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל-בָּנָיו בְּשֵׁלֹו אֶת-הַבָּשָׂר פָּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְשָׂם תֹאכְלוּ אֹתָו וְאֵת-לֶחֶם הַתְּנִיף אֲשֶׁר בְּסֶל הַמִּלֻּאִים כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי לְאֹמֵר אֶהְרֹן וּבָנָיו יֹאכְלֶהוּ:

Moïse dit à Aaron et à ses fils : « Faites cuire la chair à l'entrée de la tente de la rencontre ; c'est là que vous la mangerez, avec le pain qui se trouve dans la corbeille de l'investiture, comme je l'ai ordonné en disant : « C'est Aaron et ses fils qui la mangeront. » » (TOB)

G

καὶ εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς πρὸς Ααρων καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐψήσατε τὰ κρέα ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐκεῖ φάγεσθε αὐτὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κανὼ τῆς τελειώσεως ὃν τρόπον συντέτακται μοι λέγων Ααρων καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ φάγονται αὐτά

Ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ (*dans la cour de la tente du témoignage, dans un lieu saint*) – A la place de פתח, G porte ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, ce qui exigerait une *Vorlage* בַּצֵּר. Pourtant G n'est pas une variante réelle, mais plutôt l'expression d'une conception différente du rituel. La viande des sacrifices d'investiture doit être consommée en suivant le rite de l'oblation (6,9) et surtout du sacrifice תאֲזִיחַ (6,19). Dans ce dernier cas, cette procédure est adoptée à cause de la sainteté particulière de ce sacrifice (6,20-22). Dans le cas du sacrifice סִמְלֵשׁ, la consommation ne se produit pas dans un lieu prescrit avec précision : elle nécessite seulement certaines caractéristiques personnelles de pureté (voir 7,19-20). Evidemment G veut en quelque sorte assimiler le sacrifice d'investiture aux deux sacrifices de purification, même si elle n'établit pas explicitement pour eux le statut de « choses saintes des choses saintes ». La raison pour laquelle (dans le cas du sacrifice d'investiture, qui apparaît lui-même comme un sacrifice de communion) on prescrit une règle



relative à l'endroit où il doit être mangé (ce qui ne se produit pas dans le cas d'autres offrandes) est donnée au v. 33: les prêtres ne doivent pas quitter le sanctuaire durant les sept jours de la durée des rites d'investiture. Cependant, l'endroit où l'on consomme la viande n'est pas celui des sacrifices pour la transgression et pour la réparation (6,19; 7,6), qui sont « saints des saints », mais l'entrée de la tente de la rencontre, où est établi le contact entre la zone sacrée et la zone profane. G unifie les deux endroits, assimilant ainsi le statut des deux sacrifices.

### 3.2. *Lv 8,31*

Au lieu de צִוִּיתִי *j'ai commandé*, G, S et Targum (T) lisent συντέτακται μοι (צִוִּיתִי) *on m'a commandé* à la fois ici et en 10,18. Le problème se pose parce que en Ex 29,32 c'est YHWH, et non pas Moïse, qui donne cette instruction. Il est clair que le problème existe seulement dans la tradition de la lecture et non pas dans le texte consonantique. Ehrlich, Elliger, Noth, Levine (uniquement dans le commentaire), Milgrom (uniquement dans le commentaire), Gerstenberger, Nvolg, *Einheitübersetzung* acceptent la correction proposée en forme dubitative par la BHS<sup>12</sup>; Rendtorff estime que le צִוִּיתִי plus commun a été préféré à l'expression rare צִוִּיתִי<sup>13</sup>. BJ, TOB, NCEI, Wenham, PIR, Hartley, Deiana, Watts, refusent la correction<sup>14</sup>. Le choix est difficile, mais on peut observer que M distingue la lecture de 8,31; 10,18 où on lit כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי de celle de 8,35; 10,13 où on a כִּי־כֵן צִוִּיתִי. Ainsi, il existe un soupçon d'assimilation. Je propose donc de choisir la lecture de M comme *lectio difficilior* en accord avec Hartley<sup>15</sup> par rapport à une lecture facilitante et assimilante. La difficulté peut être expliquée de la manière suivante. Moïse qui est présenté comme le célébrant principal du rituel alors qu'il n'est pas lui-même un prêtre, joue ici le rôle de l'instructeur des nouveaux consacrés au sujet de leurs devoirs sacrés. La

<sup>12</sup> Cf. B. A. Ehrlich; *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel II. Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909), 29; K. Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT 1,4; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr 1966), 105; M. Noth, *Das dritte Buch Mose. Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 55; B. E. Levine, *Leviticus* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia – New York – Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 54; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 535; E. S. Gerstenberger, *Das dritte Buch Mose. Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 89.

<sup>13</sup> R. Rendtorff, *Leviticus* (BKAT III/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 267.

<sup>14</sup> G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), 136; *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project. Vol. 1 Pentateuch* (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1979), 173; J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1999), 108; G. Deiana, *Leviticus* (Milano: Paoline, 2005), 101; J. W. Watts, *Leviticus 1–19* (HCOT; Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 475.

<sup>15</sup> Hartley, *Leviticus*, 108.

variante qui n'est cependant pas spécifique à G, peut résulter d'une tradition de lecture soucieuse de ne pas attribuer à Moïse une action réservée à YHWH.

### 3.3. Lv 9,15

M

וַיִּקְרָב אֶת קַרְבָּנוֹ הַעֵם וַיִּלְחֹץ אֶת־שְׁעֵיר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר לְעֵם וַיִּשְׁחַטְהוּ וַיִּחַטְּאֵהוּ כְּרִאשׁוֹן:

Il présenta les dons du peuple : il prit le bouc du sacrifice pour le péché du peuple, l'égorgea et l'offrit comme la première victime ; (TOB)

G

καὶ προσήνεγκαν τὸ δῶρον τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν χίμαρον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἔσφαξεν αὐτὸ καθὰ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον

Προσήνεγκαν (*présentèrent*) – Cette lecture est celle du manuscrit B et de beaucoup de minuscules, y compris les témoins du texte byzantin (le groupe *n* de Göttingen et le groupe *y*, qui soutient souvent B). Le texte retenu par Göttingen porte le singulier προσήνεγκεν. Selon Wevers, il s'agit d'une erreur d'inattention du scribe<sup>16</sup>. À mon avis, le contexte, dans lequel προσφέρω traduit à la fois קרב Hi et מצא Hi, mène tout naturellement à penser que le traducteur de G a uniformisé le v. 15 avec ce qu'il avait dit plus tôt. En effet, les fils d'Aaron donnent à leur père les différents éléments, qu'il met en contact avec l'autel : le sang du sacrifice pour le péché et de l'holocauste (v.9 – קרב et 12 – מצא) les quartiers de la victime (v. 13 מצא), les dons du peuple, égorgés par Aaron (v. 15 קרב), et leur sang (v. 18 מצא) Le texte du manuscrit B semble défendable, précisément parce que G ne distingue pas les deux gestes et assimile ainsi l'un à l'autre. Par conséquent, je considère la lecture de Göttingen comme une assimilation à M. C'est un cas, à mon avis tout à fait clair, où il ne faut pas succomber à la tentation de soupçonner une corruption dans le texte du manuscrit B. Au contraire, on peut penser que ce manuscrit et sa tradition ont gardé la lecture originale, qui présuppose une interprétation du traducteur de G.

### 3.4. Lv 9,20

M

וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֶת־הַחֲלָבִים עַל־הַחֲזוֹת וַיִּקְטֹר הַחֲלָבִים הַמִּזְבֵּחַ:

ils les placèrent sur les poitrines et il les fit fumer à l'autel ; (TOB)

<sup>16</sup> J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1986), 124.

## G

καὶ ἐπέθηκεν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὰ στηθῦνια καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον

Les variantes des deux verbes ἐπέθηκεν et ἀνήνεγκαν doivent être examinées ensemble.

- 1) καὶ ἐπέθηκεν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὰ στηθῦνια καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον B 509 = Rahlfs
- 2) καὶ ἐπέθηκαν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὰ στηθῦνια καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον 376 b Arm
- 3) καὶ ἐπέθηκαν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὰ στηθῦνια καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον G<sup>17</sup> Syh = M
- 4) καὶ ἐπέθηκεν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὰ στηθῦνια καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν τὰ στέατα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον Rell.: (AF<sup>b</sup>M O''<sup>(-G-376)</sup> C'' *dfns*<sup>-344</sup> *t*<sup>84</sup>xyz) = Göttingen

*Il posa* (ἐπέθηκεν) – M lit un pluriel. En lisant le singulier, G (à la suite de sa *Vorlage*) comprend ce moment du rite comme officié par le seul Aaron. Le texte dispose d'une large base de manuscrits, qui comprend également une grande partie de la tradition hexaplaire, à l'exclusion de certains d'entre ses principaux représentants (manuscrits majuscule G et minuscule 376, c'est-à-dire O<sup>-58</sup>). Que la variante appartienne à la *Vorlage* de G, cela est démontré par sa présence dans Smr et dans S. Pour Wevers<sup>18</sup>, la présence de ἐπέθηκαν dans les manuscrits G-376 b Arm Syh indique qu'Origène travaillait sur un texte déjà corrigé, mais le verbe au singulier dans le reste de la tradition hexaplaire, à savoir 58<sup>19</sup> *oI oII*, pourrait suggérer que le forme des manuscrits G-376 b Arm Syh, assimilant au TM, peut résulter d'une activité posthexaplaire, et cela malgré l'autorité des manuscrits G-376. Le manque de 58 à ce témoignage pourrait confirmer cette idée. En tout cas il est clair que le texte original de G est ἐπέθηκεν.

*Et ils firent monter* (ἀνήνεγκαν) – M porte le singulier אָנִיִּנְעָקָא. C'est la lecture du manuscrit B, du groupe *b* de Göttingen et de deux autres minuscules (509 et 376, ce dernier faisant partie de *O*). Le texte de la majorité porte ἀνήνεγκεν et il est conforme à M. Contrairement à ἐπέθηκεν, ἀνήνεγκαν n'est pas soutenu par d'autres témoins textuels. Selon Wevers, le pluriel n'est pas possible dans un contexte (G-Smr.) dans lequel le grand prêtre semble le seul officiant à l'autel<sup>20</sup>. Wevers pense que la lecture ἀνήνεγκαν est due à une influence secondaire de la lecture hexaplaire, qui lit le verbe précédent (ἐπέθηκαν) au plu-

<sup>17</sup> Ms. de Leiden – Paris.

<sup>18</sup> Wevers, *Text History*, 124.

<sup>19</sup> Sur ce point, ce manuscrit est opposé aux autres membres de son groupe *O* c'est-à-dire les manuscrits G-376 et Syh, le manuscrit 476 étant exclu parce qu'il commence au chap. 16.

<sup>20</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 126.

riel<sup>21</sup>. Cependant, la majorité de la lecture hexasplaire présente ἐπέθηκεν et non ἐπέθηκαν. Si en effet ἐπέθηκαν des manuscrits G-376 *b* est le résultat de l'activité d'une recension posthexaplaire<sup>22</sup>, on pourrait remettre en question cette reconstruction.

Prendre ensemble les deux variantes pourrait mieux éclairer cette question. En fait, on peut noter quatre cas :

- 1) ἐπέθηκεν ... ἀνήνεγκαν, caractéristique du manuscrit B et de 509 (ce dernier faisant partie du groupe *x* qui présente souvent des similitudes avec les manuscrits A et B);
- 2) ἐπέθηκαν ... ἀνήνεγκαν, attesté par le manuscrit 376 (hexasplaire) *b* Arm ;
- 3) ἐπέθηκαν ... ἀνήνεγκεν attestés seulement par les manuscrits G et Syh qui sont assimilés à M. Comme on peut le voir, dans ce cas, si on considère ensemble les variantes, les manuscrits G et Syh sont opposés à tout le reste de la tradition hexasplaire. A mon avis, ce fait renforce le soupçon d'une activité posthexaplaire assez tardive, vue l'âge du manuscrit G, qui voit son accomplissement ici. Si nous acceptons l'hypothèse que la lecture originale hexasplaire du premier verbe était ἐπέθηκεν, cela indiquerait que la *Vorlage* de G était encore présente lors de la rédaction de l'Hexaples.
- 4) ἐπέθηκεν ... ἀνήνεγκεν, le texte majoritaire. En mettant les variantes dans cet ordre, on pourrait proposer l'hypothèse suivante :
  - A) ἐπέθηκεν ... ἀνήνεγκαν B 509 : texte original de G. Le premier verbe est dû à la *Vorlage*, le deuxième à une conception particulière du rite : pour M, Aaron égorgé le taureau et le bélier, puis il laisse ses fils drainer le sang des victimes et les démembrer, lui donner le sang qu'il verse ensuite sur l'autel. Après cela les fils d'Aaron déposent la graisse dans les poitrines des victimes (c.-à-dire la cage thoracique) et Aaron seul brûle la graisse. G trouve dans sa *Vorlage* le premier verbe au singulier, et, en traduisant חִי אֶנְוָרָה par ἀναφέρω, reste perplexe sur l'idée que Aaron seul puisse présenter seul les cages thoraciques d'un taureau et un bélier débordantes de leur graisse. Il considère donc que la tâche réservée à Aaron seul est de déposer la graisse, alors que ce sont ses fils qui les présentent. C'est un changement dérivant d'une interprétation particulière du rite.
  - B) Une minorité de la tradition manuscrite a assimilé le premier verbe au deuxième (ἐπέθηκαν ... ἀνήνεγκαν, 376 *b* Arm), en attribuant à tous les fils l'action de disposer la matière grasse, vu qu'ils avaient égorgé

<sup>21</sup> Wevers, *Text History*, 124.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Wevers, *Text History*, 33 pour d'autres phénomènes textuels de ce type.

les victimes. L'incohérence qui en résulte est évidente : Aaron n'a aucune part dans le rituel.

C) Un autre courant majoritaire, au contraire, assimile le deuxième verbe au premier (ἀνήνεγκεν ... ἐπέθηκεν). C'est l'interprétation qui obtient le plus de succès : Aaron est le protagoniste de tout le rituel.

D) Enfin une activité posthexasplaire assimile à tous égards G à M : (ἐπέθηκαν ... ἀνήνεγκεν, manuscrit G et Syh).

C'est clairement une hypothèse qui, si elle était vérifiée, pourrait montrer comment, derrière une dispersion des variantes, se cache une interprétation originale de G. Il est évident que le point douteux de cette hypothèse est la faiblesse d'attestations manuscrites de la variante ἐπέθηκεν ... ἀνήνεγκεν.

### 3.5. Lv 12,4

M

וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן בְּיָמֵי מֹשֶׁה בְּדִמְיֻת טְהוֹרָה בְּכֹל־קִדְשׁ אֶל־עֲזָרָה מְקַדְּשֵׁת לָאֵתְנָיָהּ עַד־מִלְאָתָהּ  
מִי טְהוֹרָה:

ensuite, pendant trente-trois jours, elle attend la purification de son sang ; elle ne touche aucune chose sainte et ne se rend pas au sanctuaire jusqu'à ce que s'achève son temps de purification.

G

καὶ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς καθίσεται ἐν αἵματι ἀκαθάρτῳ αὐτῆς· παντὸς ἀγγίου οὐχ ἄνεται, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἁγιαστήριον οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται, ἕως ἂν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρθῃως αὐτῆς.

Παντὸς ἀγγίου (*aucun récipient*) – La curieuse variante<sup>23</sup> a une autorité étrange, étant également présente dans le manuscrit A et dans quelques minuscules. Elle peut simplement refléter la dittographie d'un γ (et sûrement c'est le cas le plus probable) et donc la lecture correcte serait παντὸς ἀγίου « aucune chose sacrée ». Cependant, le fait qu'en 15,12 l'homme souffrant de gonorrhée rend impure la poterie domestique (dans ce cas, cependant, la terminologie est différente) pose question. Bien sûr, si cela était l'indice d'une *halakah* particulière, elle serait largement utopique, car elle empêcherait à la nouvelle mère de cuisiner pendant trente-trois jours (soixante-six dans le cas de la naissance d'une fille).

<sup>23</sup> L'erreur de l'itacisme des manuscrits A et B est corrigée avec ἀγγείου par l'édition de Göttingen dans l'apparat critique. Le texte de Swete suit B, tandis que Brooke-McLean corrige en ἀγίου. Le scribe qui a mis les accents sur B était peut-être incertain quant à la lecture et a écrit ἀγγ(ε)ίου avec l'esprit rude.

## 3.6. Lv 14,39

M

וְשָׁב בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וְרָאָה וְהִגִּיד פְּשָׁה הִגִּיד בְּקִרְיַת הַבַּיִת:

Le septième jour, le prêtre reviendra et procédera à l'examen : si la tache a pris de l'extension dans les parois de la maison,

G

καὶ ἐπανήξει ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἑβδόμη καὶ ὄψεται τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐ διεχύθη ἢ ἀφή ἐν τοῖς τοίχοις τῆς οἰκίας

Ὁὐ διεχύθη ἢ ἀφή (*la plaie ne s'est pas répandue*) – la négation, absente dans M, est attesté par les manuscrits A, B, xy et quelques autres minuscules. Wevers l'élimine comme dittographie des deux dernières lettres de ἰδοὺ, tandis que Rahlfs la garde<sup>24</sup>. Je pense que l'explication de Wevers est insatisfaisante. En effet, M ne tient pas compte du cas où la plaie dans la maison ne s'est pas répandue<sup>25</sup>, comme il fait au contraire dans le cas de la plaie humaine en 13,5.37. Pour Milgrom, la réponse est implicite dans ce qui est dit au v. 48: si la plaie *ne s'est pas* étendue, il faut une deuxième semaine de quarantaine<sup>26</sup>. Peut-être que l'explication de Milgrom a tendance à lire dans le texte plus que ce qu'on peut trouver réellement. Cependant le problème soulevé subsiste et la négation ajoutée par G, plutôt qu'un accident textuel, pourrait être attribuée à une tentative d'expliquer cette incohérence qu'elle voyait dans le texte. Son élimination dans la majorité de la tradition peut être due à l'assimilation avec M.

## 3.7. Lv 14,43

M

וְאִם-יִשׁוּב עֲגָבָה וַפְּתַח בַּבַּיִת אַחַר חֶלֶץ אֶת-הַצִּבּוּיִם וְאֶת-הַקְּצוּיִם אֶת-הַבַּיִת וְאֶת-רֵיחֵי הַשָּׂדֶה

Si la tache se remet à bourgeonner dans la maison après qu'on en aura arraché les pierres, après grattage de la maison et recrépissage (TOB)

G

ἐὰν δὲ ἐπέλθῃ πάλιν ἀφή καὶ ἀνατείλῃ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ μετὰ τὸ ἐξελεῖν τοὺς λίθους καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποξυσθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξαιλιφθῆναι

<sup>24</sup> Wevers, *Text History*, 109; A. Rahlfs (éd.), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006<sup>2</sup>), 183. Cf. aussi P. Lucca, *Pentateuco* (La Bibbia dei Settanta I; Brescia: Morcelliana, 2012), 541, n. 250

<sup>25</sup> Voir Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 871.

<sup>26</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 877.

Ἄφή (*une plaie*) – L’absence de l’article est attestée non seulement dans les manuscrits A et B, mais également dans une partie de la tradition hexaplaire (*oI*), les groupes Cz, dans certains manuscrits minuscules, et par Cyrille d’Alexandrie. Wevers 1986, 84 souligne le fait que, sur les 27 cas dans lesquels ἄφή traduit נגג non accompagné par λέπρας, deux occurrences (13,42; 14,35) ne comportent l’article ni en grec, ni en hébreu. Un cas (13,44) est exclu car il traduit נעג, alors que dans les 24 cas restants, la présence de l’article est textuellement garantie, sauf dans le cas qu’on est en train d’analyser, où il est omis par une partie importante de la tradition. Sur cette base, Göttingen lit ἡ ἄφή, avec la majorité des témoins. Si on prend en considération ces données, la lecture du manuscrit B peut être considérée comme s’opposant à une assimilation, et elle peut refléter une élaboration interprétative (pas la même plaie, mais une nouvelle qui apparaît).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Les cas sélectionnés au paragraphe 3 sont des variantes textuelles qui, à mon avis, ne dérivent pas d’une corruption, mais plutôt révèlent la présence d’une intervention interprétative. D’un point de vue textuel, 3.1. est le cas le plus évident ; BHS *ad loc.* suggère une rétroversion (בְּהִפְּרָו) comme possible *Vorlage* de G, mais il s’agit d’une hypothèse inutile : le texte de G est très bien explicable avec une compréhension différente du rituel. 3.2. est une tradition de vocalisation différente également présente dans S et T. Elle est utilisée par certains commentateurs pour corriger M, mais cette correction ne s’impose pas. 3.3. est une variation du nombre du verbe. 3.4. est un ensemble de variations concernant les deux verbes et leur nombre. 3.5. est une variante lexicale. 3.6. concerne la présence dans G, et l’absence dans M, d’une négation. 3.7. concerne la présence ou l’absence d’un article présent dans M, mais pas dans une tradition de G attestée par le manuscrit B.

En 3.1. et 3.2., il s’agit de variantes de la totalité des témoins de G par rapport à M, tandis que dans les autres cas, c’est la lecture du manuscrit B, soutenue par un nombre plus ou moins important d’autres témoins, qui est opposée à la lecture de la majorité des témoins, acceptée par Göttingen. J’ai essayé de défendre le texte du manuscrit B.

En 3.5., le texte du manuscrit B, bien qu’attesté ailleurs par les principaux témoins, est peu probable ; même si on pourrait soupçonner une *halakah* particulière et utopique, la présence d’une erreur est beaucoup plus vraisemblable. Il ne faut donc pas prendre en considération cet exemple. Dans 3.3.; 3.4.; 3.6.; 3.7., la lecture de la majorité, toujours accueillie par Göttingen, pourrait être

soupçonnée d'assimilation avec M, et la lecture de la minorité, toujours présente dans B, peut être comprise comme une intervention interprétative du traducteur de G, qui, grâce à des ajustements textuels relativement petites, fournit une explication d'un texte qui, d'une raison ou d'une autre, était devenu pour lui un problème. Dans tous ces cas, à mon avis, il est assez clair que le courant minoritaire de la tradition manuscrite a conservé un trait original de G, et qu'il faut résister à la tendance, manifestée par Göttingen, de suivre la majorité. Le cas traité au paragraphe 3.6. est plus ambigu, mais là aussi il peut bien s'agir d'une intervention exégétique de G, visant à résoudre une contradiction qu'il discernait dans M.

Il est clair que les exemples proposés offrent une base d'analyse encore trop étroite pour tirer des conclusions fermes. Le travail doit être continué et élargi. Le matériel présenté dans cette contribution conduit cependant à recommander une plus grande prudence quant à l'acceptation de certaines variantes de G. En effet, certaines variantes, qu'on trouve dans l'édition de Göttingen et attestées par de nombreux manuscrits, peuvent être soupçonnées d'harmonisation avec M. Dans les cas étudiés, j'ai soutenu les lectures du manuscrit B contre les autres branches de la tradition grecque. Cette approche a sans doute été inspirée par la décision de le préférer aux autres. Mais, si les cas analysés étaient confirmés par d'autres, ils pourraient suggérer que le vénérable manuscrit B conserve un texte de G plus authentique et moins sujet aux harmonisations avec M.

### Références

- Brooke A. E. et N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek. According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. I: *The Ochtateuch*. Part II: *Exodus and Leviticus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909).
- Deiana G., *Levitico* (Milano: Paoline, 2005).
- Dillmann A., *Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: Hirzel 1880).
- Dion P. E., « Early Evidence for the Ritual Significance of the 'Base of the Altar' », *JBL* 106 (1987), 487-490.
- Ehrlich B. A.; *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel II. Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909).
- Elliger K., *Leviticus* (HAT 1,4; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966).
- Gerstenberger E. S., *Das dritte Buch Mose. Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
- Haran M., *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 158-165.
- Hartley J. E., *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1999).
- Himbaza I., « The Rite of the Blood on the Altar and the Hierarchy of Sacrifices: Qumran Texts, Septuagint and Mishnah as Witnesses to a Law in Evolution »,



- in *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (éd. K. De Troyer et A. Lange; CBET 61; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 17-26.
- Jenson P. P., *Graded Holiness. A Key to the Priestly Conception of The World* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).
- Levine B. E. *Leviticus* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia – New York – Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1989).
- Lucca P., *Pentateuco* (La Bibbia dei Settanta I; Brescia: Morcelliana, 2012).
- Marx A., *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l'Ancien Testament. Formes et fonctions du culte sacrificiel à Yhwh* (VTS 105; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005).
- McCarthy C., *Deuteronomy*. (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3; New York, NY: Doubleday, 1991).
- Noth M., *Das dritte Buch Mose. Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1962).
- Péter-Contesse R., *Lévitique 1–16* (CAT IIIa; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1993).
- Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*. Vol. 1: *Pentateuch* (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1979 (PIR)).
- Rahlf's A. (éd.), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006<sup>2</sup>).
- Rendtorff R., *Leviticus* (BKAT III/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004).
- Swete H. B., *The Old Testament in Greek. According to the Septuagint*. Vol I: *Genesis–IV Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909).
- Watts J. W., *Leviticus 1–19* (HCOT; Leuven: Peeters, 2013).
- Wenham G. J., *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979).
- Wevers J. W. (éd.), *Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers J. W., *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).

ORTHOGRAPHICAL, GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL  
PECULIARITIES IN THE HEBREW TEXTS OF LEVITICUS:  
CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT HEBREW BIBLE EDITING IN THE  
LIGHT OF THE LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF HEBREW

Viktor GOLINETS

The book of Leviticus in Hebrew – as all the other books of the Pentateuch – is attested in three textual sources: in fragments from Dead Sea Scrolls, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and in medieval Hebrew manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> All of the above feature orthographical, grammatical and lexical peculiarities and variations. A critical edition of the book of Leviticus has to evaluate and to present these variations and peculiarities. Since many textual phenomena occur repeatedly in this book and not only in this book but in all Hebrew biblical and nonbiblical texts, a textual edition and a commentary have to consider all cases of one textual phenomenon in order not to offer *ad hoc* explanations. One main requirement of a textual edition is that the same textual phenomenon should be treated uniformly in all its attestations. This requirement holds for editions of both the diplomatic and the eclectic type. In the case of the former, a phenomenon should be described uniformly in the apparatus, and in the case of the latter, a phenomenon should be uniformly presented in the main text and uniformly described in the apparatus. If the context demands a different treatment as that of other cases of the same phenomenon, then all pertinent attestations should be taken into consideration and evaluated, be it in the textual commentary or in a special case study. Ideally, all types of textual variants in all textual witnesses should first be evaluated, and after the description and evaluation of the variants has been carried out, a textual edition should be prepared. There are also additional aspects that should be accounted for in an eclectic edition:

<sup>1</sup> All textual witnesses of Leviticus from Qumran, both Hebrew and Greek, are presented and described in R. A. Kugler and K. S. Baek, *Leviticus at Qumran. Text and Interpretation* (VTS 173; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2017). The edition of Hebrew texts there is taken from E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTS 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010). Some textual features of Hebrew witnesses are described in S. Metso, “Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus,” in *Houses Full of All Good Things. Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 507-519 (507-510). The partly preserved Leviticus scrolls from Masada (MasLev<sup>a</sup> and MasLev<sup>b</sup>) feature no variances in comparison with the Masoretic text (cf. S. Talmon, “Fragments of two Leviticus Scrolls from Masada,” *Textus* 19 (1998), 27-44 (30, 33).

to what extent could the text be reconstructed and what are the textual elements whose most ancient form cannot (yet) be determined due to the limitations of sources?

This paper discusses orthographical, grammatical and lexical peculiarities in the Hebrew texts of the book of Leviticus and ways they are treated in textual editions. Even if not every feature discussed below bears on the reconstruction of the earliest inferable text, theoretical considerations about editorial techniques should include all types of textual variants. In the practical application, the hermeneutics of an edition will determine the types and the number of variants referred to. A diplomatic or eclectic edition of any type of the Masoretic text would include some other categories of textual variants than an edition aiming at reconstructing the earliest inferable text.

At first, the features of the consonantal text will be examined, and afterwards the peculiarities of the Masoretic texts. Since the medieval manuscripts of the Tiberian Masoretic text are the only source for the text of the complete Hebrew Bible, the textual variants from other sources are compared with the Masoretic text. As far as the consonantal text is concerned, the different types of Hebrew texts feature the same kinds of variants, and some of them are shared by ancient Bible translations. Additionally, the Masoretic texts exhibit their own peculiarities within the vocalisation and accentuation.

## 1. CONSONANTAL TEXT

The different forms of the consonantal text attest orthographic, lexical, lexicosyntactic, morphological and morphosyntactic variation, as well as variation of word order. These types of variation are not confined to the biblical text – they occur in all Hebrew texts transmitted in manuscript form.

### 1.1. *Orthography*

Orthographical variations in the book of Leviticus are attested between manuscripts of the Masoretic type and between the Samaritan Pentateuch. They may not be featured in the oldest textual witnesses, and they do not bear on the reconstruction of the earliest inferable text. However, an edition presenting a form of the Masoretic text would need to deal with such features. Those of the book of Leviticus are discussed in this subsection.

### 1.1.1. Elision of postvocalic /ʔ/

The elision of postvocalic /ʔ/ is attested in וְנִטְמָתָם (Lev 11:43), where the medieval manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch feature the expected form וְנִטְמָתָם.<sup>2</sup> Other instances of this elision are כַּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם and כַּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם (26:18, 21) in 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup> as compared with כַּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם and כַּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם of the MT. This type of elision often occurs in Hebrew texts<sup>3</sup> and – as far as the meaning of the word is not affected – it represents an insignificant textual variant.

### 1.1.2. Interchange between *Heh* and *Aleph*

The forms וְנִמְצָה ‘and it is squeezed out’ (Lev 1:15) and יִמְצָה ‘should be squeezed out’ (5:9) appear in the Samaritan Pentateuch and in some Hebrew manuscripts as וְנִמְצָה and יִמְצָה. The interchange between *Heh* and *Aleph* may be merely graphical, but it may also be due to lexical ignorance on the part of scribes, since the verb מִצָּה is attested in the Pentateuch only in these two instances. In the latter case, the variance attests two ways of understanding the text, and it may be worth commenting upon it in an edition.

The word אֲשָׁמָה that is infinitive *Hofal* of the verb שָׁמַם ‘to be desolated’ in the Masoretic text is written in the Samaritan Pentateuch as אֲשָׁמָה (26:34, 35, 43). This variance may also be merely graphical due to the phonetic reduction of /h/ to /ʔ/. This phonetic and graphic phenomenon may have also yielded a new understanding of the text as featuring the noun אֲשָׁמָה ‘guilt’. This noun fits the context both syntactically and with regard to content. The presence of the noun אֲשָׁמָה ‘guilt’ in Lev 22:16 may have evoked the idea of guiltiness, although this noun does not appear in the latter instance in the context of punishment. One Hebrew manuscript (Kennicott nr. 129) reads *plene* הִרְשָׁמָה in 26:34, thus stressing that the form is *Hofal*.

<sup>2</sup> The medieval manuscripts are cited – if not stated otherwise – according to B. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus. Vol I, Vol. II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1776, 1780; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 2003); J. B. de Rossi, *Variae lectiones veteris testamenti. Volumen I* (Parma, 1784; reprint Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969); C. D. Ginsburg, *The Pentateuch. Diligently Revised according to the Massorah and the Early Editions with the Various Readings from MSS. and the Ancient Versions* (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1926). The Samaritan Pentateuch is cited according to the edition of S. Schorch (ed.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), and A. Tal and M. Florentin *נספחים הערות, מבוא, הערות, נספחים* (*The Pentateuch – The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version*) (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2010), that features manuscript 6 (C) from the year 1204 of the Shekhem synagogue. Following abbreviations are used: BHQ = *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*; MS(S) = Hebrew Masoretic manuscript(s); MT = Masoretic text; SP = Samaritan Pentateuch.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Third edition, revised and expanded; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), chapter 4, C.iv.

### 1.1.3. Orthography of the suffixed pronoun third person m. sg. on singular nouns

The Masoretic and Samaritan traditions differ in their understanding of the suffixed pronoun of the third person singular in Lev 1:16. The third person feminine pronoun in the phrase *בְּנִצְתָּהּ וְהִשְׁלִיךְ אֹתָהּ* ‘with its feathers, and cast it’ refers in the Masoretic text to the feminine noun *מְרֻצָתוֹ* ‘its crop’. The Samaritan text *בְּנִצְתוֹ וְהִשְׁלִיךְ אֹתוֹ* features the masculine pronoun referring to the masculine collective noun *עוֹף* ‘birds’ in verse 14. The masculine pronoun on *מְרֻצָתוֹ* also refers to *עוֹף*, similarly as the nouns *רֹאשׁוֹ* ‘its head’ and *דָּמּוֹ* ‘its blood’ in verse 15, as well as the verb *הִקְרִיבוּ* ‘he shall bring it’ (if the latter is not referring to *אָדָם* ‘man’ in verse 2, which is also the antecedent of two occurrences of *קָרְבָּנוֹ* ‘his offering’ in verse 14).

The reason for the variation in the pronoun is that the form *ה-*, which is historically the old form of the suffixed pronoun masculine singular, has been orthographically changed into the newer form *ו-* in the Samaritan tradition, while the Masoretic tradition retained the orthography and reinterpreted the form as feminine. Targum Onkelos, Targum Jonathan and the Peshitta read masculine pronouns, making the forms refer to *עוֹף*, being the object of the offering described in this passage.

Since the antecedents of the pronouns are understood differently in both Hebrew text types and in ancient translations,<sup>4</sup> the difference regarding grammar and content should be commented upon in a textual edition.

### 1.1.4. Orthography of the suffixed pronoun third person m. sg. on plural nouns

This pronoun is written as *ו-* in *יָדוֹ* in 9:22 and 16:21 in the Samaritan Pentateuch and as *Ketib* in Masoretic manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> The *Ketib* form is linguistically and chronologically the older one. The Masoretic *Qere* *יָדוֹ* disambiguates the meaning of *יָדוֹ*, which can be both singular and dual/plural. As I have argued elsewhere that an edition reconstructing the earliest inferable text should feature the older, defective form, giving the reader the possibility to determine the meaning of the passage.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897; reprint New York: Ktav, 1966), 148.

<sup>5</sup> 9:22 is not preserved within Qumran and Masada scrolls. In 16:21, 4QLev-Num<sup>a</sup> has only *יָדוֹ*.

<sup>6</sup> V. Golinets, “Some Considerations on What Philology Cannot Achieve in the Study of the Hebrew Biblical Text,” in *Philology and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute held at Fribourg on 10-11 October, 2013* (ed. I. Himbaza and J. Joosten; FAT II 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 45-69.

The pronominal form  $\text{ו}$  is ambivalent as far as the grammatical number of the pertinent noun is concerned, and a modern editor should not disambiguate its meaning. Many instances of the use of the third person masculine pronoun on plural nouns belong to the group of cases in which both readings are contextually possible, and the original meaning of the text lies beyond the reach of a text editor.<sup>7</sup> Such cases should be treated with caution, and the readings should not be pushed toward only one possible understanding.

### 1.1.5. Orthography of the preposition $\text{מִן}$

The non-assimilated form of the preposition  $\text{מִן}$  sometimes appears in the Masoretic text before an anarthrous noun. The Samaritan text features in corresponding cases the assimilated form:  $\text{מִן־בְּנֵי}$  /  $\text{מִבְּנֵי}$  (Lev 1:14; 14:30). Another example from the Pentateuch is  $\text{מִן־אֲרָם}$  (Num 23:7), which is written as  $\text{מֵאֲרָם}$  in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Both forms of the preposition alternate in the Hebrew texts in a number of cases. One reason for the increased frequency of the non-assimilated form in the course of the textual transmission may be the Aramaic influence on Hebrew, because this preposition does not assimilate in Aramaic.<sup>8</sup>

While editing the text, an editor may want to reconstruct the earliest inferable form of the preposition. However, a mechanical restitution of the non-assimilated form would be inappropriate. In case of Num 23:7, the form  $\text{מִן}$  may be considered original, and the lack of assimilation may be conditioned by the first consonant of the geographic name that is the laryngeal  $\text{/ʔ/}$ .<sup>9</sup> The use of the non-assimilated form may also have a literary dimension, since it may be a deliberate Aramaism in a text speaking about the land of Aram. The form  $\text{מִן}$  in the case of Lev 1:14 and 14:30 may be due to the assimilation to preceding cases of this form as  $\text{מִן־הָעוֹף}$  and  $\text{מִן־הַתְּרִים}$  in 1:14 and  $\text{מִן־הַתְּרִים}$  in 14:30. Accordingly, the assimilated form in Lev 1:14; 14:30 and Num 23:7 in the Samaritan Pentateuch is a correction toward the Hebrew form of the preposition. Such instances of variation belong to a number of textual features whose earliest form cannot be inferred.

### 1.2. *Lexical variation*

Another type of variant readings is lexical variation within textual witnesses. Depending on the part of speech involved in this type of variation, the estab-

<sup>7</sup> Golinets, "Some Considerations."

<sup>8</sup> Cf. V. Golinets, "Variations in the Use of Prepositions in the Texts of the Hebrew Bible. Observations on Language and Text History" (forthcoming).

<sup>9</sup> A comparable example is  $\text{מִן־אֲשֶׁר}$  (Judg 7:23).

lishment of the earliest inferable text may be impossible, since the differences between the textual witnesses may reflect both linguistic development and varying exegetical traditions.

Particles are textual elements that are most liable to change in the course of transmission. Prepositions, the particle **כִּל**, the object particle **אֵת**, the article, and the relative particle **אֲשֶׁר** belong to this group.

### 1.2.1. Presence and absence of prepositions

The expression 'to act with hostility toward somebody' is construed both with and without the preposition **ב**. Lev 26 presents various attestations of this feature.

קרי	עמי	ואם תלכו	Lev 26:21
קרי	עמי	והלכתם	Lev 26:23
בקרי	עמכם	והלכתיו אף-אני	Lev 26:24
בקרי	עמי	והלכתם	Lev 26:27
בקרי	עמכם	והלכתיו	Lev 26:28
בקרי	עמי	ואף אשר תלכו	Lev 26:40
בקרי	עמם	אף-אני אלד	Lev 26:41

The readings of verses 21, 23 and 28 are supported by 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>. In verse 24, this Qumran scroll has **קרי עמכם בחמת קרי**, which is an assimilation to verse 28. The reading of verse 27 is supported by the manuscript of Reworded Pentateuch 4Q365 (4QRP-c), fragments 25a–c, line 12.

The Samaritan Pentateuch features the preposition only in verses 24, 40 and 41,<sup>10</sup> and this is also the case in its Arabic translation.<sup>11</sup> Some Hebrew Samaritan manuscripts have the preposition in verses 21, 23 and 27.<sup>12</sup> Some Masoretic manuscripts read **בקרי** in verse 21.

It seems, the expression could be use in Hebrew both with and without the preposition **ב**. Both the presence and the absence of the preposition in this phrase in Leviticus can be very old.<sup>13</sup> If the expression is construed without the preposition, then **קרי** functions as an adverb. This is how the Septuagint under-

<sup>10</sup> It is missing in vers 41 in the manuscript 6 (C) of the Shekhem synagogue (Tal and Florentin, *חמשה חומשי תורה*, 397).

<sup>11</sup> H. Shehadeh, *The Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Edited from the Manuscripts with an Introductory Volume*. Volume Two: *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2002).

<sup>12</sup> A. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1918); Schorch, *Leviticus*.

<sup>13</sup> The expression **קרי הלכו** is also employed in 4Q504 (4QDibHam<sup>a</sup>), col. XIX, fragments 1+2 iv recto, line 7.

stands this expression (πορεύομαι πλάγιος in verses 21, 23, 27, 40 and πορεύομαι θυμῷ πλαγίῳ in verse 24).<sup>14</sup> The Septuagint translates without a preposition in all instances except for verses 28 and 41, where the preposition ἐν in the latter assimilates the expression to the former (ἐν θυμῷ πλαγίῳ).

The absence of the preposition in some verses in different textual witnesses may also indicate that it is missing due to the negligence of scribes. The present state of knowledge does not allow a definite conclusion about the oldest form of the text. The uncertainty may remain in this case, since a preposition is too small a textual element to be definitely established in all cases of its variance.

### 1.2.2. Interchange of prepositions

The Hebrew Bible attests the interchange of the prepositions לָאֵל and עַל in many places. This interchange occurs in both directions and is attested among different textual witnesses: in parallel passages, between the Masoretic text and Qumran scrolls, between the Masoretic text and ancient translations, and between medieval Masoretic manuscripts.<sup>15</sup> Both prepositions have their own semantic range and, contrary to the assertion of Sperber,<sup>16</sup> they are neither synonymous nor mutually interchangeable. A correct usage of the prepositions can be established 1. on the basis of comparison with other attestations of an expression, 2. in connection with a verb which governs one of the prepositions, 3. with the help of semantic considerations. As far as the ancient translations are concerned, the use of a preposition may be conditioned by the target language, but it may also reflect the usage of the *Vorlage*. The examples from the book of Leviticus are discussed in the following.

#### 1.2.2.1. Change from לָאֵל to עַל

The phrase קִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל קִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ ‘its blood is to be squeezed/drained out on the side of the altar’ in 1:15 features the preposition לָאֵל in the Samaritan text. The Septuagint translates the preposition with πρὸς. לָאֵל is also the reading of the citation of this verse in the Venice edition of the Babylonian Talmud of 1522,

<sup>14</sup> The Septuagint is cited according to the edition of J. W. Wevers, *Leviticus* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum II, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). This is also the reading of one manuscript of the Arabic translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch (Shehadeh, *The Arabic Translation*, 142, in the apparatus).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Golinets, “Variations in the Use of Prepositions.”

<sup>16</sup> A. Sperber, “Hebrew Grammar: A New Approach,” *JBL* 62 (1943), 137-262, § 101 (reprinted in Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to Their Solution* [Leiden: Brill, 1966], 633, § 107).



*Zevachim* 65r.<sup>17</sup> In Lev 5:9, the verb נִמְצָה is construed with the preposition אֶל both in the Masoretic and Samaritan texts. The Septuagint translates the preposition with ἐπί. It can be deduced from this evidence that the regular use of the verb נִמְצָה is with the preposition אֶל.

#### 1.2.2.2. Change from על to אֶל

The phrase וְשָׁלַח אֶת-הַצֶּפֶר הַחַיָּה עַל-פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה ‘he shall let the live bird go free over the open field’ 14:7 employs the preposition אֶל in the parallel verse 53. This is also the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the translation of the Septuagint (εἰς), while Targum Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi have על. The spatial expression וְשָׁלַח אֶת-הַצֶּפֶר הַחַיָּה עַל-פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה ‘over the open field’ regularly employs the preposition על.<sup>18</sup> The use of the latter can also be found in other instances in conjunction with the verbs שָׁלַח and שָׁלַח עַל in connection with שָׁלַח is attested in 1 Kgs 15:20, while the parallel passage 2 Chr 16:4 features אֶל (the Septuagint translates the preposition in the latter verse with ἐπί). The preposition על in connection with שָׁלַח is attested in Ezek 14:19, 21. In verse 19, it is the reading of Oriental Masoretes<sup>19</sup> and some medieval manuscripts,<sup>20</sup> while Occidental Masoretes and other manuscripts read אֶל. The variance between Oriental and Occidental Masoretes in verse 21 is recorded in a list edited by Walton.<sup>21</sup> Even if the latter three instances use the verbs שָׁלַח and שָׁלַח in connection with the preposition על in the sense of ‘to send against something’, which differs from the usage in Lev 14:7 and 53, these instances attest to the change from על to אֶל,

<sup>17</sup> Noted by Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum. Vol. 1, ad loc.* The Talmud manuscripts Munich 95, New York Columbia X 893 T 141, Paris AIU H147A as well as Vatican 118 and 121 read על. Interestingly, two other prepositional objects depending on the verb נִמְצָה, but not belonging to the biblical text, are construed in the Talmud text of the Venice edition with the preposition על.

<sup>18</sup> Lev 17:5; Num 19:16; 1 Sam 14:25; 2 Sam 11:11; 2 Kgs 9:37; Jer 9:21; Ezek 29:5; 32:4; 33:27; 39:5. Cf. also וְשָׁלַח אֶת-הַצֶּפֶר הַחַיָּה עַל-פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ ‘over the land’ in Ezek 38:20. Another exception from this usage is Ezek 16:5. However, in the latter verse, medieval manuscripts read על, and this preposition is reflected in the translation of the Septuagint and Vulgate (ἐπί, *super*). In this verse, the verb הִשָּׁלַךְ ‘to be thrown’ is used. The same variance of prepositions in connection with the verb שָׁלַח is attested in 1 Kgs 19:19 (second occurrence). Thus, Ezek 16:5 and 1 Kgs 19:19 reflect the same type of preposition interchange.

<sup>19</sup> The variance between oriental and occidental readings is recorded in the corresponding list in the Leningrad codex, fol. 467v and in a list in the London Polyglot Bible edited by B. Walton, *Ad Biblia Sacra polyglotta appendix* (London: Thomas Roycroft, 1657; reprint Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1963), 15.

<sup>20</sup> This is also the reading of the codex of Later Prophets with Babylonian vocalisation from the year 916 of the National Library of Russia, shelf-mark Евр. I B 3. See H. L. Strack, *Prophetarum posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (St. Petersburg: C. Ricker; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1876); reprint *The Hebrew Bible – Latter Prophets. The Babylonian Codex of Petrograd* (Prolegomenon by P. Wernberg-Møller; New York: Ktav, 1971).

<sup>21</sup> Walton, *Ad Biblia Sacra polyglotta appendix*, 15.

which is comparable to the verses from Leviticus. As shown in footnote 18, this change is also attested in connection with the verb שלך.

Another instance of the change from על to אל is attested in verse 51. Here, the verb הִזָּה ‘to sprinkle’ is used with the preposition אל, while 4QLev-Num<sup>a</sup>, the Samaritan Pentateuch, two medieval manuscripts, the Targum Neofiti and the Peshiṭta read על, and the Septuagint translates it with ἐπί. The same expression in a somewhat parallel text in verse 7 has the preposition על. The expression אֶל-נֹכַח ‘in direction of’ in Num 19:4 also features אל in connection with the verb הִזָּה, which is also the reading of 4QNum<sup>b</sup> and of the Samaritan Pentateuch. One manuscript reads here על, and it is the same one that reads this preposition in Lev 14:51 (Kennicott nr. 18). The preposition על is also used with Paʿal of נזה – in Lev 6:20; Isa 63:3.<sup>22</sup>

The difference in preposition between Lev 14:7 and 51 is not due to different prepositional objects (עַל הַמַּטְהָר and אֶל-הַבַּיִת respectively), because the same variation is also attested between the parallel texts Lev 14:7 and 14:53. Thus, the interchange of both prepositions is not conditioned by other lexical items of the context.

Another instance of the change from על to אל is Lev 8:8, where in the phrase וַיִּתֵּן אֶל-הַזֶּהוּשׁ, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshiṭta feature על, while the Septuagint translates the preposition with ἐπί. The preposition על fits the context better than אל.

The change is also attested in 9:22 in some Masoretic manuscripts in the expression וַיִּשָּׂא יָדָיו עַל ‘to lift hands above’. The description of this gesture of blessing is elsewhere construed with the preposition על.<sup>23</sup> The Samaritan Pentateuch, Targum Neofiti, Peshiṭta and some manuscripts of the Masoretic text feature this preposition in 9:22. The Septuagint translates the preposition with ἐπί.

Another case of the change is 18:18. Here, the preposition אל is used in the expression meaning ‘together with, in addition to’. The Targum Neofiti and the Peshiṭta render here with וְ, and the Septuagint translates the preposition with ἐπί. This expression regularly employs the preposition על.<sup>24</sup> Exact parallels to

<sup>22</sup> With in אל 2 Kgs 9:33 (2x). While the Septuagint translates it with πρὸς, the Targum and the Peshiṭta feature על.

<sup>23</sup> Gen 49:14, 17; with the verb וַיִּשָּׂא in Sirach 50:20.

<sup>24</sup> Gen 28:9; 31:50; 32:12; Lev 7:12 (2°), 13 (2°); Num 6:20; 15:9; 28:10, 15, 24; 35:6; Deut 23:14; Judg 15:8; Isa 32:10; Jer 4:20; Ezek 16:37, 43; Hosea 10:14; Amos 3:15; Job 16:14. The change into אל in this expression is also attested in Jos 13:22; Ezek 7:26; 16:61; 44:7. Jos 13:22 has a parallel in Num 31:8 where the preposition על is used. In Ezek 7:26 the preposition על is also attested in the same context. There are no variant readings for Ezek 16:61 and 44:7 in the sources available to me, but the regular usage of the expression וְעַל-פִּנֵּי הַשְּׂדֵה is established. Since the Book of Ezekiel features more instances of על and אל interchange than any other biblical book, a textual critic may either restore the correct form or preserve the lexical idiosyncrasy of the book.

this verse are Gen 28:9 and 31:50 ('to take a wife in addition to/besides another one').

In 16:2 the change from על to אַל in connection with the verb נראה is attested in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Masoretic text, the Targums Onkelos, Yerushalmi und Neofiti as well as the Peshitta feature על. The Septuagint and the Vulgate translate the preposition with ἐπί and *super*, respectively.

The examples of interchange between the prepositions על and אַל show how grammatical and textual issues are intertwined, and a presentation of these cases in a textual edition should take into consideration both linguistic usage and textual development.

### 1.2.3. The particle כֹּל

The presence and absence of the particle כֹּל or its translational equivalent vary in many places.<sup>25</sup> The Masoretic and Samaritan texts of Leviticus differ in the usage of this particle.

אַחַת מִמִּצְוֹת	4:27
אַחַת מִכָּל מִצְוֹת	SP

The presence of the particle in SP 4:27 may be an assimilation to 4:2, 13, 22 or to 15:17.

עַל-כֹּל-זֶרַע	11:37; MasLev <sup>b</sup>
עַל זֶרַע	SP

אֶת הַבְּשָׂרוֹ	16:4
אֶת כָּל בְּשָׂרוֹ	SP

וְשִׁמְרֶתֶם אֶת הַחֻקִּי	20:8
שִׁמְרֶתֶם אֶת כָּל חֻקֵּי	SP

The reading with the particle in 20:8 could be an assimilation to the usage in 19:37 and 20:22.

<sup>25</sup> Cf., e.g., its absence in the rendering in the Septuagint of the Book of Leviticus in 19:2, and cf. Zech 3:9 in 4QXII<sup>c</sup> and the Septuagint, as well as Esth 8:5. A. Schenker, Y. A. P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, G. J. Norton, S. Pisano, J. de Waard, R. D. Weis, P. B. Dirksen, R. Schäfer, M. Sæbø (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 18. *General Introduction and Megillot* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004).

ומלְבַד מתְנוּתִיכֶם	23:38
ומלְבַד כל מתְנוּתִיכֶם	SP
אֶךְ רֶבְכוֹר	27:26
אֶךְ כל בְּכוֹר	SP

None of the cited instances affected by the variation in the use of the particle *כֹּל* are attested in Qumran. The particle functions to reinforce the expression or to expand its effectiveness. Thus, the presence of the particle may in many instances be regarded as an addition in the course of textual transmission and/or exegetical expansion of meaning. The deletion of the particle in an eclectic edition should not be carried out mechanically, since it could also be argued that the original particle has been omitted in some instances.

#### 1.2.4. Interchange of nouns

The interchange of nouns *בְּנֵי* and *בֵּית* occurs in 17:13 and 20:2, where the first noun is featured in the Masoretic text and the second one in the Samaritan Pentateuch and other textual witnesses.

וְאִישׁ אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	17:13
וְאִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל	SP; MSS; Targum Yerushalmi <sup>26</sup>
אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	20:2
אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל	SP; 11QpaleoLev <sup>a</sup> ; MS <sup>27</sup>

The expressions *בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* and *בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל* in connection with the preposition *מִן* are synonymous in the contexts under discussion. The latter expression also appears in the Masoretic text in Lev 17:3, 8, 10; 22:8 and Ezek 14:4, 7, but the former is attested more often.<sup>28</sup> In Lev 17:3, the Septuagint and the Peshitta read *בְּנֵי*. The Septuagint also reads it in 17:8, 10<sup>29</sup> and 22:18.

<sup>26</sup> The latter translates *וְאִישׁ אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* 'a young man or old man from the house of the family Israel' (M. Ginsburger, *Pseudo-Jonathan [Thargum Jonathan Ben Uziel zum Pentateuch]. Nach der Londoner Handschrift [Brit. Mus. add. 27031] herausgegeben*; Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1971).

<sup>27</sup> *In margine*. See Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*. Vol. I (cf. *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*. Vol. II, 106, nr. 600).

<sup>28</sup> Lev 17:13; 20:2; Num 3:12; 8:16; 16:2; 25:6; Deut 23:18; 24:7; Jos 2:2; 4:4; Judg 19:12; 1 Sam 9:2; 2 Sam 21:2; 1 Kgs 9:20; Ezra 7:7; Dan 1:3.

<sup>29</sup> Peshitta features no equivalent for either of the Hebrew nouns in Lev 17:10 and in Ezek 14:7.

It could be surmised on the basis of this evidence that the expression מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in the book of Leviticus is older than מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, but there is no definitive proof for it, because the variation between the two nouns is also attested elsewhere, and it goes in both directions:

וַיִּקְרָאוּ בֵּית-יִשְׂרָאֵל <sup>30</sup>	וַיִּקְרָאוּ בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל <sup>31</sup>	Exod 16:31
מִבֵּית עֵדֶן	ἐξ ἀνδρῶν Χαρραν (= מבני חרן)	Amos 1:5
οἶκος Ἰσραηλ	בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Amos 3:1
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως	וְעַל-בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ	Zeph 1:8

In some cases, either of the expressions can be an assimilation to other instances of its use within a particular book. Both expressions may be cited in an edition as a synonymous reading without making a statement about which one is the older variant.

The Masoretic text, 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>, and the Samaritan Pentateuch feature in 26:20 the expression עֵץ הָאֲרָץ ‘the trees of the land’. This expression is attested only here, while the regular form of the collocation is עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה ‘the trees of the field’.<sup>32</sup> The form עֵץ הָאֲרָץ originated out of a spontaneous use of a synonymic noun (אֲרָץ/שָׂדֶה) and it is not a stable collocation. The reading of the Samaritan text is supported by the Septuagint, Targums Yerushalmi and Neofiti, as well as some Masoretic manuscripts. The Qumran scroll 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup> demonstrates that the change from שָׂדֶה to אֲרָץ has occurred quite early in the course of the text transmission. Accordingly, the reading ‘field’ in other textual witnesses may be characterised as a later assimilation to the more common form of the collocation. A textual edition aiming at reconstructing the earliest inferable text has to decide to either feature אֲרָץ as the oldest attested form or to feature שָׂדֶה as the form that the author may have indented according to what we know about the use of corresponding expressions in Biblical Hebrew.

<sup>30</sup> 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>; 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>l</sup>, SP, Targum Onkelos, Targum Yerushalmi, Vulgate.

<sup>31</sup> Septuagint, Targum, Neofiti, Peshitta, MSS.

<sup>32</sup> Exod 9:25; Lev 26:4; Deut 20:19; Jer 7:20; Ezek 34:27; עֵצֵי הַשָּׂדֶה Isa 55:12; Ezek 17:24; 31:4, 5, 15; Joel 1:12, 19. Cf. also the expressions שִׁיחַ הַשָּׂדֶה ‘shrub of the field’ (Gen 2:5); עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה ‘plant of the field’ (Gen 2:5; Exod 9:22; 10:15; Jer 12:4); חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה ‘beast of the field’ (Gen 2:19, 20; 3:1, 14, 18; Exod 23:11, 29; Lev 26:11; 27:21; Deut 7:22; 2 Sam 21:10; 2 Kgs 14:9; Isa 43:20; Jer 12:9; 27:6; 28:14; Ezek 31:6, 13; 34:5, 8; 38:20; 39:4, 17; Hos 2:14, 20; 4:3; 13:8; 2 Chr 25:18; Job 5:23; 39:15; 40:20); גֵּרֶק הַשָּׂדֶה ‘grass of the field’ (Num 22:4); צִיץ הַשָּׂדֶה ‘flower of the field’ (Isa 40:6; Ps 103:15); צִמָּח הַשָּׂדֶה ‘spout of the field’ (Ezek 16:7); יַעַר הַשָּׂדֶה ‘forest of the field’ (Ezek 21:2).

### 1.2.5. Interchange of verbs

There are instances of variation of verbs where the Masoretic text and the Samaritan Pentateuch feature contextual synonyms.

MT	SP	
יָאָשֶׁם	יחטא	5:5
תִּגְיַע יָדוֹ	תשיג ידו	5:7
יִשִּׁים	יצק	5:11
וַיִּשֶׂם	ויתן	8:9
וַיִּקְרַב	ויגיש	8:18

None of these verses are attested in Qumran or Masada. The original readings can easily be established through comparison with neighbouring verses. The first two readings of the SP assimilate to other verses: 5:5 to 4:22; 5:7 to 5:11. In the case of 5:11, the verb יצק may be an assimilation to 14:26 and Num 5:15, but it could also be argued that the verb יִשִּׁים of the MT is secondary, because its meaning is not specific. The Septuagint with ἐπιχεεῖ ‘he shall pour out’ supports the reading of the SP.

The reading of SP in 8:9 may be an assimilation to Exod 39:31, because, although the verb נתן with the preposition על is also employed in Exod 34:33; Lev 8:15, 23; 9:9 and Num 11:25, it is used in Exod 39:31 in connection with the noun מִצְנֶפֶת ‘turban’. The reading of SP in 8:18 may be an assimilation to 8:14.

### 1.3. Lexicosyntactic variation

This type of variation occurs, where the presence or absence of a lexeme bears on the syntax and, as the case may be, on the meaning of the phrase. The lexemes involved are the *nota objecti* אַת, the article, the relative particle אֲשֶׁר, and the pronoun הוּא employed as copula in verbless clauses.

#### 1.3.1. The *nota objecti* אַת

The *nota objecti* אַת is another grammatical and textual element whose distribution of attestations complicate the reconstruction of the earliest inferable text. Similar to the interchange of the prepositions אֶל and עַל, to the interchange of the nouns בְּנֵי and בְּיַת, as well as to the presence or absence of the particle כִּלְ, this change goes both directions in the book of Leviticus. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Qumran texts manifest the tendency to supply the *nota objecti* in

places where the Masoretic text employs none. In some instances, however, the *nota obiecti* is missing in the SP, while it is featured in Qumran and in the Masoretic texts.

Without ׀	With ׀
1:4 <sup>33</sup>	SP
SP	1:9
3:2; 4QLev <sup>e</sup>	SP
4:17	SP; MSS
4:28 <sup>34</sup>	SP; MSS
5:5	SP
SP	8:21
12:3	SP
14:6	SP
SP	14:47; 1° in 4QLev-Num <sup>a35</sup>
15:13	SP
15:15 (2x); SP    parallel passage	15:30; SP
SP	16:24
17:10	SP; 4QLev <sup>d</sup>
19:15	SP
19:23	SP; MSS
20:20	SP
21:6	SP
SP	1° 21:10; 11QpaleoLev <sup>a</sup> ; MS
SP; MSS	2° 22:15; 4QLev <sup>b</sup>
22:31	SP; MSS
27:19, SP	2° in 11QpaleoLev <sup>a</sup>

The tendency to complement the *nota obiecti* is also visible in the Qumran texts and medieval manuscripts in many other places in the Hebrew Bible. The question arises, whether it is necessary to indicate all such cases in the critical apparatus or if it would be better to list them as part of the introduction to an edition under the description of textual witnesses. The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ) of Genesis<sup>36</sup> notes in the apparatus the absence of the *nota* in SP in 41:51 and its presence in SP and other textual witnesses. The BHQ Genesis characterises the presence of the *nota* as “facilitation of a syntactical difficul-

<sup>33</sup> The chapter and verse indications refer to the Masoretic texts.

<sup>34</sup> The parallel passage 4:23 features the *nota obiecti*.

<sup>35</sup> The part of the text with the second occurrence of ׀ is missing in this fragment.

<sup>36</sup> A. Tal (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica quinta editio cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 1. *Genesis* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015).

ty”,<sup>37</sup> “assimilation to specific words or phrases in the context of the current passage”,<sup>38</sup> “assimilation to the typical form of the expression as found in Biblical Hebrew”,<sup>39</sup> “liberty in respect to syntactic matters”<sup>40</sup> and simply “liberty”.<sup>41</sup> These characterisations imply that the presence of this particle is secondary. At the same time, there are instances where the presence of the *nota obiecti* is connected with major textual variants and with change of the syntactic structure of the passage. Such instances in the book of Genesis are 11:8 and 14:19 (cf. BHQ).

According to the editorial guidelines of the BHQ,<sup>42</sup> both types of variants should be noted in the apparatus, but it can be argued that those of the first type rather belong to the realm of linguistic development as well as subsequent text modernisation and have no bearing on the content. Most instances of the absence or presence of the particle נָח may be seen as what the editors of the *Hebrew Bible Critical Edition* following Greg<sup>43</sup> term “accidentals” of the text.<sup>44</sup> These are features that accompany the text but do not constitute its indispensable elements. On the one hand, the absence or presence of the particle could not always be surely reconstructed for the earliest inferable text, and on the other hand, there are too many instances of this variation in all textual witnesses to indicate them in the apparatus of an *editio critica minor*, and perhaps also even in the *editio critica major*. The use of the *nota obiecti* is a topic of the Hebrew syntax, and its usage may rather be conditioned by dialectal or idiolectal than by textual factors. A diachronic study of the use of this particle in Ancient Hebrew could probably develop arguments for the possibility or impossibility of reconstructing it in the earliest inferable text.

### 1.3.2. The article

The article is a relatively late lexicosyntactic element in Hebrew and other Canaanite languages. Its use has increased in the course of the linguistic development, and the number of arthrous forms has grown bigger during the transmission of the biblical text. However, a mechanical restitution of

<sup>37</sup> In 2:9; 15:10; 17:5; 18:17; 22:14; 34:14.

<sup>38</sup> In 2:19; 21:10.

<sup>39</sup> In 16:11; 17:24; 23:4.

<sup>40</sup> In 19:37; 20:7; 29:33.

<sup>41</sup> In 48:17.

<sup>42</sup> Schenker et al., *Biblia Hebraica quinta*, XII.

<sup>43</sup> W. W. Greg, “The Rationale of Copy-Text,” *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–1951), 19–36 (21).

<sup>44</sup> R. Hendel (ed.), “The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition Guide for Editors (Revised August 2014),” 4 ([ohb.berkeley.edu/Editor's%20Guide%202014.pdf](http://ohb.berkeley.edu/Editor's%20Guide%202014.pdf); retrieved 31.08.2017); M. V. Fox, *Proverbs. An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary* (The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition 1; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015), 23.



anarthrous forms in an eclectic edition of the Hebrew Bible would be methodologically unwarranted, since the distribution of arthrous and anarthrous forms is not always clear-cut. Besides contextual factors, dialectal or idiolectal preferences may have been influential. The following examples of the variation of article usage are attested in the Hebrew texts of the book of Leviticus.

בגד צמר או פושתים	11QLev <sup>b</sup>
בגד הצמר או הפושתים	13:59; SP
כלי-כלי עור	13:59; 11QLev <sup>b</sup>
כל כלי העור	SP

Since the three textual witnesses in 13:59 treat the three instances where the article may be used differently, and since the material names can be construed without determination, it can be argued that the use of the article is secondary in all three instances.

אחד הטאת ואחד עליה	SP
אֶחָד הַטָּאֵת וְאֶחָד עֲלֶיהָ	15:15

In the parallel formulation in 15:30, both text types employ the article: אֶת־הָאֶחָד הַטָּאֵת וְאֶת־הָאֶחָד עֲלֶיהָ. None of these texts are attested in Qumran or Masada. The use of the article in this expression may be facultative, and the presence of the article in 15:15 in SP may be due to assimilation that has been carried out only partly.

לזבח שלמים	23:19; 4QLev <sup>b</sup>
לזבח השלמים	SP
בן הישראלית ואיש ישראלי	SP
בן הישראלית ואיש הישראלי	Lev 24:10

The absence of the article in the SP of 24:10 better fits the context, because the second entity referred to in the verse is not mentioned previously, in contrast to the first entity. Thus, the absence of definiteness is required by the context.

The presence or absence of the article occurs in the textual witnesses of the Hebrew Bible in many places. Such cases should be treated outside a textual edition, and a special study should search for arguments for the reconstruction of texts affected by the variation in the article usage.

### 1.3.3. The relative particle אֲשֶׁר

The relative particle אֲשֶׁר also belongs to the group of grammatical elements whose presence in the text has increased over the course of the textual transmission. It appears in two places in the Samaritan Pentateuch where it is not featured in the Masoretic text. None of these texts are attested in Qumran or Masada.

מִזְבַּח יְהוָה	פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד	17:6
מִזְבַּח יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר	פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד	SP

וּמִן־הַגֵּר	הַגֵּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם	17:10
וּמִן הַגֵּר אֲשֶׁר יֵגוּר	בְּתוֹכְכֶם	SP

The presence of the particle אֲשֶׁר eliminates asyndetic constructions in order to syntactically simplify the phrase. The addition of the particle is also attested in other places, e.g., in Eccl 1:13 in the manuscript British Library, Arundel Or 2, fol. 301r (= no. 129 of Kennicott's collation).

### 1.3.4. The use of the pronoun הוּא in verbless clauses

The pronoun functions as a copula to mark the surface structure of verbless predicative constructions. Since the presence of the pronoun in this position is facultative in Hebrew, its supplementation in the texts is secondary and due to the linguistic development as well as the exegetical specification of the text meaning. There are two examples in the book of Leviticus.

עֲלֶה	אִשָּׁה	1:9
עֲלֶה הוּא אִשָּׁה		SP

אִשָּׁה הוּא לִיהוָה		8:28
אִשָּׁה	לִיהוָה	SP

### 1.4. *Variation of word order*

The same phrase may feature varying word order in its occurrences. The fluctuation of the word order can thus be a free variation stemming from the original composition. A variant may get assimilated to other occurrences of the pertinent phrase. However, the variation may also occur spontaneously in the course of textual transmission. It is not always possible to discern between the two possibilities.

## 1.4.1. Word order variation within enumeration

Word order variation within enumeration may affect single words (4:28) or syntagmas (14:51, 52).

תְּמִימָה נִקְבָּה	4:28
נִקְבָּה תְּמִימָה	SP; Septuagint

וְאֶת־הָאֵזוֹב וְאֵת שְׁנֵי הַתּוֹלְעוֹת	14:51; 4QLev-Num <sup>a</sup>
וְאֵת שְׁנֵי הַתּוֹלְעוֹת וְאֵת הָאֵזוֹב	SP; Septuagint

The word order of the SP in 14:51 has a parallel in verse 14:6.

וּבְאֵזוֹב וּבְשְׁנֵי הַתּוֹלְעוֹת	14:52; Septuagint
וּבְשְׁנֵי הַתּוֹלְעוֹת וּבְאֵזוֹב	SP

The word order of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint in 4:28 may be an assimilation to 4:32.

אֶחָד לְעֵלָה וְאֶחָד לְחַטָּאת	12:8
אֶחָד לְחַטָּאת וְאֶחָד לְעֵלָה	SP; Septuagint

## 1.4.2. Word order variation between subject and predicate

שְׁנֵיהֶם מוֹת יוֹמָתוֹ	20:13; Septuagint
מוֹת יוֹמָתוֹ שְׁנֵיהֶם	SP

וְלֹא־תִקְיָא אֶתְכֶם הָאֶרֶץ	20:22; 1QpaleoLev-Num <sup>a</sup> ; Septuagint
וְלֹא תִקְיָא הָאֶרֶץ אֶתְכֶם	SP

The word order of the SP in 20:22 has a parallel in 18:28.

## 1.4.3. Word order variation between subject and object

וְטָמְא אֹתוֹ	13:27
אֹתוֹ הִכְהֵן	SP; Septuagint

וְטָמְא אֹתוֹ הִכְהֵן	13:30; Septuagint
הִכְהֵן אֹתוֹ	SP

In 13:27 and 13:30 the variation between both types of text goes in both directions. The word order of the MT in 13:27 has a parallel in verse 22, while the word order of 13:30 has a parallel in verse 25. Thus, every sequence is attested two times in the Masoretic text,<sup>45</sup> and the Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to either of them.

#### 1.4.4. Word order variation between subject and attribute

וְלֹגְ אֶחָד שָׁמֶן	14:10
וְלֹגְ שֶׁמֶן אֶחָד	SP; Septuagint

#### 1.5. Morphological variation

Morphological variation in the third feminine singular form of the suffix conjugation of verbs *tertiaie vocalis* is attested between the Masoretic and Samaritan texts in 25:21 and 26:34. The MT features the more archaic form *\*qalat*,<sup>46</sup> while in the SP this form has been replaced with the form *\*qaltā*, which is a linguistic modernisation (compare עָשָׂתָּ and הִרְצָתָּ with עָשְׂתָּהּ and הִרְצִיתָּהּ). None of these verses are attested within the Qumran or Masada scrolls.

#### 1.6. Morphosyntactic variation

Morphosyntactic variation between the Masoretic and the Samaritan text is attested in 26:43, where the former features a *way-yiqtol* and the latter features a *wě-qatal* form:

וְהָאָרֶץ תְּעֹזֵב מֵהֶם וְתָרַץ	אֶת־שִׁבְתֶּיהָ
וְהָאָרֶץ תְּעֹזֵב מֵהֶם	וְהִרְצִיתָּהּ אֶת שִׁבְתֶּיהָ

Both verbal forms are possible here as a continuation of a clause started with a prefix conjugation form (תְּעֹזֵב in this case).<sup>47</sup> The reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch is an assimilation to 26:34, where both texts feature a suffix conjugation form, although of different morphological shapes (cf. item 1.5).

Most types of textual variation discussed in this section belong to the realm of grammar. Apart from the instances where lexical variation is affected (items

<sup>45</sup> The distribution of the occurrences constitutes a chiasmic pattern.

<sup>46</sup> S. H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1922; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1962), § 57z.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), § 32.2.1 and 33.3.2.

1.1.2; 1.1.3; 1.2.3; 1.2.4), these variants have almost no impact on the meaning of the text. The absence or presence of particles may be assigned to accidentals of the text whose reconstruction for the earliest accessible text is both negligible and impossible. Such accidentals should be prearranged and described before an edition is started in order to treat all pertinent cases of textual variety uniformly.

## 2. PECULIARITIES OF THE MASORETIC TEXTS

Let us now turn to the peculiarities of the Masoretic texts. I use the term ‘Masoretic texts’ in plural because there are many forms of the biblical text vocalised by the Masoretes, but our knowledge about all these Masoretic texts is still limited. This limitation of knowledge is twofold. On the one hand, we do not possess information about the text, vocalisation and Masorah of all extant Hebrew manuscripts, and the modern Bible editions resort to a diplomatic presentation of one manuscript. This is the way *Biblia Hebraica*,<sup>48</sup> *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia*,<sup>49</sup> *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ), the *Hebrew University Bible Project* edition<sup>50</sup> and *Hebrew Bible Critical Edition* (HBCE) proceed.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, the Hebrew and Biblical scholarship in the past hundred years has neglected hundreds of manuscripts, while studying only a few selected manuscripts.<sup>52</sup> Exceptions were the studies of manuscripts of the expanded Tiberian tradition by Kahle<sup>53</sup> and Díez Macho,<sup>54</sup> studies of manuscripts of the Babylonian tradition by Kahle,<sup>55</sup>

<sup>48</sup> R. Kittel and P. Kahle (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica* (Textum masoreticum curavit P. Kahle. Editionem tertiam denuo elaboratam ad finem perduxerunt A. Alt et O. Eissfeldt. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937).

<sup>49</sup> A. Dotan, *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001).

<sup>50</sup> M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995); C. Rabin, S. Talmon and E. Tov (ed.), *The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and S. Talmon (ed.), *The Book of Ezekiel* (The Hebrew University Bible; Jerusalem: Magnes 2004).

<sup>51</sup> All these editions except the *Hebrew University Bible Project* edition are based on the Leningrad Codex. Cf. M. V. Fox, *Proverbs*, 17 for the use of Leningrad codex as a base of the HBCE. The *Hebrew University Bible Project* edition is based on the Aleppo Codex (Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah*, xx).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens II. Das palästinische Pentateuchargum, die palästinische Punktation, der Bibeltext des Ben Naftali* (BWANT III/14; Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen 4; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), 45\*-46\*.

<sup>53</sup> Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, 45\*-68\*.

<sup>54</sup> A. Díez Macho, “A New List of So-Called ‘Ben-Naftali’ Manuscripts, Preceded by an Inquiry into the True Character of These Manuscripts,” *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver* (ed. D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 16-52.

Yeivin,<sup>56</sup> and Miletto,<sup>57</sup> as well as in the series *Biblia Babilónica*,<sup>58</sup> and studies of manuscripts of the Palestinian tradition by Kahle,<sup>59</sup> Dietrich,<sup>60</sup> Revell,<sup>61</sup> and Chiesa.<sup>62</sup>

The Leningrad Codex is, together with the Aleppo Codex, the most studied manuscript of the Hebrew Bible. The new look into the Leningrad Codex initiated by the BHQ edition has revealed many peculiarities of its text that have been unnoticed in the edition of Kittel/Kahle and the BHS. Since this manuscript is the textual base for BHQ and HBCE, the discussion of its textual features in the book of Leviticus will benefit both editions.

The vocalisation (including the signs *Dagesh* and *Mappiq*) of the Leningrad Codex exhibits some variation from the patterns of the Standard Tiberian system. The pertinent variants are of importance only for editions of the Masoretic text.

### 2.1. Omitting of *Dagesh* due to avoidance of gemination in adjacent syllables

*Dagesh* is missing in the Leningrad Codex in many places where it is featured in pertinent forms elsewhere in the manuscript or in the same word in other manuscripts. It has been shown that the absence of *Dagesh* is not due to mistakes of the *Naqdan* but due to the tendency to avoid consonantal gemination

<sup>55</sup> P. Kahle, *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902; reprint Hildesheim: Olms 1966).

<sup>56</sup> I. Yeivin, 'מסורת הלשון העברית המשתייכת בניקוד הבבלי' (*The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization*) (The Academy of the Hebrew Language Text and Studies 12; Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985) (in Hebrew).

<sup>57</sup> G. Miletto, *L'Antico Testamento ebraico nella tradizione babilonese. I frammenti della Genizah* (Quaderni di Henoch 3; Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1988).

<sup>58</sup> C. Amparo Alba, *Biblia babilónica. Ezequiel. Edición crítica según manuscritos hebreos de puntuación babilónica* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 27; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1980); *Biblia babilónica. Isaías. Edición crítica según manuscritos hebreos de puntuación babilónica* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 28; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1980); *Biblia Babilónica. Jeremías. Edición crítica según manuscritos de puntuación babilónica* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 41; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1987); A. Díez Macho, *Biblia Babilónica. Fragmentos de Salmos, Job y Proverbios (Ms. 508A del Seminario Teológico de Nueva York)* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 42; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1987).

<sup>59</sup> P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*.

<sup>60</sup> M. Dietrich, *Neue palästinisch punktierte Bibelfragmente. Veröffentlicht und auf Text und Punctuation untersucht* (Massorah, série II, 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968).

<sup>61</sup> E. J. Revell, *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalisation* (Near and Middle East Series 7; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970); *Biblical Texts with Palestinian Pointing and Their Accents* (Masoretic Studies 4; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

<sup>62</sup> B. Chiesa, *L'Antico Testamento ebraico secondo la tradizione palestinese* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1978).

in two adjacent syllables.<sup>63</sup> Thus, the gemination is omitted, inter alia, after the article and in the letter *Yod* of *way-yiqtol* forms of the third person masculine singular. The pertinent cases in the book of Leviticus are *וַיִּתֵּן*,<sup>64</sup> *וַיִּקְרָא* (8:24), *וַיִּקְרָא* (8:28, 29), and *וַיִּתְּנוּ* (10:1).<sup>65</sup> The printed and electronic Bible editions apart from the *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia* have not paid attention to this feature of the Leningrad Codex<sup>66</sup> or have characterised corresponding cases as an error.<sup>67</sup>

According to our present knowledge, the omission of gemination in these positions is an idiosyncrasy of the Codex.<sup>68</sup> A broad study of other manuscripts would offer arguments for a comparative linguistic treatment of this phenomenon. There are also cases in the Leningrad Codex in which the absence of *Dagesh* is due to an error (e.g. *וַיִּקְרָא* Lev 6:6), and they should not be mixed up with the absence of *Dagesh* conditioned by the morphological pattern.

## 2.2. Missing Mappiq

The omission of gemination is a grammatical peculiarity of the Leningrad Codex, but it also features graphic variation which can be explained both in grammatical-exegetical and graphic ways. This is the missing of *Mappiq* marking the suffixed pronoun third feminine singular. The corresponding instances in the book of Leviticus are *וְהָלַכְתָּ* and *אֲזַכְּרֶתְךָ* (4:35 and 5:12). This *Mappiq* is

<sup>63</sup> A. Dotan, “Deviation in Gemination in the Tiberian Vocalization,” *Estudios masoréticos (V congreso de la IOMS). Dedicados a Harry M. Orlinsky* (ed. E. Fernández Tejero; Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 33; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1983), 63-77; reprinted with minor changes in Dotan, *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 1243-1251; V. Golinets, “Dageš, Mappiq, Specks on Vellum, and Editing of the Codex Leningradensis,” *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 15 (2013), 233-263 (237-247).

<sup>64</sup> Lev 14:25. Cf. Golinets, “Dageš, Mappiq, Specks on Vellum,” 243. In *וַיִּצְפֹּר* 14:53, there is a duple in the letter *šadeh*, but there is no ink in it. This *Dagesh* might have been erased, or the ink might have flaked off. The word *וַיִּצְפֹּר* in verses 6 (x3), 7, 50 and 51 (x2) features *Dagesh*.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Dotan, “Deviation in Gemination”, 71; *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia*, 1249; Golinets, “Dageš, Mappiq, Specks on Vellum”, 244.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Golinets, “Dageš, Mappiq, Specks on Vellum”, 247.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. BHS and BHQ 1 in Gen 14:10; 15:10; 18:25; 24:53; 31:51; 40:3; 41:7, 24 (x2), 27; BHQ 5 in Deut 5:12, 15 (C. McCarthy [ed.], *Biblia Hebraica quinta editio cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 5. *Deuteronomy*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007); BHQ 7 in Judg 6:34, 35; 11:32. See N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica quinta editio cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 7. *Judges* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011); BHQ 13 in Hos 9:4, 7; Joel 1:15; Amos 1:1, 2; Mic 4:2; 7:3. See A. Gelston, *Biblia Hebraica quinta editio cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 13. *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010).

<sup>68</sup> The gemination after the article is regularly omitted in the Tiberian system on the vowelless first consonant of the word, e.g. *וַיִּקְרָא*.

also missing in some other instances,<sup>69</sup> and it may be due to negligence of the *Naqdan*, since some other word-final vocalisation signs like vowels – e.g. Pataḥ in תַּגִּיעַ, Lev 5:7 – and *Shwa* are also sometimes missing in this manuscript.<sup>70</sup>

### 2.3 Variation in vocalisation

Variation in vocalisation of guttural consonants in open and closed syllables is featured in the Leningrad Codex but it is not confined to it.<sup>71</sup> An example from the book of Leviticus is וְהִתְנַחֲלֶתֶם, where other MSS and editions feature וְהִתְנַחֲלֶתֶם.<sup>72</sup> Since this variation is broadly attested in Masoretic manuscripts, it should be explained in linguistic terms and not regarded as an error.<sup>73</sup>

The form בְּבִהָרָת (Lev 13:26) with *Segol* under *Bet* instead of the expected בִּבְהָרָת with *Pataḥ* (Lev 13:25)<sup>74</sup> may be an error but it may also be a by-form conditioned by stress and prosody (cf. the pausal form וְלִבְהָרָת in Lev 14:56).

## 3. METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS ABOUT HEBREW BIBLE EDITING IN THE LIGHT OF THE EXAMPLES PRESENTED ABOVE

All features of the consonantal and Masoretic texts discussed above appear not only in the book of Leviticus, but in all biblical books. This means that the evaluation of these peculiarities should not be carried out for singular instances but for the whole Bible. It is clear that these cases should be included and commented upon in Bible editions, but how should it best be done?

Firstly, the type and scope of variants presented in the edition should be outlined. The array of the variants will depend on the rationale of the edition. A diplomatic edition of the Leningrad codex should find a way to present the peculiarities of the manuscript text. An edition of the Tiberian Masoretic text should feature peculiarities of single manuscripts, as far as they are relevant for

<sup>69</sup> Cf. V. Golinets, “Die *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* und ihre Behandlung des Textbefundes masoretischer Handschriften,” *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 21 (2016), 75-99 (93).

<sup>70</sup> Loc. cit., 92-93.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. loc. cit., 82-85.

<sup>72</sup> Loc. cit., 84.

<sup>73</sup> The BHQ characterises corresponding forms as an error. Cf. BHQ 1 in Gen 14:17; 41:46; 43:7 (Tal, *Genesis*); BHQ 5 in Deut 9:3; 25:18 (McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*); BHQ 7 in Judg 5:2 (Fernández Marcos, *Judges*) and BHQ 17 in Prov 21:11. See J. de Waard, *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 17. *Proverbs* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008).

<sup>74</sup> This form of the noun is also attested in Lev 13:2, 4, 19, 23-25, 28.



the history of the language, of the text, and of the Masoretic tradition. The nuances of vocalisation described in section two are irrelevant for an edition aiming at the reconstruction of the earliest inferable text. However, if such an edition prints the text vocalised according to the Tiberian Masoretic system, like the HBCE does, it should expound its treatment of the vocalisation and accentuation.<sup>75</sup>

Secondly, the way of presenting the variants within the edition should be designed. An *editio critica minor* like the BHQ based on a single manuscript features only one textual apparatus that cites all the readings an editor considers relevant from all the textual witnesses he or she consults. This means that the same apparatus of the BHQ contains, besides the purely content variants, information about orthography of Qumran texts, about grammatical solutions of the Septuagint, about Midrashic additions of the Targum, as well as about vowel variation and missing *Dagesh* and *Mappiq* signs in Masoretic manuscripts. It goes without saying that these variants stem from texts written in different languages, and they belong to different spheres of text reception like manuscript transmission, translation, and exegesis. The apparatus not only throws diverse data together, but also combines data from different strata of Biblical Hebrew: from Qumran, from Samaritan Hebrew, from Masoretic Hebrew that is attested in manuscripts from a variety of geographical areas and spans from the tenth to the sixteenth century.<sup>76</sup> While the variants of the consonantal texts from Qumran belong to the earliest stages of Bible transmission, the minutiae of Masoretic texts are late and they constitute accidentals of the text.

A Hebrew Bible edition by definition features not only literary but also linguistic information, and modern editions should pay more attention to this fact than their predecessors. An edition of the Hebrew text should present linguistic information to an extent and in a way that allows both the evaluation of its impact on the meaning and reception of the text, as well as its exploitation in the historical study of the Hebrew language. Thus, examples of omitted gemination (item 2.1) are irrelevant for the textual history but are of great importance for a historical description of the Tiberian Masoretic Hebrew. It can even be argued that an edition of the Masoretic text should primarily contain variants from different types of Masoretic manuscripts and not the variants from older textual strata like the Qumran texts and ancient translations. This idea developed to its logical conclusion will demand two distinct types of criti-

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Fox, *Proverbs*, 13-23.

<sup>76</sup> The Yemenite manuscript of Hagiographa “Cambridge Add. 1753” used in the BHQ is from the year 1577 (cf. Fox, *Proverbs*, 17). S. C. Reif, *Hebrew Manuscripts at Cambridge University Library. A Description and Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 52; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 70 gave a tentative date “fifteenth or sixteenth century”.

cal editions: one of the Masoretic texts and one of the earliest inferable text. The former can be carried out as a search for the earliest inferable Masoretic text or as a comparative edition of Masoretic text forms. Then another edition may try to put the earliest accessible text and the earliest Masoretic text in relation to each other.

An eclectic text edition like the HBCE, which features vocalisation and accentuation of a single Masoretic manuscript, may have to list the Masoretic peculiarities of its base text. If the edition changes in its main text the forms described above in section two towards more common Masoretic forms, then the pertinent instances should be mentioned in the introduction to the edition.

There are two ways how the minutiae of the Masoretic text may be presented in editions like BHQ and HBCE. They can be mentioned in the preface or they can be featured in a separate textual apparatus that contains only such variants. The advantage of the first way of presentation is that the apparatus would be free from the information that has no bearing on reconstructing the earliest form of the text. The advantage of the second way is that an additional apparatus, by recording vocalisation and accentuation of the manuscripts edited, would present information that is relevant for the Hebrew grammar and the history of the Masoretic tradition. *The Hebrew University Bible Project* edition proceeds in the second way as it records the variants of orthography, vowels and accents in its fourth apparatus.

I think that even the diplomatic *editio critica minor* like the BHQ should present the variants of orthography, vowels and accents in an apparatus that is distinct from the one that records the variants which bear on the text meaning. Separating of variant readings with regard to their type and assigning them to another text apparatus would help the reader to easier discern the textual data and to better evaluate the development both of the grammar and the text.

As shown in this study, many variants in the text of the Hebrew Bible are primarily of linguistic nature. Some of them are conditioned by the evolution of the language through centuries and millennia. These variants may affect the text meaning (like in items 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.3.2), but they may also be of interest only for grammarians (items 1.1.1, 1.1.2). A strict separation of both types of variants is impossible, because, depending on the context, the same feature may be both meaningful and unimportant for the meaning. The earliest inferable text may be reconstructed on the base of linguistic argument and textual data in the case of variation in the use of preposition (items 1.2.2.), absence or presence of the particles כִּל (1.2.3) and אַח (1.3.1), the article (1.3.2), the subjunction אַחֲשֶׁר (1.3.3), the pronoun functioning as copula (1.3.4), and morphological and morpho-syntactic variation of verbal forms (1.5 and 1.6). Other variants like spelling of the preposition מִן (item 1.1.5), presence or absence of prepositions (1.2.1), interchange of nouns (1.2.4) and variation of

word order (1.4) reflect orthographic and linguistic variations whose earliest inferable form cannot be definitely postulated. Modern editions of the Hebrew Bible should search for ways of comprehensible presentation and evaluation of both pure grammatical variants and those affecting the meaning of the text.

### References

- Amparo Alba C., *Biblia babilónica. Ezequiel. Edición crítica según manuscritos hebreos de puntuación babilónica* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 27; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano”, 1980).
- Bauer S. H. and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1922; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1962).
- Biblia babilónica. Isaías. Edición crítica según manuscritos hebreos de puntuación babilónica* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 28; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano”, 1980).
- Biblia Babilónica. Jeremías. Edición crítica según manuscritos de puntuación babilónica* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 41; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano”, 1987).
- Biblical Texts with Palestinian Pointing and Their Accents* (Massoretic Studies 4; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- Chiesa B., *L'Antico Testamento ebraico secondo la tradizione palestinese* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1978).
- de Rossi J. B., *Variae lectiones veteris testamenti*. Volumen I (Parma, 1784; reprint Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969).
- de Waard J., *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 17. Proverbs (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008).
- Dietrich M., *Neue palästinisch punktierte Bibelfragmente. Veröffentlicht und auf Text und Punktation untersucht* (Massorah, série II, 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968).
- Díez Macho A., “A New List of So-Called ‘Ben-Naftali’ Manuscripts, Preceded by an Inquiry into the True Character of These Manuscripts,” *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver* (ed. D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 16-52.
- Díez Macho A., *Biblia Babilónica. Fragmentos de Salmos, Job y Proverbios (Ms. 508A del Seminario Teológico de Nueva York)* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 42; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1987).
- Dotan A., “Deviation in Gemination in the Tiberian Vocalization.” *Estudios masoréticos (V congreso de la IOMS). Dedicados a Harry M. Orlinsky* (ed. E. Fernández Tejero; Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 33; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1983), 63-77; reprinted with minor changes in Dotan, *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 1243-1251.

- Dotan A., *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001).
- Fernández Marcos N. (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato. 7. Judges* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011).
- Fox M. V., *Proverbs. An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary* (The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition 1; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015).
- Gelston A., *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato. 13. The Twelve Minor Prophets* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010).
- Ginsburg C. D., *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897; reprint New York: Ktav, 1966).
- Ginsburg C. D., *The Pentateuch. Diligently Revised according to the Massorah and the Early Editions with the Various Readings from MSS. and the Ancient Versions* (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1926).
- Ginsburger, M., *Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan Ben Usiël zum Pentateuch). Nach der Londoner Handschrift (Brit. Mus. add. 27031) herausgegeben* (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1971).
- Golinets V., “Dageš, Mappiq, Specks on Vellum, and Editing of the Codex Leningradensis,” *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 15 (2013), 233-263.
- Golinets V., “Some Considerations on What Philology Cannot Achieve in the Study of the Hebrew Biblical Text,” in *Philology and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Colloquium of the Institut Dominique Barthélemy held at Fribourg on 10-11 October, 2013* (ed. I. Himbaza and J. Joosten; FAT II 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 45-69.
- Golinets V., “Die *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* und ihre Behandlung des Textbefundes masoretischer Handschriften,” *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 21 (2016), 75-99.
- Goshen-Gottstein M. H. (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995).
- Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. and S. Talmon (ed.), *The Book of Ezekiel* (The Hebrew University Bible; Jerusalem: Magnes 2004).
- Greg W. W., “The Rationale of Copy-Text,” *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–1951), 19-36.
- Kahle P., *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902; reprint Hildesheim: Olms 1966).
- Kahle P., *Masoreten des Westens II. Das palästinische Pentateuchtargum, die palästinische Punktation, der Bibeltext des Ben Naftali* (BWANT III/14; Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen 4; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930).
- Kennicott B., *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus. Vol I, Vol. II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1776, 1780; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 2003).

- Kittel R. and P. Kahle (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica* (Textum masoreticum curavit P. Kahle. Editionem tertiam denuo elaboratam ad finem perduxerunt A. Alt et O. Eissfeldt; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937).
- Metso S., "Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus," in *Houses Full of All Good Things. Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 507-519.
- Miletto G., *L'Antico Testamento ebraico nella tradizione babilonese. I frammenti della Genizah* (Quaderni di Henoch 3; Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1988).
- Rabin C., S. Talmon and E. Tov (ed.), *The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997).
- Reif S. C., *Hebrew Manuscripts at Cambridge University Library. A Description and Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 52; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Revell E. J., *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalisation* (Near and Middle East Series 7; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970).
- Schenker A., Y. A. P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, G. J. Norton, S. Pisano, J. de Waard, R. D. Weis, P. B. Dirksen, R. Schäfer, M. Sæbø (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 18. *General Introduction and Megillot* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004).
- Schorch, S. (ed.), *Leviticus* (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior 3; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).
- Shehadeh H., *The Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Edited from the Manuscripts with an Introductory Volume*. Volume Two: *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2002).
- Sperber A., "Hebrew Grammar: A New Approach," *JBL* 62 (1943), 137-262, § 101. Reprinted in Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to Their Solution* (Leiden: Brill, 1966).
- Strack H. L., *Prophetarum posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (St. Petersburg: C. Ricker – Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1876); reprint *The Hebrew Bible – Latter Prophets. The Babylonian Codex of Petrograd* (Prolegomenon by P. Wernberg-Møller; New York: Ktav, 1971).
- Tal A. (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*. 1. *Genesis* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015).
- Tal A. and M. Florentin, *חמשה חומשי תורה. נוסח שומרון ונוסח המסורה. מבוא, הערות, נספחים* (*The Pentateuch – The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version*) (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2010).
- Talmon, S. "Fragments of two Leviticus Scrolls from Masada," *Textus* 19 (1998), 27-44.
- Tov E., *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed., revised and expanded; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).
- Ulrich E., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTS 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

- von Gall A., *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1918).
- Waltke B. K. and M. O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990).
- Walton B., *Ad Biblia Sacra polyglotta appendix* (London: Thomas Roycroft, 1657; reprint Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1963).
- Wevers J. W., *Leviticus* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum II, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Yeivin I., מסורת הלשון העברית המשתקפת בניקוד הבבלי (*The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization*) (The Academy of the Hebrew Language Text and Studies 12; Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985) (in Hebrew).



LEVITICUS 19:2 AND JOSHUA 24:19:  
AN EXAMPLE OF LITERARY ALLUSION?

Esias E. MEYER

1. INTRODUCTION

Some biblical critics such as David Carr and especially Michael Lyons and William Tooman shy away from using the term “intertextuality” for several reasons.<sup>1</sup> Basically the theories of Julia Kristeva, who coined the term, are not regarded as providing suitable tools for diachronic studies.<sup>2</sup> Carr is slightly more optimistic than Tooman, but argues that the concept of intertextuality has a very specific purpose:<sup>3</sup>

I propose reserving the term “intertextuality” to designate a broader realm of often unreconstructable ways in which all biblical texts depend on already-used language from a variety of canonical and often non-canonical, even unwritten, sources in a variety of conscious and unconscious ways.

The important word here is “unreconstructable,” which means that we presume there were texts which had an influence, but they are not accessible to us and we cannot construct them – and by “texts” here we are referring only to written documents. For Carr the main use of the theoretical concept of intertextuality is to keep us biblical critics honest and remind us of how little we actually know, or as he puts it, “help us see what we do not see.”<sup>4</sup> Carr also thinks that we should rather stick to more traditional terms such as “allusion” or “influence”, but then this is only with reference to “binary, reconstructable relationships between biblical texts....”<sup>5</sup>

Similarly, Tooman sticks to more traditional terms such as “allusion,” “echo” and “influence.”<sup>6</sup> He describes “literary allusion” as the “simultaneous

<sup>1</sup> D. M. Carr, “The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential,” in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* (ed. M. Nissinen; VTS 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 505-535; M. A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel’s Use of the Holiness Code* (LHB/OTS 507; London: T&T Clark, 2005); W. A. Tooman, *Gog of Magog* (FAT II/52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

<sup>2</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Carr, “The Many Uses,” 523.

<sup>4</sup> Carr, “The Many Uses,” 532.

<sup>5</sup> Carr, “The Many Uses,” 532.

<sup>6</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 6.



activation of two texts,” a definition he adopts from Ziva Ben-Porat, but it is also used by Lyons.<sup>7</sup> Later Tooman elaborates:<sup>8</sup>

Literary allusion, then, is between written texts, and it is intentional. It presupposes that readers have access (physically or through memory) to the evoked text, and that readers’ recognition of the allusion will influence their understanding of both the evoked and alluding texts, maximizing the scope and complexity of an allusion’s effects.

In his book Tooman actually refers to “reuse” most of the time, which seems to be a synonym for “allusion” to him.<sup>9</sup> His book shows how Ezekiel 38-39 reused texts from the rest of Ezekiel and other texts from the Torah and the Prophets.<sup>10</sup>

I find the idea of activating two or more texts at the same time rather fascinating and this will be my underlying question when comparing certain verses from Joshua 24 to the Holiness Legislation (H)<sup>11</sup> and the Decalogue. Was the author of either the Holiness Legislation or Joshua 24:19 (whoever came second) somehow attempting to activate both texts at the same time?

Tooman presents us with criteria for determining whether some kind of scriptural reuse is actually taking place.<sup>12</sup> He calls these criteria *uniqueness*, *distinctiveness*, *multiplicity*, *thematic correspondence*, and/or *inversion*. I will not define these now, but return to some of them where they might be more applicable in the later discussion. Tooman also provides us with criteria for determining directionality,<sup>13</sup> which are similar to those other scholars such as Lyons and even Carr have presented.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 52.

<sup>8</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 7.

<sup>9</sup> See, for instance, Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 196, where he refers to a “tapestry of allusion” or even to the “author’s technique of allusion”. This is part of his conclusion to ch. 5, which is about “Examining the Reuse.” Or see p. 240, where he talks of “constellations of passages alluded to in GO”, once again under a similar heading: “Effect of Scriptural Reuse”. It is clear that most of the time the term “reuse” is used, but that this is the same as “allusion” for Tooman.

<sup>10</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 88-90, points out a few examples of where Ezekiel 38–39 draw from the Holiness Legislation. For Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 88, “GO is replete with H locutions”.

<sup>11</sup> By using the term “Holiness Legislation” rather than the more traditional “Holiness Code” I follow Nihan. According to him, Leviticus 17–26 never existed as an independent collection, but was created as a result of the re-interpretation or exegesis of P, D and other legal traditions. See especially Chr. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch* (FAT II/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 545-559.

<sup>12</sup> Tooman, *God of Magog*, 27.

<sup>13</sup> Tooman, *God of Magog*, 32-34.

<sup>14</sup> Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 59-67. See especially an earlier essay by Carr which is often cited: D. Carr, “Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11-26 and its Parallels,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (ed. M. Köckert and E. Blum; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2001), 107-140.

But let us turn to the texts – first Joshua 24 and then the parenetic frame of the Holiness Legislation.

## 2. JOSHUA 24 LATE OR EARLY?

The problem of the double ending of the book of Joshua is well known and, as Ed Noort once put it, “Hier stehen zwei Kapitäne auf der Abschlußbrücke des Josuaschiffes.”<sup>15</sup> This double ending is not something unique to Joshua. Leviticus would be another good example of such a double ending. This article will first focus on Joshua 24, which has quite a reputation as being one of those chapters about which biblical scholars differ greatly. Martin Noth actually had trouble agreeing with himself and offers four different opinions on how to understand this chapter.<sup>16</sup>

In 1998 Noort still thought that the Hexateuch debate was dead, when he said that “noch in den achtziger Jahren konnte anhand von Jos 24 ein Hexateuchmodell verteidigt werden.”<sup>17</sup> It turned out that the Hexateuch debate was not dead and has been making a comeback.<sup>18</sup> As we will see in a moment, Joshua 24 plays a crucial role not only in this debate, but also the debate about a possible Enneateuch.<sup>19</sup> This fairly recent development has, of course, to do with the re-evaluation of Martin Noth’s Deuteronomistic History.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>15</sup> E. Noort, *Das Buch Josua: Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (EdF 292; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 205.

<sup>16</sup> For a fairly detailed explanation of how Noth changed his mind at least four times see Noort, *Das Buch Josua*, 209-211. See also K. Schmid, “Die Samaritaner und die Judäer: Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24,” in *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen* (ed. J. Frey, U. Schattner-Rieser and K. Schmid; SJ 70; StSam 7; Berlin: De Gruyter; 2012), 31-49, here, 39, who describes Noth as “ratlos”. Or, M. Popović, “Conquest of the land, loss of the land: Where does Joshua 24 belong?,” in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology. Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (ed. J. van Ruiten and J. Cornelis de Vos; VTS 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87-98 (89).

<sup>17</sup> Noort, *Das Buch Josua*, 206.

<sup>18</sup> A very good example of this development is a book such as *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T. B. Dozeman, T. Römer and K. Schmid; Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2011). The present article draws on many of the essays in this book.

<sup>19</sup> See, for instance, T. Römer, “How Many Books (*teuchs*): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch?* (ed. Dozeman, Römer and Schmid), 25-42 (30). Or E. Blum, “The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; Symposium Series 34; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006), 89-106 (106).

<sup>20</sup> See especially T. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

Apart from this recent development of the re-emergence of the Hexateuch debate, it is clear that most of the scholars quoted below are drawing from the work Moshe Anbar.<sup>21</sup> Broadly speaking, one could speak of two groups of scholars who would argue for two different historical contexts: either somewhere in the late monarchical period or somewhere in the post-exilic period. Especially the latter group seem to be indebted to Anbar. Many of these scholars will feature below, although this article mostly draws from the work of Thomas Römer, Erhard Blum, Konrad Schmid, Christophe Nihan and a few others who would all argue for the later date. This article enquires specifically about Josh 24:19-21 and its relation with the rest of chapter 24, its probable relation to the rest of the Former Prophets and its possible relation to the Holiness Legislation and the Decalogue.

I would broadly agree with Römer that Joshua 23 was meant as a conclusion to a combination of the book of Joshua and the book of Deuteronomy, and that chapter 24 was meant as a conclusion to something larger, the Hexateuch probably.<sup>22</sup> Römer sums up the reasons for regarding Joshua 24 as a conclusion to the Hexateuch; these include the retelling of the story of the Hexateuch in this chapter, the portrayal of Joshua the lawgiver as a second Moses, and then all the well-known references to funerals and other ceremonies which includes the burying of the bones of Joseph.<sup>23</sup> One finds similar arguments in Blum and even Schmid,<sup>24</sup> although Schmid is inclined to argue for an Enneateuch.<sup>25</sup> All of these scholars would argue for a post-exilic dating of the text.

One scholar who seems representative of scholars arguing for an older dating is William Koopmans.<sup>26</sup> The striking thing for me about Koopmans is that he never even considers the idea that there might be allusions to Priestly texts in Joshua 24. To me this seems to be one of the strong points of those arguing for a later date. There are, of course, still plenty of other scholars who, like Koopmans, argue for an older dating. The recent commentary by Rösel is a good example. He says that “we tentatively still prefer a pre-Deuteronomic

<sup>21</sup> M. Anbar, *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1-28)* (BBET 25; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992). I did not have access to this book.

<sup>22</sup> T. Römer, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um ‘deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk’ und ‘Hexateuch,’” *ZAW* 118 (2006), 523-548 (534).

<sup>23</sup> T. Römer, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches”, 541-546.

<sup>24</sup> Blum, “The Literary Connection”, 98-99, and also E. Blum, “Pentateuch – Hexateuch – Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?,” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch?* (ed. Dozeman, Römer and Schmid), 43-72 (69-71)

<sup>25</sup> Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 46. Or earlier K. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 211-212.

<sup>26</sup> W. T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTS 93; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 410-413.

dating along the lines of Peritt or Noort, namely in the seventh or the eighth century BCE”.<sup>27</sup>

Quite a few scholars have recently presented arguments that there are allusions to Priestly texts in Joshua 24. Thus Brettler and Römer describe the strange mixture of language of Joshua 24 from Priestly and Deuteronomistic texts, and then conclude that this “explains why the chapter shares such a vast amount of phraseology with material that crosses all source-critical boundaries.”<sup>28</sup> Nihan has presented similar arguments, showing, for instance, how the author of Josh 24:6-7 already knew about Exodus 14 in its final form – a point also made by Brettler and Römer and more recently also by Schmid.<sup>29</sup> Josh 24:3 refers to *לְאֹהֲרָיִם*, another Priestly term.<sup>30</sup> Although one should probably add that it is also a term found in the Holiness Legislation in Lev 18:3 and 25:38.<sup>31</sup> Then, as Schmid points out, the mention of Aaron in Josh 24:5 is difficult to explain without the Priestly Exodus narrative.<sup>32</sup>

There is also some disagreement about the literary unity of Joshua 24. Römer is convinced that vv. 19-21 were added later and thus have little to do with the creation of a Hexateuch.<sup>33</sup> Nihan seems to agree, pointing also to the *Wiederaufnahme* of the people’s words in v. 21, words already spoken in reverse word order in v. 18.<sup>34</sup> Even Rösel, who argues for an earlier date, acknowledges that v. 19 actually warns against such a date, and although he

<sup>27</sup> H. N. Rösel, *Joshua* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 363. He is referring to L. Peritt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 271-269, and E. Noort, “Zu Stand und Perspektiven: Der Glaube Israels zwischen Religionsgeschichte und Theologie. Der Fall Josua 24,” in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament & Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTS 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 82-108 (104). Another example of a monarchical dating would be D. S. Sperling, “Joshua 24 Re-Examined,” *HUCA* 58 (1987), 119-136.

<sup>28</sup> T. C. Römer and M. Z. Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000), 401-419 (414).

<sup>29</sup> Chr. Nihan, “The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187-223 (194-195). Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 410. See also Chr. Nihan, “The Literary Relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua: A Reassessment,” in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. K. Schmid and R. F. Person; FAT II/56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 79-114 (96 n. 44).

<sup>30</sup> See Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 41, who argues that especially the expression *לְאֹהֲרָיִם* could be understood as a Priestly expression found in Gen 17:8.

<sup>31</sup> J. Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26* (VTS 67; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 149-150.

<sup>32</sup> Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 41-42. Aaron is also absent in the LXX.

<sup>33</sup> Römer, “Das doppelte Ende,” 539. Römer also cites the work of E. Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 174-175. One should add that Aurelius cuts much more away than just vv. 19-21. His diachronic scissors get rid of vv. 14b, 15b, 17-18a and then 19-21 and 23-24.

<sup>34</sup> Nihan, “The Torah between Samaria,” 193. Also Römer, “Das doppelte Ende,” 539.

does not mention some kind of diachronic solution, it might actually solve some of Rösel's dating problems.<sup>35</sup> I can agree with some kind of diachronic measure, but I would still like to explore *why* vv. 19-21 were added later, if indeed that was the case.<sup>36</sup>

Josh 24:19-21 (BHS)	Josh 24:19-21 (NRSV)
<p>19 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־הָעָם לֵאמֹר לֹא תִוְכְלוּ לַעֲבֹד אֶת־יְהוָה כִּי־אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּא הֵוא לֹא־יִשָּׂא לְפִשְׁעֵכֶם וּלְחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם: 20 כִּי תַעֲזֹבוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וַעֲבַדְתֶּם אֱלֹהֵי נְכַר וְשָׁב וְהִרְעֵ לְכֶם וּכְלָה אֶתְכֶם אַחֲרַי אֲשֶׁר־הֵיטִיב לְכֶם: 21 וַיֹּאמְרוּ הָעָם אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לֵאמֹר כִּי אֶת־יְהוָה נַעֲבֹד:</p>	<p>19 But Joshua said to the people, “You cannot serve the LORD, for he is a holy God. He is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions or your sins. 20 If you forsake the LORD and serve foreign gods, then he will turn and do you harm, and consume you, after having done you good.” 21 And the people said to Joshua, “No, we will serve the LORD!”</p>

As Martin Noth already saw some time ago, Joshua seems much more sceptical here than he did in v. 14 and the tensions between these verses and what happens earlier in the chapter (as in v. 14) is one of quite a few reasons why vv. 19-21 are sometimes regarded as material added later:<sup>37</sup>

Josh 24:14 (BHS)	Josh 24:14 (NRSV)
<p>וְעַתָּה יִרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וְעַבְדוּ אֹתוֹ בְּחִמּוּם וּבְאֵמֶת וּבְהִסְרִיר וְאֶת־אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר עֲבַדוּ אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם בְּעַבְרָה סְנֵהָר וּבְמִצְרַיִם וְעַבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה:</p>	<p>“Now therefore revere the LORD, and serve him in sincerity and in faithfulness; put away the gods that your ancestors served beyond the River and in Egypt, and serve the LORD.”</p>

To serve the Lord or other gods is an important theme in Joshua 24 and even chapter 23. The root עבד occurs fifteen times in chapter 24 and twice in 23.<sup>38</sup> The object of the verb is either the other gods served by the fathers, or YHWH himself. By the way, the idea to serve (עבד) YHWH is simply absent from Priestly texts (H included) and is nowhere to be found in the book of Leviticus. This is thus not an example of Joshua 24 knowing about a Priestly

<sup>35</sup> Rösel, *Joshua*, 363.

<sup>36</sup> Römer, “Das doppelte Ende,” 539, thinks that the purpose of this later addition is to criticise the Deuteronomistic idea of covenant theology and to relativise the report of the cutting of a covenant in Joshua 24. It is not clear to me why this critique of the covenant could not have been there from the start.

<sup>37</sup> M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT I/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938), 136.

<sup>38</sup> Josh 23:7 and 16. In v. 7 the object of the verb is the other gods. Josh 24:2, 14(x3), 15(x4), 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24 and 31. In ch. 24 the verb is also used with the other gods of the fathers as object, but mostly YHWH is the object.

text. One does find lots of examples of serving either YHWH or God<sup>39</sup> or other gods<sup>40</sup> or nations serving other gods<sup>41</sup> in Deuteronomy. Yet it should be clear that in v. 14 Joshua is still very positive about the addressees being able to serve YHWH, whereas five verses later in v. 19 he sounds thoroughly sceptical.

For Schmid these verses point forward to the *Unheil* which will eventually befall Israel, another reason why scholars like Römer would regard these verses as later.<sup>42</sup> For Römer these verses were added “nachdem die Idee eines Hexateuchs sich nicht hatte durchsetzen können.”<sup>43</sup> They do not point backwards like the rest of chapter 24, but rather forwards to the Former Prophets and thus prepare “the reader or the listener for the following story of divine judgement.”<sup>44</sup> Now although the argument by Römer seems plausible, I am not so sure that that is wholly true of vv. 19-21. I will explore the possibility that a number of things in those verses point backwards. One could argue (like Blum, drawing on the earlier work of Anbar) that Joshua’s prediction in vv. 19-21 actually puts him in the same league as Moses and simply complements the image of Joshua as a second Moses.<sup>45</sup> In short, many arguments are undecided, but this does not mean that Römer is totally wrong; you could after all have a text pointing both ways, but then we end up again with Schmid’s idea of a hinge. Schmid asks whether Joshua 24 is a reflection on the combined stories of Genesis and Exodus and then answers:<sup>46</sup>

Nein – Jos 24 schließt vielmehr die mit Gen einsetzende Heilsgeschichte Israel mit seinem Gott ab, ja, etabliert sie allererst, und läßt alles Nachfolgende, insbesondere die Königszeit – jedenfalls in grundsätzlichem Sinn – in negativem Licht erscheinen: Ri–2Kön erzählen nur noch Unheilgeschichte.

This is a very negative view of the chapter and in a sense Schmid allows the negativity of vv. 19 and 20 to colour his reading of the chapter as a whole as well as the functioning of this chapter in the larger scheme of things. But the point I am trying to make is that it should be clear that vv. 19-21 are in themselves a bone of contention between scholars. These verses are in tension with the rest of the chapter and where the rest of the chapter is pointing backwards, they could be understood as pointing forwards, although I will hopefully show that the matter is not that simple either. There has been a further recent devel-

<sup>39</sup> Deut 4:28, 6:13, 10:12, 20; 11:13; 13:5 etc.

<sup>40</sup> Deut 7:4, 16; 8:19; 11:16; 13:3 etc.

<sup>41</sup> Deut 12:2, 30 etc.

<sup>42</sup> Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 212; Römer, “Das doppelte Ende,” 539.

<sup>43</sup> Römer, “Das doppelte Ende,” 539.

<sup>44</sup> Römer, “How Many Books,” 35.

<sup>45</sup> Blum, “The Literary Connection,” 99.

<sup>46</sup> Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 211-212.

opment in the interpretation of this chapter, though, which also plays a role in its dating.

The fact that the events narrated in Joshua 24 take place at Shechem has always been an interesting point of discussion amongst scholars and especially the fact that the LXX changes Shechem to Shiloh, which some think could be understood as witnessing to an “anti-Samaritan tendency.”<sup>47</sup> Thus the debate about the Samaritans enters the discussion. Strange thinks that “this chapter was written after the Samaritan schism and is a Samaritan effort to make Shechem with Garizim the centre of the Holy Land.”<sup>48</sup> Schmid also thinks that the text and the location at Shechem has to do with the Samaritans in the latter half of the Persian Period. Yet for him it is a text written in Judah but aimed at the north as a kind of invitation, or as he puts it:<sup>49</sup>

Die Wahl Sichems als Ort der Szenerie lässt eigentlich kaum einen Zweifel daran, dass nicht nur in der erzählten Welt, sondern auch in der Welt der Erzähler spezifisch der Norden angesprochen ist.

The theological motivation behind this invitation is similar to the idea found in Chronicles, namely that Israel consists of all of Israel, north and south, but whereas the Chronicler is focused on Jerusalem, Joshua 24 is not.<sup>50</sup> Joshua 24 thus attempts to portray north and south not “als Konkurrenz, sondern als Konkordanz.”<sup>51</sup> This Samaritan perspective also points to a post-exilic dating, which for Schmid means fifth century BC.<sup>52</sup>

In the rest of this paper I will look at how God is characterised in v. 19 and then look at other possible links between Josh 24:19-21 and other priestly or post-priestly texts.

### 3. HOLY GOD

In Josh 24:19 God is presented as holy and jealous. If one looks backwards from Joshua 24, God is explicitly described as holy in only one book, namely

<sup>47</sup> Rösel, *Joshua*, 364; Noort, *Das Buch Josua*, 206.

<sup>48</sup> J. Strange, “The book of Joshua – origin and dating,” *SJOT* 16 (2010), 44-51 (49).

<sup>49</sup> Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 48. See also J. Wildenboer, “Joshua 24: Some literary and theological remarks,” *Journal for Semitics* 24/2 (2015), 484-502.

<sup>50</sup> Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 43, argues that the ancient Shechem, or *Tel Balāṭa*, was not occupied between 480-330 BCE and this would mean that Shechem was not really any threat to Jerusalem. In this period, it would have been safe to tell this story as taking place at Shechem, since there was nothing there that could compete with Jerusalem and at the same time the story could still function as an invitation to the north.

<sup>51</sup> Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 49.

<sup>52</sup> Schmid, “Die Samaritaner,” 47.

Leviticus and especially in the Holiness Legislation. Schwartz defines the holiness of God as follows:<sup>53</sup>

In reference to the deity, *qds* I expresses His transcendent divinity, namely the idea that He is altogether separate from the created world, ‘totally Other’.

In Leviticus the first example – in what has traditionally been known as the Holiness Code – of YHWH being described as holy occurs in Lev 19:2; this introduces us to the language of holiness, which has obviously given Leviticus 17–26 its name, although the holiness language is found only in chapters 19 to 21.

Lev 19:2 (BHS)	Lev 19:2 (NRSV)
<p>דַּבֵּר אֶל-כָּל-עֵדֻת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם  קְדוֹשִׁים תִּהְיוּ כִּי קְדוֹשׁ אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם:</p>	<p>Speak to all the congregation of the people of Israel and say to them: You shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy.</p>

Descriptions of God’s holiness are found in this verse, as well as in Lev 20:26, 21:8 and then, of course, also Lev 11:44 and 45, which is usually regarded as on the same diachronic level as Leviticus 17-26.<sup>54</sup> The fascinating thing about the use of the adjective קְדוֹשׁ is that when applied to YHWH it is always written out “full” with the *waw*, but when applied to the addressees the defective spelling is used. Milgrom, following Hoffman, pointed this out, but despite this observation he still thinks that “Holiness means *imitatio Dei*.”<sup>55</sup> For Milgrom God is the seat of ethics and imitating him means obeying his laws.<sup>56</sup> Schwartz, though, does not think that this text is about imitating God.<sup>57</sup>

Close reading of the texts reminds us that the Israelites are not told to be holy like God; rather they are commanded to be holy *because* He is holy. Their holiness cannot be like His, it can only be analogous.

<sup>53</sup> B. J. Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness: the Torah Traditions,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus* (ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; JCPs 2; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 47-59 (47-48).

<sup>54</sup> See discussion in Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 569-570.

<sup>55</sup> J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 687.

<sup>56</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 731; J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 1604.

<sup>57</sup> Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 57.



But then he agrees with Milgrom that the way in which Israel needs to seek holiness is by obeying the laws and thus becoming separate from the other nations as God is the “totally Other”.

Yet if we compare the examples from H with that of Joshua 24 then it should be clear that theologically these texts say totally different things. Both regard God as holy, but for the authors of Lev 19:2 this means that Israel should become holy themselves (whatever that might mean exactly), whereas the authors of Joshua 24 use God’s holiness to point out how impossible it is to serve him. There are some clear differences between these two portrayals of God as holy:

Lev 19:2*	Josh 24:19
<p>קדושים תהגו כי קדוש אני יהוה אלהיכם:</p>	<p>לא תוכלו לעבד את־יהוה כי־אלהים קדושים הוא</p>

In Leviticus it is in the first person with YHWH doing the talking, and in Joshua 24 Joshua is talking and referring to God in the third person. In Joshua it is אלהים, actually after Joshua had said that they cannot worship YHWH. In Leviticus it is יהוה אלהיכם. In the light of the comment above by Milgrom, the adjective “holy” is spelled differently in the two texts.<sup>58</sup> In Joshua it is the defective spelling, the spelling always used for the addressees in H. Yet in both cases you have God described as holy by means of a nominal or verbless sentence which is part of a motivational clause, which motivates two opposite statements. If one compares all the cases of YHWH explicitly being called holy with each other then they look like this:

והתקדשתם והייתם קדושים כי קדוש אני	Lev 11:44
והייתם קדושים כי קדוש אני	Lev 11:45
קדושים תהגו כי קדוש אני יהוה אלהיכם:	Lev 19:2
והתקדשתם והייתם קדושים כי אני יהוה אלהיכם:	Lev 20:7
והייתם לי קדושים כי קדוש אני יהוה	Lev 20:26
קדש יהוה־לך כי קדוש אני יהוה מקדשכם	Lev 21:8
כי־אלהים קדושים הוא	Josh 24:19

<sup>58</sup> The only texts that I could find which use the plural of קדוש, but with the *waw*, are Hosea 12:1 and Psalm 16:3.

The highlighted texts are all nominal sentences, where קדוש is always the predicate, apart from the example in Joshua 24 and Leviticus 20. Nominal sentences have two semantic functions, namely identification and classification. In the case of the former both subject and predicate are definite and in the case of the latter the predicate is indefinite. Most of these examples are thus cases of classification and, according to Waltke and O'Connor, they answer the question: "What is the subject like?" In this case the answer would be "holy."<sup>59</sup> The example in Lev 20:7 is a case of identification and here God is not described as holy. Although the example from Joshua is a nominal sentence, it is structured differently in the sense that it has a more elaborate predicate. You have a noun (אֱלֹהִים) and an adjective (קדושים) joined attributively and together they form the predicate with a pronoun as the subject. It is also a case of classification.

As I have already indicated, these examples mentioned from H and Josh 24:19 are the only examples in the Pentateuch/Hexateuch where God is explicitly described as holy. There are also places later in the Former Prophets where YHWH is described as holy, such as 1 Sam 2:2; 6:20 or 2 Kgs 19:22, but these are different grammatical constructions.<sup>60</sup> None of them are nominal sentences. The holiness of God does not seem to get that much attention in the Former Prophets. Fritz says that "die Heiligkeit Gottes wird in der deuteronomisch-deuteronomistischen Theologie nicht thematisiert."<sup>61</sup> The book of Deuteronomy refers to the עַם קדוש (Deut. 7:6; 14:2; 26:19 and 28:9), but the adjective קדוש is never applied to God in the book of Deuteronomy. In general P does not say much about the holiness of God either, which might come as a surprise. Wright argues that the "Priestly Torah offers only a few, indirect words about God's holiness."<sup>62</sup> Thus the holiness of God is only implied in P, but made explicit in H. This does not mean that the authors of P did not think of God as holy; on the contrary, this holiness is implied in quite a few texts. Schwartz makes the point that YHWH's presence by means of his כבוד "automatically exudes holiness" and he then refers to Exod 29:43-44.<sup>63</sup> This kind of holiness is contagious and can be transferred, and the tool which brings about the contagion is the כבוד of YHWH. Thus it is clear that although it is never said explicitly in P that God is קדוש, it is implied in many texts, but the only two cases

<sup>59</sup> B. K. Waltke and M. P. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; 1990), 132. For a similar discussion see also P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: Revised English Edition* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), 530. They use "descriptive" instead of "classification."

<sup>60</sup> 1 Sam 2:2 is from the song of Hanna (אִיר־קְדוֹשׁ בְּיָמֶיהָ), 1 Samuel 6:20 (הַעֲלֵתֶימָה הַקְדוֹשׁ הַגָּדוֹל), 2 Kings 19:22 (עַל־קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל).

<sup>61</sup> V. Fritz, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; 1994), 246.

<sup>62</sup> One of these is Lev 10:3. D. P. Wright, "Holiness in Leviticus and Beyond: Differing Perspectives," *Interpretation* 53/4 (1999), 351-364 (352).

<sup>63</sup> Schwartz, "Israel's Holiness," 53.

where God is explicitly described as holy Joshua 24 and H (that is looking backwards from Joshua 24). The two texts differ on what the implications of this would be. For H it means the people should be holy too; for the authors of Josh 24:19 it means that the people are set up to fail.

The question is obviously whether these two texts were engaging with each other. Was Josh 24:19 somehow correcting the parenetic texts in H, or was it the other way around? Not many scholars presume any kind of allusion here, but I will return to them later; first it might be useful to return to Tooman's criteria to establish when scripture is being reused. His first criterion is "uniqueness," which for him means that "the element in question may be unique to a particular source."<sup>64</sup> In our case in terms of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch, H is the only text which describes YHWH as explicitly holy. And now we have a similar depiction of YHWH in Josh 24:19. If you look backwards from Joshua 24, then the depictions of YHWH as holy are indeed unique. This argument could function as a correction to Römer's argument that vv. 19-21 point forwards and should be regarded as later. If we can establish that they point both ways, is this diachronic solution still that viable? Apart from pointing back to H, it might actually be pointing backwards to other texts as well.

#### 4. JEALOUS GOD

Josh 24:19 also describes YHWH as being jealous. The Hebrew word קנוא occurs only here and in Nah 1:2, but another form of this adjective with the same meaning, קנא, is found in Exod 20:5, 34:14(x2); Deut 4:24, 5:9 and 6:15. Once again Joshua 24 uses a different spelling from the other texts. Yet in both cases you have an adjective and noun combined in an attributive way. However, a closer look at Josh 24:19 shows that the pronoun הוא is added, which then turns that into a nominal sentence as well, with אֶל-קְנוֹא as predicate and הוא as subject. This is also a case of classification, where the predicate is indefinite. This change to a nominal sentence was probably intended to make the syntax symmetrical to "a holy God is he".

Exod 20:5 (BHS)	Josh 24:19 (BHS)
<p>לֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְהֵם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם כִּי אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה  אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קַנָּא פֶקֶד עֵינָי אֶבֶת עַל-בְּנֵי עַל-  שְׁלֵשִׁים וְעַל-רַבְעִים לְשָׁנָא י׃</p>	<p>וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל-הָעָם לֹא תוֹכְלוּ לַעֲבֹד אֶת-  יְהוָה כִּי-אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים הוּא אֶל-קְנוֹא הוּא לֹא-  יֵשָׂא לַפְשָׁעֵכֶם וְלַחַטָּאוֹתֵיכֶם׃</p>

<sup>64</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 27.

Some scholars such as Dohmen, Konkel and Dozeman have linked this description of God in Exodus with the marriage metaphor used in Hosea.<sup>65</sup> It is, as Dohmen points out, a very anthropomorphic way of referring to God.<sup>66</sup> Dozeman thinks that Exod 34:14 is dependent on the Decalogue in Exodus 20 and is thus younger, although Konkel is not so convinced.<sup>67</sup> Otto also traces the jealous God of Deut 5:9 back to Hosea's theology.<sup>68</sup> The same goes for the loving and forgiving God of the next verse. The other two verses in Deuteronomy where God is described as "jealous" are also related to the Decalogue.<sup>69</sup> Once again the question is whether Josh 24:19 is an allusion to the Decalogue or any of the other texts mentioned. All of these texts (apart from the Decalogue ones) are regarded as post-exilic by Otto:<sup>70</sup>

Abgesehen von dem deuteronomistischen Dekaloggebot in Dtn 5,9 par. Ex 20,5 sind die Belege für den 'el qannā' "eifernden Gott" in Dtn 4,24; Ex 34,14; Jos 24,19; Nah 1,2 nachexilisch, und das gilt auch für Dtn 6,15.

On the other side, Koopmans argues, based on what he calls the parallelism of the two nominal sentences, that this might be a case of "ancient cultic formulations," but few others seem to consider this idea.<sup>71</sup> Yet if these are allusions to the Decalogue, then what is fascinating is the fact that Josh 24:19 is possibly combining the God of the Holiness Legislation with the God of the Decalogue. The holy God meets the jealous God, if you will. God is described as, on the one hand, so different from human beings, namely holy, and on the other hand, as so like human beings, namely jealous – that is, of course, if some kind of allusion is indeed present. One should also point out that Josh 24:19 is the only place where the adjectives "holy" and "jealous" are used together.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Chr. Dohmen, *Exodus 19–40* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 368; M. Konkel, *Sünde und Vergebung* (FAT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 200-201; T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus* (Eerdmans Critical Commentaries; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 485.

<sup>66</sup> Dohmen, *Exodus 19–40*, 368.

<sup>67</sup> Dozeman, *Exodus*, 745; Konkel, *Sünde und Vergebung*, 201.

<sup>68</sup> E. Otto, *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 726.

<sup>69</sup> Otto, *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32*, 568, calls the example in 4:24 a "Dekalogzitat". He also argues that Dt 6:15 is citing 5:9 (783).

<sup>70</sup> For Otto, *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32*, 787, these texts are all part of his "Horebredaktion".

<sup>71</sup> Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 340.

<sup>72</sup> D. J. A. Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2007), 7:270.

## 5. ALLUSION OR NOT?

With regard to Joshua 24 and H, there are actually very few scholars that I know of who argue for some kind of intentional allusion going on. It is noteworthy that most commentaries on Joshua tend to shy away from arguing for any kind of allusion or diachronic relationship between Josh 24:19 and the parenetic frame of H. None of the half a dozen or so commentaries on Joshua 24 argue that this text was alluding to Lev 19:2.<sup>73</sup> Fritz mentions that this definition of holiness originates in the cult, but then leaves it there.<sup>74</sup> Knauf calls the expression of God as holy a tautology and then adds in brackets texts from the Holiness Code and the *שֶׁדָּוָה עַם* texts from Deuteronomy, but says nothing about any interaction taking place between the texts.<sup>75</sup> Rösel contrasts the view of Josh 24:19 with that of H, but does not provide specific arguments that Joshua was reinterpreting or correcting the other texts or the other way around.<sup>76</sup> He does not spell out his understanding of the diachronic relationship between these texts. He does mention that what we find in Josh 24:19, namely *אֱלֹהֵימָּה קָדוֹשׁ*, is a hapax and the combination of “holy” with “jealous” is unique. But all of them seem reluctant to specifically argue that there is allusion or something similar going on.

One exception is Achenbach, who understands Josh 24:19 as the older text.<sup>77</sup> In his scheme of things (which is similar to Otto’s) there was at some stage a Hexateuch which already concluded with Josh 24:1-28, but which did not include H.<sup>78</sup> When Joshua was cut off to create the Pentateuch, the Holiness Legislation was added. Achenbach argues that the scene described in Josh 24:14-15, where each family had to perform some kind of distancing ritual (Abrenuntiations-Akt) that entailed the rejection of the gods of Egypt, Mesopotamia and the Amorites would seem improbable (obszön)<sup>79</sup> after the parenetic

<sup>73</sup> R. D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster, 1997), 270-271. G. E. Wright and R. G. Boling, *Josua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (AB 6; New York: Doubleday, 1982), 538-539. J. F. D. Creach, *Joshua* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY: John Knox, 2003), 126-127.

<sup>74</sup> Fritz, *Das Buch Josua*, 246.

<sup>75</sup> E. A. Knauf, *Josua* (ZBK; Zürich: TVZ, 2008), 198.

<sup>76</sup> Rösel, *Josua*, 372.

<sup>77</sup> R. Achenbach, “Das Heiligkeitsgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen des Numeribuches im Horizont der Pentateuch redaktion,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 240; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 145-175 (153).

<sup>78</sup> Achenbach, “Das Heiligkeitsgesetz”. For a similar understanding of the Hexateuch see Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 170 and 251, or E. Otto, “The Holiness Code in diachrony and synchrony in the legal hermeneutics of the Pentateuch,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings. Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ed. S. Schectman and J. S. Baden; ATANT 95; Zürich: TVZ, 2009), 135-156 (135-139).

<sup>79</sup> Otto, “The Holiness Code,” 141, describes it as “improbable”, which I take as a good translation of “obszön.”

frame of H, especially Lev 18:1-5, where Israel is warned not to follow in the footsteps of the Egyptians and the Canaanites.<sup>80</sup> If this had already been part of the corpus, then Josh 24:14-15 would consequently not be needed. The same goes for Lev 19:2, which adds a categorical imperative to the Holiness Legislation against Josh 24:19-20. Against the statement in Joshua 24 that Israel cannot serve YHWH, the quest for holiness is proclaimed in the Holiness Legislation. For Achenbach the parenetic frame of the Holiness Code, especially in chapters 18 and 19, functions as some kind of literary scalpel which cut off the book of Joshua. The Holiness Legislation is thus alluding to Joshua 24, which means in the light of Tooman's terminology that when hearers or readers would have read the parenetic frame of the Holiness Legislation, Joshua 24 would have been activated at the same time. Yet the purpose was actually to replace Joshua, or the get rid of Joshua. In a sense for Achenbach activating both texts would have created an *unbearable* tension between the two texts, a tension which meant that one had to give way to the other. Both could not be part of the same corpus.

One problem I have with Achenbach's reading is that the quest for holiness in the parenetic frame of the Holiness Legislation could be reduced to just this adversary role against Joshua 24 and in my view that undermines the role of the holiness texts in the Holiness Legislation itself. One gets the impression from Achenbach that the holiness language is more of a response to Joshua 24 than playing its own crucial role in the Holiness Legislation. In short, Achenbach thinks there is allusion going on, but Lev 19:2 is alluding to Josh 24:19 and such allusion was part of the literary mechanics which created the Pentateuch.

Another scholar who has argued for links between the Holiness Legislation and Joshua 24 is Ada Taggar-Cohen; in an article in ZAR in 2005 she compared Joshua 24 with legal documents, specifically contract documents found at Elephantine.<sup>81</sup> Her argument is that the chapter was composed by a scribe who was familiar with the legal contracts from Elephantine and was influenced by them. Taggar-Cohen thinks that the view of the possession of land is similar to that in the Holiness Code.<sup>82</sup> She also argues that the author of Joshua 24 thinks that "the land is given to the people not for ownership but as a usufruct, and on condition that they worship YHWH alone while maintaining holiness."<sup>83</sup> This idea the author apparently gets from the Holiness Legislation, but I think she is overstating her case here. I am not convinced that we have the same view of the possession of land here. In the Holiness Legislation the term

<sup>80</sup> Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz," 152-153.

<sup>81</sup> A. Taggar-Cohen, "The Covenant as Contract: Joshua 24 and the Legal Aramaic Texts from Elephantine," ZAR 11 (2005), 27-50.

<sup>82</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The Covenant as Contract," 28.

<sup>83</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The Covenant as Contract," 44, 49.

הַקָּדָשׁ is used exclusively<sup>84</sup> and in Joshua 24 it is הַקְּלֵהָ (vv. 28 and 30).<sup>85</sup> The former is often understood as access to use of land, as described in the quote from Taggar-Cohen, but not the latter. Another difference is that there is no expectation of the people to be holy in Joshua 24, but the contrary.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, the potential loss of land is not really used as a threat in Joshua 24, which is how it functions in the Holiness Legislation. V. 20 promises that God will do them harm and consume them, but the loss of land is not explicitly mentioned. In short Taggar-Cohen thinks that we have allusion here, but that Joshua 24 is the younger text, although the actual allusions in the text which she identifies are not very convincing. Taggar-Cohen's arguments also support those scholars arguing for a date somewhere in the Persian Period, but she is careful not to commit herself to the historical debate.

Ten years later in a *Festschrift* for Victor Hurowitz, she attempted to take her arguments further.<sup>87</sup> She is still adamant that Joshua 24 is a legal text "such as a contract or a transaction."<sup>88</sup> Yet now she offers another interpretation of vv. 19-20 which is for her the "core of the new legal relationship".<sup>89</sup> Taggar-Cohen argues that the clause לֹא תִשְׁבַּח לַעֲבוֹד should not be translated as "you are not able to serve", but rather as "you are forbidden to serve/worship." Her argument is based on the equivalent verb in Aramaic (כָּהַל/יכַל) and especially in Elephantine documents, where similar clauses are translated as "it is forbidden." She wants to translate v. 19 as "you are forbidden to worship YHWH while you worship other gods, as validated in the agreement to be set in this covenant."<sup>90</sup> Eventually this translation helps her to argue that in both Joshua 24 and the Holiness Legislation "the holiness of YHWH should be the 'guideline' for worshipping him."<sup>91</sup> The main problem, though, is that a lot is added to the verse which is simply not there. There is nothing in v. 19 about serving other gods. That point is introduced only in v. 20 after a conditional כִּי and she has to rearrange these two verses to make her argument work. If she is correct

<sup>84</sup> Lev 25:10, 13, 13, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 41, 45, 46.

<sup>85</sup> See discussion by Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 66-68 (n. 241). See also Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2185-2191, or M. Bauks, "Die Begriffe מִן־שָׁמַיִם וּמִן־אֲדָמָה in P<sup>s</sup>. Überlegungen zur Landkonzeption der Priestergrundschrift," *ZAW* 116 (2004), 171-188. Most scholars usually draw from an older article by G. Gerleman, "Nutzrecht und Wohnrecht. Zur Bedeutung von אֲחֻזָּה וְנִחְלָה," *ZAW* 89 (1977), 313-325.

<sup>86</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The Covenant as Contract," 31. She thinks that the vv. 22-24 show "the way of reaching holiness", but there is no expectation in the text that the people should become holy.

<sup>87</sup> A. Taggar-Cohen, "The 'Holiness School' – Creativity and Editorial Activity in the Book of Joshua: The Case of Joshua 24," in *Marbeh Hokmah: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Loving Memory of Victor Avigdor Hurowitz* (ed. S. Yona, E. L. Greenstein et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; 2015), 541-556.

<sup>88</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The 'Holiness School'," 547.

<sup>89</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The 'Holiness School'," 547.

<sup>90</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The 'Holiness School'," 548.

<sup>91</sup> Taggar-Cohen, "The 'Holiness School'," 549.

that כּל should be translated as “forbidden,” then vv. 19 and 20 read “you are forbidden to worship YHWH, because he is holy.” This does not make much more sense than “you cannot serve YHWH, because he is holy.” I am not convinced that her argument works.

Taggar-Cohen does offer a much longer discussion in which she identifies links between Joshua 24 and language used in the Holiness Legislation.<sup>92</sup> In this section she draws the work of Knohl on the Holiness School (HS), especially his description of how holiness in the Priestly Torah (PT) was restricted to the cult and now in HS it is applied to all the people.<sup>93</sup> This is indeed true of the Holiness Legislation and recently Olivier Artus has spoken of the *Demokratisierung* of holiness in the Holiness Legislation, a point also taken up by Hieke.<sup>94</sup> Yet this is true only of the Holiness Legislation but is totally absent in Joshua 24. Holiness is never expected of the addressees. Taggar-Cohen points out that the root שׁדק is sometimes used in the broader book of Joshua, but neglects to mention that it is never expected of the people in Joshua 24 or any other text in Joshua for that matter.<sup>95</sup>

Some of her other arguments are much more convincing. Both Joshua 24 and the Holiness Legislation refer to deliverance from אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. Josh 24:16-18 and Lev 25:38 are good examples mentioned by Taggar-Cohen.<sup>96</sup> And in close proximity (Josh 24:3) mention is made of אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן. The combinations of these two kinds of land are reminiscent of the Holiness Legislation, although here אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן is the place through which Abraham is led, whereas in the Holiness Legislation it is always the place where Israel is going to.<sup>97</sup> And we have already mentioned that אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן is also typical of Priestly texts, as Schmid pointed out.

Taggar-Cohen sees similar combinations between Joshua 24 in the use of יִרָשׁוּ and נָתַן (Lev 20:24 and Josh 24:4).<sup>98</sup> She also sees similarities in the way in which the Holiness Legislation portrays the relationship between YHWH and the people and Joshua 24. She thinks that what German scholars call the *Bundesformel* וְהָיָה לְכֶם לְאֱלֹהִים וְאַתֶּם תְּהִיוּ לִי לְעָם in Lev 26:12 is very similar to נֶעֱבַד

<sup>92</sup> Taggar-Cohen, “The ‘Holiness School’.” 550.

<sup>93</sup> I. Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 180-181.

<sup>94</sup> O. Artus, “Die Pentateuch-Gesetze,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Die Bücher der Hebräischen Bibel und die alttestamentlichen Schriften der katholischen, protestantischen und orthodoxen Kirchen* (ed. T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi and Chr. Nihan; Zürich: TVZ, 2013), 165-176 (172); T. Hieke, *Levitikus 16–27* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2014), 613.

<sup>95</sup> Taggar-Cohen, “The ‘Holiness School’,” 550.

<sup>96</sup> Taggar-Cohen, “The ‘Holiness School’,” 550. One could also add other texts from the Holiness Legislation which refer to אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, namely Lev 11:45; 18:3; 19:34, 36; 22:33; 23:43; 25:38, 42, 55; 26:13, 45.

<sup>97</sup> Lev 18:3 and 25:38.

<sup>98</sup> Taggar-Cohen, “The ‘Holiness School’,” 551.



אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת־יְהוָה כִּי־הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּ in Josh 24:18.<sup>99</sup> Yet this seems a bit of a stretch, since there are other books in the Hebrew Bible (such as Jeremiah) where the *Bundesformel* with basically exactly the same words occurs a lot, but this does not mean that the authors of the Holiness Legislation had a hand in the book of Jeremiah.<sup>100</sup> The similarities between Josh 24:18 and Lev 26:12 seem rather meagre.

Previously I mentioned that the verb to serve (עבד), found a lot Joshua 24, is absent from Leviticus altogether. Taggar-Cohen reminds us that the noun עֶבֶד is actually used a lot in the Holiness Legislation in chapter 25.<sup>101</sup> But still one wonders whether this is a strong enough similarity.

In short, although I think that at times Taggar-Cohen makes useful observations, her main argument that the same scribe who edited the Holiness Legislation had a hand in the final version of Joshua 24 does not seem convincing.<sup>102</sup> If her alternative translation of Josh 24:19 does not work, then the major differences between the two texts still remain. For the Holiness Legislation the holiness of God inspires Israel to strive for holiness themselves. In Josh 24:19 the opposite is true. The main difference between Taggar-Cohen and Achenbach is that she tries to get rid of the tension between the two texts, whereas Achenbach highlights the differences and in this regard I think that Achenbach's arguments are much stronger.

In short, apart from Achenbach and Taggar-Cohen few scholars think that there is some kind of literary allusion between Lev 19:2 and Josh 24:19. The strongest argument we can present is in the light of Tooman's criterion of uniqueness, since only in these texts is God explicitly described as holy. The question is whether this is enough to claim that Josh 24:19 is pointing backwards as well as forwards.

I would like to explore a further allusion to earlier texts in Josh 24:19. The second half of the verse says that YHWH will not bear (נשא) the פֶּשַׁע and חַטָּאת of the addressees. As far as I can see, one finds no combinations of these terms in the rest of the Former Prophets, yet looking backwards I find two interesting combinations of these terms. The first one is in Gen 50:17:

Gen 50:17 (BHS)	Gen 50:17 (NRSV)
<p>כֹּה־תֹאמְרוּ לְיוֹסֵף אֲנִי שָׂא נָא פְשַׁע אֲבוֹתַי וְחַטָּאתָם כִּי־רָעָה גָּמְלוֹד וַעֲתָה שָׂא נָא לְפָשַׁע עֲבָדֵי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתַי גִּבְרֵהּ יוֹסֵף בְּדַבְרָם אֵלָיו:</p>	<p>‘Say to Joseph: I beg you, forgive the crime of your brothers and the wrong they did in harming you.’ Now therefore please forgive the crime of the servants of the God of your father.” Joseph wept when they spoke to him.</p>

<sup>99</sup> See R. Rendtorff, *Die “Bundesformel”*. Eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung (SBS 160; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995).

<sup>100</sup> Jer 7:23; 11:4; 24:7; 30:22; 32:38.

<sup>101</sup> Taggar-Cohen, “The ‘Holiness School’,” 556. See Lev 25:6, 39, 42(x2), 44(x2), 55(x2).

<sup>102</sup> Taggar-Cohen, “The ‘Holiness School’,” 556.

This is part of the story after the death of Jacob; the brothers are scared that Joseph might use the opportunity to take revenge. They put words in the mouth of Jacob to convince Joseph to bear (נשא) their פשע and חטאת. Is this an allusion to that text? Possibly, since we read of the bones of Joseph at the end of Joshua 24, while Gen 50:25 is the verse where Joseph makes them promise that when they leave they must take his bones with them. If this is an allusion, Joshua 24 is basically saying that God will not forgive as easily as Joseph did, but one wonders why is the text reminding the hearers of the forgiveness of Joseph? The suggestions of Schmid comes to mind about a text reaching out to Samaritans, as descendants of northern tribes and thus of Joseph. Are they reminded of the forgiveness of Joseph, which might imply that the authors of Joshua 24 are asking for the forgiveness of their northern brothers, albeit in a very coded way? Yet it seems like a rather roundabout way of bringing Joseph and forgiveness into the text, especially since it is saying very harsh things about YHWH, who will not be forgiving. The other text where I find the same combination נשא, פשע and חטאת is a Priestly text in Leviticus:

Lev 16:16 (BHS)	Lev 16:16 (NRSV)
<p>וּכְפַר עַל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ מִטְּמֵאת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִפְּשָׁעֵיהֶם  לְכָל־חַטֹּאתֵיהֶם וְכֹן יַעֲשֶׂה לְאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד הַשֶּׁבֶן אִתָּם  בְּהוֹרֵךְ טְמֵאתָם:</p>	<p>Thus he shall make atonement for the sanctuary, because of the uncleannesses of the people of Israel, and because of their transgressions, all their sins; and so he shall do for the tent of meeting, which remains with them in the midst of their uncleannesses.</p>

Lev 16:16 concludes the sacrifice of the first goat, the purification offering. One only finds the two nouns (פשע and חטאת) here, but not the verb. Yet later in the chapter we find a combination of פשע, חטאת and נשא in close proximity:

Lev16:21-22 (BHS)	Lev 16:21-22 (NRSV)
<p>21 וְסָמַךְ אֶת־יָדָיו עַל־רֹאשׁ הַשְּׂעִיר־הַחַיִּי וְהִתְנַחֵה עָלָיו אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל  וְאֶת־כָּל־פְּשָׁעֵיהֶם לְכָל־חַטֹּאתֵיהֶם וְנָתַן אֹתָם עַל־  רֹאשׁ הַשְּׂעִיר וְשָׁלַח בְּיַד־אִישׁ עַתִּי הַמַּדְבָּרָה:  22 וְנִשָּׂא הַשְּׂעִיר עָלָיו אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹתָם אֶל־אֶרֶץ  גְּזֵרָה וְשָׁלַח אֶת־הַשְּׂעִיר בַּמַּדְבָּר:</p>	<p>21 Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task.  22 The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region; and the goat shall be set free in the wilderness.</p>

Here we have Aaron confessing the  $\text{עֲשָׂה}$  and  $\text{אֲחַט}$ , but also the  $\text{זָנָה}$ , which is a typical priestly term and hardly features in the book of Joshua. And then in the next verse the goat bears ( $\text{נִשָּׂא}$ ) the  $\text{זָנָה}$  of the people. Thus within two verses, around the ritual of the second goat, you have these three terms in very close proximity. If Joshua 24 is alluding to this text, then Josh 24:19 becomes an anti-priestly text. God will not bear your transgressions and sins and no Priestly ritual involving goats will help you. If this is part of Joshua being portrayed as a second Moses, then Joshua is a dark Moses when compared to the way that Moses is portrayed in Leviticus. Even if Moses predicts exile in Leviticus 26, in that text – at least towards the end of the chapter – there is a turn-around of events. That does not seem possible in Joshua 24, neither do the rituals of Leviticus 16.

But the important question here is whether these similarities in vocabulary – and it must be said that this specific combination is rare – would that have been enough to activate both Genesis 50 and Leviticus 16 for the hearers of Joshua 24? What kind of an audience would have picked this up? I simply do not know the answer to this question.

## 6. CONCLUSION

My question at the beginning was whether there is any evidence that vv. 19 and 20 of Joshua 24 were engaging with or alluding to earlier texts? By earlier I mean canonically earlier and not necessarily earlier from a diachronic perspective. I have shown that there is an important tension between Josh 24:19 and texts from the parenetic frame of the Holiness Legislation, especially Lev 19:2. Then there is the possibility of allusion to the Decalogue and the other jealousy texts from Exodus and Deuteronomy. The question is whether there is textual evidence that vv. 19 and 20 are not only pointing forwards towards the doom at the end of the Former Prophets, but also backwards to previous texts. I have indicated textual similarities which might be considered cases of allusion to previous texts. In favour of an argument for allusion, Tooman's criterion of *uniqueness* could be used. For Tooman this means that "the element in question may be *unique* to a particular source."<sup>103</sup> And indeed YHWH is only explicitly described as holy in Joshua 24 and H.

Another argument in favour of allusion could be the wider arguments about dating the different texts. Schmid thinks that Joshua 24 should be dated to the fifth century, somewhere between the Priestly text and Nehemiah.<sup>104</sup> Some-

<sup>103</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 27.

<sup>104</sup> Schmid, "Die Samaritaner," 47.

body like Nihan would argue that H was created in the latter part of the fifth century.<sup>105</sup> Otto also thought that all the texts about the “jealous” God, apart from the Decalogue examples, were post-exilic.<sup>106</sup> If different texts were written so close to each other historically speaking, it would not be far-fetched to argue that the authors of these texts knew about each other and knew about each other’s texts.

The strongest arguments for allusion would thus be based on the criterion of uniqueness and the broader historical arguments. Still weaknesses remain in the argument, the most important of which are the following:

- 1) Why the difference in spelling of “holy” and “jealous” between Joshua 24 and the texts it might be alluding to? I have shown that both “holiness” and “jealousy” are spelled differently and one would think that an author aiming at allusion would have used the same spelling.
- 2) We also saw that the syntax of the “he is holy” sentences was different. The reason for this in Josh 24:19 might simply be to create a symmetry between אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים הוּא, on the one hand, and אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא, on the other, while at the same time alluding to the Holiness Legislation and the Decalogue.
- 3) Another possible argument against allusion takes us back to the theoretical insights of Carr about intertextuality discussed at the beginning of the article. Yes, God is not often explicitly described as holy and God is not often described as jealous, not in the Pentateuch or the Former Prophets, but what we do not know is how ordinary Israelites, or in our case inhabitants of the province of Yehud, spoke of God. If in their everyday language they used these adjectives in talking about God, if they would refer to God as holy and jealous in their prayers for instance, then Josh 24:19 would not necessarily have activated the other texts from the Holiness Legislation and the Decalogue, but would simply have activated this everyday talking about God for the ancient hearers. But obviously we do not know how they spoke about God and we cannot really answer this question. Yet this brings us back to the original definition of the more general term “intertextuality” and the way in which Carr thinks we should use it, namely to remind ourselves of all the things we do not know, all the texts (oral or written) which we do not have, which he called “unreconstructable”, that might have been around when Joshua 24 was written.

I am thus undecided as to whether any allusion is taking place here. The main argument for it would simply be Tooman’s criterion of uniqueness. These

<sup>105</sup> Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 574. See also K. Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz Leviticus 17–26: Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie* (BZAW 271; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999), 379–381, who aims for the middle of the fifth century.

<sup>106</sup> For Otto, *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32*, 787.

are the only texts, from Genesis to Joshua, where YHWH is explicitly described as holy, but as Carr reminds, many other texts might have been around which we do not have and cannot reconstruct.

Yet if there was some kind of allusion going on between the two texts, then the question will obviously be what the exact diachronic relationship between them would be. Which text is younger and thus alluding to an older text? In that case I would adopt the opposite view to Achenbach's. Both Tooman and Lyons have a criterion to which they give different names, but in terms of content they amount to the same thing.<sup>107</sup> Lyons calls it "incongruity" and Tooman talks of "integration" but actually means *lack of* integration. Basically this means that in the borrowing text not everything is all that coherent. This is probably what most diachronic scholars picked up from the start about vv. 19 to 21. There is a tension with v. 14, there is the possibility of a *Wiederaufnahme*, all the things already spotted by Noth, Römer, Nihan etc. In short, vv. 19 and 20 have not really been integrated into Joshua 24.

In this understanding Römer could still be right that these verses were added after the attempt at creating a Hexateuch failed. If I can use my earlier words when I described Achenbach: "In a sense for Achenbach activating both texts would have created an unbearable tension between the two texts, a tension which meant that one had to give way to the other." Where Achenbach thought that the parenetic frame of the Holiness Legislation was getting rid of Joshua, I would think it could be the other way around. Joshua 24 was leaving the Pentateuch and the Holiness Legislation behind. These verses were added after the Hexateuch project failed and the book of Joshua was removed, and this is more or less the argument of Römer.

Yet all of this would be irrelevant if no literary allusion was actually going on, or if Josh 24:19 was alluding to other oral texts, the god talk of ordinary people, in the time when this text was written, if it was a case of "intertextuality" in the classic Kristeva sense of the word.

### References

- Achenbach R., "Das Heiligkeitsgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen des Numeribuches im Horizont der Pentateuchredaktion," in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 240; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 145-175.
- Anbar M., *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1-28)* (BBET 25; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992).
- Artus O., "Die Pentateuch-Gesetze," in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Die Bücher der Hebräischen Bibel und die alttestamentlichen Schriften der katholi-*

<sup>107</sup> Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 33; Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 62-63.

- schen, protestantischen und orthodoxen Kirchen* (ed. T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi and Chr. Nihan; Zürich: TVZ, 2013), 165-176.
- Aurelius E., *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003).
- Bauks M., “Die Begriffe מִוֶּרְשָׁה und אֶרֶץ in P<sup>e</sup>. Überlegungen zur Landkonzeption der Priestergrundschrift,” *ZAW* 116 (2004), 171-188.
- Blum E., “Pentateuch – Hexateuch – Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T. B. Dozeman, T. Römer and K. Schmid; Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2011), 43-72.
- Blum E., “The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; Symposium Series 34; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006), 89-106.
- Carr D., “Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11-26 and its Parallels,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Ex 32-34 und Dtn 9-10* (ed. M. Köckert and E. Blum; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2001), 107-140.
- Carr D. M., “The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential,” in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* (ed. M. Nissinen; VTS 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 505-535.
- Clines D. J. A., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2007).
- Creach J. F. D., *Joshua* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 2003).
- Dohmen Chr., *Exodus 19–40* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2012), 368.
- Dozeman T. B., *Exodus* (Eerdmans Critical Commentaries; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009).
- Dozeman T. B., T. Römer and K. Schmid (ed.), *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2011).
- Fritz V., *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).
- Gerleman G., “Nutzrecht und Wohnrecht. Zur Bedeutung von אֶרֶץ und נַחֲלָה,” *ZAW* 89 (1977), 313-325.
- Grünwaldt K., *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz Leviticus 17–26. Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie* (BZAW 271; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999).
- Hieke T., *Leviticus 16–27* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2014).
- Joosten J., *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26* (VTS 67; Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Joüon P. and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: Revised English Edition* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006).
- Knohl I., *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
- Konkel M., *Sünde und Vergebung* (FAT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
- Koopmans W. T., *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTS 93; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

- Lyons M. A., *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's use of the Holiness Code* (LHB/OTS 507; London: T&T Clark, 2005).
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).
- Nelson R. D., *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster, 1997).
- Nihan Chr., "The Literary Relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua: A Re-assessment," in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. K. Schmid and R. F. Person; FAT II 56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 79-114.
- Nihan Chr., "The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua," in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187-223.
- Nihan Chr., *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch* (FAT II/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).
- Noort E., *Das Buch Josua: Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (EdF 292; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998).
- Noort E., "Zu Stand und Perspektiven: Der Glaube Israels zwischen Religionsgeschichte und Theologie. Der Fall Josua 24," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (VTS 73; ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 82-108.
- Noth M., *Das Buch Josua* (HAT I 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938).
- Otto E., "The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ed. S. Schectman and J. S. Baden; ATANT 95; Zürich: TVZ, 2009), 135-156.
- Otto E., *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2012).
- Perlitt L., *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969).
- Popović M., "Conquest of the Land, Loss of the Land: Where does Joshua 24 belong?" in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology. Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (ed. J. van Ruiten and J. Cornelis de Vos; VTS 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87-98.
- Rendtorff R., *Die "Bundesformel". Eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung* (SBS 160; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995).
- Römer T., *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2005).
- Römer T., "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" *ZAW* 118 (2006), 523-548

- Römer T., "How Many Books (*teuchs*): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?" in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T. B. Dozeman, T. Römer and K. Schmid; Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2011), 25-42.
- Römer T. C. and M. Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000), 401-419.
- Rösel H. N., *Joshua* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 2011).
- Schmid K., "Die Samaritaner und die Judäer: Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24," in *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und Samaritanischen Traditionen* (ed. J. Frey, U. Schattner-Rieser and K. Schmid; SJ 70; StSam 7; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 31-49.
- Schmid K., *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999).
- Schwartz B. J., "Israel's holiness: the Torah Traditions," in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus* (ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; JCPS 2; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 47-59.
- Sperling D. S., "Joshua 24 Re-Examined," *HUCA* 58 (1987), 119-136.
- Strange J., "The book of Joshua – origin and dating," *SJOT* 16 (2010), 44-51.
- Taggar-Cohen A., "The Covenant as Contract: Joshua 24 and the Legal Aramaic Texts from Elephantine," *ZAR* 11 (2005), 27-50.
- Taggar-Cohen A., "The 'Holiness School' – Creativity and Editorial Activity in the Book of Joshua: The Case of Joshua 24," in *Marbeh Hokmah: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Loving Memory of Victor Avigdor Hurowitz* (ed. S. Yona, E. L. Greenstein et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; 2015), 541-556.
- Tooman W. A., *Gog of Magog* (FAT II/52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).
- Waltke B. K. and M. P. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; 1990).
- Wildenboer J., "Joshua 24: Some literary and theological remarks," *Journal for Semitics* 24/2 (2015), 484-502.
- Wright D. P., "Holiness in Leviticus and Beyond: Differing Perspectives," *Interpretation* 53/4 (1999), 351-364.
- Wright G. E. and R. G. Boling, *Josua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (AB 6; New York: Doubleday, 1982).





# THE TEXT FORM OF THE LEVITICUS QUOTATIONS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Gert J. STEYN

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that the book of Leviticus is not frequently quoted among those from the Pentateuch by Mark, Matthew and the Lukan writings, at least one clear allusion and five explicit quotations from Leviticus are to be found in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. This allusion and most of the five quotations are largely, but not exclusively, confined to Leviticus 10 – 24 and include the following:

- Lev 10:9 is alluded to by Luke in 1:15 in the reference regarding the *prohibition of wine and strong drink* in the case of John the Baptist.
- Lev 5:11 is explicitly quoted by Luke in 2:24<sup>1</sup> with reference to the *prescription of the postnatal purification sacrifice* of Mary.
- Lev 19:18 and 19:34 are frequently and explicitly quoted by the Synoptic writers,<sup>2</sup> Paul<sup>3</sup> and James<sup>4</sup> with regard to *the Love commandment*.
- Lev 20:9 is explicitly quoted with reference to *the negative formula of the 5<sup>th</sup> commandment* by Mark 7:10b and introduced with the formula: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν. Matthew (15:4b) too, explicitly quotes Lev 20:9 – probably as part of his Markan source material – but he introduces the same quotation with the words: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς εἶπεν ... καί.
- Lev 23:29, as a *warning on the neglect of Atonement Day*, is explicitly quoted by Luke in Acts 3:23 as part of a composite quotation made up of references and phrases similar to those found in Deut 18:19, Exod 30:33, Lev 18:29 and Lev 23:29. Luke introduces the conglomerate of Pentateuch references as an explicit quotation with the words: Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν ὅτι.
- Lev 24:20, the *lex talionis*, has identical intertextual readings in Exod 21:24 and Deut 19:21, and is explicitly quoted by Matthew's Jesus during his

<sup>1</sup> Luke 2:24 has a clear introductory formula: κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the introductory formulae of Luke 10:27 (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν); Mark 12:31 (ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρώτη ἐστὶν· δευτέρα αὐτῆ); Matt 5:43 (Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη); Matt 19:19 (τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς. λέγει αὐτῷ· ποίας; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τό); Matt 22:39 (δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῆ).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the introductory formulae of Rom 13:9 (ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. τὸ γάρ) and Gal 5:14 (ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the introductory formula of Jas 2:8 (Εἰ μὲντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφήν).

Sermon on the Mount (5:38). He introduces it with the words: Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη·

This study wants to investigate the New Testament text form of the Leviticus allusion and quotations as they occur in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts in order to establish the possible *Textvorlage(n)* of the particular New Testament author. Did these New Testament authors use the Hebrew or the LXX version of Leviticus? Can we trace the particular textual tradition of Leviticus in the trajectory of the New Testament quotation? What role did the oral and liturgical traditions play in the transmission and reception of the text form of these quotations? How does the New Testament quotation compare to that of the extant textual evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, on the one hand, and the text form of the same quotation by Philo of Alexandria, on the other hand? Hence, this contribution seeks to contribute to our understanding of the text traditions of the Leviticus text and its reception by the authors of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, as well as in reference to Philo of Alexandria.

In engaging with these six identified cases from Leviticus in the New Testament text, it should be noted that there were no LXX revisions of the printed Göttingen editions noted by Rahlfs and Fraenkel<sup>5</sup> in any of these cases, nor do any of them seem to surface in the Schøyen Collection.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the many very small fragments from 4Q120 LXX Lev<sup>b</sup> (Frgs. 32-97) are of virtually no importance to this investigation as the verses to which they testify cannot be identified.

## 2. LEVITICUS 10:9 – PROHIBITION OF WINE AND STRONG DRINK

Although the warning against, or the prohibition to abstain from, “wine and strong drink” occurs at several places in biblical literature,<sup>7</sup> it is found only once in the book of Leviticus (10:9). The prohibition has particularly strong cultic connections and often applies to priests on duty or before entering the Tent of Meeting.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, Bd. I,1 (bearbeitet von D. Fraenkel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. K. De Troyer, “Leviticus,” in *Papyri Graecae Schøyen II* (ed. D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina 40; Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Greek Papyri 5.3; Firenze: Gonelli, 2010), 1-68.

<sup>7</sup> Num 6:3; Deut 29:5-6 (cf. Deut 14:26); Judg 13:4, 7, 14; Isa 5:11, 22; 24:9; 28:7; 29:9. With οἶνον only: 1 Kgdms 1:15; Prov 20:1; 31:4, 6; Mic 2:11. See also D. F. Watson, “Wine,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. J. B. Green and S. McKnight; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 870.

Lev 10:9 MT	Lev 10:9 LXX	Philo, <i>Ebr.</i> 127	Philo, <i>Ebr.</i> 138	Luke 1:15
<p>וַיִּן וַיִּשְׂכַּר וַיִּשְׂתֵּי-לֵאלֹהִים</p>	<p>Οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ πῖεσθε</p>	<p>οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ πῖεσθε</p>	<p>οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ πῖεσθε</p>	<p>καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πῖη</p>

The MT uses the negative לֹא + the Qal 2<sup>nd</sup> person *singular* as indirect command for expressing the prohibition, whereas the LXX translator used the negative οὐ + the 2<sup>nd</sup> person *plural* aorist imperative πῖεσθε. Luke, in turn, employs the strong negative οὐ μὴ + the 3<sup>rd</sup> person *singular* subjunctive. Luke's quotation remains closest to that of Lev 10:9 despite the fact that some scholars imply similarities with Num 6:3.<sup>8</sup>

Philo of Alexandria twice quoted from Lev 10:9 (*Ebr.* 127 and 138; cf. also *Spec. Leg.* 4.191 *passim*). The quotation from Lev 10:9 is only found once in the New Testament, namely in Luke 1:15, where Luke adapted the Leviticus passage by, what seems to be, a possible superimposing of similar wording to that of LXX Isa 44:12 onto the prohibition of Lev 10:9: καὶ οὐ μὴ πῖη ὕδωρ. It is the only place in the LXX where this expression occurs.

The text form of both occurrences in Philo (*Ebr.* 127; 138) are in exact agreement with that of LXX Lev 10:9. Luke's version, however, reads the strong double negative οὐ μὴ and is supported by all Lukan manuscripts. There are thus no Lukan variants that support the LXX reading as it occurs in Lev 10:9 and in Philo so that Luke's reading should be accepted as it stands. But the situation is different among the LXX variants of Lev 10:9. Three manuscripts also have οὐ + μὴ.<sup>9</sup> It is clear, however, from the dating and the weight of those witnesses that their inclusion of μὴ is a later addition in order to conform to the text of Luke 1:15. Furthermore, judging on the evidence of the two occurrences in Philo, it is likely that the LXX indeed read here πῖεσθε, and not οὐ μὴ πῖη as in the version of Luke 1:15, or πίνω in some LXX manuscripts.<sup>10</sup> An interesting alternative is found in *T. Rub.* 1.10: Οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπιον.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See G. L. Archer and G. Chirichigno who includes the text of Num 6:3 in their synopsis. They state that "The language is of course a little bit different in Num 6:3 ... but the sense is the same" (*Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* [Chicago: Moody Press, 1983], 29). The same could actually be said with regard the other OT occurrences of this prohibition as well.

<sup>9</sup> Namely 53 (1439 CE), Basilius Magnus Caesariensis I-IV (PG 29-32), and 381 (11<sup>th</sup> cent. C.E.)

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the Ethiopic translation [+16-46-77-131-500-529-739]; the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum Onkelos.

<sup>11</sup> K. Penner and M. S. Heiser, *Old Testament Greek Pseudepigrapha with Morphology* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2008).

Hence, the Philonic readings thus confirm those of the LXX, whilst the reading of Luke 1:15, which divert from all these, should be ascribed to the editorial hand of Luke himself.<sup>12</sup>

### 3. LEVITICUS 5:11 – PRESCRIPTION OF A POSTNATAL PURIFICATION SACRIFICE

The prescription of a purification sacrifice<sup>13</sup> consisting of turtledoves or pigeons<sup>14</sup> occurs at least nine times in Leviticus (1:14; 5:7, 11; 12:6, 8; 14:22, 30; 15:14, 29). Its particular prescription for *postnatal* purification occurs, however, only in Lev 12:6 and 12:8.

Lev 5:11 MT	Lev 5:11 LXX	Philo, <i>Mut</i> 234; 245	Luke 2:24
וְאִם־לֹא תִשָּׂיג יָדוֹ לְשֵׁפֵי תְרִים אוֹ לְשֵׁנֵי בְנֵי־יוֹנָה	Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εὐρίσκη αὐτοῦ ἢ χεῖρ ζευγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοσσοῦς περιστερῶν	[234] εἰάν δὲ μὴ εὐρίσκη ἢ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ζευγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσοῦς περιστερῶν [245] καὶ ζευγος τρυγόνων ἢ περιστερῶν	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ζευγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοσσοῦς περιστερῶν.
Lev 12:8 MT	Lev 12:8 [= 5:7] LXX	Philo, <i>Mut.</i> 233	
וְאִם־לֹא תִמָּצֵא יָדוֹ דֵּי שָׁה וְלִקְחָהּ שְׁפֵי־ תְרִים אוֹ שְׁנֵי בְנֵי יוֹנָה אֶתְד לְעֵלָה וְאֶתְד לְחִטָּאת וְכִפֶּר עָלֶיהָ הַכֹּהֵן וְטָהַרָהּ:	καὶ λήμψεται δύο τρυγόνας ἢ δύο νοσσοῦς περιστερῶν	δύο τρυγόνας ἢ δύο νεοσσοῦς περιστερῶν, ἓνα περὶ ἀμαρτίας καὶ ἓνα εἰς ὄλοκαύτωμα	

<sup>12</sup> An important contrast can be observed by Luke between being drunk from wine and strong drink, versus being filled by the Holy Spirit. Compare the prohibition to John the Baptist here in Luke 1:15 (καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πῖη, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται) and the Pentecost event with the apostles in Acts 2:4 (ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου) and Acts 2:13 (γλεύκοις μεμεστωμένοι εἰσίν).

<sup>13</sup> The offerer shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, according to Lev 1:4. See R. E. Averbeck, "Sacrifices and Offerings," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* (ed. T. D. Alexander and D. W. Baker; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 706-733 (712).

<sup>14</sup> These birds were "considered ceremonially clean and usable for sacrifice". Cf. J. D. Barry, "Pigeon," in *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (ed. J. D. Barry et al.; Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2015).

The explicit reference to “two turtledoves” (δύο τρυγόνας) or to “two young pigeons” (δύο νοσσοῦς περιστερῶν) is frequently found in Leviticus (LXX Lev 5:7, 11; 12:8; 14:22; 15:14, 29). The LXX presents a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew text of Lev 5:11:

אֵל־מִאֵי	אִשָּׁת	יָדָי	לְשֵׁתֵי הָרִימִים	אוּ לְאִשָּׁתֵי בְּרִייתֵינוּן
Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ	εὗρίσκη	αὐτοῦ ἢ χεῖρ	ζευγος τρυγόνων	ἢ δύο νοσσοῦς περιστερῶν

It is striking, however, that only LXX Lev 5:11 refers to “a pair” (ζευγος). The LXX translator translated here the same Hebrew numeral (אִשָּׁת), which is used in both phrases in the Hebrew, with two different Greek words: ζευγος (“a pair”) and δύο (“two”). In LXX Lev 12:8, however, the LXX translator translated more consistently by using the same Greek word in both cases: אִשָּׁת = δύο. Philo makes three times reference to this sacrifice and quotes the wording of both the LXX Leviticus passages: twice from LXX Lev 5:11 with the term ζευγος (*Mut.* 234 and *Mut.* 245) and once from LXX Lev 12:8 (*Mut.* 233). The New Testament, in turn, cites the sacrificial prescription from Leviticus only once in Luke 2:24.<sup>15</sup> The quotation in Luke 2:24 with ζευγος, is closer in verbal agreement with LXX Lev 5:11 than with LXX Lev 12:8<sup>16</sup> – despite the fact that most scholars usually and frequently point to Lev 12:8 as the *locus* for Luke’s quotation<sup>17</sup> – perhaps because its context clearly contains the prescription for *postnatal purification*. The former trajectory (LXX Lev 5:11) was probably the more established version in the reception tradition. The fact that Luke quotes from Lev 5:11 and not from 12:8 where the context clearly deals with *postnatal purification*, might be an indication that Luke perhaps quoted a

<sup>15</sup> Cf. J. Nolland: “While the fact receives no emphasis in Luke’s text, the use of pigeons in sacrifice as an alternative to the usual sacrificial animals was a special concession to the poor” (*Luke 1:1–9:20* [WBC 35A; Dallas, TX: Word, 2002], 118). “Mary made use of the concession to poor people, and brought two doves as an offering for her purification” (J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* [trans. F. H. Cave, C. H. Cave and M. E. Dahl; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], 116). So also C. S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), Lk 2:22–24; R. J. Utley, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Study Guide Commentary Series 3A; Marshall: Bible Lessons International, 2004), Lk 2:21–52.

<sup>16</sup> So also M. M. Culy, M. C. Parsons and J. J. Stigall: “Although the allusion is to Lev 12:8, the use of ζευγος (neut sg) here, rather than δύο, matches Lev 5:11” (*Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text* [Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010], 81). It should be noted, furthermore, that there are no textual variants amongst the Lukan witnesses.

<sup>17</sup> Cf., for instance, S. Westerholm: “The sacrifice mentioned in Luke 2:24 is that for the purification of a mother who is poor (Lev 12:8)” (“Clean and Unclean,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* [ed. J. B. Green and S. McKnight; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992], 130). Also C. A. Evans, “Old Testament in the Gospels,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 586; and G. L. Archer and G. Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations*, 28.

well-known formulation of the prescription from memory and not through first-hand consultation of his Leviticus text.

Furthermore, whereas both LXX Lev 5:11 and 12:8 used  $\nu\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$  as translation for  $\text{וְיָיִן}$  (followed by Luke 2:24), all three of Philo's quotations of these passages, in turn, used the variant  $\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ . The former,  $\nu\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ , is well attested in Classical Greek literature although more frequent in later Hellenistic literature. The latter,  $\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ , is used more frequently in Classical Greek literature with less preference by later Hellenistic writers. The LXX textual tradition shows some activity on this issue. Whereas  $\nu\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  is confirmed by the oldest witnesses (B and G),<sup>18</sup> variations of  $\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  are to be found in a few late minuscules.<sup>19</sup> Interestingly, the Alexandrian writers, Philo and Cyrilus (I 972), both prefer the  $\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  reading (followed later also by Alfred Rahlfs' LXX edition).

#### 4. LEVITICUS 19:18 – THE LOVE COMMANDMENT

It has been noted that “The enactments of Leviticus 19 are as varied as life itself.”<sup>20</sup> Betz, amongst others, has pointed out quite rightly that “The formulation of the essence of the Torah as contained in Lev 19:18 is by no means a Christian *proprium*,” but that it is also attributed in Jewish tradition to Rabbi Hillel.<sup>21</sup> He states, furthermore, that the tradition may be legendary as it was later also attributed to Rabbi Aqiba.<sup>22</sup> Hagner, too, indicated that “There is evidence that the question concerning the most important commandment ... was of considerable interest in rabbinic discussions.”<sup>23</sup> Hence, the summary of the law in its *negative form* was already known in pre-Christian Jewish sources, such as in Rabbi Hillel's “Negative Golden Rule”<sup>24</sup> to a proselyte. Although Hillel's summary is not directly related to Lev 19:18, his statement in *b. Šabb.* 31a implies having Lev 19:18 in mind. The statement, “That which

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also the later witnesses 108-118-314\* 127 130-321-344 55.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the following minuscules:  $\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  (68);  $\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  (618, 46<sup>o</sup>);  $\nu\epsilon\omega\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  (799).

<sup>20</sup> J. A. Motyer, “Judgment,” in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (ed. T. D. Alexander and B. S. Rosner; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 613. Motyer states further: “There is, however, a single binding thread: fourteen times a command is reinforced with the words ‘I am the Lord your God’/‘I am the Lord’.”

<sup>21</sup> H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 276.

<sup>22</sup> H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, 276.

<sup>23</sup> D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998), 646. He refers to, amongst others, to Rabbi Hillel [*b. Šabb.* 31a] and Rabbi Simlai [*b. Mak.* 24a; *Midr. Tanhuma B* on Judg §10 (16b)] and to Rabbi Akiba [*Sifra Lev.* 19:18] and *Gen. Rab.* 24 [16b].

<sup>24</sup> R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998), 243–244. It reads: “What is hateful to yourself, do to no other: that is the whole law and the rest is commentary” (*b. Šabb.* 31a).

you hate do not do to your fellows; this is the whole law; the rest is commentary; go and learn it”, is appended to “You shall love your neighbor as yourself” in *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Lev 19:18.<sup>25</sup> Also later, in the early second century CE, Rabbi Akiba “spoke of the same passage (Lev 19:18) as ‘the greatest general principle in the Torah’”<sup>26</sup> (see *Gen. Rab.* xxiv.7 and *Sipra* on Lev 19:18).<sup>27</sup> Other pre-Christian Jewish sources which also include the summary of the law, are to be found in “Tob 4:15 (cf. Sir 31:15), *Ep. Arist.* 207-208 (with the positive also indicated), and the Jerusalem Targum of Lev 19:18.”<sup>28</sup> Despite being rare, the *positive form* can also be found in pre-Christian Jewish literature (e.g. *Let. Arist.* 20; 2 *En.* 61:2; *m. Ab.* 2.10, 12).<sup>29</sup>

Although Philo quotes extensively from particularly Leviticus 19<sup>30</sup> and its festival tradition in the *Corpus Philonicum*, explicit quotations from Lev 19:18 and 19:34 are absent in his works. Some interesting intertextual connections regarding Lev 19:18 can also be found in both the *Testament of Dan*,<sup>31</sup> as well as in the *Testament of Issachar*.<sup>32</sup>

But it is especially Lev 19:18 which displays a broad early Christian trajectory, covering the Pauline and Gospel traditions, the Western text (D and a few other witnesses), Acts 15:20 and 15:28, POxy 654.5, as well as the Didache (*Did.* 1.2<sup>33</sup>), the early Church Fathers (*Barn.* 19.5; Justin *Dial.* 93.2) and the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* 6.<sup>34</sup> It is no surprise that the New Testament writers

<sup>25</sup> R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 243-244.

<sup>26</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998), 778.

<sup>27</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentary; London: Continuum, 1993), 289.

<sup>28</sup> D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (WBC 33A; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998), 176.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. R. Bauckham, *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of the Epistle of James* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2003), 115.

<sup>30</sup> Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.224 (Lev 19:1); *Spec. Leg.* 2.239 (Lev 19:3); *Leg. All.* 3.22; *Spec. Leg.* 1.25 (Lev 19:4); *Somn.* 2.23 (Lev 19:9); *Spec. Leg.* 4.39 (Lev 19:11); *Virt.* 88 (Lev 19:13); *Spec. Leg.* 4.197 (Lev 19:14); *Spec. Leg.* 4.183 (Lev 19:16); *Plant.* 95; 109; 113 (Lev 19:23); *Abr.* 13; *Plant.* 135 (Lev 19:24); *Plant.* 117 (Lev 19:25); *Sacr.* 77 (Lev 19:32); *Her.* 162 (Lev 19:35); *Spec. Leg.* 4.193 (Lev 19:36); *Spec. Leg.* 2.238 (Lev 19:38).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *T. Dan* 5:3: Ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν Κύριον ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ζῳῇ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἐν ἀληθινῇ καρδίᾳ (see K. Penner and M. S. Heiser, *Old Testament Greek Pseudepigrapha with Morphology* [Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2008]).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *T. Iss.* 5:2: ἀλλ' ἀγαπᾶτε Κύριον καὶ τὸν πλησίον, πένητα καὶ ἀσθενή ἐλεᾶτε (K. Penner and M. S. Heiser, *OT Greek Pseudepigrapha*). See also J. Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998), 581.

<sup>33</sup> “The ‘Two Ways’ (*Did.* 1.2) begins with a quotation of the two commandments to love God (Deut 6:5) and to love your neighbor (Lev 19:18) as refracted through Jesus’ teaching” (R. P. Martin and P. H. Davids, ed., *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997], 827).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 176. He further states: “The negative and positive forms are two ways of saying the same thing, but although the former is original and may be more fundamental, the latter is the superior form (contra Luz, Davies-Allison) and ‘the fuller expression of practical morality’ (Abrahams, *Studies* 1:22). The positive form must include the negative form but not vice versa.”



frequently quote the so-called “golden rule”, or “rule of reciprocity” from Lev 19:18. They probably traced the origins of the “golden rule” back to a Logion in the Jesus-tradition which contained Jesus’ own summary of the law. The love command from Lev 19:18 lies behind Jesus’ interpretation<sup>35</sup> and is quoted by the Synoptics<sup>36</sup> (Mark 12:31, 33; Matt 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Luke 10:27), as well as by Paul as the fulfillment of the “whole law” (Gal 5:14<sup>37</sup>) and as the summing up of “the commandments” (Rom 13:9<sup>38</sup>). It is also quoted by James as “the royal law according to scripture” (Jas 2:8<sup>39</sup>).

Lev 19:18 MT	Lev 19:18 LXX	Lev 19:34 MT	Lev 19:34 LXX	4Q26 <sup>a</sup> (4QLev <sup>e</sup> ) <sup>40</sup>
<p>תבא לך לך לך לך</p>	<p>καὶ οὐκ ἐκδικᾷταί σου ἡ χεὶρ, καὶ οὐ μνησιεύς τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ σου· <b>καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου</b> ὡς σεαυτὸν· ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος.</p>	<p>תבא לך לך לך</p>	<p>ὡς ὁ αὐτόχθων ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ προσπορευόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς, <b>καὶ ἀγαπήσεις αὐτὸν</b> ὡς σεαυτὸν, ὅτι προσήλυτοι ἐγενήθητε ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ</p>	<p>ת[בא] 19:34 לך כן גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים אני יהוה אלהיכם</p>
<p>Mark 12:31, 33</p>	<p>Matt 5:43</p>	<p>Matt 19:19</p>	<p>Matt 22:39</p>	<p>Luke 10:27</p>
<p>[31]δευτέρα αὕτη· <b>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.</b></p>	<p>Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· <b>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου</b></p>	<p><i>τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.</i></p>	<p>δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῆ· <b>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.</b></p>	<p>ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· <b>ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου</b></p>

<sup>35</sup> Cf. C. S. Keener: “Following Jewish interpretive technique, Jesus links the two commandments (Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18) by a common key word, “love.” These passages were also linked in Jewish tradition (e.g., Philo), and some other teachers felt that these were the greatest commandments that summarized the law” (*IVP Bible Background Commentary*, Mk 12:29-34).

<sup>36</sup> All manuscripts are in agreement in the cases of Mark and Matthew.

<sup>37</sup> All manuscripts are in agreement in the reading of Gal 5:14. Paul quotes LXX Lev 19:18 in Gal 5:14, “which does not mean that he quotes directly from the LXX; it is more likely that he takes the quotation from primitive Christian tradition, where it is widely attested” (H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, 276).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. J. D. G. Dunn: “The fact that he (i.e. Paul, *GJS*) does not cite Jesus as the authority for the assertion is explained partly by the character of earliest Christian remembering of the Jesus tradition...and partly by the fact that the assertion was by no means controversial for many Jews” (*Romans 9–16*, 779–780).

<sup>39</sup> All manuscripts are in agreement in the reading of James 2:8.

<sup>40</sup> *4Q26a Leviticus<sup>e</sup>* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2010), Lev 3:9–19:34. This reference is not listed by A. Lange and M. Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 348.

μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολή οὐκ ἔστιν. [33] καὶ τὸ <i>ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν</i>	καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου.			<i>καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχυί σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</i>
Rom 13:9	Gal 5:14	Jas 2:8		
καὶ εἴ τις ἐτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιο ῖται [ἐν τῷ]. <i>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</i>	ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ· <i>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</i>	Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν· <i>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν,</i> καλῶς ποιεῖτε·		

The frequently quoted Love Commandment of Lev 19:18 also occurs in Lev 19:34 – but with one difference: whereas LXX Lev 19:18 reads καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, LXX Lev 19:34, in turn, reads καὶ ἀγαπήσεις αὐτόν ὡς σεαυτόν. The phrase τὸν πλησίον σου runs like a golden thread through Leviticus 19 but serves as translation equivalent for two Hebrew terms which consistently alternates between vv. 13 and 18, namely תַּיִשָּׁרֵף (*associate, fellow, relation*) and חֵבֵד (*friend, companion, fellow*).<sup>41</sup> It surfaces in:

- v. 11 (οὐ συκοφαντήσει ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον / תַּיִשָּׁרֵף וְיָאָס);
- v. 13 (οὐκ ἀδικήσεις τὸν πλησίον / חֵבֵד);
- v. 15 (ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρινεῖς τὸν πλησίον σου / תַּיִשָּׁרֵף);
- v. 16 (οὐκ ἐπισυστήσῃ ἐφ’ αἷμα τοῦ πλησίον σου / חֵבֵד);
- v. 17 (ἐλεγμῶ ἐλέγξεις τὸν πλησίον σου / תַּיִשָּׁרֵף);
- v. 18 (καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν / חֵבֵד).

It is evident, however, that the New Testament authors all quoted from the LXX Lev 19:18 version and not from the LXX Lev 19:34 version. Luke 10:27 is the only place among the New Testament versions which includes a substantial editorial adjustment with the substantial plus: κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχυί σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. This is inserted between ἀγαπήσεις and καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. There are no variant readings pertaining to the text form of the

<sup>41</sup> F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs. *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

original quote itself (ἀγαπήσεις καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν) as it appears in LXX Lev 19:18. The plus, however, shows a lot of activity with several textual variations such as some omissions of σου and καί, as well as changes in the word order of (a) ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας; (b) ἐν ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ; (c) καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου; and (d) καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.

Furthermore, some witnesses of Rom 13:9 follow, instead of σεαυτόν,<sup>42</sup> the variant reading ἐαυτόν<sup>43</sup> - which is also testified by some late LXX witnesses of both Lev 19:18<sup>44</sup> and Lev 19:34.<sup>45</sup> None of the remaining LXX textual variants of either Lev 19:18<sup>46</sup> or Lev 19:34<sup>47</sup> are supported by any of the New Testament quotations.

It became clear that the identification of who the “neighbor” might be resulted in different interpretations. According to Luz:

The essential difference between the Christian and the Jewish interpretations of Lev 19:18 is that in Christianity the ‘neighbor’ was applied universally to all fellow human beings who are in need and was understood in terms of the love of one’s enemy, while in the Jewish tradition human solidarity that extended beyond the borders of Israel was not based on Lev 19:18.<sup>48</sup>

But Dunn has warned that it should not “be assumed that all Jews inevitably took ὁ πλησίον as the fellow Israelite”.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>42</sup> This reading is followed by the text of NA28 and is supported by P<sup>46</sup> κ A B D 048. 6. 81. 1505. 1739 *pm*; Clement of Alexandria.

<sup>43</sup> Supporting NT witnesses of this variant reading include: F G L P Ψ 33. 104. 365. 1175. 1506. 1881 *pm*.

<sup>44</sup> The variant εαυτον is supported in LXX Lev 19:18 by the following witnesses: 58-64\*-72-707\* C<sup>v-16</sup> 313 414 b 610 53'-129 54-75-767 30\*-85'-321' 76-84 619 318 68'-126' 18 646 799 CanAp 266 Cyr I 520; absc 628 (J. W. Wevers, ed., *Leviticus* [vol. II, 2; Vetus Testamentum Graecum; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], 214).

<sup>45</sup> These include 58-72-82 b 44 53' 54 85 84\*(vid) 527 126-628' 18 799; vos<sup>Lat</sup>cod 103 Spec 12 Aeth<sup>C</sup> = Tar<sup>P</sup> (J. W. Wevers, ed., *Leviticus*, 219).

<sup>46</sup> This includes the possible omission of the καί [Spec 15<sup>ap</sup>] – except for possible support by Matt 19:19, the alternative αγαπησης [54\*-458], and the possible omission of σου [46\*].

<sup>47</sup> This includes the possible omission of καί [<sup>Lat</sup>cod 103 Spec 12 Aeth<sup>PR</sup>] – except for possible support by Matt 19:19, the alternative αγαπησης [19' 246-664 458; *diligetis*<sup>Lat</sup>cod 103 Spec 12 Aeth<sup>CG</sup> = Tar<sup>P</sup>] and the possible omission of ὡς σεαυτόν [130-321'] – except for possibly Matt 5:43.

<sup>48</sup> U. Luz, *Matthew 21–28: a Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005), 86.

<sup>49</sup> According to Dunn, “ὁ πλησίον can be used equally of ‘the fellow man’... and there are some indications of a greater openness on this point elsewhere in Jewish writings.” Dunn lists, apart from Lev 19:34, also Prov 6:1, Sir 13:15, *I En.* 99:15; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 2.63; *Virt.* 116; Josephus, *War* 7.260; *T. Iss.* 7.6 (J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 779–780).

5. LEVITICUS 20:9 – THE 5<sup>TH</sup> COMMANDMENT

I dealt with the first part of this quotation fairly extensively elsewhere,<sup>50</sup> but did not compare Lev 20:9 in my exposition there – which is appropriate to be included now here as well. The 5<sup>th</sup> commandment is present in Lev 20:9; Exod 20:12; and Deut 5:16. It is furthermore quoted by Philo (*Det.* 52; *Spec.* 2.261), Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2:206), Pseudo-Philo 11:9-10,<sup>51</sup> as well as by all three Synoptic Gospels (Mark 7:10; Matt 15:4; Luke 18:20) and also by the author of Ephesians (6:2-3). There are clear differences in the order and structure of the commandments in the New Testament<sup>52</sup> – a discussion which is not in the focus of our study here. Suffice it to say, however, that a specific trajectory of a particular version of the commandments (either Exodus 20 or Deuteronomy 5) in its particular Greek textual tradition (Uncials B,  $\kappa$  and A) is clearly noticeable in a particular New Testament book.<sup>53</sup> The Leviticus version of the 5<sup>th</sup> commandment reflects a *negative* statement (ὁς ἄν κακῶς εἶπη ... κακῶς εἶπεν, Lev 20:9), whereas the Exodus- and Deuteronomy versions are linked to a *positive* statement (ἵνα, εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16).

5.1. *The positive-formula of the 5<sup>th</sup> commandment*

The quotation in Philo (*Det.* 52; *Spec.* 2.261), the Synoptics (Mark 7:10a; 10:19; Matt 15:4a; 19:19; Luke 18:20b), and Ephesians (6:2-3) is closer to the versions of Exod 20:12 and Deut 5:16 with the inclusion of τίμα, than to that of Lev 20:9 where it is absent.

LXX Exod 20:12 [α]	LXX Deut 5:16 [β]	Mark 7:10a [β]	Mark 10:19 [α]
τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα,	τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα <u>σου</u>	τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα <u>σου</u>	τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα
Matt 15:4a [γ]	Matt 19:19 [γ]	Luke 18:20b [α]	Eph 6:2-3 [α]
τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα,	τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα	τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα	τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα,
Sir 3:8a	Philo, <i>Det.</i> 52 [γ]	Philo, <i>Spec.</i> 2.261	

<sup>50</sup> Cf. G. J. Steyn, "Pretexts of the second table of the Decalogue and early Christian intertexts," *Neot.* 30.2 (1996), 451-464.

<sup>51</sup> B. H. McLean, *Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture in Early Christian and Jewish Writings Through 180 C.E.* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 35.

<sup>52</sup> Cf., for instance, W. R. G. Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 15-17; Steyn, *Pretexts*, 451-464.

<sup>53</sup> See Steyn, *Pretexts*, 451-464.

ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου	τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα	τίμα πατέρα καὶ μητέρα	
---	-----------------------------------	---------------------------	--

One striking difference between the texts above is the use of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person personal pronoun σου – which is consistently reflected in both MT versions of the Decalogue (Exod 20:12 and Deut 5:16), not only after “father” (אָבִי) but also after “mother” (אִמִּי). Its absence in LXX 20:12 after μητέρα, presents an alternative translation tradition to that of LXX Deut 5:16. The result is, that at least three distinct reception trajectories in the tradition can be identified from the versions of LXX Exod 20:12 and Deut 5:16 with regard to the use of the second person personal pronoun:

- The first [ $\alpha$ ] is that of LXX Exod 20:12 (partially present in Sir 3:8a), which is followed by Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20b; and Eph 6:2-3 – all retaining the personal pronoun singular σου after πατέρα.
- The second [ $\beta$ ] is that of LXX Deut 5:16, which is clearly followed by Mark 7:10a, and which duplicates the personal pronoun σου singular also after μητέρα.
- A third [ $\gamma$ ] trajectory is represented by Philo (*Det.* 52; *Spec.* 2.261) and also noticeable in Matt 15:4a and 19:19 – which omits the personal pronoun in both cases after πατέρα and μητέρα. Menken is of the opinion that “Matthew is consistent...in omitting possessive genitives of the personal pronoun after πατήρ and μητήρ wherever these two words occur in immediate conjunction”. His conclusion is that this omission in Matthew “is best explained as a simple editorial retouching of the evangelist for stylistic reasons”.<sup>54</sup> He reckons, furthermore, that although the personal pronoun which is also absent in Philo might be suggestive of the existence of another textual tradition, an “editorial explanation” “still remains the simplest one in the case of Matthew (and probably also for Philo)”.<sup>55</sup>

## 5.2. The negative-formula of the 5<sup>th</sup> commandment

Besides the quotation of the 5<sup>th</sup> commandment from LXX Deut 5:16 in Mark 7:10a, the author of Mark’s gospel links it with καὶ to a second quotation in Mark 7:10b. The gospel of Matthew utilizes the same Markan material and links the quotation of the 5<sup>th</sup> commandment from LXX Exod 20:12 / Deut 5:16 in Matt 15:4a to Mark’s second quotation in Matt 15:4b. Whereas the first quotation is a statement which expresses a positive command (τίμα), the sec-

<sup>54</sup> Cf. M. J. J. Menken, *Matthew’s Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 206–207. He continues: “A secondary motive may have been Matthew’s wish to enhance the parallelism between the two OT quotations in 15,4...”.

<sup>55</sup> Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 207.

ond quotation is a statement which expresses a negative command and contains the punishment when the first is not executed or violated (θανάτω τελευτάτω). But the textual origin of this second quotation which “Moses said” (Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν, Mark 7:10a; Matt 15:4a), is unclear. There seem, however, to be two possibilities that closely resemble the wording of the quotation in Mark and Matthew, namely Exod 21:15 / Lev 20:9,<sup>56</sup> on the one hand, and Exod 21:16, on the other hand. The last possibility seems to be more likely and matches the wording the closest. Especially three striking differences between the versions of LXX Lev 20:9 / Exod 21:15 and 21:16 are pointing in this direction:

- Firstly, the beginning of the quotation with ὁ κακολογῶν is identical to LXX Exod 21:16. (Note that the LXX interchanged the order of the Hebrew text of Exod 21:16 and 21:17).<sup>57</sup>
- Secondly, the words at the end of the quotation (θανάτω τελευτάτω) are closer to Exod 21:16 (τελευτήσῃ θανάτω) than to Exod 21:15 / Lev 20:9 (θανάτω θανατούσθω).
- Thirdly, the definite articles are absent before πατέρα and μητέρα.

The LXX passages retain the personal pronoun both after πατέρα as well as after μητέρα. It is absent, however, in both instances after πατέρα and μητέρα in Mark 7:10b and Matt 15:4b.

Exod 21:15 MT	Exod 21:15 LXX	Lev 20:9 MT	Lev 20:9 LXX
<p>וּמַכֵּהוּ בְּיָדוֹ וְאָמַר מִוֹת יָמָת:</p>	<p>ὅς τύπτει <b>πατέρα αὐτοῦ</b> <b>ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ,</b> <b>θανάτω</b> <b>θανατούσθω.</b></p>	<p>כִּי־אִישׁ אִישׁ אָשַׁר יִקְלֵל אֶת־אָבִיו אֶת־אִמּוֹ מִוֹת יָמָת  אָבִיו וְאִמּוֹ קָלֵל דְּמַי בּוֹ:</p>	<p>ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ὁς ἂν κακῶς εἶπη <b>τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ</b> <b>ἢ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ,</b> <b>θανάτω</b> <b>θανατούσθω·</b> πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ κακῶς εἶπεν, ἔνοχος ἔσται.</p>

<sup>56</sup> See also the combination of Lev 20:9 + Exod 21:17 in Prov 30:11 (listed by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 85).

<sup>57</sup> So also M. Karrer and W. Kraus: “Die LXX hat gegenüber dem MT die Reihenfolge von V.16 und V.17 vertauscht, offensichtlich um die beiden Kapitalverbrechen gegen Eltern einander unmittelbar zuzuordnen” (*Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament, Bd. 1: Genesis bis Makkabäer* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011], 302).

Exod 21:17 MT	Exod 21:16 LXX	Mark 7:10b	Matt 15:4b
לְזַרְמָה וְזָרָה וְזָרָה :תַּמָּה תִּזְ	ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ τελευτήσει θανάτῳ.	καί· ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω.	καί· ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω.

In the light of the comparisons above, it might be concluded that the pre-text of the second quotation in Mark 7:10b and Matt 15:4b should not be sought in Lev 20:9, but rather in Exod 21:16.

#### 6. LEVITICUS 23:29 – WARNING AGAINST NEGLECT OF ATONEMENT DAY

Luke’s quotation in Acts 3:23<sup>58</sup> is a composite quotation that is made up of explicit references and compiled from phrases that are similar to those found in Deut 18:19, Exod 30:33, Lev 18:29 and Lev 23:29.<sup>59</sup> In fact, upon closer examination, the composition of Acts 3:23 (ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ) seems to be made up from a reference to Deut 18:19<sup>60</sup> (ἂν μὴ ἀκούσῃ ... ὁ προφήτης; phrase Y), as well as another reference to Exod 30:33 / Lev 23:29 (ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ; phrase Z). Yet another reference that closely resembles the latter is also to be found in Lev 18:29: ἐξολεθρευθήσονται αἱ ψυχαὶ αἱ ποιοῦσαι ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῶν. These two references (phrases Y+Z), are actually presented by Luke as the end of a longer quotation in which “Moses said” (Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν, Acts 3:22). The first part (phrase X) consists of an almost verbatim quotation from LXX Deut 18:15:

LXX Deut 18:15	Acts 3:22 (phrase X)
προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα ὅσα	προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεός ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

<sup>58</sup> For a comprehensive exposition of the quotation in Acts 3:23, see G. J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos – Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 140-153 (148-149).

<sup>59</sup> “Blending texts was common, and this passage certainly follows the practice” (C. S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, Vol. 2: 3:1 – 14:28 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013), 1116).

<sup>60</sup> For quotations from Deut 18:19 amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Deut 18:18-19 = 4QTest (4Q175) 5.8 / Deut 18:18-20 = 4BibPar (4Q158) 6 6.8 (listed by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 104).

The latter two phrases of Acts' quotation consists of two formulations that were probably well known – especially in the oral tradition.<sup>61</sup> Together it forms a conditional sentence (ἐάν μὴ ἀκούσῃ) with clear consequences attached to its violation.

- Phrase Y (Deut 18:19) is a reminder to listen to the words of the prophet – which Luke adapts in Acts 3:23 to now read “*that* prophet” (προφήτου ἐκείνου). This second phrase (Y) connects closely to the theme of the first quotation (X) and both these phrases can be traced back to Deuteronomy 18 (vv. 15 and 19).<sup>62</sup> There are two interesting differences between the Hebrew of the MT and the LXX translation. Firstly, whereas the MT and 4Q175 read “*my* words” (אִנִּי), the LXX has “*his* words” (τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ).<sup>63</sup> The LXX reading is also supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch. Secondly, the reference to “the prophet” is absent in the MT, but present in 4Q175 and in LXX Deut 18:19 (ὁ προφήτης).
- The third phrase (Z) (Exod 30:33 / Lev 23:29),<sup>64</sup> in turn, commands by means of a future indicative passive the action of excommunication (ἐξολεθρευθήσεται).<sup>65</sup> It is detached as a pretext from the two previous parts and aligns closest to the wording of Exod 30:33 and Lev 23:29. There is no LXX textual support in favour of the changes in Acts 3:23 and they can relatively safely be ascribed to the hand of Luke.<sup>66</sup> There is, however, one clear instance that the LXX textual tradition of Deuteronomy 18 attempted to compensate for this oddity by including an identical reading to that of Acts 3:23 – probably retrospectively and in the light of Acts 3:23 – through an expansion of Deut 18:19 (cf. comma apparatus) and a late gloss to Deut 31:8 (only by minuscule 55).

The relation between Lev 23:29 and Acts 3:23 can be summarised as follows:

<sup>61</sup> Similarly Keener: “Peter’s speech may thus allude to the language of just punishment for any act of rebellion against the Lord” (*Acts*, 1116).

<sup>62</sup> Deut 18:18-19 is also to be found in 4QTest 5-8 and 1QS 9:11. (Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations*, 141; Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 104). Cf. Keener: “The vision of the Qumran Scrolls may be closest to Acts here ... not only the Gentiles but unrepentant Jews (those who did not join the elect community represented at Qumran) would be destroyed” (*Acts*, 1116).

<sup>63</sup> So also Karrer and Kraus, *Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, 572.

<sup>64</sup> According to E. J. Schnabel, Luke “quotes a portion of Deut 18:15-20, combined with Lev 23:29” (*Acts: Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012], 217).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Gen 17:14; Exod 12:15, 19; 30:33; 31:14; Lev 17:4, 9, 14; 22:3; 23:29; Num 9:13; 15:30; 19:20; Ruth 4:10; 3 Kgdms 2:4; Ps 36:28; Zech 9:10; 13:8; Jer 31:8; Ezek 6:3; Dan<sup>Theot</sup> 9:26 (this exact form does not occur in either Philo or Josephus).

<sup>66</sup> Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations*, 148.



The syntactical similarities between Acts 3:23 and Lev 23:9 should not be pushed too far in the effort to accommodate (create?) the possible contextual connections. A few things must be considered here: (a) the context of the words in Lev 23:29 has *no* relationship with either Deut 18:15-20 or with Acts 3; (b) the formula itself seems to be typical of the literature which deals with the obedience of God’s law, and the disobedience of the laws seems to be closely linked with this curse – which is found extensively in ‘the OT’; (c) Luke himself may have compiled the curse here, within the framework of the nature of this law-material, which seems always to be combined with the curse. He would have done this with the help of his knowledge of the well known terminology used in the Torah, as well as with the help of the rest of the context of Deut 18(19).<sup>67</sup>

McNamara<sup>68</sup> has pointed out some interesting differences in interpretation at the beginning of the citation of Lev 23:29 that can be observed elsewhere. Whereas both the MT and LXX refer to “humiliation” (הַשְׁתַּחֲוֹתֻם / μὴ ταπεινωθήσεται), the *Epistle of Barnabas* (7:3) refers, for instance, to “fasting” (μὴ νηστεύσῃ τὴν νηστείαν). Targums Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan (but not Onqelos) read here similarly: “For whoever eats on the *fast*, and does not fast at the time of the fast of the atonement, shall be blotted out from the midst of the people.”<sup>69</sup>

Exod 30:33 MT	Exod 30:33 LXX	Lev 23:29 MT	Lev 23:29 LXX	11Q1 (paleoLev <sup>70</sup> )
אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִרְקַח כְּמִהוּ וְאֲשֶׁר יִסֵּן מִמֶּנּוּ עַל-יָד וְנִכְרַת מֵעַמּוּי:	καὶ ὃς ἂν δῶ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀλλογενεῖ, ἐξολεθρευθή- σεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ	כִּי כָל-הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא-תַעֲנֶה בְּעֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְנִכְרְתָה מֵעַמּוּיָהּ:	πᾶσα ψυχῆ, ἥτις μὴ ταπεινωθή- σεται ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ, ἐξολεθρευθή- σεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς.	כִּי כָל הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא-תַעֲנֶה בְּעֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְנִכְרְתָה מֵעַמּוּיָהּ:

<sup>67</sup> Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations*, 148-149.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 243.

<sup>69</sup> M. McNamara refers to the work of G. A. Allon (“The Halacha in *Barnabae epistula*,” *Tarbiz* 11 [1939–40], 23-38; “A Note to ‘The Halacha in *Barnabae epistula*,” *Tarbiz* 11 [1939–1940], 223) who “has found quite a resemblance between the halakhah of *Barnabas* and that of Pseudo-Jonathan” (McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited*, 243).

<sup>70</sup> This reference is not listed by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 86, 348.

Deut 18:19 MT	Deut 18:19 LXX	Deut 18:19 LXX (comma – App.)	Deut 31:8 LXX (gloss: min. 55)	Acts 3:23
<p>וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר      לֹא יִשְׁמָע אֶת-      דְּבַר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר יִדְבֹר      בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ      מֵעַתָּה:</p>	<p>καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος,      ὃς <u>ἂν μὴ</u>  <u>ἀκούσῃ</u> τῶν      λόγων αὐτοῦ,      ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ  <u>ὁ προφήτης</u>      ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί      μου, ἐγὼ      ἐκδικήσω ἐξ      αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p><u>comma</u>] εσται      δε πασα ψυχη      ητις εαν μη      ακουση του      προφητου      εκεινου      εξολεθρευθη      σεται εκ του      λαου</p>	<p>και ειπεν      μουσης τοις      υιοις ιηλ σπι      προφητην υμιν      αναστησει κς ο      θς ημων εκ των      αδελφων υμων      ως εμε αυτου      ακουσεσθε κατα      παντα οσα αν      λαληση προς      υμας εσται δε      πασα ψυχη ητις  <u>εαν μη ακουση</u>  <u>του προφητου</u>  <u>εκεινου</u>      εξολοθρευθησε      ται εκ του λαου      αυτοις</p>	<p>ἔσται δὲ      πᾶσα ψυχὴ      ἣτις  <u>ἂν μὴ</u>  <u>ἀκούσῃ τοῦ</u>  <u>προφήτου</u>  <u>ἐκείνου</u>      ἐξολεθρευ      θήσεται      ἐκ τοῦ      λαοῦ.</p>

## 7. LEVITICUS 24:20 – LEX TALIONIS: THE LAW OF RETALIATION

The 18<sup>th</sup> century BCE retaliation law from the Code of Hammurabi, the King of Babylon, found its way into the Torah of Israel. It is especially the reception of the two lines on the blinding of an eye and the fracturing of the bone of another *awīlu* that is noticeable in the Torah of Israel.

Hammurabi's Code (ca. 1754 B.C.E.):<sup>71</sup>

§196 XXXIII 45-49	§197 XXXIII 50-53
<i>šum-ma a-wi-lum i-in mâr a-wi-lim uḫ-tab-bi-it i-in-šu u-ḫa-ap-pa-du</i>	<i>šum-ma NER.PAD.DU a-wi-lim iš-te-bi-ir NER.PAD.DU-šu i-še-ib-bi-ru</i>
If an <i>awīlu</i> should blind the eye of another <i>awīlu</i> , they shall blind his eye.	If he should break the bone of another <i>awīlu</i> , they shall break his bone.

<sup>71</sup> King of Babylon, 1792-1750 B.C.E. (T. A. Caldwell, J. N. Oswalt and J. F. X. Sheehan, *An Akkadian Grammar. A Translation of Riemschneider's Lehrbuch des Akkadischen* [5<sup>th</sup> ed.; Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1978], 42). Text: R. F. Harper, ed., *The Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904). Translation: W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, *Context of Scripture*, Vol. 2: *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 348.

The retaliation of “eye for eye, tooth for tooth” is quoted in Exodus (21:24), Leviticus (24:20) and Deuteronomy (19:21). It is interesting that Philo nowhere makes reference to this law in his extant corpus of literature. In the New Testament, however, it is only the gospel of Matthew which refers to the law of retaliation (Matt 5:38) when Jesus re-interprets it in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7).<sup>72</sup> The Hebrew versions of Exod 21:24 (MT) and Lev 24:20 (4Q24; MT) have identical readings in the extant Dead Sea Scrolls fragments and the MT. However, that of Deut 19:21 (4Q33; MT) is slightly different when תחת is replaced with פ in Deuteronomy. Turning to the LXX, all three texts (Exod 21:24; Lev 24:20; Deut 19:21) display an identical text form which stands as confirmation that this was a well established formula in both the oral and the written tradition. Matthew’s quotation is also identical to those of the three LXX versions, although he has editorially linked the “eye for eye” part with a καί to the “tooth for tooth” part.

Exodus (21:24) lists *eight* bodily harms (life, eye, tooth, hand, foot, burn, wound, bruise), whilst Leviticus (24:18-20) only lists *four* (life, fracture, eye, tooth), and Deuteronomy (19:21) lists *five* (life, eye, tooth, hand, foot). Matthew, in turn, only selected the two that are explicitly linked to the face.

4Q22 (4QpaleoExod <sup>m</sup> ) <sup>73</sup>	Exod 21:24 MT	Exod 21:24 LXX	
עין [ ] ]שן	עין תחת עין שן תחת שן	ὄφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὄφθαλμοῦ, ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος	
4Q24 (4QLev <sup>b</sup> ) <sup>74</sup>	Lev 24:20 MT	Lev 24:20 LXX	
עין תחת עין שן תחת שן	עין תחת עין שן תחת שן	ὄφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὄφθαλμοῦ, ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος	
4Q33 (4QDeut <sup>f</sup> ) <sup>75</sup>	Deut 19:21 MT	Deut 19:21 LXX	Matt 5:38
עין [ ] שן בשן	עין פ עין שן פ שן	ὄφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὄφθαλμοῦ, ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος	ὄφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὄφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. J. A. Motyer: *The lex talionis* “was given as a directive for the court, not (as in the misunderstanding Jesus counters in Matt. 5:38) as a permission for private revenge” (“Judgment,” in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* [ed. T. D. Alexander and B. S. Rosner; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000], 613).

<sup>73</sup> This reference is not listed by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 74, 347.

<sup>74</sup> Not listed by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 86, 348.

<sup>75</sup> Not listed by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, 351-352.

## 8. CONCLUSION

Leviticus is seldom quoted or alluded to by the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. The quotations from Leviticus, which were surveyed in this study, are very brief and the New Testament writers were probably familiar with all of them via oral traditions. The text forms of these Leviticus quotations in the New Testament are closer to the LXX than to the Hebrew texts and they closely follow those of our known LXX reconstructions. There is no evidence in any of them of another LXX text tradition than that known to us. The six cases may thus be summarized as follows:

- Firstly, the difference in reading between Lev 10:9 and its *allusion to the prohibition of wine and strong drink* in Luke 1:15 should be ascribed to the hand of Luke on text critical grounds.
- Secondly, it is evident from Luke 2:24 that the text form aligns closest to the LXX version of Lev 5:11 in the *prescription of the postnatal purification sacrifice*. Luke’s use of ζεῦχος – which is also testified by Philo (in *Mut.* 234 and 245) – stands as confirmation of his use of this particular text tradition.
- Thirdly, the reception of the *Love Commandment* of Lev 19:18 by the New Testament writers consistently follows the LXX translation with τὸν πλησίον σου and traces its origins back far beyond the beginnings of early Christianity.
- Fourthly, the textual origin of the negative command, which is linked to the *5<sup>th</sup> Commandment* by the Synoptic Gospel writers in Mark 7:10a and Matt 15:4a, should probably rather be sought in the reading of Exod 21:16, than in Exod 21:15 or Lev 20:9.
- Fifthly, Luke compiled a composite quotation in Acts 3:23 which has been patched together from references and phrases similar to those found in Deut 18:19, Exod 30:33, Lev 18:29 and Lev 23:29.
- Lastly, the New Testament reception of the *lex talionis* is only found in Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount which follows the identical readings of LXX Lev 24:20, Exod 21:24 and Deut 19:21.

*References*

- Allon G. A. “The Halacha in *Barnabae epistula*,” *Tarbiz* 11 (1939–40), 23–38.
- Archer G. L. and G. Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983).
- Averbeck R. E., “Sacrifices and Offerings,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* (ed. T. D. Alexander and D. W. Baker; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 706–733.

- Barry J. D., "Pigeon," in *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (ed. J. D. Barry et al.; Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2015).
- Bauckham R., *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of the Epistle of James* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2003).
- Betz H. D., *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).
- Brown F., S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs. *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- Caldwell T. A., J. N. Oswalt and J. F. X. Sheehan, *An Akkadian Grammar. A Translation of Riemschneider's Lehrbuch des Akkadischen* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.; Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1978).
- Culy M. M., M. C. Parsons and J. J. Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010).
- De Troyer K., "Leviticus," in *Papyri Graecae Schøyen II* (ed. D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina 40; Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Greek Papyri 5.3; Firenze: Gonelli, 2010), 1-68.
- Dunn J. D. G., *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998).
- Dunn J. D. G., *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentary; London: Continuum, 1993).
- Hagner D. A., *Matthew 1–13* (WBC 33A; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998).
- Hagner D. A., *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998).
- Hallo W. W. and K. L. Younger, *Context of Scripture*, Vol. 2: *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Harper R. F. (ed.), *The Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904).
- Jeremias J., *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* (trans. F. H. Cave, C. H. Cave and M. E. Dahl; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).
- Karrer M. and W. Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*. Bd. 1: *Genesis bis Makkabäer* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011).
- Keener C. S., *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, Vol. 2: *3:1–14:28* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013).
- Keener C. S., *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993).
- Lange A. and M. Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
- Loader W. R. G., *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).
- Longenecker R. N., *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998).
- Luz U., *Matthew 21–28: a Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 2005).
- Martin R. P. and P. H. Davids (ed.), *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997).

- McLean B. H., *Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture in Early Christian and Jewish Writings Through 180 C.E.* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992).
- McNamara M., *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010).
- Menken M. J. J., *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2004).
- Motyer J. A., "Judgment," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (ed. T. D. Alexander and B. S. Rosner; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000).
- Nolland J., *Luke 1:1–9:20* [WBC 35A; Dallas, TX: Word, 2002].
- Nolland J., *Luke 9:21–18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998).
- Penner K. and M. S. Heiser, *Old Testament Greek Pseudepigrapha with Morphology* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2008).
- Penner K. and M. S. Heiser, *Old Testament Greek Pseudepigrapha with Morphology* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2008).
- Rahlf's A., *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, Bd. I,1 (bearbeitet von D. Fraenkel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).
- Schnabel E. J., *Acts: Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012).
- Steyn G. J., "Pretexts of the second table of the Decalogue and early Christian intertexts," *Neot.* 30.2 (1996), 451-464.
- Steyn G. J., *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos – Leuven: Peeters, 1995).
- Utley R. J., *The Gospel According to Luke* (Study Guide Commentary Series 3A; Marshall: Bible Lessons International, 2004).
- Watson D. F., "Wine," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. J. B. Green and S. McKnight; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992).
- Westerholm S., "Clean and Unclean," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. J. B. Green and S. McKnight; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992).



## THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS IN JOSEPHUS' WRITINGS

Michael AVIOZ

The book of Leviticus has always presented a great challenge for readers and interpreters, both Christian and Jewish. Devoid of plot and full of technical terms, its style is repetitive. However, this did not prevent the rabbinic Sages of the Second Temple period from advising educators to use Leviticus as the first book that children should be taught.<sup>1</sup> The rabbis attempted to shed light upon the complicated ritual laws as well as the moral issues raised in Leviticus. Other early Jewish sources in which Leviticus plays a prominent role are Philo, Josephus and some of the Qumran scrolls.<sup>2</sup> One must also take ancient textual witnesses of the Bible into account.

“The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception,”<sup>3</sup> is a relatively recent study, which analyzes the book of Leviticus’s representation in the latter sources. This volume, however, lacks a comprehensive analysis of Josephus’ reworking of Leviticus. If we take Josephus’ testimony at face value, namely that he was a Jerusalemite priest, the book of Leviticus must have been a source of great importance for him.<sup>4</sup>

Josephus rewrites the book of Leviticus in the third and fourth books of his *Judean Antiquities*; more precisely, in *Ant.* 3. 90-286 and *Ant.* 4.196-301. *Ant.* 3.224-286 follow Leviticus and Numbers; *Ant.* 4.196-301 largely draw upon Deuteronomy.<sup>5</sup>

In *Ant.* 3.224-57 Josephus outlines the various sacrifices required by the law, as well as the main annual festivals instituted by Moses: Tabernacles, Passover and Pentecost. In *Ant.* 3.258-68 Josephus discusses the purity laws,

\* I wish to thank the Beit Shalom fund in Japan for their generous support of this research.

<sup>1</sup> Midrash Leviticus Rabbah (Tzav 7:3): “R. Isi said: Why do children begin their study of Torah with Leviticus? They should start with Genesis! The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Since sacrifices (in Leviticus) are pure and children are pure, let the pure (children) begin by studying (the laws about) purities.” Translated by I. G. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in Medieval Europe* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 38.

<sup>2</sup> S. Metso, “The Character of Leviticus Traditions at Qumran,” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (ed. T. M. Law, M. Liljeström and K. De Troyer; CBET 72; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 645-658.

<sup>3</sup> R. Rendtorff et al. (ed.), *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (VTS 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>4</sup> On Josephus as a priest, see M. Tuval, *From Jerusalem Priest to Roman Jew: On Josephus and Paradigms of Ancient Judaism* (WUNT II/357; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> Translation of the texts from Josephus’ writings are based upon the Brill translation. See L. H. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary* (ed. Steve Mason; Leiden: Brill, 2000).



including a short section on clean and unclean food. *Ant.* 3.269 deals with childbirth, and *Ant.* 3.270-279 with rules concerning marriage and adultery. In *Ant.* 3.280-86 Josephus deals with the sabbatical year and the year of the Jubilee.

## 1. METHODOLOGY

One of the most important scholars in the field of Josephus studies is Louis Feldman. He has published a commentary on Books 1-4 in *Antiquities*, as well as hundreds of papers, which have been collected in three separate volumes.<sup>6</sup>

Despite Feldman's declaration that Josephus is to be viewed as "the earliest systematic commentator on the Bible,"<sup>7</sup> he does not emphasize this aspect of Josephus' adaptation of the biblical record. Rather, he argues that Josephus' own apologetic agenda probably accounts for many of his alterations and embellishments of the biblical narrative.

While Feldman is correct in questioning Josephus' familiarity with oral traditions that found their way into rabbinic writings in later centuries,<sup>8</sup> his general methodology of analyzing Josephus' rewriting of the Bible is problematic. He makes many assumptions about the source text, and then accuses Josephus of manipulating, or failing to understand, what is essentially Feldman's own reading of the source text. His treatment of the book of Leviticus is no exception. He blames Josephus for failing to understand what he perceives as the difference between various types of sacrifices. He presupposes that the biblical account has only one meaning; therefore, he implies, if Josephus does not follow it, then there must be hidden reasons for his changes. This way of reading Josephus is methodologically flawed.

Christopher Begg also addresses certain sections of Josephus' treatment of Leviticus.<sup>9</sup> However, Josephus' analysis of the book of Leviticus as a whole has hardly been discussed by scholars. In this regard, Milgrom's reference to Josephus in his Anchor Bible commentary is illustrative: he mentions him from time to time, mainly as support for certain practices or interpretations.<sup>10</sup> Sever-

<sup>6</sup> L. H. Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998); idem, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); idem, *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Leiden: Brill, 2006). Feldman deals with the reordering of Leviticus laws in the latter publication, on pp. 387-394.

<sup>7</sup> Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation*, xiv.

<sup>8</sup> Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation*, 66.

<sup>9</sup> C. T. Begg, "The Death of Nadab and Abihu According to Josephus," *Liber Annus* 59 (2009), 155-167; idem, "Yom Kippur in Josephus," *The Day of Atonement. Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. T. Hieke and T. Nicklas; Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 15; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012), 97-120.

<sup>10</sup> J. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3 vols. (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001).

al dissertations have explored the Halakhah in Josephus, or addressed certain sections of Josephus' adaptation of Leviticus.<sup>11</sup>

The objective of this paper is to provide some general insights into his rewriting of this book: what was preserved, what was omitted, what was changed, and why. This study will refer to the Septuagint for comparison, as well as to other second Temple sources. Needless to say, this paper does not claim to be exhaustive.

## 2. THE STRUCTURE OF LEVITICUS

As I often claim in my studies of Josephus, good command of the biblical material that will be compared to Josephus' rewriting is crucial before approaching Josephus' works. Each primary source should be studied and mastered on its own before conducting a comparison between them. Perhaps this seems obvious when stated thus, but it is evident that some previous scholars of Josephus have not employed this methodology.

The first step is to grasp the structure of Leviticus. In the following table, I present a comparison between the book's structure as proposed by Wenham<sup>12</sup> and the structure reconstructed from Josephus' rewriting of Leviticus:

- I. Laws on Sacrifice (1:1-7:38)
- II. Institution of the Priesthood (8:1-10:20)
- III. Uncleaness and its Treatment (11:1-16:34)
  - A. Unclean Animals (ch. 11)
  - B. Uncleaness of Childbirth (ch. 12)
  - C. Unclean Diseases (ch. 13)
  - D. Cleansing of Diseases (ch. 14)
  - E. Unclean Discharges (ch. 15)
  - F. Purification of the Tabernacle from Uncleaness (ch. 16)
- IV. Prescriptions for Practical Holiness (17:1-27:34)
  - A. Basic Principles about Sacrifice and Food (ch. 17)
  - B. Basic Principles of Sexual Behavior (ch. 18)
  - C. Principles of Neighborliness (ch. 19)
  - D. Capital and Other Grave Crimes (ch. 20)
  - E. Rules for Priests (ch. 21)

<sup>11</sup> D. Goldenberg, "Halakah in Josephus and Tannaitic Literature: a Comparative Study" (PhD diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia, 1978); R. Gallant, "Josephus' Exposition of Biblical Law: An Internal Analysis" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1988); D. Nakman, "The Halakhah in the Writings of Josephus" (in Hebrew; PhD diss., Bar Ilan University, 2004). The conclusions drawn by these scholars are sometimes diametrically opposed with regard to Josephus' method and knowledge of the Halakha.

<sup>12</sup> J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979).

- F. Rules about Eating Sacrifices (ch. 22)
- G. Religious Festivals (ch. 23)
- H. Rules for the Tabernacle (24:1-9)
- I. A Case of Blasphemy (24:10-23)
- J. Sabbatical and Jubilee Years (ch. 25)
- K. Exhortation to Obey the Law: Blessing and Curse (ch. 26)
- L. Redemption of Votive Gifts (ch. 27)

### 2.1. *The structure of the laws of Leviticus in Josephus' Antiquities*

- *Ant.* 3.224-257: The various sacrifices, the main annual festivals, namely, Tabernacles, Passover and Pentecost (*Olah* [Burnt Offering], *Shelamim* [Peace Offering], *Hattat* (sin offering) and *Asham* (guilt offering); Grain offering; Sabbath and New Moon Sacrifices; Sacrifices of the Festivals; Bread of the Presence; Daily Grain Offering of the High Priest).
- *Ant.* 3.258-268: Purity laws, including a short section on clean and unclean food.
- *Ant.* 3.269: Childbirth.
- *Ant.* 3.270-279: Rules concerning marriage and adultery (Incest Prohibited marriages for priests; Priests' Holiness).
- *Ant.* 3.280-286: Sabbatical year and the year of the Jubilee.

Overall, most of the book of Leviticus is paralleled in Josephus' adaptation; the differences chiefly lie in the units' order and specific details. Sarianna Metso<sup>13</sup> counts twenty out of twenty seven chapters in Josephus' rewriting. Josephus placed the story of Nadab and Abihu in his rewriting of the building of the Tabernacle in Exodus 25-40. This change was probably due to logical considerations on Josephus' part: the narrative episode's placement in the MT, in a sense, interrupts the structure of Leviticus, while the story is an integral part of the consecration of the Tabernacle narrative; five priests are reduced to three when two of Aaron's sons meet their death.

In *Ant.* 4.197 Josephus states that the laws were "in scattered condition," so he therefore restructures them:

The arrangement of each topic according to its class has been innovated by us. For the writings were left by him in scattered condition, just as he ascertained each item from God. I considered it necessary to mention this beforehand, so that some blame may not be assigned to us for having erred by my fellow countrymen who encounter this text.

<sup>13</sup> S. Metso, "Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus," in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and J. H. Newman; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2012), 67-80.

Josephus apologizes for making changes to the text of the Torah. This apology is intended to appeal to his Jewish readers. However, this does not serve to settle the controversial issue of Josephus' audience; in many other places, he seems to have a gentile audience in mind.<sup>14</sup>

## 2.2. *The starting point of Leviticus*

In his book *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*, Brian Bibb asks the following questions:<sup>15</sup>

Can Leviticus even be considered a proper subject for literary analysis? In other words, can one distinguish Leviticus in any useful way from the material before and after it, and can one discern the internal logic and consistency expected in a work of literature? Is Leviticus, read as a book, sufficiently unified in its composition and distinct from its literary surroundings?

The opening words of the book, ויקרא “And the Lord summoned,” connects Leviticus firmly to the preceding book of Exodus, in which God charges Moses with the building of the Tabernacle, or the “tent of meeting.”<sup>16</sup> There, the glory of God is manifest, and divine will is periodically communicated to Israel. The priesthood is appointed as a mediating body between God and the nation, and priestly duties and vestments are prescribed.

Josephus' adaptation lacks the formal opening of Leviticus, as he views the books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers as continuous. He begins his retelling of Leviticus in the third part of Exodus, chs. 25-40. Some modern scholars view Leviticus similarly;<sup>17</sup> they hold that Leviticus is not an independent narrative, but is part of the priestly narrative context of the Sinai pericope, found in Exod 19:1-Num 10:10. In this sense, Josephus may be regarded as the first source that considers a different division of the books of Exodus-Numbers.

<sup>14</sup> See the discussion in G. E. Sterling, *Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 297-308.

<sup>15</sup> B. D. Bibb, *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus* (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 18-19.

<sup>16</sup> S. H. Kellogg, *The Book of Leviticus* (The Expositor's Bible; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906), 18.

<sup>17</sup> On the continuity between these books, see A. Ruwe, “The Structure of the Book of Leviticus in the Narrative Outline of the Priestly Sinai Story (Exod 19:1–Num 10:10),” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55-78. Ruwe argues that Leviticus is not an independent narrative, but is part of the priestly narrative context of the Sinai pericope, Exod 19:1–Num 10:10.

### 2.3. *The ending of Leviticus*

In the MT, Lev 27 serves as the final chapter of the book. Milgrom suggests that this conclusion was designed to generate closure with the book's opening topic (chs. 1-9). Both deal with sanctification: of sacrifices (chs. 1-7); and of people, animals, houses, and land (ch. 27).<sup>18</sup>

Josephus ends Leviticus in ch. 25, with the following statement:

Moyses ascertained carefully from God the arrangement of the laws, when he encamped the army beneath Mount Sinai, and he transmitted it in written form to the Hebrews. (*Ant.* 3.286)

Episodes found in the book of Numbers appear at different points during Josephus' retelling of Leviticus: Num 7 appears in the middle of Lev 10 (*Ant.* 3.220 ff.); Num 15 appears during Josephus' retelling of Lev 5 (*Ant.* 3.234); Num 28 appears after Lev. 22 (*Ant.* 3.237-48). The opposite is true as well: Josephus transfers verses from Leviticus to Numbers. Thus, Lev 27 is retold in *Ant.* 4.73, in the middle of a passage that convenes laws from various places in Numbers.

### 3. SACRIFICES IN JOSEPHUS

Josephus evidently planned the writing of a book on Judaism in four volumes, entitled "The Customs and Causes" (περὶ ἔθῶν καὶ αἰτιῶν, *Ant.* 4.198), a plan he eventually abandoned. This book was to have contained certain sections devoted to sacrificial rites (περὶ θυσιῶν, *Ant.* 3.205) and Jewish laws (περὶ τῶν νόμων, *Ant.* 3.223).<sup>19</sup>

Some scholars hold that Josephus had little knowledge of these matters; one such scholar is Feldman. In his extensive commentary on Josephus, Feldman's assessment of Josephus' knowledge of sacrifices is negative: "Despite Josephus' statement that these two types of sacrifice are performed in a similar manner, the only feature in common between thank-offerings and sin-offerings is the burning of fats upon the altar". In this context, he then lists all the differences he believes that Josephus should have noted between the two rites.

<sup>18</sup> J. Milgrom, "HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 24-40 (28).

<sup>19</sup> See D. Altshuler, "The Treatise *peri ethon kai airion* 'On Customs and Causes' by Flavius Josephus," *JQR* 69 (1979), 226-32.

In contrast to this attitude, in a recent article, Christoph Batsch<sup>20</sup> defends Josephus, arguing that the book of Leviticus does not provide clear classification of the sacrifices. Various scholars identify four, six, eight, or nine such categories. Unlike Philo,<sup>21</sup> who suffices in enumerating the sacrifices, Josephus attempts to classify them.

Now I shall mention some few of the *regulations pertaining to the rites of purification and types* of sacrificial ceremonies. For it happens that my discussion is presently concerned with the sacrifices. There are two *types of sacrifices*, those carried out by individuals and those by the community; and they are of *two forms*. In the one case all of the sacrifice is burnt whole and for this reason it has acquired such a name. The other is for thanksgiving and is offered as a feast for those who have offered the sacrifice. I shall speak about the former. (*Ant.* 3. 224-25)

The first axis is defined by the contrast between community, or collective, ceremonies (δῆμος), and ceremonies executed by individuals (ἴδιος). The second is defined by the opposition between two *modus operandi*: sacrifices completely burned on the altar, which are entirely dedicated to God, versus sacrifices of which part is consumed by those who offered the sacrifice. These definitions are followed by a detailed list of the various Israelite sacrifices.

With regard to Feldman's note, Josephus did not mean קרבן תודה but rather something closer to *Shelamim*, using the Greek word, χαριστήριον, a word unparalleled in the Septuagint. According to *Ant.* 3.229, "After presenting the breast and the right leg to the priests they feast for two days upon what is left of the flesh, and they burn whatever remains."

#### 4. LAWS OMITTED BY JOSEPHUS

Josephus omitted many laws from Leviticus 19 in his rewriting: the laws from Lev 19:16, 17-18, 26-31, 32, 33-34 are missing. Possible explanations for these omissions include:

- 1) Josephus may have relocated some of these laws for apologetic reasons in order to show how highly Jews value life compared to non-Jews. Thus, we find some of these laws in *Ag. Ap.* 2.210, 257, 261. These laws present Judaism as a sympathetic religion with high moral values, relatively to other religions.

<sup>20</sup> Chr. Batsch, "Le système sacrificiel de Flavius Josèphe au Livre III des Antiquités Juives (*Ant.* 3.224-236)," in *Flavius Josephus. Interpretation and History* (ed. J. Pastor, P. Stern and M. Mor; JSJSupp. 146; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2011), 39-51.

<sup>21</sup> *Spec.* 1.162-256.

- 2) Some laws may have been omitted for the sake of brevity. Josephus did not want to burden his readers with too much detail about Jewish law. The same seems to hold true in regard to the slave laws of Exodus. Obviously, this explanation does not explain why particular laws were omitted; we may conclude that we cannot always comprehend why Josephus includes certain laws and omits others.

## 5. ADDITIONS TO THE MT

Whereas Lev 21:7 forbids that a priest marries a prostitute, Josephus (*Ant.* 3.276) adds that they may not marry a slave, a prisoner of war, and “those women who obtain their livelihood from tavern-keeping and from keeping an inn, or those who for whatever reasons have been separated from their former husbands.”

Thackeray explains that Josephus was thinking of Rahab, who was an inn-keeper (*Ant.* 5.7-8).<sup>22</sup> Others suggested that הללה was explained by Josephus as a slave or a prisoner of war.<sup>23</sup>

However, it is possible that Josephus understood הללה to mean prostitute, and that is the reason why הללה is not mentioned separately. In other words, he considered the words הללה וזנה as hendiadys.

## 6. AVOIDING DOUBLETS AND REPETITIONS

In many parts of his rewriting of the biblical narratives, Josephus tries to avoid doublets; places where the story seems to be repeated twice or even more.<sup>24</sup> He treats biblical laws similarly:

- 1) The priests are anointed with blood and oil in both Exod 29 and Lev 8, and he therefore deals with these sources only once.<sup>25</sup>
- 2) The festivals are repeatedly mentioned throughout the books of Exodus-Deuteronomy; Tabernacles (Sukkoth), for example, is mentioned in each of these four books. Josephus omits the reference in Exod 23, Exod 34, Num

<sup>22</sup> H. St. J. Thackeray, *Jewish Antiquities, Books 1–4* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), 450, n. b.

<sup>23</sup> Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1-4*, 314, n. 836.

<sup>24</sup> See M. Avioz, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Books of Samuel* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), 167-75.

<sup>25</sup> Milgrom surmises that Lev 8:10-12 is attempting to resolve a discrepancy between Exod 29, Exod 30 and Exod 40. Exodus 29 does not discuss the anointing of the Tabernacle, while Exod 30:26-29 and Exod 40:9-11 do. Milgrom believes Lev 8:10-12 to be an interpolation based on Exod 40:9-11.

- 28-29, and Deut 16, and only refers briefly to Sukkoth in his rewriting of Lev 23 (*Ant.* 3.244-47).<sup>26</sup>
- 3) While in the MT, the death of Nadab and Abihu is mentioned in both Lev 10 and 16, Josephus mentions it only in his rewriting of Lev 10 (*Ant.* 3.209).
  - 4) Josephus also avoids the repetition of formulae such as “just as [God] had commanded them”, which appears seven times in Lev 8, but is not recorded at all by Josephus.

### 7. APOLOGETIC CONCERNS

Whereas rabbinic sources describe the cultic rite of Leviticus 16 vividly, Josephus' depiction of sending the goat to Azazel is somewhat dry. Josephus adheres closely to the biblical text, and does not provide a firsthand account of the high priest performing the various rites. This may be because Josephus could not have omitted such a well-known ritual completely, but he did not wish to draw further attention to a ritual so evocative of paganism.

Josephus retells the laws concerning those suffering from leprosy, which appear in Lev 13-14 (*Ant.* 3.261-64), and immediately repudiates the claim that the nation of Israel were expelled from Egypt because they suffered from leprosy (*Ant.* 3.265-68).<sup>27</sup>

Josephus' vocabulary seems to deliberately recall Greek ritual language, presumably in order to suit a non-Jewish audience: he uses ἀποτροπιασμός (*Ant.* 3.240-41) to refer to the scapegoat. The very same root was used by Julian.<sup>28</sup>

### 8. THE TEXT AT JOSEPHUS' DISPOSAL

There are many cases in which Josephus follows the LXX, sometimes against the MT:

Lev 27:1-3 MT	Lev 27:1-3 LXX	Josephus ( <i>Ant.</i> 4.73)
“The LORD spoke to Moses, saying:	“And the Lord spoke to Moyses, saying:	“Those who call themselves “Korban” to

<sup>26</sup> For a thorough study on Sukkoth, see J. L. Rubenstein, *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995). On Josephus, see Rubenstein, 75-84.

<sup>27</sup> See M. Avioz, “The Purification of the Levites According to Josephus,” *ETL* 90 (2014), 441-451.

<sup>28</sup> D. J. Stökl “The Christian Exegesis of the Scapegoat between Jews and Pagans,” in *Sacrifice in Religious Experience* (ed. A. I. Baumgarten; SHR 93; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 226.



<p>Speak to the people of Israel and say to them: When a person makes an explicit vow to the LORD concerning the equivalent for a human being, the equivalent for a male shall be: from twenty to sixty years of age.”</p>	<p>Speak to the sons of Israel, and you shall say to them: A person who vows a vow to the Lord, for instance the value of his life...”</p>	<p>God – this signifies “gift” in the language of the Greeks.”</p>
--	--	--

Both Josephus and the LXX reflect a version that has נפשו in the singular rather than נפשות in the MT.<sup>29</sup>

However, there are cases in which Josephus differs from the LXX: While the LXX usually follows the MT when translating the verb שָׁחַט (appearing in Leviticus 30 times) with the Greek verb σφάζω,<sup>30</sup> Josephus uses this verb only three times during his retelling of Leviticus (*Ant.* 3.226, 237, 249).

MT to Lev 19:19 reads: “you shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed.” The LXX translates: “you shall not sow your vineyard with something different.” Josephus (*Ant.* 4.228) writes: “for nature does not rejoice in association of dissimilar things.” The prohibitions of the MT and Josephus are more restrictive, forbidding the mixed sowing of two kinds of grains in any field, not just in vineyards.

The final example just presented is somewhat problematic; it cannot be definitely determined whether Josephus’ text was close to the MT or whether Josephus independently wished to generalize the law, and perhaps even hint to segregation between Jews and gentiles, as Christine Hayes suggests.<sup>31</sup>

Finally, according to MT Lev 24:16, “One who blasphemes the name of the LORD shall be put to death,” while the LXX reads, “Whoever names the name of the Lord – by death let him be put to death.” Josephus (*Ant.* 4.202) has here: “Let one who blasphemes be stoned and hanged for a day; let him be buried without honor and in obscurity.”

While MT and Josephus forbid the cursing of God’s name (blasphemy), the LXX, is more precise: it specifies both naming and cursing: τὸ ὄνομα κατηγορεῖσθαι, καὶ ἠγγαγον.

<sup>29</sup> É. Nodet, “Josephus and the Pentateuch,” *JSJ* 28 (1997), 154-194. However, Wevers assigns this change to the Greek translator. See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL.SCSS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 466.

<sup>30</sup> O. Michel, “σφάζω, σφάγη,” *TDNT* VII, 925-38.

<sup>31</sup> C. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 71.

Another example that shows Josephus' inconsistency in regard to biblical source texts is Lev 25:10: "And you shall hallow the fiftieth year and you shall proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants. It shall be a jubilee for you: you shall return, every one of you, to your property and every one of you to your family."

According to the LXX, the year is a manifestation of release (ἐνιαυτὸς ἀφέσεως σημασία), where ἄφεσις ("release") is the translation of לָרָוּר ("liberty"). Thackeray<sup>32</sup> asserts that Josephus (*Ant.* 3.282) has erroneously equated ἄφεσις with לָרָוּר. Schalit refutes this interpretation, relating this change to Josephus' imprecision.<sup>33</sup>

Thackeray and Nodet<sup>34</sup> suggest that Josephus' source text for the Pentateuch was a Semitic or a Hebrew text.

Begg has analyzed the pericope in which Josephus rewrites Leviticus 16; the law of Yom Kippur, Day of Atonement.<sup>35</sup> He concludes that one cannot determine whether Josephus was using a text which is similar to the MT or to the Septuagint. Fernández Marcos<sup>36</sup> states that it is generally difficult to draw conclusions from Josephus due to his tendency towards paraphrasing, and due to the scarce knowledge we have of the pre-hexaplaric Septuagint.

## 9. JOSEPHUS' WRITINGS AND RABBINIC HALAKHAH<sup>37</sup>

The significance of Josephus' writings as important testimony of the Halakhah in the second Temple period has long been recognized.<sup>38</sup> Chronologically, Josephus stands between the Qumran material and the rabbinic literature.

Certain aspects of Lev 16 correspond to rabbinic Halakhah, while others do not. Josephus does not describe the clothes of the High Priest, his immersion;

<sup>32</sup> *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV* (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1930, reprinted 1961), ad loc.

<sup>33</sup> *Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews* (Hebrew; ed. and trans. A. Schalit; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1967), Vol. 2, 74, n. 207.

<sup>34</sup> E. Nodet, "Josephus and the Pentateuch," *JSJ* 27 (1997), 154-194.

<sup>35</sup> Begg, "Yom Kippur in Josephus."

<sup>36</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, "Review of E. Nodet, *Le Pentateuque de Flavius Josèphe*," *JSJ* 29 (1998), 110-113. On Josephus' duality with regard to the use of the LXX and the MT in the Pentateuch, see also J. D. H. Norton, *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus, and the Yahad* (Library of New Testament Studies 430; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 73-74.

<sup>37</sup> Safrai defines "Halakha" as follows: "the sum total of rules and laws – derived from the Bible, from religious thought and teaching, from jurisprudence and custom – that govern all aspects of Jewish life." See S. Safrai, "Halakha," *The Literature of the Sages*. Part 1: *Oral Tora, Halakha, Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud, External Tractates* (ed. S. Safrai; CRINT II/3a; Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum – Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1987), 121-209.

<sup>38</sup> See the references above in n. 11.

the two lots associated with two sacrificial goats; the *Qetoret* / incense; *semi-kha* – the priests' placing of their hands upon the goat's head; or the confession of sins. How can this be explained?

Discrepancies between Josephus' writings and rabbinic Halakhah may be attributed to his being at Rome during the crystallization and development of the Halakhah,<sup>39</sup> while similarity between Josephus and rabbinic Halakhah may be explained by arguing for Josephus' acquaintance with the oral law that would later be codified by the rabbis.

Feldman presents thirty-six cases where Josephus' legal position diverges from the plain meaning of the biblical text. In exactly half of these cases, Josephus' view concurs with that of rabbinic Halakhah, and Feldman suggests that the other half reflect an "earlier or alternate version of the Oral Torah."<sup>40</sup> As we will shortly see, Feldman's conclusions should be taken with caution; moreover, these issues are considerably more complex than Feldman's simplistic solution suggests.

### 9.1. *Lev 19:23-24*

The fruits of the fourth year must be redeemed. The produce is to be offered to the Lord. According to the Book of Jubilees (*Jub.* 7.36), the Temple Scroll (11QT<sup>a</sup> 60.2-4), *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (13, 62-63), and Philo (*Virtues* 159),<sup>41</sup> these fruits should be brought to the priests. However, the rabbinic sages taught that they belong to the owners, i.e. the worshippers. Josephus (*Ant.* 3.227) follows the view of the Pharisees (*m. Ma'as.* Š. 5.1-5).

### 9.2. *Etrog (Citron)*

Josephus identifies "the fruit of *hadar*, goodly trees" (*Lev* 23:40) as the *Persea* (*Ant.* 3.245). Feldman erroneously blames Josephus for failing to identify this fruit as the biblical citron. Feldman believes that Josephus identified the *Etrog* as the avocado.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>39</sup> See B. Revel, "Some Anti-Traditional Laws of Josephus," *JQR* n. s. 14 (1923-24), 293-301.

<sup>40</sup> Vered Noam follows this line of thought. See V. Noam, "Josephus and Early Halakhah: The Exclusion of Impure Persons from Holy Precincts," in *'Go Out and Study the Land' (Judges 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. A. M. Maeir, J. Magness and L. H. Schiffman; JSJ Supp; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 133-146. See also J. Schwartz, "Sacrifice without the Rabbis: Ritual and Sacrifice in the Second Temple Period according to Contemporary Sources," in *The Actuality of Sacrifice: Past and Present* (ed. A. Houtman et al.; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2014), 123-149.

<sup>41</sup> See V. Noam, "Embryonic Legal Midrash in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid et al.; FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 237-262.

<sup>42</sup> Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1-4*, 301, n. 700.

Let us look at Josephus' text in its original Greek: τοῦ μήλου τοῦ τῆς περσέας. Thackeray translates "the fruit of the Persea," while Schalit translates "the fruit of the Peach". Schalit's translation is erroneous, as the Greek for peach is μῆλον περσικόν. And while "persea" can refer to a Persea-tree<sup>43</sup>, here perseas comes from Perseis, Persea meaning "Persian" and should be translated: "The Persian apple" or "Persian fruit."<sup>44</sup> Josephus clearly refers to the citron. If so, then the law of the Etrog serves as another example of a case where Josephus' view concurs with the rabbinic law. Additionally, in this case, Josephus deviates again from the Septuagint, whose translation literally means καρπον ξύλου ὠράτον – the "ripe fruit of a tree." Josephus actually mentions the citron in *Ant.* 13.272. In fact, Josephus' definition of the four species is identical to the rabbinic definitions (*m. Sukkah* 3.4).<sup>45</sup>

### 9.3. *The blasphemer (Lev. 24)*

According to Josephus, the blasphemer in Lev. 24 was hanged after stoning (*Ant.* 3. 202). This version of the law concurs with the rabbinic sources,<sup>46</sup> but Josephus might have reached it independently in light of the law in Deut 21:22. The question therefore arises: did Josephus' acquaintance with the tannaitic Halakha teach him that the blasphemer was hanged, or did he deduce this punishment by himself? This scholarly debate remains undecided. In any case, Josephus' description implies that he aspired to provide an accurate articulation of the law, and was not satisfied with a technical rewriting of the verses of the Torah. Though we cannot determine whether his description is the product of logic and analytical skills, or whether it is based upon oral traditions, one thing is certain: Josephus strives for accuracy in this passage.

While Goldenberg concludes that "the restriction of the double penalty to the crime of blasphemy by Josephus is in agreement with contemporaneous tannaitic Halakhah and is most probably based upon it,"<sup>47</sup> we should not dismiss the option that he reached this conclusion through careful analysis of the laws in Leviticus.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>43</sup> See H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925–40), 1395.

<sup>44</sup> Rubenstein, *Sukkot*, 74.

<sup>45</sup> Feldman, *Judean Antiquities* 1–4, 301, n. 697.

<sup>46</sup> *m. Sanh.* 6:4; *Sifre Deut.* 221. See D. W. Chapman, *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion* (WUNT II/244; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

<sup>47</sup> Goldenberg, "Halakhah in Josephus," 67.

<sup>48</sup> Nakman, *Halakhah*, passim.

## 10. CONCLUSION

As our study has shown, Josephus' writings make a very limited contribution to the recovery of the ancient text of Leviticus. This is because Josephus' adaptation reflects neither the text of the MT nor the LXX with any consistency whatsoever; sometimes his text concurs with the MT, at other times it concurs with the LXX, and on yet other occasions, it reflects neither.

A study of his modes of interpretation, however, promises to yield more interesting conclusions. They recall some methods of interpretation of the Qumran scrolls.<sup>49</sup> Both the Qumran scribes and Josephus seem to address an audience or audiences that may have difficulty reading Leviticus without mediation. Both, it seems, have made great efforts to employ their skills as interpreters to shed light upon the difficult text.

*References*

- Altshuler D., "The Treatise *peri ethon kai airion* 'On Customs and Causes' by Flavius Josephus," *JQR* 69 (1979), 226-232.
- Avioz M., "The Purification of the Levites According to Josephus," *ETL* 90 (2014), 441-451.
- Avioz M., *Josephus' Interpretation of the Books of Samuel* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015).
- Batsch Chr., "Le système sacrificiel de Flavius Josèphe au Livre III des Antiquités Juives (Ant. 3.224-236)," in *Flavius Josephus. Interpretation and History* (ed. J. Pastor, P. Stern and M. Mor; JSJSupp. 146; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2011), 39-51.
- Begg C. T., "The Death of Nadab and Abihu According to Josephus," *Liber Annuus* 59 (2009), 155-167.
- Begg C. T., "Yom Kippur in Josephus," *The Day of Atonement. Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. T. Hieke and T. Nicklas; Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 15; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012), 97-120.
- Bibb B. D., *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus* (London: T&T Clark, 2009).
- Chapman D. W., *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion* (WUNT II/244; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
- Feldman L. H., *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998).
- Feldman L. H., *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

<sup>49</sup> M. J. Bernstein, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 61-87.

- Feldman L. H., *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary* (ed. Steve Mason; Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Feldman L. H., *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Fernández Marcos N., "Review of E. Nodet, *Le Pentateuque de Flavius Josèphe*," *JSJ* 29 (1998), 110-113.
- Gallant R., "Josephus' Exposition of Biblical Law: An Internal Analysis" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1988).
- Goldenberg D., "Halakah in Josephus and Tannaitic Literature: a Comparative Study" (PhD diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia, 1978).
- Hayes C., *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews* (Hebrew; ed. and trans. A. Schalit; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1967).
- Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV* (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1930, repr. 1961).
- Kellogg S. H., *The Book of Leviticus* (The Expositor's Bible; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906).
- Liddell H. G. and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925–40).
- Marcus I. G., *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in Medieval Europe* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996).
- Metso S., "Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus," in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and J. H. Newman; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2012), 67-80.
- Metso S., "The Character of Leviticus Traditions at Qumran," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (ed. T. M. Law, M. Liljeström and K. De Troyer; CBET 72; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 645-58.
- Michel O., "σφάζω, σφάγή," *TDNT* VII: 925-38.
- Milgrom J., "HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 24-40.
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus*, 3 vols. (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001).
- Nakman D., "The Halakhah in the writings of Josephus" (in Hebrew; PhD diss., Bar Ilan University, 2004).
- Noam V., "Embryonic Legal Midrash in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid et al.; FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 237-262.
- Noam V., "Josephus and Early Halakhah: The Exclusion of Impure Persons from Holy Precincts," in *'Go Out and Study the Land' (Judges 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. A. M. Maeir, J. Magness and L. H. Schiffman; JSJ Supp; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 133-146.
- Nodet E., "Josephus and the Pentateuch," *JSJ* 27 (1997), 154-194.
- Norton J. D. H., *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus, and the Yahad* (Library of New Testament Studies 430; London: T&T Clark, 2010).

- Rendtorff R. et al. (ed.), *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (VTS 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Revel B., "Some Anti-Traditional Laws of Josephus," *JQR* n. s. 14 (1923–24), 293–301.
- Rubenstein J. L., *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Ruwe A., "The Structure of the Book of Leviticus in the Narrative Outline of the Priestly Sinai Story (Exod 19:1–Num 10:10)," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55–78.
- Safrai S., "Halakha," *The Literature of the Sages*. Part 1: *Oral Tora, Halakha, Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud, External Tractates* (ed. S. Safrai; CRINT II/3a; Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum – Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1987), 121–209.
- Schwartz J., "Sacrifice without the Rabbis: Ritual and Sacrifice in the Second Temple Period according to Contemporary Sources," in *The Actuality of Sacrifice: Past and Present* (ed. A. Houtman et al.; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2014), 123–149.
- Sterling G. E., *Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- Stökl D. J. "The Christian Exegesis of the Scapegoat between Jews and Pagans," in *Sacrifice in Religious Experience* (ed. A. I. Baumgarten; SHR 93; Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Thackeray H. St. J., *Jewish Antiquities, Books 1–4* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961).
- Tuval M., *From Jerusalem Priest to Roman Jew: On Josephus and Paradigms of Ancient Judaism* (WUNT II/357; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).
- Wenham J., *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979).
- Wevers J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL.SCSS 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).

# QUELQUES PROBLÈMES DE TRADUCTION DANS LE CHAPITRE 11 DU LÉVITIQUE

René PÉTER-CONTESSÉ

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Il va de soi que tout traducteur, que ce soit de la Bible ou d'ouvrages profanes, doit bien connaître la langue source (la langue de départ) et la langue cible (la langue d'arrivée) ; mais cela ne suffit pas. Il faut aussi qu'il ait de bonnes connaissances de la « linguistique », c'est-à-dire de la manière dont fonctionnent les langues en général, la langue source et la langue cible en particulier. En effet, il ne s'agit pas de traduire des mots considérés isolément et placés les uns à côté des autres, mais des phrases, des unités de pensée, un « message ». Et, dans la traduction de la Bible en particulier, il faut savoir en plus à qui est destinée la traduction entreprise. Vise-t-on un public cultivé, ou un public de condition modeste qui n'a pas fait d'études supérieures ? Vise-t-on un public de jeunes ? Un public de néoalphabétisés ? Un public dont la langue cible n'est peut-être pas la langue maternelle ? Tout cela doit être pris en compte.

Certains excellents connaisseurs de l'hébreu et du français peuvent produire des traductions parfois bien difficiles à comprendre, sauf pour les lecteurs qui ont étudié l'hébreu... !

Le chapitre 11 du Lévitique – tout comme son parallèle de Deutéronome 14 – présente des listes d'animaux impurs, animaux dont les Hébreux ne devaient par conséquent pas consommer la chair.

Pour les traducteurs de la Bible, des problèmes de divers ordres se posent, en rapport avec la traduction de ce chapitre. Le plus important est évidemment celui de l'identification des animaux. Certains ne sont mentionnés que dans ces deux listes, et quelques-uns ne figurent même que dans le Lévitique. N'étant pas compétent en zoologie, je ne vais pas me risquer à proposer des identifications nouvelles. Sur ce point, je me borne à renvoyer à deux ouvrages importants que les traducteurs consulteront avec profit : il s'agit du « Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible »<sup>1</sup> et de « Fauna and Flora of the Bible »<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible* (publié sous la direction du Centre Informatique et Bible, Abbaye de Maredsous; Turnhout: Brepols, 1987).

<sup>2</sup> *Fauna and Flora of the Bible* (Helps for translators; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; London: United Bible Societies, 1980).



Je me propose donc maintenant d'aborder, de manière assez brève, six petits problèmes concrets de traduction rencontrés dans le chapitre 11 du Lévitique ; j'examinerai ensuite un septième problème qui me retiendra un peu plus longuement.

## 2. LÉVITIQUE 11,9

La Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible (TOB)<sup>3</sup> propose la traduction suivante de Lv 11,9 : « Parmi tous les animaux aquatiques, voici ceux que vous pouvez manger : tout animal aquatique, de mer ou de rivière, qui a nageoires et écailles, vous pouvez le manger ». Une traduction mot à mot serait : « Ceci vous mangerez parmi tout ce qui est dans l'eau : tout ce qui a une nageoire et une écaille dans l'eau, dans les < mers > et dans les cours d'eau, vous les mangerez ».

La traduction de la TOB – et de nombreuses autres versions – va probablement amener certains lecteurs à se demander ce qu'il en est des animaux aquatiques vivant dans les « lacs ». Sont-ils purs ou impurs, peut-on les manger, oui ou non ?

Une telle question ne se posait certainement pas pour les anciens Hébreux, car ils savaient que le mot ךַּ *yâm* pouvait avoir un champ sémantique plus large que le français « mer », que l'anglais « sea » ou que l'allemand « Meer ». En Jos 1,4, הַיָּם הַהַיְדוּלַי *hayyâm haggâdôl* désigne la « Mer Méditerranée », et en Gn 14,3, הַיָּם הַמֵּת *yâm hammelâh* désigne la « Mer Morte ». Mais en Nb 34,11, יַם קִנְרֵת *yâm kinnèret* désigne le « lac de Génésareth » (voir λίμνη Γεννησαρέτ *limnèn Gennêsaret* en Lc 5,1, et θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος *thalassês tês Galilaias tês Tiberiados* en Jn 6,1). Enfin, en 1 R 7,24ss, הַיָּם *hayyâm* désigne même le grand bassin de bronze destiné à contenir l'eau pour les ablutions des prêtres<sup>4</sup>.

Pour éviter aux lecteurs modernes de se poser la question, non pertinente, de savoir si les poissons des lacs peuvent être consommés, on trouve dans certaines versions modernes deux solutions possibles :

1) la Bible en Français Courant (BFC)<sup>5</sup> et quelques autres versions du même type proposent « ... dans *les lacs, les mers* et les rivières » ;

<sup>3</sup> Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible (TOB) (11<sup>e</sup> éd.; Paris: Cerf – Villiers-le-Bel: Bibli'O [Société Biblique Française], 2010).

<sup>4</sup> En Jr 51,36, *yammâh* désignerait même, selon certains commentateurs, le « [large] fleuve » Euphrate.

<sup>5</sup> La Bible en français courant. Ancien et Nouveau Testament (nouvelle éd. rév.; Alliance Biblique Universelle, 1997).

2) la Revised English Bible (REB)<sup>6</sup> propose “Of creatures that live in water these may be eaten : all, whether *in salt water or fresh*, that have fins and scales”.

Dans la plupart des langues d’aujourd’hui, pour ne pas dire dans toutes, il doit être possible de trouver une formulation analogue à – ou inspirée de – l’une de ces deux<sup>7</sup>.

### 3. LÉVITIQUE 11,18

Les versets 13-19 du chap. 11 énumèrent les noms de vingt volatiles dont les Hébreux ne devaient pas non plus consommer la chair.

Le deuxième oiseau du v. 18 est le  $\text{קָא'אֵט}$  *qâ'ât* dont l’identification est très incertaine. A la suite de la LXX ( $\text{πελεκάν}$  *pelekan* = pélican), de la Vulgate (onocrotalus = une variété de pélican) et du Targum ( $\text{קָאֵט} / \text{קָאֵט} qata'$  = pélican), de nombreuses versions ont opté pour cette identification (p.ex. une douzaine de versions de langue française, une demi-douzaine de versions de langue anglaise, ainsi que les versions en italien<sup>8</sup> et en espagnol<sup>9</sup> courants, parmi la trentaine de versions consultées).

Il est possible que cette identification ait été retenue par les traducteurs anciens sur la base d’un rapprochement étymologique. En effet, le verbe hébreu  $\text{קִי'}$  *qî'* (par exemple Lv 18,28), lequel signifie « vomir » ou « recracher », a pu être compris comme étant à l’origine du mot  $\text{קָא'אֵט}$  *qâ'ât*, du fait que, comme on pouvait le constater, le pélican conservait le poisson qu’il avait attrapé dans la poche inférieure de son bec, avant de le régurgiter pour nourrir ses petits.

Cependant, l’identification « pélican » n’a été retenue ni par la TOB – « corneille » –, ni par la BFC ou Parole de Vie (français fondamental)<sup>10</sup> – « chouette chevêche ». L’identification « pélican » est en effet très invraisemblable, du fait que le  $\text{קָא'אֵט}$  *qâ'ât* n’est mentionné ailleurs dans la Bible hébraïque qu’en Es 34,11 et So 2,14, où il s’agit d’un oiseau habitant dans des ruines, et en Ps 102,7, qui mentionne un  $\text{קֵצַת מִדְבָּר}$  *qe'at midbâr*, « un *qâ'ât* du désert ». Or il est invraisemblable qu’on puisse rencontrer un « pélican » en plein désert ou nichant au milieu des ruines, car le pélican est un oiseau que l’on trouve

<sup>6</sup> *The Revised English Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2000).

<sup>7</sup> Signalons ici, en passant, le cas particulier de l’américain qui désigne sous le nom de « Great Salt Lake » une mer intérieure des Etats-Unis, à proximité de laquelle se situe la ville de « Salt Lake City ».

<sup>8</sup> *Parola del Signore: La Bibbia in lingua corrente* (Leumann: Ed. Elle Di Ci; Roma: Alleanza Biblica Universale, 1985).

<sup>9</sup> *Dios Habla Hoy: La Biblia con Deuterocanónicos, versión popular* (Nueva York: Sociedad Biblica Americana, 1979).

<sup>10</sup> *La Bible « Parole de Vie »* (édition interconfessionnelle; Villiers-le-Bel: Société Biblique Française – Alliance Biblique Universelle, 2000).

essentiellement – pour ne pas dire uniquement – à proximité des cours d'eau ou des étendues d'eau.

C'est pourquoi un certain nombre de versions modernes ont opté pour des oiseaux de nuit que l'on peut rencontrer dans des endroits particulièrement secs. C'est le cas de Chouraqui<sup>11</sup>, qui parle de la « chouette », de la Bible du Centenaire<sup>12</sup> et d'Osty<sup>13</sup>, la « hulotte », de la New English Bible (NEB)<sup>14</sup>, le « horned owl », c.-à-d. le « hibou cornu » (une variété de grand duc), et de la New American Bible (NAB)<sup>15</sup>, la New International Version<sup>16</sup> et la New Revised Standard Version<sup>17</sup>, le « desert owl » (le hibou du désert).

#### 4. LÉVITIQUE 11,19

Certains lecteurs peuvent être surpris de voir la « chauve-souris » figurer dans une liste d'« oiseaux ». Qui peut encore ignorer aujourd'hui que la « chauve-souris » est un mammifère, dont le développement particulier lui a permis de se déplacer dans les airs en volant ?

Or il faut se rappeler que les systèmes scientifiques de classification zoologique (et botanique) sont relativement récents – et, comme je le signalerai plus loin, qu'ils ne sont pas forcément immuables ! Les peuples d'il y a 2000 ans ne disposaient pas des connaissances qui sont les nôtres aujourd'hui, et par conséquent leurs systèmes de classification pouvaient différer de nos systèmes actuels.

Dans la trentaine de versions – en diverses langues – que j'ai pu consulter, toutes mentionnent la « chauve-souris », à l'exception d'une seule : Luther<sup>18</sup> a traduit l'hébreu שְׂחָלָבַי « *'atalléf* » par « Schwalbe », c'est-à-dire « hirondelle ». Par ailleurs, une seule autre version, la NAB, offre une note disant : « The bat : actually a mammal, but listed here with the birds because of its wings ».

En ce qui concerne la traduction, il est donc conseillé de rendre le mot hébreu par « chauve-souris », en donnant, si cela est jugé nécessaire, une brève note s'inspirant de celle de la NAB.

<sup>11</sup> *La Bible* (trad. et prés. par André Chouraqui; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1992).

<sup>12</sup> *La Bible du Centenaire. La Sainte Bible: traduction nouvelle* (4 vol.; Paris: Société biblique, 1928–1947).

<sup>13</sup> *La Bible* (trad. E. Osty, avec la collaboration de J. Trinquet; Paris: Seuil, 1973).

<sup>14</sup> *The New English Bible* (Oxford – Cambridge: Penguin Books, 1974).

<sup>15</sup> *The New American Bible* (transl. by members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America; Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1970).

<sup>16</sup> *The Holy Bible. New International Version* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984).

<sup>17</sup> *The Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989).

<sup>18</sup> *Stuttgarter Erklärungs-bibel. Die Heilige Schrift nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992).

## 5. LÉVITIQUE 11,22

La consommation de sauterelles est mentionnée à plusieurs reprises dans la Bible, tant dans l'Ancien que dans le Nouveau Testament. Lv 11,22 énumère quatre espèces d'insectes – vraisemblablement des sauterelles – que les Hébreux sont autorisés à manger : le אֲרֵבֶה *'arebèh*, le סִלְעָם *sole'âm*, le חֲרָגֹל *ḥa-regól* et le חֲגָב *ḥâgâv*. De ces quatre noms, le premier figure 24 fois dans l'AT et le quatrième 5 fois, alors que le second et le troisième n'apparaissent que dans le verset en question. Le אֲרֵבֶה *'arebèh* se retrouve en Jl 1,4, second terme d'une autre liste d'insectes, dont les trois autres sont rares aussi (respectivement 3, 7 et 6 fois). Il est quasi impossible aujourd'hui d'identifier avec quelque assurance ces sept insectes. Certains commentateurs supposent que les quatre noms de Jl 1,4 pourraient désigner des phases de développement de la sauterelle, d'autres penchent plutôt pour des espèces différentes de sauterelles, comme c'est vraisemblablement le cas en Lv 11,22.

Les traducteurs de la TOB proposent les noms de quatre insectes plus ou moins apparentés : « les différentes espèces de sauterelles, criquets, grillons et locustes », avec une note signalant le degré d'incertitude. La NAB fait de même : « the various kinds of locusts, the various kinds of grasshoppers, the various kinds of katydids, the various kinds of crickets ». On trouve des solutions analogues dans un bon nombre d'autres versions. Luther se borne à transcrire les noms hébreux : « ...die Heuschrecken, als da sind : den Arbe mit seiner Art, den Solam mit seiner Art, den Hargol mit seiner Art, den Hagab mit seiner Art ». Louis Segond<sup>19</sup> procéda de manière presque identique en 1887 : « la sauterelle, le solam, le hargol et le hagab », formulation conservée dans les rééditions jusque dans les années 1960. La NEB et la REB (édition révisée parue ultérieurement) proposent « every kind of great locust, every kind of longheaded locust, every kind of green locust, and every kind of desert locust ».

La transcription des noms hébreux (Luther, Segond) est fortement déconseillée car, pour les lecteurs, il s'agit de ce qu'on appelle en linguistique des « mots à sens zéro ». La formulation proposée par la NEB et la REB est également déconseillée, car elle suggère que l'identification précise des insectes est assurée.

Il est donc conseillé aux traducteurs de s'inspirer soit de la TOB – et de plusieurs autres versions –, soit de la Bible en Français Courant et de plusieurs autres versions aussi, qui disent de manière abrégée : « les diverses espèces de sauterelles et de criquets ».

<sup>19</sup> *La Sainte Bible* (trad. Louis Segond; Oxford: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1887).

## 6. LÉVITIQUE 11,27

La TOB propose la traduction suivante : « ... tous les quadrupèdes qui marchent sur la plante des pieds sont impurs pour vous ; ... ». La grande majorité des versions modernes vont dans le même sens. La Bible de la Pléiade (BP)<sup>20</sup> ajoute une note qui dit ceci : « L'hébreu קַף *kaph*, 'paume' de la main, signifie aussi la 'plante' des pieds. Il s'agit des plantigrades. »

Ces deux traductions du mot hébreu קַף *kaph* figurent ainsi dans la plupart des dictionnaires de la langue hébraïque, mais une étude attentive des emplois de ce mot dans l'AT, en parallèle avec les emplois de יָד *yâd* (traditionnellement « main ») et de רֶגֶל *règèl* (traditionnellement « pied ») montre que les choses sont quelque peu différentes. Le mot יָד *yâd* désigne généralement la « main », mais peut aussi désigner le « bras », du bout des doigts à l'aisselle ; le mot רֶגֶל *règèl* désigne généralement le « pied », mais peut aussi désigner la « jambe », du bout des orteils à la cuisse. Quant au mot קַף *kaph*, il peut désigner soit la « main », soit le « pied » dans leur totalité, et non seulement la partie intérieure de la main (la paume) ou la partie inférieure du pied (la plante)<sup>21</sup>.

Il résulte de ce qui précède que la description donnée en Lv 11,27 ne s'applique pas uniquement aux « plantigrades » (au sens moderne du mot), c'est-à-dire aux « ursidés », la famille des ours. Le contexte immédiat oppose cette catégorie d'animaux à ceux qui ont des sabots, à savoir les « ongulés » ; par conséquent, il est simplement question, en Lv 11,27, des animaux « qui n'ont pas de sabots ».

## 7. LÉVITIQUE 11,36

Les vv. 33-36 de ce chapitre traitent de la contamination de l'eau par quelque bestiole qui tomberait dans cette eau et s'y noierait. Les vv. 33-35 envisagent le cas d'un simple récipient contenant de l'eau destinée aux besoins du ménage. Le v. 36 aborde par contre le cas bien différent d'un « point d'eau » où les gens pouvaient venir se ravitailler.

Le v. 36 est traduit de la manière suivante dans la TOB : « pourtant en ce qui concerne source et citerne, la masse d'eau reste pure, mais celui qui touche le cadavre devient impur ».

<sup>20</sup> *La Bible. L'Ancien Testament* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris: Gallimard, 1956–1959).

<sup>21</sup> Voir notre article : R. Péter-Contesse, « Main, Pied, Paume ? Les noms des extrémités des membres (*yâd*, *règèl*, *kaph*) en hébreu et en araméen biblique, » *RB* 105/4 (1998), 481-491.

Malheureusement, la plupart des versions offrent une traduction erronée de ce verset. C'est le cas par exemple des trois versions – de langue française – suivantes :

- 1) la Bible de Jérusalem (BJ)<sup>22</sup> : « (toutefois sources, citernes et étendues d'eau resteront pures) ; quiconque touche à l'un de leurs cadavres sera impur » ;
- 2) la BP : « Bien que fontaine, puits et amas d'eau restent purs, ce qui aura touché à leur cadavre sera impur » ;
- 3) La Nouvelle Bible Segond (NBS)<sup>23</sup> : « Toutefois une source et une citerne formant une réserve d'eau resteront pures ; mais celui qui touche leur cadavre sera impur ».

Or en hébreu, la phrase est structurée de la manière suivante : elle commence par une particule (אך 'ak), marquant une légère opposition, laquelle est suivie de deux mots (au singulier : « une source et une citerne »), qui sont liés par la conjonction de coordination (ו wâw = « et ») et qui constituent ce qu'on appelle en grammaire un *casus pendens* (deux mots mis en évidence au début d'une phrase) ; ils sont suivis de l'expression « la masse d'eau », *sans conjonction de coordination*, expression qui est manifestement le sujet du verbe – au singulier – qui suit : « sera pure ».

La BFC a donc recouru à la formulation suivante, en recourant à une légère explicitation reprise du v. 33 (« Si une de ces bêtes tombe dans [un récipient de terre] ») : « Toutefois, si le cadavre tombe dans une source ou une citerne, l'eau reste pure... ».

Soit dit en passant, ces quelques versets – parmi d'autres – reflètent le bon sens naturel d'un juriste qui n'est pas enfermé dans son cabinet, au milieu de ses livres de droit, et qui veut appliquer les prescriptions légales dans toute leur rigueur. Il s'agit au contraire d'un juriste qui a les pieds sur terre, qui est disposé à appliquer les règles de pureté de la loi juive, mais qui n'est pas « légaliste » au point de condamner toute la communauté locale à être privée d'eau pendant un temps indéterminé, à cause d'une souris qui serait tombée dans une citerne et s'y serait noyée !

## 8. LÉVITIQUE 11,2B-7

J'aborde maintenant, un peu plus longuement, le cas suivant :

Le début de Lv 11 traite des « animaux terrestres », selon que leur chair peut, ou ne doit pas, être consommée.

<sup>22</sup> *La Bible de Jérusalem* (nouvelle éd. revue et augmentée; Paris: Cerf, 1998).

<sup>23</sup> *La Nouvelle Bible Segond. Edition d'étude* (Paris: Alliance Biblique Universelle, 2002).

Pour que la chair d'un animal, d'un quadrupède en l'occurrence, puisse être consommée, cet animal doit présenter deux caractéristiques bien précises :

- il doit avoir des « sabots fendus » en deux parties, et
- il doit « ruminer ».

Il s'agit donc principalement des animaux domestiques suivants : les « bovins », c'est-à-dire les vaches, les « ovins », c'est-à-dire les moutons, et les « caprins », c'est-à-dire les chèvres. Des animaux sauvages tels que les cerfs ou les gazelles entrent aussi dans cette catégorie.

Si un animal ne présente qu'une seule de ces deux caractéristiques, il est impur et sa chair ne doit donc pas être consommée.

Voici ce que prescrit précisément Lv 11,4-7 (TOB) :

Ainsi, parmi les ruminants et parmi les animaux ayant des sabots, vous ne devez pas manger ceux-ci :

- le chameau, car il rumine, mais n'a pas de sabots : pour vous il est impur ;
- le daman, car il rumine, mais n'a pas de sabots : pour vous il est impur ;
- le lièvre, car il rumine, mais n'a pas de sabots : pour vous il est impur ;
- le porc, car il a le sabot fendu, mais ne rumine pas : pour vous il est impur.

L'identification de ces quatre espèces d'animaux n'est généralement contestée ni par les spécialistes de l'hébreu, ni par ceux de la zoologie. Pourtant certains croyants sont gênés par la présence dans cette liste d'un « lièvre qui rumine ». Les défenseurs de l'« inerrance de la Bible »<sup>24</sup> affirment donc qu'il doit exister quelque part sur terre un « lièvre qui rumine », mais qu'on ne l'a pas encore identifié. Selon eux, on découvre chaque jour de nouvelles espèces animales inconnues jusqu'alors. Ce n'est donc qu'une question de temps pour découvrir un jour le fameux « lièvre qui rumine »<sup>25</sup>.

Cette façon d'aborder le problème et d'essayer d'y apporter une réponse n'est pas très convaincante. Il en va de même d'autres explications proposées par divers traducteurs ou commentateurs de la Bible :

- André Chouraqui, manifestement gêné par cette mention surprenante, renonce à traduire le mot hébreu et se contente de le transcrire en di-

<sup>24</sup> Pour certains chrétiens, la Bible étant « la Parole de Dieu », elle ne peut en aucun cas se tromper dans ce qu'elle déclare.

<sup>25</sup> Il est intéressant de relever que le daman, un petit mammifère herbivore de l'Afrique du Nord et du Proche-Orient, mais qui n'est pas un ruminant non plus, n'a guère soulevé de problèmes aux yeux des partisans de l'« inerrance de la Bible », du fait qu'il est quasi inconnu dans les pays occidentaux et outre-atlantique.

sant « l'arnèbèt ». C'est là une manière « élégante » de ne pas chercher à résoudre un problème réel ;

- Edouard Dhorme, dans la Bible de la Pléiade, déclare dans une note « C'est par erreur qu'on le (= le lièvre) classe parmi les ruminants » ;
- Pierre Buis et Jacques Leclercq, dans leur commentaire du Deutéronome<sup>26</sup>, parlent d'une « classification zoologique très sommaire, sinon fantaisiste ».

Or il y a là un problème que l'on n'a pas le droit de négliger, mais qui doit être abordé sous un autre angle, en vue de proposer des traductions correctes de Lv 11,4-7 ou de Dt 14,7-8.

Il faut considérer divers éléments, dont voici les deux principaux :

Premièrement, les principes de classification des animaux, généralement admis depuis le XX<sup>e</sup> siècle sur la base d'observations minutieuses, ne sont pas identiques à ceux qui ont prévalu dans l'Antiquité, ou qui peuvent prévaloir aujourd'hui encore dans des sociétés contemporaines. Les principes d'autrefois ou d'ailleurs sont *différents* de ceux d'il y a dix ou cinquante ans, mais cela ne signifie pas qu'ils soient « fantaisistes » ou qu'ils constituent des « erreurs ». Aujourd'hui, en zoologie ou en botanique, le recours au critère du code génétique est susceptible de remettre en question des conceptions qui, hier, étaient tenues pour acquises, sans que pour autant elles aient été « fantaisistes ».

Deuxièmement, que signifient exactement les deux tournures hébraïques généralement traduites par « ruminer » ? C'est à cette dernière question que je vais essayer de répondre dans les lignes qui suivent.

On trouve en Lv 11 et Dt 14 deux expressions pratiquement synonymes, à savoir הַגֵּרָה (ה) הַעֵלָה *hè'èlâh (hag)gérâh*, signifiant « faire (re)monter (de) la nourriture broutée »<sup>27</sup>, et גָּרָר גֵּרָה *gârar gérâh*, « brouter de la nourriture broutée »<sup>28</sup>. Le substantif גֵּרָה *gérâh* ne figure jamais ailleurs dans l'AT. Sa signification est pourtant assurée par le contexte : il s'agit de l'herbe qu'un animal a mangée en broutant, et qu'il « fait remonter » ensuite dans sa bouche pour la mâcher une seconde fois, avant de l'avaler de nouveau et de la digérer. Comme c'est souvent le cas en hébreu, l'expression גָּרָר גֵּרָה *gârar gérâh* combine un verbe et un objet direct de la même racine. Ces deux expressions désignent donc manifestement le même phénomène.

<sup>26</sup> P. Buis et J. Leclercq, *Le Deutéronome* (Sources bibliques; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1963), 115.

<sup>27</sup> Dix emplois, tous dans Lv 11 et Dt 14.

<sup>28</sup> Un seul emploi, en Lv 11,7.



La zoologie moderne a pu étudier en détail le phénomène complexe et la physiologie de la rumination chez certaines espèces animales. Il est évident que les anciens Hébreux et leurs contemporains n'ont jamais eu accès à des connaissances aussi approfondies. Les éleveurs de bétail de l'Antiquité constataient certainement que leurs bêtes, après avoir mangé une bonne quantité d'herbe, se couchaient et mâchaient une seconde fois l'herbe ingurgitée. Ils en déduisaient que l'herbe était « remontée » de leur panse dans la bouche, pour subir cette seconde mastication. Mais ils en voyaient essentiellement l'aspect extérieur, à savoir, le mouvement longuement répété des mâchoires de l'animal, vache ou chameau par exemple.

En ce temps-là, le lièvre n'avait pas été domestiqué, du fait qu'il était un animal impur dont on ne devait pas consommer la chair. Il était par conséquent moins connu que la vache, le mouton ou le chameau. Mais ce que les gens constataient quand ils voyaient un lièvre, c'est que son museau (comme celui du lapin domestique d'aujourd'hui) est presque continuellement en mouvement. De là à conclure que le lièvre mâchait peut-être une seconde fois sa nourriture, il n'y avait qu'un pas qui a pu être facilement franchi.

La même constatation peut être faite en ce qui concerne le daman, d'où son classement, également, dans la catégorie des ruminants, donc des animaux impurs.

Bien entendu, il ne suffit pas d'avoir correctement compris le sens des deux expressions hébraïques examinées ci-dessus ; il faut savoir comment les traduire. Le problème est délicat, et il n'y a certainement pas de solution simple et évidente, quelle que soit la langue cible.

Si une langue dispose d'un verbe particulier désignant clairement et spécifiquement l'action d'un animal dont la mâchoire est en mouvement régulier lors de la mastication des aliments, il devrait être possible de l'utiliser et de l'appliquer sans difficulté au daman et au lièvre comme au chameau et aux autres « (vrais) ruminants ».

Si un tel verbe n'est pas disponible, mais qu'il existe un verbe signifiant « ruminer », il sera peut-être inévitable de l'utiliser. Dans ce cas, une note explicative peut s'avérer nécessaire, par exemple : « Les Hébreux considéraient que les lièvres et les damans faisaient partie de la classe des ruminants, car ils voyaient que leur museau est très souvent en mouvement, comme celui d'une vache qui rumine ».

Les traducteurs veilleront en tout cas à ne pas recourir à une périphrase descriptive<sup>29</sup> qui alourdirait le texte, en mettant l'accent sur un aspect qui n'est pas essentiel pour la compréhension globale du passage en question.

<sup>29</sup> Périphrase du genre : « parmi les animaux qui mâchent une seconde fois la nourriture qu'ils ont fait remonter de leur estomac ».

## Références

- Buis P. et J. Leclercq, *Le Deutéronome* (Sources bibliques; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1963).
- Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible* (publié sous la direction du Centre: Informatique et Bible, Abbaye de Maredsous; Turnhout: Brepols, 1987).
- Dios Habla Hoy: La Biblia con Deuterocanónicos, versión popular* (Nueva York: Sociedad Bíblica Americana, 1979).
- Fauna and Flora of the Bible* (Helps for translators; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; London: United Bible Societies, 1980).
- La Bible « Parole de Vie »* (édition interconfessionnelle; Villiers-le-Bel: Société Biblique Française – Alliance Biblique Universelle, 2000).
- La Bible* (trad. E. Osty, avec la collaboration de J. Trinquet; Paris: Seuil, 1973).
- La Bible* (trad. et prés. par André Chouraqui; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1992).
- La Bible de Jérusalem* (nouvelle éd. revue et augmentée; Paris: Cerf, 1998).
- La Bible du Centenaire. La Sainte Bible : traduction nouvelle* (4 vol.; Paris: Société biblique, 1928-1947).
- La Bible en français courant. Ancien et Nouveau Testament* (nouvelle éd. rév.; Paris: Société Biblique Française – Alliance Biblique Universelle, 1997).
- La Bible. L'Ancien Testament* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris: Gallimard, 1956–1959).
- La Nouvelle Bible Segond. Edition d'étude* (Paris: Alliance Biblique Universelle, 2002).
- La Sainte Bible* (trad. Louis Segond; Oxford: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1887).
- Parola del Signore : La Bibbia in lingua corrente* (Leumann: Ed. Elle Di Ci; Roma: Alleanza Biblica Universale, 1985).
- Péter-Contesse R., « Main, Pied, Paume ? Les noms des extrémités des membres (*yâd, règèl, kaph*) en hébreu et en araméen biblique, » *RB* 105/4 (1998), 481-491.
- Stuttgarter Erklärungsbibel. Die Heilige Schrift nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992).
- The Holy Bible. New International Version* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984).
- The Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989).
- The New American Bible* (trans. members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America; Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1970).
- The New English Bible* (Oxford – Cambridge: Penguin Books, 1974).
- The Revised English Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2000).
- Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible (TOB)* (11<sup>e</sup> éd.; Paris: Cerf – Villiers-le-Bel: Bibli'O [Société Biblique Française], 2010).



# INDEX

## INDEX OF REFERENCES (except the long lists of pp. 2-5; 20-32; 43-44; 86-94, 110-112)

### *Genesis*

2:5 160  
2:19 160  
2:20 160  
3:1 160  
3:14 160  
3:18 160  
4:10 18  
4: 11 18  
6:18 113  
8:6-12 60  
9:9 113  
9:11 113  
11:31 123  
14:3 244  
14:10 170  
14:17 171  
14:19 77  
15:10 170  
17:7 113  
17:8 183  
17:13 113  
17:14 219  
17:19 113  
17: 21 113  
18:25 170  
19:13 96  
24:53 170  
27:16 71  
28:9 157, 158  
31:19 126  
31:50 157, 158  
31:51 170  
32:12 157  
38:11 123  
38:24 123  
40:3 170  
41:7 170  
41:24 170

41:27 170  
41:46 171  
41:51 162  
43:7 171  
46:4 71  
49:14 157  
49:17 157  
50:17 196-197  
50:25 197

### *Exodus*

4:25 18  
4:26 18  
6:4 113  
9:22 160  
9:25 160  
10:15 160  
11:7 124  
12:9 15  
12:15 219  
12:18 29  
16:31 160  
20:5 190, 191  
20:12 26, 27, 215-216  
21:12 26  
21:24 205  
21:15 217, 223  
21:16 217-218, 223  
21:17 217-218  
21:24 222, 223  
23 234  
23:9 122  
23:11 160  
23:29 160  
27:20-21 8  
28:4-7 108  
28:40 29  
29 234  
29:16 136

29:29	123	4:35	170
29:31	30	5:2	96
29:32	140	5:5	161, 162
29:34	128	5:7	161, 171, 208, 209
29:43-44	189	5:8	136-137
30	234	5:9	114, 135, 136, 156
30:20	19, 25	5:10	114
30:24-29	234	5:11	161, 205, 208-210, 223
30:28	25	5:17	95
30:33	205, 218, 219, 220, 223	5:12	170
32:19	72, 73	6:6	170
34	234	6:20	98-99, 157
34:14	190, 191	7:2	136
34:33	161	7:12	157
39:31	161	7:13	157
40	234	7:19	96
40:5	26	7:36	72
40:9-10	138	8:8	75, 157
40:9-11	234	8:9	161
<i>Leviticus</i>		8:10-11	137-138
1:4	73, 162, 208	8:10-12	234
1:5	134, 136	8:14	100
1:9	162, 165	8:15	161
1:11	136	8:18	161
1:14	153, 208	8:21	162
1:15	135, 151	8:23	161
1:16	152	8:23-24	94
2:13	95	8:24	170
3:1	95, 97-98	8:28	165, 170
3:2	73, 136, 162	8:31	139-141
3:2-7	39	8:31-11:40	41
3:7	98	8:35	140
3:8	136	9:8-11	138
3:11	114	9:9	161
3:12	113	9:15	141
3:13	136	9:20	8, 141-144
4:6	113, 114	9:22	69-79, 138-139, 157
4:7	96, 136, 158	10:1	170
4:12	134	10:1-2	128
4:15	73	10:3	189
4:17	162	10:4	96
4:18	96	10:9	19, 96, 205, 207- 208, 223
4:22	95	10:13	140
4:27	95, 113	10:15	96
4:28	162, 166		

10:15-13:6	6	14:16-17	94
10:18	140	14:22	208, 209
11:2-7	249-252	14:25	94, 170
11:9	244-245	14:27-28	94
11:13-14	50	14:30	153, 208
11:13-16	7	14:35	146
11:13-19	40-42, 47, 49, 58	14:39	145
11:14	51, 59	14:43	145
11:15	51, 59	14:47	162
11:17	41, 57	14:51	75, 157, 166
11:17-51	41	14:52	166
11:18	56, 245-246	14:53	75, 156, 157, 170
11:19	57, 246	14:56	171
11:22	247	15:12	144
11:27	248	15:13	162
11:36	248-249	15:14	208, 209
11:37	158	15:15	162, 164
11:43	151	15:27	96
11:44	187, 188	15:29	208, 209
11:45	188, 195	15:30	162
12:3	162	16:2	158
12:4	144	16:4	158
12:5	18	16:16	197
12:6	208	16:21	71, 72, 74, 75, 79
12:7	18	16:21-22	197-198
12:8	166, 208-210	16:24	162
13:2	171	16:33	96
13:3	86	17:3	159
13:4	171	17:4	39, 97, 219
13:5	145	17:5	96, 100-101, 156
13:19	171	17:6	136, 165
13:23	171	17:7	95
13:25	167, 171, 171	17:8	159
13:26	171	17:9	97, 219
13:27	166, 167	17:10	159, 162, 165
13:28	171	17:13	159
13:30	166, 167	17:14	219
13:37	145	18:1-5	193
13:42	146	18:3	183, 195
13:44	146	18:15	123
13:48	145	18:18	75, 157
13:58	99	18:20	95
13:59	164	18:27	39
14:6	162	18:28	166, 245
14:7	156, 157	18:29	205, 218, 223
14:10	167	19:1	211

19:2	158, 179, 187, 188, 192, 193, 196, 198	22:31	162
19:3	96, 211	22:33	195
19:4	211	23:12	94
19:9	211	23:19	164
19:11	211	23:20-30	6
19:14	211	23:29	205, 218-223
19:15	162	23:38	159
19:16	211, 233	23:40	96, 238
19:17-18	233	23:41	95
19:18	205, 210-214, 223	23:43	195
19:19	127, 236	24	8
19:20	95	24:3-4	8
19:23-24	238	24:4	195
19:23	162, 211	24:10	164
19:24	127, 211	24:14	73
19:25	211	24:16	236
19:26-31	233	24:19	188
19:32	211, 233	24:20	205, 222, 223
19:33-34	233	25:6	196
19:34	195, 205, 212-214	25:10	194, 237
19:35	211	25:13	194
19:36	95, 96, 101, 195, 211	25:21	167
19:38	211	25:24	194
20:2	159	25:25	194
20:7	188, 189	25:28	194
20:8	158	25:30-40	6
20:9	205, 215-218, 223	25:32	194
20:12	123	25:33	194
20:13	166	25:38	195
20:18	18	25:39	196
20:20	162	25:41	194
20:22	158, 166	25:42	195, 196
20:24	195	25:44	196
20:25	95	25:45	102-103, 194
20:26	187, 188	25:46	194
20:23-24	39	25:55	195, 196
21:6	162	26:2-16	108
21:7	234	26:3-9	108
21:8	187, 188	26:4	160
21:10	71, 162	26:5	114, 115
22:3	96, 219	26:6	108
22:15	162	26:9	113, 115
22:16	151	26:11	113, 160
22:18	101-102, 159	26:12	113, 115, 116, 195, 196
22:25	96	26:13	195

26:16 56  
 26:21 154  
 26:23 154  
 26:24 154  
 26:25 96  
 26:27 154  
 26:28 154  
 26:33 95  
 26:33-37 108  
 26:34 167  
 26:40 154  
 26:41 154  
 26:45 195  
 27:1-3 235  
 27:19 162  
 27:21 96, 160  
 27:26 159

*Numbers*

3:12 159  
 5:11 161  
 5:18 125  
 6:3 206, 207  
 6:20 157  
 6:23 69  
 6:24 70  
 8:16 159  
 9:13 219  
 10:10 231  
 11:16 121  
 11:24-25 121  
 11:25 161  
 15:9 157  
 15:30 219  
 16:2 159  
 19:4 157  
 19:16 156  
 19:20 219  
 22:4 160  
 23:7 153  
 24:25 121  
 25:6 159  
 27:18 73  
 27:23 73  
 28:10 157  
 28:15 157

28:24 157  
 31:8 157  
 34:11 244  
 35:6 157

*Deuteronomy*

4:24 190, 191  
 4:28 185  
 5:9 190, 191  
 5:12 170  
 5:15 170  
 5:16 215-216  
 6:5 211, 212  
 6:13 185  
 6:15 190, 191  
 7:4 185  
 7:6 189  
 7:16 185  
 7:22 160  
 8:19 185  
 9:3 171  
 9:15 74  
 9:17 74  
 10:12 185  
 10:20 185  
 11:4 108  
 11:13 185  
 11:16 185  
 12:2 185  
 12:30 185  
 12:27 136  
 13:3 185  
 13:5 185  
 14:2 189  
 14:7-8 116  
 14:12-13 50  
 14:12-18 40-42, 47,  
 58  
 14:13 50, 51, 59  
 14:14 45, 51, 59  
 14:15 41  
 14:17 53  
 14:18 41  
 14:19 41  
 14:26 206  
 16:7 15



16:9-10 126  
 18:15 218, 219  
 18:15-20 220  
 18:18-19 218, 219  
 18: 18-20 218  
 18:19 205, 218, 219, 221,  
 223  
 19:21 205, 222, 223  
 20:19 160  
 21:22 239  
 22:9 125, 127  
 22:9-11 127  
 22:10 127  
 22:11 126  
 22:16 128  
 23:14 157  
 23:18 159  
 5:18 171  
 26:19 189  
 28:9 189  
 28:22 56  
 28:49 50  
 29:5-6 206  
 31:14 83  
 31:14-30 83  
 31:18 219  
 32:1-29 83  
 32:30-33,1 83  
 34:9 73

**Joshua**

1:14 244  
 2:2 159  
 4:4 159  
 13:22 157  
 23:7 184  
 23:16 184  
 24:1-28 192  
 24:2 184  
 24:3 183, 195  
 24:4 195  
 24:5 183  
 24:6-7 183  
 24:14 184  
 24:14-15 192, 193  
 24:15 184

24:16-18 195  
 24:18 196  
 24:19 179, 186, 188-192,  
 196, 198-200  
 24:19-20 193  
 24:19-21 182, 184, 186

**Judges**

5:2 171  
 6:34 170  
 6:35 170  
 7:23 153  
 9:27 127  
 11:32 170  
 13:4 206  
 13:7 206  
 13:14 206  
 15:8 157  
 19:12 159

**1 Samuel**

2:2 189  
 6:20 189  
 9:2 159  
 14:25 156

**2 Samuel**

11:11 156  
 21:2 159  
 21:10 160

**1 Kings**

7:24 244  
 17:5-7 60  
 15:20 156  
 19:19 156  
 9:20 159

**2 Kings**

9:37 156  
 14:9 160  
 19:22 189

**Isaiah**

2:20 53  
 5:11 206

13:21 52  
 32:10 157  
 34:11 52, 57  
 40:6 160  
 43:20 52, 160  
 44:12 207  
 55:12 160  
 63:3 157

***Jeremiah***

4:20 157  
 7:20 160  
 7:23 196  
 8:7 52  
 9:21 156  
 11:4 196  
 12:4 160  
 12:9 160  
 24:7 196  
 30:22 196  
 31:8 219, 221  
 32:8 196  
 48:10 264  
 49:22 264  
 50:39 52  
 51:36 244

***Ezekiel***

6:3 219  
 7:26 157  
 8:7 125  
 14:4 159  
 14:7 159  
 14:19 156  
 14:21 156  
 16:5 156  
 16:7 160  
 16:37 157  
 16:45 130  
 16:61 157  
 17:24 160  
 21:2 160  
 29:5 156  
 31:6 160  
 31:13 160  
 34:5 160

34:27 160  
 38:20 156, 160  
 39:4 160  
 39:17 160  
 42:14 99  
 43:26 73  
 44:7 157  
 44:12 75

***Hosea***

2:14 160  
 2:20 160  
 4:3 160  
 9:4 170  
 9:7 170  
 10:14 157  
 12:1 188  
 13:8 160

***Joel***

1:4 247  
 1:12 160  
 1:15 170  
 1:19 160

***Amos***

1:1 170  
 1:2 170  
 1:5 160  
 3:1 160  
 3:15 157

***Micha***

2:11 206  
 4:2 170  
 7:3 170

***Nahum***

1:2 190, 191

***Zephaniah***

1:8 160  
 2:4 52

***Zechariah***

3:9 158

5:9 52  
 9:10 219  
 13:8 219

***Psalms***

16:3 188  
 18:11 50  
 28:2 75  
 36:28 219  
 102:7 52, 57, 245  
 103:15 160  
 104:7 52  
 134:2 69, 75-77,  
 79

***Job***

5:18 73  
 5:23 160  
 6:27 89  
 16:14 157  
 30:29 52  
 39:13 52  
 39:14 52  
 39:15 160  
 40:20 160

***Proverbs***

6:1 214  
 20:1 206  
 21:11 171  
 30:11 217  
 34:4 206  
 34:6 206

***Ruth***

1:7 123  
 4:10 219

***Qohelet/Ecclesiastes***

1:13 165

***Lamentations***

4:3 52

***Daniel***

1:3 159

***Ezra***

7:7 159

***2 Chronicles***

16:4 156  
 25:18 160

***Tobit***

4:15 211

***Ben Sira/Sirach***

31:15 211  
 50:20 157

***Matthew***

5:38 222  
 5:43 205, 212, 214  
 15:4 205, 215-218, 223  
 19:19 205, 212, 214-216  
 22:39 205, 212

***Mark***

7:10 205, 215-218, 223  
 10:19 216  
 12:31 205, 212  
 12:33 212

***Luke***

1:15 205, 207-208,  
 223  
 2:24 205, 208-210,  
 223  
 5:1 244  
 10:27 205, 212-213  
 18:20 215, 216

***Acts of the Apostles***

2:4 208  
 2:13 208  
 3:22 218  
 3:23 205, 218-221, 223  
 15:20 211  
 15:28 211

***Romans***

13:9 205, 212-214

**Galatians**

5:14 205, 212, 213

**Ephesians**

6:2-3 215, 216

**James**

2:8 205, 212-213

**Dead Sea Scrolls**

1QpaleoLev-Num<sup>a</sup> 166  
 1QS 77, 219  
 1QS<sup>a</sup> 78  
 4Q26<sup>a</sup> 212  
 4Q26<sup>b</sup> 3  
 4Q26<sup>c</sup> 108  
 4Q45 41  
 4Q418 127  
 4QDibHam<sup>a</sup>/4Q504 154  
 4QDeut<sup>f</sup>/4Q33 222  
 4QExod-Lev 33  
 4QLev<sup>b</sup>/4Q24 39, 222  
 4QLev<sup>d</sup> 39, 129,  
 130, 162  
 4QLev<sup>e</sup>/4Q26<sup>a</sup> 212  
 4QLev<sup>e</sup>/4Q26<sup>b</sup> 3  
 4QLev<sup>e</sup>/4Q26 212

4QLXXDeut 108  
 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> 6, 41, 42,  
 108, 110-  
 116  
 4QpaleoDeut<sup>f</sup> 41  
 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> 160, 222  
 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>l</sup> 160  
 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>/4Q120 6, 41, 108,  
 110-114,  
 116  
 4QRP<sup>c</sup>/4Q365 39, 154  
 4QRP<sup>d</sup>/4Q366 40, 41  
 4QRP<sup>e</sup>/4Q367 40, 130  
 4QTest/4Q175 218, 219  
 7QpapLXXExod 108  
 11QLev<sup>b</sup> 33, 164  
 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>/11Q1 151, 154,  
 159, 160,  
 162, 220  
 11QT<sup>a</sup> 9, 136,  
 238  
 MasLev<sup>a</sup> 149  
 MasLev<sup>b</sup> 41, 149,  
 158  
 MMT/4Q396 127, 238  
 Mur/HevLev 108  
 XQLev<sup>c</sup> 108

## INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Achenbach R. 192, 193, 196,  
 200  
 Aitken J. 6, 12, 46, 56, 63, 66,  
 107, 109  
 Alexander P. S. 11  
 Alexander T. D. 208, 210, 222,  
 223  
 Allon G. A. 220, 223  
 Alt A. 168, 176  
 Altshuler D. 232, 240  
 Amparo Alba C. 169, 174  
 Anbar M. 182, 185, 200  
 Andersen F. I. 13, 35  
 Angelini A. VII, 39, 55, 63  
 Archer G. L. 207, 209, 223  
 Arnaldez R. 8, 10  
 Arnott W. G. 55, 56, 57, 63  
 Artus O., 195, 200  
 Attridge H. W. 9  
 Aurelius E. 183, 201  
 Averbek R. E. 208, 223  
 Avioz M. VII, 227, 234, 235,  
 240  
 Baden J. S. 192, 202  
 Baek K. S. 1, 10, 109, 118, 149,  
 176  
 Baglioni I. 46, 66  
 Baillet M. 9  
 Baker D. W. 208, 223  
 Bar-Asher M. 84, 105  
 Bare G. 48, 63  
 Barr J. 13, 35, 58, 63  
 Barry J. D. 208, 224  
 Barthélemy D. 9, 76, 89, 107,  
 117, 133, 152, 175  
 Baruch Y. 1, 10  
 Batsch Chr. 233, 240  
 Bauckham R. 211, 224  
 Bauer S. H. 167, 174  
 Bauks M. 194, 201  
 Baumgarten A. I. 235, 242  
 Baumgarten J. 9  
 Baumgartner W. 101, 102, 105  
 Begg C. T. 228, 237, 240  
 Ben-Hayyim Z. 6, 9, 71, 78, 85,  
 86, 94-100, 102-104  
 Ben-Zvi I. 84, 104  
 Berges U. 52, 64  
 Betz H. D. 210, 212, 224  
 Bibb B. D. 231, 240  
 Blum E. 180-182, 185, 201  
 Boling R. G. 192, 204  
 Bonfiglio R. P. 76, 79  
 Bons E. 17, 49, 55, 63, 65  
 Brady M. 11  
 Brettler M. Z. 183, 203  
 Briggs C. A. 213, 224  
 Brock S. 58, 64  
 Brooke A. E. 42, 64, 133, 144,  
 147  
 Brooke G. I. 131, 132  
 Brown F. 213, 224  
 Büchner D. 124, 125, 126, 129,  
 131  
 Buis P. 251, 253  
 Caldwell T. A. 221, 224  
 Cansdale G. 48, 64  
 Carr D. M. 179, 180, 199-201  
 Cave C. H. 209, 224  
 Cave F. H. 209, 224  
 Chantraine P. 56, 64  
 Chapman D. W. 239, 240  
 Chiesa B. 169, 174  
 Chirichigno G. 207, 209, 223  
 Clines D. J. A. 102, 104, 191,  
 201  
 Cornelis de Vos J. 181, 202  
 Cowley A. E. 84, 85, 104  
 Creach J. F. D. 192, 201  
 Cross F. M. 11, 12  
 Crown A. 84, 105  
 Culy M. M. 209, 224  
 D'Arcy Thompson W. 53, 64  
 Dahl M. E. 209, 224  
 Dahood M. 75, 79  
 Daniel S. 125, 132  
 Dávid N. 238, 241  
 Davids P. H. 211, 224

- Davis K. 1, 10, 108, 117  
 de Rossi J. B. 151, 174  
 De Troyer K. 1, 9, 15, 41, 42,  
 64, 107, 117, 136, 148, 206,  
 124, 227, 241  
 De Vaux R. 9  
 de Waard J. 158, 171, 174, 176  
 Deiana G. 140, 147  
 Del Olmo Lete G. 50, 52, 64  
 Den Hertog C. J. 47, 74  
 Dietrich M. 169, 174  
 Dietrich W. 76, 81  
 Díez Macho A. 7, 9, 73, 80, 158,  
 168, 169, 174  
 Dillmann A. 138, 147  
 Dion P. E. 136, 147  
 Dirksen P. B. 158, 176  
 Dohmen Chr. 191, 201  
 Dorival G. 35, 36, 47, 65, 108,  
 117, 264  
 Dotan A. 5, 9, 74, 80, 168, 170,  
 174, 175  
 Dozeman T. B. 181, 182, 191,  
 201, 203  
 Drijvers H. J. W. 7, 10  
 Driver G. R. 49, 51-53, 64  
 Driver S. R. 213, 224  
 Duhm B. 75, 80  
 Dunn J. D. G. 211, 212, 214,  
 224  
 Ehrlich B. A. 140, 147  
 Eidsvåg G. M. 113, 117  
 Eissfeldt O. 167, 176  
 Elgvin T. 1, 10, 108, 117  
 Elliger K. 140, 147  
 Erbes J. E. 7, 10  
 Eshel E. 14, 35, 36, 129, 132  
 Eshel H. 1, 10  
 Feldman L. H. 227, 228, 232,  
 234, 238-241  
 Feliks J. 49, 51, 64  
 Fernández Marcos N. 47, 64,  
 170, 171, 175, 237, 241  
 Fernández Tejero E. 170, 174  
 Field F. 45, 64  
 Flint P. W. 1, 10, 33, 36, 39, 64  
 Florentin M. 6, 11, 18, 36, 84,  
 86, 98, 105, 151, 176  
 Forbes A. D. 13, 35  
 Fox M. V. 163, 168, 172, 175  
 Fraenkel D. 6, 11, 42, 66, 206,  
 226  
 Frankel Z. 15, 17, 19, 30, 36,  
 125, 126, 132  
 Frey J. 181, 203  
 Fritz V. 189, 192, 201  
 Gallagher E. L. 109, 117  
 Gallant R. 229, 241  
 García Martínez F. 9, 10, 11,  
 183, 202  
 Gasquet F. A. 7, 10  
 Gelston A. 170, 175  
 Gerleman G. 194, 201  
 Gerstenberger E. S. 140, 147  
 Gesenius W. 101-103, 105  
 Gibert P. 7, 11  
 Ginsburg C. D. 74, 80, 151, 152,  
 175  
 Ginsburger, M. 159, 175  
 Giovannini A. 85, 105  
 Glanville S. 53, 64  
 Goldenberg D. 229, 239, 241  
 Goldman Y. 15, 36, 176  
 Golinets V. VII, 149, 152, 153,  
 155, 170, 171, 175  
 Goshen-Gottstein M. H. 168,  
 175  
 Gottheil R. 84, 85, 105  
 Graupner A. 50, 55, 64  
 Greenstein E. L. 194, 203  
 Greg W. W. 163, 175  
 Griffith F. L. 53, 64  
 Grünwaldt K. 199, 201  
 Gryson R. 7, 12  
 Guasparri A. 48, 49, 65  
 Hagner D. A. 210, 211, 224  
 Hallo W. W. 221, 224  
 Hanhart R. 131, 132  
 Haran M. 138, 147  
 Harl M. 47, 65, 117  
 Harlé P. 5, 10, 73, 80, 111, 117,  
 125, 126

- Harper R. F. 221, 224  
 Hartley J. E. 48, 65, 140, 147  
 Hayes C. 236, 241  
 Hayman A. P. 7, 10  
 Heiser M. S. 207, 211, 225  
 Hendel R. S. 35, 36, 163  
 Hiebert J. V. 125, 131  
 Hiebert R. 125, 131  
 Hieke T. 47, 65, 73, 80, 195,  
 201, 228, 240  
 Himbaza I. VII, 9, 10, 33, 42,  
 46, 65, 69, 72, 74, 78, 80, 84,  
 99, 105, 107-110, 118, 136,  
 147, 152, 175  
 Hoftizer J. 48, 65  
 Hospers J. H. 7, 10  
 Hossfeld F.-L. 75, 76, 80  
 Houston W. 46, 61, 65  
 Houtman A. 238, 242  
 Huber K. 15, 36  
 Jenson P. P. 138, 148  
 Jeremias J. 219, 224  
 Jobes K. H. 72, 80  
 Joosten J. VII, 17, 37, 55, 63,  
 78, 80, 91, 99, 105, 152, 175,  
 183, 201  
 Joüon P. 189, 201  
 Kahle P. 83, 168, 169, 175, 176  
 Karrer M. 72, 80, 109, 118, 217,  
 219, 224  
 Keel O. 50, 65, 76, 80  
 Keener C. S. 209, 212, 218, 219,  
 224  
 Kellogg S. H. 231, 241  
 Kennicott B. 151, 156, 157, 159,  
 175  
 Kenyon F. G. 42, 65  
 Kim K.-R. 35, 36  
 Kittel R. 168, 169, 176  
 Klein M. L. 8, 10  
 Kloppenborg J. S. 39, 65, 230,  
 241  
 Knohl I. 195, 201  
 Knoppers G. N. 183, 202  
 Köckert M. 180, 201  
 Koehler L. 101, 102, 105  
 Kogan L. 49, 65  
 Konkel M. 191, 201  
 Koopmans W. T. 182, 191, 201  
 Kraft R. A. 17, 36  
 Kraus W. 72, 80, 109, 118, 217,  
 219, 224  
 Kreuzer S. 34, 37, 42, 47, 64,  
 65, 72, 80, 109, 118  
 Kronholm T. 50, 51, 55, 65  
 Kugler R. A. 1, 6, 8, 10, 33, 36,  
 39, 62, 64, 65, 73, 80, 109,  
 118, 149, 231, 232, 241, 242  
 Kuntzmann R. 8, 10  
 Lane D. J. 7, 10  
 Lange A. 1-3, 10, 35-37, 109,  
 118, 136, 148, 212, 217-220,  
 222, 224  
 Langlois M. 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 35,  
 36, 108, 117  
 Law T. M. 227, 241  
 Le Déaut R. 8, 10  
 Leander P. 167, 174  
 Leclercq J. 251, 253  
 Lemaire A. 53, 65  
 Lesch J. P. 47, 64  
 Levine B. E. 140, 148  
 Levinson B. M. 183, 202  
 Liddell H. G. 239, 241  
 Liljeström M. 227, 241  
 Lindars B. 131, 132  
 Loader W. R. G. 215, 224  
 Longenecker R. N. 210, 211,  
 224  
 Lucca P. 145, 148  
 Luz U. 211, 214, 224  
 Lyons M. A. 179, 180, 200, 202  
 Macchi J.-D. 195, 201  
 Macdonald Griffith N. 53, 64  
 Macuch R. 84, 85, 96, 101-103,  
 105  
 Maeir A. M. 238, 241  
 Magness J. 238, 241  
 Maiberger P. 52, 65  
 Marcus I. G. 227, 241  
 Marquis G. 17, 36  
 Martin R. P. 221, 224

- Marx A. 134, 148  
 Mathews K. A. 128, 132  
 McCarthy C. 73, 80, 84, 105, 136, 148, 170, 171  
 McHardy W. D. 168, 174  
 McKendrick S. 72, 81, 109, 118  
 McLean B. H. 215, 225  
 McLean N. 42, 64, 133, 144, 147  
 McNamara M. 8, 10, 220, 225  
 Meiser M. 13, 37, 72, 80, 109, 118  
 Menken M. J. J. 216, 225  
 Metso S. 6, 10, 39, 40, 62, 65, 109, 114, 118, 149, 176, 227, 230, 241  
 Metzger B. 47, 65  
 Meyer E. E. VII, 179  
 Michel O. 236, 241  
 Miletto G. 169, 176  
 Milgrom J. 47, 59, 63, 65, 69, 73, 80, 99, 105, 136, 140, 145, 148, 187, 188, 194, 202, 228, 232, 234, 241  
 Milik J. T. 9  
 Minutoli D. 42, 64, 206, 224  
 Motyer J. A. 210, 222, 225  
 Müller H.-P. 48, 50, 53, 65  
 Munnich O. 35, 36, 47, 65, 108, 117  
 Muraoka T. 189, 201  
 Nakman D. 229, 239, 241  
 Nelson R. D. 192, 202  
 Newman J. H. 39, 65, 241  
 Nicklas T. 228, 240  
 Nihan C. VII, 39, 46, 51, 59, 63, 65, 66, 180, 182, 183, 187, 194, 195, 199-202  
 Nissinen M. 149, 176, 179, 201  
 Noam V. 238, 241  
 Nodet E. 236, 237, 241  
 Nolland J. 209, 211, 225  
 Noort E. 181, 183, 186, 202  
 Normand H. 55, 57, 66  
 Norton G. J. 158, 176  
 Norton J. D. H. 237, 241  
 Noth M. 140, 148, 181, 184, 200, 202  
 O'Connor M. P. 167, 177, 189, 203  
 O'Sullivan O. A. 72, 81, 109, 118  
 Olyan S. 39, 66  
 Ornan T. 70, 76, 80  
 Oswalt J. N. 221, 224  
 Otto E. 191, 192, 199, 202  
 Pakkala J. 149, 176  
 Parker C. S. 1, 11  
 Parsons M. C. 209, 224  
 Parsons P. J. 107, 118  
 Paximadi VII, 133  
 Penner K. 207, 211, 225  
 Perkins L. 46, 66,  
 Perlitt L. 183, 202  
 Person R. F. 183, 202  
 Péter-Contesse R. VII, 73, 80, 99, 105, 138, 148, 243, 248, 253  
 Petersen N. 108, 118  
 Pfann, S. J. 11  
 Pintaudi R. 42, 64, 206, 224  
 Pisano S. 158, 176  
 Polak F. H. 17, 36  
 Poorthuis M. J. H. M. 187, 203  
 Popović M. 40, 66, 181, 202  
 Porat R. 1, 10  
 Porath Y. 1, 11  
 Pralon D. 6, 10, 73, 80, 111, 118, 125, 126  
 Prijs L. 19, 36, 125, 129, 132  
 Puech E. 78, 81  
 Pummer R. 84, 105  
 Rabin C. 168, 176  
 Rahlfs A. 6, 11, 20, 22-24, 42, 47, 66, 74, 110-112, 114, 115, 121, 132, 142, 145, 146, 148, 206, 210, 225.  
 Reich N. 74, 80  
 Reif S. C. 172, 176  
 Reiter K. 50, 66  
 Rendtorff R. 1, 6, 8, 10, 33, 36, 39, 62, 64, 65, 73, 80, 109,



- 138, 140, 148, 196, 202, 227,  
231, 232, 241, 242
- Revel B. 238, 242
- Revell E. J. 169, 176,
- Riede P. 49, 50, 66
- Robertson E. 102, 105
- Römer T. 72, 81, 109, 119, 181-  
185, 192, 195, 200, 201-203
- Rösel H. N. 182, 183, 184, 186,  
192, 203
- Rösel M. 15, 35, 36
- Roth-Mouthon M.-G. VII, 83
- Rubenstein J. L. 235, 239, 242
- Ruwe A. 231, 242
- Sabatier P. 7, 11
- Sabourin L. 75, 81
- Sadaqa A. 71, 81, 104, 105
- Sæbø M. 158, 176
- Safrai S. 237, 242
- Sanderson J. E. 11, 109, 118
- Sanmartín J. 50, 52, 64
- Schäfer R. 158, 176
- Schalit A. 237, 239, 241
- Schattner-Rieser U. 181, 203
- Schectman S. 192, 202
- Schenker A. 15, 36, 84, 105,  
158, 163, 176
- Schiffman L. H. 9, 11, 40, 66,  
238, 241
- Schlosser J. 8, 10
- Schmid K. 181-183, 185, 186,  
195, 197, 198, 201-203
- Schnabel E. J. 219, 225
- Schorch S. 6, 11, 17, 71, 72, 81,  
83, 84, 86, 90, 92, 99-102,  
104, 105, 151, 154, 176
- Schwartz B. J. 187, 189, 203
- Schwartz J. 187, 238, 242
- Scott R. 239, 241
- Seales W. B. 1, 11
- Segal M. 1, 11, 40, 66
- Sheehan J. F. X. 221, 224
- Shehadeh H. 154, 155, 176
- Shor P. 1, 11
- Sigismund M. 80, 118
- Silva M. 72, 80, 109, 118
- Simon R. 7, 11
- Skehan P. W. 11, 109, 118
- Sperber A. 7, 11, 155, 176
- Sperling D. S. 183, 203
- Spiegelberg M. 53, 66
- Sterling G. E. 231, 242
- Steyn G. J. VII, 205, 215, 218-  
220, 225
- Stigall J. J. 209, 224
- Stökl D. J. 235, 242
- Strack H. L. 156, 176
- Strange J. 186, 203
- Swete H. B. 133, 144, 148
- Taggar-Cohen A. 193-196, 203
- Tal A. 6-8, 11, 18, 36, 83, 84,  
86, 96, 105, 106, 151, 154,  
162, 171, 176
- Talmon S. 41, 149, 166, 168,  
175, 176
- Tamulénas A. J. 49-52, 66
- Taylor B. 131, 132
- Teeter D. A. 15, 19, 36, 39, 66
- Thackeray H. St. J. 234, 237,  
239, 241, 242
- Thompson H. 53, 64
- Tigchelaar E. J. C. 2, 3, 10, 11
- Toepler T. E. 15, 36
- Tommasi C. 46, 66
- Tooman W. A. 179, 180, 190,  
198-200, 203
- Tov E. VII, 1, 5, 6, 11, 13, 16,  
17, 33-37, 40, 66, 72, 81, 107,  
109, 118, 121-123, 132, 151,  
168, 176
- Tuval M. 227, 242
- Tzoref Sh. 33, 37
- Uehlinger Chr. 15, 36, 76, 80
- Ulrich E. 6, 10-12, 33, 37, 62, 65,  
72, 81, 109, 114, 118, 149, 176
- Utley R. J. 209, 225
- van der Kooij A. 158, 176
- van der Kooij G. 48, 65
- Van der Louw T. A. W. 72, 81,  
109, 118
- van Ruiten J. 181, 203
- Van Vliet W. M. 7, 10

- VanderKam J. 9, 11  
Vernus P. 55, 66  
Vieyra M. 53, 66  
Voitila A. 6, 12, 46, 66, 107,  
118  
Von Gall A. F. 84, 98, 100, 101,  
103, 106, 154, 177  
Wagner A. 76, 81  
Waltke B. K. 167, 177, 189, 203  
Walton B. 156, 177  
Watson D. F. 206, 225  
Watson W. G. E. 50, 64  
Watts J. W. 72, 81, 140, 148  
Weber R. 7, 12  
Weigold M. 212, 217-220, 222,  
224  
Weis R. D. 158, 176  
Wenham G. J. 140, 148, 229,  
242  
Westerholm S. 209, 225  
Westermann C. 60, 66  
Wevers J. W. 6, 7, 12, 15, 18,  
20, 22-24, 37, 41, 42, 45, 47,  
59, 60, 66, 67, 74, 108, 110-  
112, 114, 115, 119, 121, 125,  
126, 129, 131-133, 136, 138,  
141-143, 145, 146, 148, 155,  
177, 214, 236, 242  
Whitekettle R. 51, 67  
Wildenboer J. 186, 203  
Winton Thomas D. 168, 174  
Wolterman C. 53, 67  
Wright D. P. 189, 203  
Wright G. E. 192, 204  
Wright J. 39, 66  
Yadin Y. 9, 12, 41, 67  
Yardeni A. 1, 11  
Yeivin I. 169, 177  
Yerkes R. K. 46, 47, 59, 61, 67  
Yona S. 194, 203  
Young I. 33, 37  
Younger K. L. 191, 194, 200,  
221, 224  
Yoyotte J. 55, 66  
Zenger E. 75, 76, 80  
Zgoll A. 70, 81  
Zipor M. A. VII, 35, 37, 121,  
132  
Zsengellér J. 83, 106  
Zucker A. 46, 67



## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

*Anna Angelini*

Post-doctoral researcher, Institut Romand des Sciences Bibliques, Université de Lausanne, Switzerland

*Michael Avioz*

Professor and Chair, Zalman Shamir Department of Bible, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

*Viktor Golinets*

Professor of Hebrew Language, Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg

*Innocent Himbaza*

Titular Professor, Institut Dominique Barthélemy, Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg, Switzerland

*Esias E. Meyer*

Associate Professor, Department of Old Testament and Hebrew Scripture, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, South Africa

*Christophe Nihan*

Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible and History of Ancien Israel, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

*Giorgio Paximadi*

Professor of Exegesis of the Old Testament, Faculty of Theology of Lugano, Switzerland

*René Péter-Contesse*

Translator Old Testament, Colombier, Switzerland

*Mary-Gabrielle Roth-Mouthon*

Doctoral Candidate, Institut Dominique Barthélemy, Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg, Switzerland

*Gert J. Steyn*

Professor of New Testament studies, University of Pretoria, South Africa

*Emanuel Tov*

J.L. Magnes Professor, emeritus, Department of Bible, Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem, Israel

*Moshe A. Zipor*

Professor, Department of Bible, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan

## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface .....	VII
Abbreviations .....	IX

### *Innocent Himbaza*

INTRODUCTION: WHERE DOES THE TEXT OF LEVITICUS STAND? .....	1
1. Dead Sea Scrolls .....	1
2. The book of Leviticus in textual traditions .....	5
3. Textual discrepancies and literary evolution .....	8

### *Emanuel Tov*

TEXTUAL HARMONIZATION IN LEVITICUS .....	13
1. Introduction .....	13
2. The data .....	20
2.1. LXX ≠ MT SP (134 + 48 + 19 = 201 x).....	20
2.1.1. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (134 x) .....	20
2.1.2. Remote context (48 x) .....	25
2.1.3. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (19 x) .....	27
2.2. SP LXX ≠ MT (58 + 18 + 4 = 80 x) .....	27
2.2.1. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (58 x) .....	27
2.2.2. Remote context (18 x) .....	29
2.2.3. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (4 x) .....	30
2.3. SP ≠ MT LXX (5 + 2 + 1 = 8 x) .....	30
2.3.1. Repetition or change of details found elsewhere in the context (5 x) .....	30
2.3.2. Remote context (2 x) .....	31
2.3.3. Addition/expansion of subject/object, etc. (1 x) .....	31
2.4. MT SP ≠ LXX (18 + 2 = 20 x) .....	31
2.4.1. Repetition of details found elsewhere in the context (18 x)....	31
2.4.2. Remote context (2 x) .....	32
2.5. MT ≠ SP LXX (5 x) .....	32
3. Some conclusions .....	32

### *Anna Angelini and Christophe Nihan*

UNCLEAN BIRDS IN THE HEBREW AND GREEK VERSIONS OF LEVITICUS AND DEUTERONOMY .....	39
1. The list of unclean birds and textual fluidity in Leviticus .....	39

2. A first approach to the list of unclean birds in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 .....	40
3. Bird names and taxonomy in the Hebrew tradition of Leviticus and Deuteronomy .....	48
4. The character of the Greek translation and its correspondence with the Hebrew list .....	54
5. Evaluating the differences between LXX and MT and their implications for the lists of unclean birds .....	59
6. Conclusion: The list of unclean birds and the transmission of Leviticus and Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period .....	62

*Innocent Himbaza*

LA BÉNÉDICTION D’AARON EN LÉVITIQUE 9,22 ET LE PENTATEUQUE SAMARITAIN .....	69
1. La problématique : lever la main ou lever les mains ? .....	69
2. Les témoins textuels .....	70
3. Les témoins textuels reflètent-ils des pratiques différentes ? .....	71
4. La Massorah de Lv 9,22 .....	73
5. Une occurrence parallèle en dehors du Pentateuque : Ps 134,2 .....	75
6. L’iconographie atteste les deux postures .....	76
7. Les manuscrits de la Mer Morte attestent les deux postures .....	77
8. Conclusion .....	79

*Mary-Gabrielle Roth-Mouthon*

LE LÉVITIQUE DANS LE PENTATEUQUE SAMARITAIN : ÉTUDE COMPARÉE DES MANUSCRITS 6 (C) DE SICHEM, CBL 751 (DUBLIN) ET BCU L2057 (FRIBOURG) .....	83
1. Introduction .....	83
2. Étude du Lévitique .....	85
2.1. Tableau comparatif des manuscrits F, S, D et de la transcription orale de Ben-Hayyim .....	85
2.2. Observations statistiques .....	94
2.3. Observations textuelles de quelques variantes .....	97
2.3.1. Lv 3,1 .....	97
2.3.2. Lv 6,20 .....	98
2.3.3. Lv 8,14 .....	100
2.3.4. Lv 17,5 .....	100
2.3.5. Lv 19,36 .....	101
2.3.6. Lv 21,18 .....	101
2.3.7. Lv 25,45 .....	102
3. Conclusion .....	103

*Innocent Himbaza*

## THE EDITED SEPTUAGINT OF LEVITICUS IS NOT THE SEPTUAGINT:

## A PLEA FOR A PARADIGM SHIFT ..... 107

1. The place of the Greek manuscripts of Leviticus discovered at Qumran ..... 107
2. Particular readings of manuscripts 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> and 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> 110
  - 2.1. 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup> versus G-ed ..... 110
  - 2.2. 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> versus G-ed ..... 111
3. The Greek manuscripts from Qumran, the editions of Rahlfs and Wevers and the question of eclecticism ..... 114
4. Conclusion ..... 116

*Moshe A. Zipor*

## THE NATURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS ... 121

1. Background ..... 121
2. Standard equivalents ..... 122
3. GL as exegete ..... 123
4. Rare Hebrew words ..... 124
5. Contextual renderings ..... 125
6. Unique expressions ..... 126
7. Text-critical value ..... 127
8. Different vocalization ..... 127
9. Alternative structure of phrase ..... 128
10. Harmonization? ..... 128
11. Pluses and minuses ..... 129
12. Word order ..... 130
13. Conclusion ..... 131

*Giorgio Paximadi*

## ENTRE VARIANTES ET INTERPRÉTATIONS. CORRUPTION TEXTUELLE

## OU EXÈGESE DANS LE TEXTE DE LA SEPTANTE DU LÉVITIQUE ? ..... 133

1. Interprétations déjà présentes dans la Vorlage ..... 134
  - 1.1. Lv 1,5 ..... 134
  - 1.2. Lv 4,12 ..... 134
2. Changements reflétant une interprétation de G ..... 135
  - 2.1. Lv 1,15 ..... 135
  - 2.2. Lv 5,8 ..... 136
  - 2.3. Lv 8,10-11 ..... 137
  - 2.4. Lv 9,22 ..... 138



3. Variantes qui peuvent dissimuler une intervention interprétative ...	139
3.1. Lv 8,31 .....	139
3.2. Lv 8,31 .....	140
3.3. Lv 9,15 .....	141
3.4. Lv 9,20 .....	141
3.5. Lv 12,4 .....	144
3.6. Lv 14,39 .....	145
3.7. Lv 14,43 .....	145
4. Conclusion .....	146

*Viktor Golinets*

ORTHOGRAPHICAL, GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL PECULIARITIES IN THE HEBREW TEXTS OF LEVITICUS: CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT HEBREW BIBLE EDITING IN THE LIGHT OF THE LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF HEBREW ....	149
1. Consonantal text .....	150
1.1. Orthography .....	150
1.1.1. Elision of postvocalic /ʔ/ .....	151
1.1.2. Interchange between <i>Heh</i> and <i>Aleph</i> .....	151
1.1.3. Orthography of the suffixed pronoun third person m. sg. on singular nouns .....	152
1.1.4. Orthography of the suffixed pronoun third person m. sg. on plural nouns .....	152
1.1.5. Orthography of the preposition <i>עַן</i> .....	153
1.2. Lexical variation .....	153
1.2.1. Presence and absence of prepositions .....	154
1.2.2. Interchange of prepositions .....	155
1.2.2.1. Change from <i>עַל</i> to <i>אֶל</i> .....	155
1.2.2.2. Change from <i>עַל</i> to <i>אֶל</i> .....	156
1.2.3. The particle <i>כִּל</i> .....	158
1.2.4. Interchange of nouns .....	159
1.2.5. Interchange of verbs .....	161
1.3. Lexicosyntactic variation .....	161
1.3.1. The <i>nota objecti</i> <i>אֵת</i> .....	161
1.3.2. The article .....	163
1.3.3. The relative particle <i>אֲשֶׁר</i> .....	165
1.3.4. The use of the pronoun <i>הוּא</i> in verbless clauses .....	165
1.4. Variation of word order .....	165
1.4.1. Word order variation within enumeration .....	166
1.4.2. Word order variation between subject and predicate .....	166
1.4.3. Word order variation between subject and object .....	166
1.4.4. Word order variation between subject and attribute .....	167

1.5. Morphological variation .....	167
1.6. Morphosyntactic variation .....	167
2. Peculiarities of the Masoretic texts .....	168
2.1. Omitting of Dagesh due to avoidance of germination in adjacent syllables .....	169
2.2. Missing Mappiq .....	170
2.3. Variation in vocalisation .....	171
3. Methodological questions about Hebrew Bible editing in the light of the examples presented above .....	171

*Esias E. Meyer*

LEVITICUS 19:2 AND JOSHUA 24:19: AN EXAMPLE OF LITERARY ALLUSION? .....	179
1. Introduction .....	179
2. Joshua 24 late or early? .....	181
3. Holy God .....	186
4. Jealous God .....	190
5. Allusions or not? .....	192
6. Conclusion .....	198

*Gert J. Steyn*

THE TEXT FORM OF THE LEVITICUS QUOTATIONS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES .....	205
1. Introduction .....	205
2. Leviticus 10:9 – Prohibition of wine and strong drink .....	206
3. Leviticus 5:11 – Prescription of a postnatal purification sacrifice ..	208
4. Leviticus 19:18 – The Love Commandment .....	210
5. Leviticus 20:9 – The 5 <sup>th</sup> commandment .....	215
5.1. The positive-formula of the 5 <sup>th</sup> commandment .....	215
5.2. The negative-formula of the 5 <sup>th</sup> commandment .....	216
6. Leviticus 23:29 – Warning against neglect of Atonement Day .....	218
7. Leviticus 24:20 – Lex talionis: The law of retaliation .....	221
8. Conclusion .....	223

*Michael Avioz*

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS IN JOSEPHUS' WRITINGS .....	227
1. Methodology .....	228
2. The structure of Leviticus .....	229
2.1. The structure of the laws of Leviticus in Josephus' Antiquities ...	230
2.2. The starting point of Leviticus .....	231

2.3. The ending of Leviticus .....	232
3. Sacrifices in Josephus .....	232
4. Laws omitted by Josephus .....	233
5. Additions to the MT .....	234
6. Avoiding doublets and repetitions .....	234
7. Apologetic concerns .....	235
8. The text at Josephus' disposal .....	235
9. Josephus' writings and rabbinic Halakhah .....	237
9.1. Lev 19:23-24 .....	238
9.2. Etrog (Citron) .....	238
9.3. The blasphemer (Lev. 24) .....	239
10. Conclusion .....	240

*René Péter-Contesse*

QUELQUES PROBLÈMES DE TRADUCTION DANS LE CHAPITRE 11 DU

LÉVITIQUE .....	243
1. Introduction .....	243
2. Lévitique 11,9 .....	244
3. Lévitique 11,18 .....	245
4. Lévitique 11,19 .....	246
5. Lévitique 11,22 .....	247
6. Lévitique 11,27 .....	248
7. Lévitique 11,36 .....	248
8. Lévitique 11,2b-7 .....	249
Index .....	255
List of Contributors .....	271
Detailed Table of Contents .....	273

## ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- Bickel S., Schroer S., Schurte R., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Bilder als Quellen. Images as Sources. Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel*, 2007, XLVI-560 p. + XXXIV pl.
- 25.1a Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band Ia: Der syrische Text der Edition in Estrangela. Faksimile des griechischen Papyrus Bodmer XI*, 1980, 64 p.
- 25.3 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band III: Forschungsgeschichtliche Bibliographie 1799-1984 mit kritischen Anmerkungen. Mit einem Beitrag von Majella Franzmann: A Study of the Odes of Solomon with Reference to French Scholarship 1909-1980*, 1986, XXXIV-478 p.
- 25.4 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band IV*, 1998, XII-272 p.
- 46 Hornung E., *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskub. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen. Dritte Auflage*, 1982, XII-133 p.
- 50.2 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 2: Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations*, 1986, XVIII-71-1013 p.
- 50.3 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, 1992, CCXLII-1150 p.
- 50.4 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 4: Psaumes*, 2005, XLVIII-931 p.
- 50.5 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qobélet et Cantique des Cantiques*, 2015, XXVIII-974 p.
- 55 Frei P., Koch K., *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich. Zweite, bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage*, 1996, 337 p.
- 61 Engel H., *Die Susanna-Erzählung. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung*, 1985, 205 p.
- 75 Schulman A.R., *Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards. Some Historical Scenes on New Kingdom Private Stelae*, 1988, XXX-223 p. + 35 fig. + 6 pl.
- 77 Utschneider H., *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz. Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25-40; Lev 8-9)*, 1988, XIV-320 p.
- 78 Gosse B., *Isaïe 13,1-14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations*, 1988, 300 p.
- 81 Beyerlin W., *Bleilot, Brecheisen oder was sonst? Revision einer Amos-Vision*, 1988, 61 p.
- 82 Hutter M., *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelbithitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6)*, 1988, 180 p.
- 85 Otto E., *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch». Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen*, 1989, IV-209 p.
- 89 Abitz F., *Baugeschichte und Dekoration des Grabes Ramses' VI.*, 1989, 196 p.
- 90 Henninger J., *Arabica Varia. Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. Contributions à l'histoire culturelle de l'Arabie et de ses régions limitrophes*, 1989, 498 p.
- 92 O'Brien M.A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. A Reassessment*, 1989, XIV-319 p.

- 94 Cortese E., *Josua 13-21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, 1990, VI-122 p.
- 96 Wiese A.B., *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*, 1990, XVI-207 p. + XXXII Taf.
- 98 Scharf A., *Mose und Israel im Konflikt. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüsten-erzählungen*, 1990, VI-284 p.
- 100 Keel O., Shuval M., Uehlinger C., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band III: Die Frühe Eisenzeit. Ein Workshop*, 1990, XIV-458 p. + XXII Taf.
- 103 Schenker A., *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, 1991, VIII-302 p.
- 105 Osumi Y., *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b-23,33*, 1991, XII-273 p.
- 107 Staubli T., *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn*, 1991, XII-308 p. + 125 Abb.
- 109 Norton G.J., Pisano S. (eds), *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, 1991, XII-310 p. + VII pl.
- 114 Schneider T., *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*, 1992, XIV-482 p.
- 115 von Nordheim E., *Die Selbstbehauptung Israels in der Welt des Alten Orients. Religions-geschichtlicher Vergleich anhand von Gen 15/22/28, dem Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten, 2 Sam 7, 1 Kön 19 und Psalm 104*, 1992, VI-220 p.
- 117 Richards F.V., *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*, 1992, XII-138 p. + XIII pl.
- 118 Goldman Y., *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie*, 1992, XIV-259 p.
- 119 Krapf T.M., *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit. Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernach-lässigte Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion*, 1992, XX-351 p.
- 123 Zwickel W. (ed.), *Biblische Welten. Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburts-tag*, 1993, XII-248 p. + VIII Taf.
- 125 Sass B., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991*, 1993, XXIV-336 p.
- 126 Bartelmus R., Krüger T., Utzschneider H. (eds), *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 1993, X-401 p.
- 127 Ivantchik A.I., *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*, 1993, 325 p.
- 128 Voss J., *Die Menora. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem*, 1993, 112 p.
- 131 Burkert W., Stolz F. (eds), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, 1994, 123 p.
- 132 Mathys H.-P., *Dichter und Beter. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit*, 1994, X-374 p.
- 135 Keel O., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV. Mit Registern zu den Bänden I-IV*, 1994, XII-325 p. + 23 Taf.
- 136 Stipp H.-J., *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches. Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte*, 1994, VIII-186 p.
- 137 Eschweiler P., *Bildzauber im alten Ägypten. Die Verwendung von Bildern und Gegen-ständen in magischen Handlungen nach den Texten des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches*, 1994, X-371 p. + XXVI Taf.
- 143 Bieberstein K., *Josua - Jordan - Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Land-nahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6*, 1995, XII-483 p.

- 144 Maier C., *Die «fremde Frau» in Proverbien 1-9. Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie*, 1995, XII-296 p.
- 145 Steymans H.U., *Deuteronomium 28 und die «adè» zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*, 1995, XII-425 p.
- 146 Abitz F., *Pharao als Gott in den Unterweltbüchern des Neuen Reiches*, 1995, VIII-219 p.
- 148 Bachmann M., *Die strukturalistische Artefakt- und Kunstanalyse. Exposition der Grundlagen anhand der vorderorientalischen, ägyptischen und griechischen Kunst*, 1996, 80 p.
- 150 Staehelin E., Jaeger B. (eds), *Ägypten-Bilder. Akten des «Symposiums zur Ägypten-Rezeption», Augst bei Basel, vom 9.-11. September 1993*, 1997, 383 p. + 96 Taf.
- 152 Rossier F., *L'intercession entre les hommes dans la Bible hébraïque. L'intercession entre les hommes aux origines de l'intercession auprès de Dieu*, 1996, XIV-380 p.
- 153 Kratz R.G., Krüger T. (eds), *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld. Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck*, 1997, 139 p.
- 154 Bosshard-Nepustil E., *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit*, 1997, XIV-521 p.
- 156 Wagner A., *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, 1997, VIII-199 p.
- 157 Artus O., *Études sur le livre des Nombres. Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*, 1997, X-298 p.
- 158 Böhler D., *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras Alpha und Esra-Nehemia. Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels*, 1997, XIV-435 p.
- 159 Oswald W., *Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinai-perikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund*, 1998, X-286 p.
- 160.5 Veenhof K.R., Eidem J., *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen 5*, 2008, 382 p.
- 163 Bietenhard S.K., *Des Königs General. Die Heerführertraditionen in der vorstaatlichen und frühen staatlichen Zeit und die Joabgestalt in 2 Sam 2-20; 1 Kön 1-2*, 1998, XIV-363 p.
- 164 Braun J., *Die Musikkultur Altisraels/Palästinas. Studien zu archäologischen, schriftlichen und vergleichenden Quellen*, 1999, XII-388 p.
- 167 Bollweg J., *Vorderasiatische Wagentypen im Spiegel der Terracottaplastik bis zur Altbabylonischen Zeit*, 1999, X-206 p.
- 168 Rose M., *Rien de nouveau. Nouvelles approches du livre de Qohéleth. Avec une bibliographie (1988-1998) élaborée par Béatrice Perregaux Allison*, 1999, 629 p.
- 171 Macchi J.-D., *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49*, 1999, XIV-380 p.
- 172 Schenker A., *Recht und Kult im Alten Testament. Achtzehn Studien*, 2000, X-208 p.
- 173 Theuer G., *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24*, 2000, XVIII-657 p.
- 174 Spieser C., *Les noms du Pharaon comme êtres autonomes au Nouvel Empire*, 2000, XII-398 p.
- 176 de Pury A., Römer T. (eds), *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen*, 2000, VI-189 p.
- 177 Egger J., *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14. The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present*, 2000, VIII-143 p.
- 178 Keel O., Staub U., *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV.*, 2000, XII-147 p.
- 179 Goldman Y., Uehlinger C. (eds), *La double transmission du texte biblique. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2001, VI-114 p.
- 180 Zwingenberger U., *Dorfkultur der frühen Eisenzeit in Mittelpalästina*, 2001, XX-593 p.

- 181 Tita H., *Gelübde als Bekenntnis. Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament*, 2001, XVI-251 p.
- 182 Bosse-Griffiths K., *Amarna Studies and Other Selected Papers. Edited by J. Gwyn Griffiths*, 2001, IV-244 p.
- 183 Reinmuth T., *Der Bericht Nehemias. Zur literarischen Eigenart, traditionsgeschichtliche Prägung und innerbiblischen Rezeption des Ich-Berichts Nehemias*, 2002, XIV-383 p.
- 184 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel II*, 2002, XII-194 p.
- 185 Roth S., *Gebietlerin aller Länder. Die Rolle der königlichen Frauen in der fiktiven und realen Aussenpolitik des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 2002, XII-168 p.
- 186 Hübner U., Knauf E.A. (eds), *Kein Land für sich allein. Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebirnäri für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2002, VIII-331 p.
- 187 Riede P., *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel*, 2002, XII-364 p.
- 188 Schellenberg A., *Erkenntnis als Problem. Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen*, 2002, XII-333 p.
- 189 Meurer G., *Die Feinde des Königs in den Pyramiden-texten*, 2002, X-404 p.
- 190 Maussion M., *Le mal, le bien et le jugement de Dieu dans le livre de Qohélet*, 2003, VIII-199 p.
- 192 Koenen K., *Bethel. Geschichte, Kult und Theologie*, 2003, X-251 p.
- 193 Junge F., *Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, 2003, 286 p.
- 194 Lefebvre J.-F., *Le jubilé biblique. Lv 25 - exégèse et théologie*, 2003, XII-443 p.
- 195 Wettengel W., *Die Erzählung von den beiden Brüdern. Der Papyrus d'Orbiney und die Königsideologie der Ramessiden*, 2003, VI-301 p.
- 196 Vonach A., Fischer G. (eds), *Horizonte biblischer Texte. Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag*, 2003, XII-316 p.
- 197 Porter B.N., *Trees, Kings, and Politics. Studies in Assyrian Iconography*, 2003, XVI-113 p. + 33 pl.
- 199 Schenker A., *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*, 2004, XXII-197 p.
- 200 Keel-Leu H., Teissier B., *Die vorderasiatischen Rollsiegel der Sammlungen «Bibel+Orient» der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. The Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals of the Collections «Bibel+Orient» of the University of Fribourg*, 2004, XXII-472 p.
- 201 Alkier S., Witte M. (eds), *Die Griechen und das antike Israel. Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Religions- und Kulturgeschichte des Heiligen Landes*, 2004, X-199 p.
- 202 Sayed Mohamed Z., *Festvorbereitungen. Die administrativen und ökonomischen Grundlagen altägyptischer Feste*, 2004, XVI-185 p.
- 204 Cornelius I., *The Many Faces of the Goddess. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qadeshet, and Asherah c. 1500-1000 BCE*, 2008, XVI-216 p. + 77 pl.
- 205 Morenz L.D., *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen. Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens*, 2004, XXII-373 p.
- 206 Dietrich W. (ed.), *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettreit. Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuchs*, 2004, 312 p.
- 207 Himbaza I., *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte. Études des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 2004, XIV-354 p.
- 208 Isler-Kerényi C., *Civilizing Violence Satyrns on 6th-Century Greek Vases*, 2004, XII-123 p.
- 209 Schipper B.U., *Die Erzählung des Wenamun. Ein Literaturwerk im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Geschichte und Religion*, 2005, XII-383 p. + XII Taf.

- 210 Suter C.E., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Crafts and Images in Contact. Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE*, 2005, XXXII-395 p. + LIV pl.
- 211 Léonas A., *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, 2005, X-340 p.
- 212 Strawn B.A., *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 2005, XXX-587 p.
- 214 Böhler D., Himbaza I., Hugo P. (eds), *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2005, XXXII-472 p.
- 215 O'Connell S., *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polygot Bible*, 2006, XII-178 p.
- 216 Meyer-Dietrich E., *Senebi und Selbst. Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches*, 2006, XII-438 p.
- 217 Hugo P., *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18*, 2006, XXII-389 p.
- 218 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*, 2006, XXIV-254 p.
- 219 Knigge C., *Das Lob der Schöpfung. Die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich*, 2006, XII-365 p.
- 220 Schroer S. (ed.), *Images and Gender. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art*, 2006, 383 p. + 29 pl.
- 221 Stark C., «Kultprostitution» im Alten Testament? Die Qedeschen der Hebräischen Bibel und das Motiv der Hurerei, 2006, X-249 p.
- 222 Pruin D., *Geschichten und Geschichte. Isebel als literarische und historische Gestalt*, 2006, XII-398 p.
- 223 Coulange P., *Dieu, ami des pauvres. Étude sur la connivence entre le Très-Haut et les petits*, 2007, XVI-282 p.
- 224 Wagner A. (ed.), *Parallelismus membrorum*, 2007, VIII-300 p.
- 225 Herrmann C., *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen aus Qantir. Band II: Katalog der Sammlung des Franciscan Biblical Museum, Jerusalem und zweier Privatsammlungen*, 2007, X-125 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 226 Heise J., *Erinnern und Gedenken. Aspekte der biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, 2007, IV-385 p.
- 227 Frey-Anthes H., *Unheilsmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger. Vorstellungen von «Dämonen» im alten Israel*, 2007, XIV-363 p.
- 228 Becking B., *From David to Gedaliah. The Book of Kings as Story and History*, 2007, XII-227 p.
- 229 Dubiel U., *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen. Studien zu Typologie und Tragsitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich*, 2008, XVI-270 p. + XVIII Taf.
- 230 Giovino M., *The Assyrian Sacred Tree. A History of Interpretations*, 2007, VIII-242 p. + 107 fig.
- 231 Kübel P., *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung*, 2007, X-238 p.
- 232 Paz S., *Drums, Women, and Goddesses. Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel*, 2007, XII-143 p.
- 233 Himbaza I., Schenker A. (eds), *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible. Du texte à la théologie au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, 2007, X-151 p.
- 234 Tavares R., *Eine königliche Weisheitslehre? Exegetische Analyse von Sprüche 28-29 und Vergleich mit den ägyptischen Lehren Merikaras und Amenemhats*, 2007, XIV-306 p.
- 235 Witte M., Diehl J.F. (eds), *Israeliten und Phönizier. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel der Archäologie und der Literatur des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 2008, VIII-295 p.



- 236 Müller-Roth M., *Das Buch vom Tage*, 2008, XII-603 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 237 Sowada K.N., *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom. An Archaeological Perspective*, 2009, XXIV-309 p. + 48 fig. + 19 pl.
- 238 Kraus W., Munnich O. (eds), *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie. Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale. Texte der Septuaginta in Doppelüberlieferung oder in wörtlicher Übersetzung*, 2009, XII-307 p.
- 239 Mittermayer C., *Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata. Ein ungleicher Wettstreit*, 2009, VIII-386 p. + XIX Taf.
- 240 Waraksa E.A., *Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct. Context and Ritual Function*, 2009, XII-246 p.
- 241 Ben-Shlomo D., *Philistine Iconography. A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*, 2010, X-232 p.
- 242 LeMon J.M., *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms. Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts*, 2010, XIV-231 p.
- 243 El Hawary A., *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*, 2010, XII-499 p. + XXIV pl.
- 244 Wälchli S.H., *Gottes Zorn in den Psalmen. Eine Studie zur Rede vom Zorn Gottes in den Psalmen im Kontext des Alten Testaments und des Alten Orients*, 2012, VIII-191 p.
- 245 Steymans H.U. (ed.), *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden. Gilgamesch: Epic and Iconography*, 2010, XII-452 p.
- 246 Petter D.L., *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*, 2011, XVI-198 p.
- 247 Fischer E., *Tell el-Far'ah (Süd). Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 2011, X-430 p.
- 248 Petit T., *Cedipe et le Chérubin. Les sphinx levantins, cypriotes et grecs comme gardiens d'Immortalité*, 2011, X-291 p. + 191 fig.
- 249 Dietrich W. (ed.), *Seitenblicke. Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch*, 2011, 459 p.
- 250 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Langlois M. (eds), *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. Actes du colloque organisé par les chaires d'Assyriologie et des Milieux bibliques du Collège de France, Paris, les 6 et 7 avril 2009*, 2011, VI-360 p.
- 251 Jaques M. (ed.), *Klagetraditionen. Form und Funktion der Klage in den Kulturen der Antike*, 2011, VIII-110 p.
- 252 Langlois M., *Le texte de Josué 10. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique*, 2011, 266 p.
- 253 Béré P., *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh. Un portrait exégétique de Josué dans le livre éponyme*, 2012, XVI-275 p.
- 254 Kilunga B., *Prééminence de YHWH ou autonomie du prophète. Étude comparative et critique des confessions de Jérémie dans le texte hébreu massorétique et la «Septante»*, 2011, XVI-216 p.
- 255 Gruber M., Ahituv S., Lehmann G., Talshir Z. (eds), *All the Wisdom of the East. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, 2012, XXVIII-475-85\* p.
- 256 Mittermayer C., Ecklin S. (eds), *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*, 2012, XVIII-452 p.
- 257 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Hutzli J. (eds), *Les vivants et leurs morts. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 14-15 avril 2010*, 2012, X-287 p.

- 258 Thompson R.J., *Terror of the Radiance. Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant*, 2013, X-260 p.
- 259 Asher-Greve J.M., Westenholz J.G., *Goddesses in Context. On Divine Powers, Roles, Relationships and Gender in Mesopotamian Textual and Visual Sources*, 2013, XII-454 p.
- 260 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Vol. 2: Texts*, 2013, XIV-743 p.
- 261 Braun-Holzinger E.A., *Frühe Götterdarstellungen in Mesopotamien*, 2013, X-238 p. + 46 pl.
- 263 Sugimoto D.T. (ed.), *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar - Astarte - Aphrodite*, 2014, XIV-228 p.
- 264 Morenz L.D., *Anfänge der ägyptischen Kunst. Eine problemgeschichtliche Einführung in ägyptologische Bild-Anthropologie*, 2014, XVIII-257 p.
- 265 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Bürki M. (eds), *Comment devient-on prophète? Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 4-5 avril 2011*, 2014, XII-223 p.
- 266 Michel P.M., *La culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite*, 2014, VIII-312 p.
- 267 Frevel C., Pyschny K., Cornelius I. (eds), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, 2014, X-440 p.
- 268 Bleibtreu E., Steymans H.U. (eds), *Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag. A Centenary Volume*, 2014, XVI-642 p.
- 269 Lohwasser A. (ed.), *Skarabäen des 1. Jahrtausends. Ein Workshop in Münster am 27. Oktober 2012*, 2014, VI-200 p.
- 270 Wagner A. (ed.), *Göttliche Körper - Göttliche Gefühle. Was leisten anthropomorphe und antropopathische Götterkonzepte im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament?*, 2014, X-273 p.
- 271 Heintz J.-G., *Prophétisme et Alliance. Des Archives royales de Mari à la Bible hébraïque*, 2015, XXXVI-373 p.
- 272 von der Osten-Sacken E., *Untersuchungen zur Geflügelwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, 2015, XVI-670 p.
- 273 Jaques M., *Mon dieu qu'ai-je fait? Les diğir-ša-dab<sub>(5)</sub>-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*, 2015, XIV-463 p.
- 274 Durand J.-M., Guichard M., Römer T. (eds), *Tabou et transgressions. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 11-12 avril 2012*, 2015, XII-314 p.
- 275 Himbaza I. (ed.), *Making the Biblical Text. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible*, 2015, XIV-192 p.
- 276 Schmid K., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Laws of Heaven - Laws of Nature: Legal Interpretations of Cosmic Phenomena in the Ancient World. Himmelsgesetze - Naturgesetze: Rechtsförmige Interpretationen kosmischer Phänomene in der antiken Welt*, 2016, X-177 p.
- 277 Wasmuth M. (ed.), *Handel als Medium von Kulturkontakt. Akten des interdisziplinären altertumswissenschaftlichen Kolloquiums (Basel, 30.-31. Oktober 2009)*, 2015, VIII-175 p.
- 278 Durand J.-M., Marti L., Römer T. (eds), *Colères et repentirs divins. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 24 et 25 avril 2013*, 2015, X-393 p.
- 279 Schütte W., *Israels Exil in Juda. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Schriftprophetie*, 2016, X-270 p.
- 280 Bonfiglio R.P., *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies*, 2016, XIV-364 p.
- 281 Rückl J., *A Sure House. Studies on the Dynastic Promise to David in the Books of Samuel and Kings*, 2016, VIII-356 p.
- 282 Schroer S., Münger S. (eds), *Khirbet Qeiyafa in the Shephelah. Papers Presented at a Colloquium of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies Held at the University of Bern, September 6, 2014*, 2017, IV-168 p.

- 283 Jindo J.Y., Sommer B.D., Staubli T. (eds), *Yehezkel Kaufmann and the Reinvention of Jewish Biblical Scholarship*, 2017, XVIII-376 p.
- 284 Nocquet D.R., *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah. Territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque*, 2017, X-354 p.
- 285 Kipfer S. (ed.), *Visualizing Emotions in the Ancient Near East*, 2017, VIII-294 p.
- 286 Römer T., Dufour B., Pfitzmann F., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Entre dieux et hommes: anges, démons et autres figures intermédiaires. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 19 et 20 mai 2014*, 2017, XII-367 p.
- 287 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L. (eds), *Représenter dieux et hommes dans le Proche-Orient ancien et dans la Bible. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 5 et 6 mai 2015*, 2019, XII-386 p.
- 288 Wyssmann P., *Vielfältig geprägt. Das spätperserzeitliche Samaria und seine Münzbilder*, 2019, XII-368 p.
- 289 Anthonioz S., Mouton A., Petit D. (eds), *When Gods Speak to Men. Divine Speech according to Textual Sources in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin*, 2019, X-138 p.
- 290 Wasserman N., *The Flood: The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary and a Literary Discussion*, 2020, X-187 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Briend J., Humbert J.-B. (eds), *Tell Keisan (1971-1976), une cité phénicienne en Galilée*, 1980, XXXVIII-392 p. + 142 pl.
- 5 Müller-Winkler C., *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette. Mit Publikation der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, ehemals Sammlung Fouad S. Matouk*, 1987, 590 p. + XL Taf.
- 12 Wiese A.B., *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie*, 1996, XXII-194 p. + 93 Taf.
- 14 Amiet P., Briend J., Courtois L., Dumortier J.-B., *Tell el Far'ab. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie*, 1996, IV-91 p.
- 18 Nunn A., *Die figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, 2000, XII-269 p. + 78 Taf.
- 19 Bignasca A.M., *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche*, 2000, XII-324 p.
- 20 Beyer D., *Emar IV: Les Sceaux. Mission archéologique de Meskéné-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata*, 2001, XXII-490 p. + 50 pl.
- 21 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 3: Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaras zur Zeit der Archive von Mari<sub>(2)</sub> und Šubat-enlil/Šehnā*, 2001, 298 p. + 14 maps
- 22 Herrmann C., *Die ägyptischen Amulette der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. Anthropomorphe Gestalten und Tiere*, 2003, X-291 p.
- 23 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 4: Vorbericht 1988-2001*, 2003, 253 p. + 8 Pläne
- 24 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band III*, 2006, XII-359 p.
- 25 Egger J., Keel O., *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Persezeit*, 2006, XVIII-510 p.
- 26 Kaelin O., «Modell Ägypten». *Adoption von Innovationen im Mesopotamien des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, 2006, 204 p.
- 27 Ben-Tor D., *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*, 2007, XVI-211 p. + 109 pl.
- 28 Meyer J.-W., *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem 'Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder*, 2008, X-655 p.
- 29 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton*, 2010, XIV-642 p.
- 30 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh I: The Excavation of the 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit and the Cult Stands*, 2010, XII-297 p. + 176 pl.
- 31 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band III: Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir*, 2010, VI-461 p.
- 32 Rohn K., *Beschriftete mesopotamische Siegel der Frühdynastischen und der Akkad-Zeit*, 2011, XIV-385 p. + 66 pl.
- 33 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band IV: Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche*, 2013, XVI-715 p.
- 34 Golani A., *Jewelry from the Iron Age II Levant*, 2013, XII-313 p.
- 35 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band V: Von Tel el-Idham bis Tel Kitan*, 2017, XVIII-672 p.

- 36 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit*, 2015, XIV-288 p. + 63 pl.
- 37 Choi G.D., *Decoding Canaanite Pottery Paintings from the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I. Classification and Analysis of Decorative Motifs and Design Structures - Statistics, Distribution Patterns - Cultural and Socio-Political Implications*, 2016, XII-272 p. + CD.
- 38 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV: Von der Spätbronzezeit IIB bis in römische Zeit*, 2016, XVI-510 p.
- 39 Keel O., *700 Skarabäen und Verwandtes aus Palästina/Israel. Die Sammlung Keel*, 2020, XX-319 p.
- 40 Attinger P., Cavigneaux A., Mittermayer C., Novák M. (eds), *Text and Image. Proceedings of the 61e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Geneva and Bern, 22-26 June 2015*, 2018, XXIV-526 p.

#### ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SUBSIDIA LINGUISTICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Van Damme D., *Altarmenische Kurzgrammatik*, 2004, X-149 p.