Torijano Morales, Pablo A., and Andrés Piquer Otero, eds.

Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense

Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 158

Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pp. xxviii + 427. Hardcover. €155.00. ISBN 9789004219076.

Andrea Ravasco
Deutsche Schule Genua
Genoa, Italy

The volume is a Festschrift dedicated to Julio Trebolle Barrera on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday. As Florentino García Martínez writes in the *Tabula gratulatoria* ("Recollections: A Scholarly Profile of Julio C. Trebolle Barrera"), Trebolle Barrera is a Spanish scholar best known for his work on the Septuagint, the Old Latin version, the Hebrew biblical texts from Qumran, and the historical books of the Bible. He is a contributor to the critical editions for the books of Kings both in Greek (Septuaginta-Unternehmen of Göttingen) and Hebrew (Oxford Hebrew Bible Project).

The volume includes twenty-three essays by well-known scholars in the fields of textual criticism, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls. A bibliography of Trebolle Barrera (about 130 works) closes the volume.

In "Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1," Anneli Aejmelaeus deals with the interdependence between textual criticism and textual history. She presents examples from the story of Hannah in 1 Samuel in order to demonstrate that "both corruption and deliberate editing, involving theological or ideological tendency, have taken place in the Masoretic textual tradition" (5–6). Through examples taken from 1 Sam 1:9; 11; 13; 14; 18; 23; 24, and the comparison with LXX and 4QSam[a], Aejmelaeus

observes that MT in these passages contains both corruption and correction, revealing editorial measures and a late editorial layer as a result of theological or ideological motivation. She proposes a date for these corrections around the first century B.C.E. She concludes that this indicates that the books of Samuel "was not yet considered to be 'canonical' in the sense of being sacred Scripture and being authoritative and unchangeable in its wording" (17).

A. Graeme Auld, in "David's Census: Some Textual and Literary Links," presents a comparison between 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21. The two versions about David's census present some differences. Graeme Auld concludes, "It may be that 1 Chr 21 has been written from 2 Sam 24 with close and purposeful attention to a series of passages elsewhere in Samuel" (33). Both 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21 include several expansions from shorter and earlier forms of these texts, and several of the key differences between the texts result from rewriting.

Hans Ausloos's "The Septuagint's Rendering of the Hebrew Toponyms as an Indication of the Translation Technique of the Book of Numbers" analyzes the rendering of the toponyms in Num 11:1–3, 34; 13:24; 20:13 and 27:14; 21:3. The translation of names as Taberah with "Burning," Kibroth-hattaavah with "Tombs of craving," Eshcol with "Cluster Ravine," and Hormah with "Anathema" demonstrates that the translator of Numbers "chooses to consistently translate (and thus not to transliterate) every toponym that occurs within an etiology, in order to emphasize the connection between the place name and the incident related" (49). Thus, the phenomenon of the wordplay demonstrates the translation relevance as a *content-related* criterion.

George J. Brooke ("4QGenesis[d] Reconsidered"), on the basis of material remains, scribal evidence, and the interpretation of Genesis in the sectarian and nonsectarian literature, suggests that 4QGenesis[d] (4Q4), surviving in only a single fragment, could not have been a complete copy of the book of Genesis. Furthermore, it was a short manuscript and contained only a few chapters of Genesis (from Gen 1:1 to Gen 4 or 5 or a little farther) that were of little concern to sectarian interpreters, indicating a shift in the approach to Genesis among some sectarians in the second half of the first century B.C.E.

Devorah Dimant, in "Abraham the Astrologer at Qumran? Observations on *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225 2 I 3–8)," deals with the rewriting technique of 4Q225 that implies the view that Abraham was versed in astrology. As the Qumranites were themselves versed in astrology and *Biblical Antiquities*, Philo, and rabbinic literature are familiar with the tradition of Abraham the astrologer, the detail regarding the observation of the stars in 4Q225 illustrates one aspect of the "rewriting the Bible" technique.

In "Ancient Interpretations of Jewish Scriptures in Light of Dead Sea Scrolls," Florentino García Martínez and Marc Vervenne focus on the concept of what one may not consider as "Scripture" but "Interpretation of Scripture." In the Dead Sea Scroll, for example, one finds books that are considered authoritative. Paying more attention to the authoritative strategies used by each composition to affirm its authority could be a way to solve the problem. The authors conclude that the production of Jewish religious authoritative texts was still an ongoing process, and a correct way to look at the evidence is "to try to understand it from the perspective and with the categories of the people who put together the collection" (97).

Ronald S. Hendel's "The Two Editions of the Royal Chronology in Kings" deals with the double edition of the royal chronology (MT and LXX), which derives, according to him, from divergent understandings of the chronological implication of 1 Kgs 16:23. His analysis attempts to clarify the relationships between the proto-MT and proto-LXX textual traditions. Hendel argues that the proto-LXX tradition is secondary because this edition of the chronology from the reign of Omri to Jehu is a systematic revision of the proto-MT chronology.

Philippe Hugo, Ingo Kottsieper, and Annette Steudel, in "Reflections on Epigraphy and Critical Editing of 4QSamᵃ (4Q51) Col. XI," present here a second study dedicated to the analysis of the *editio princeps* of the Scrolls of Samuel (DJD XVII). The first one was edited in *Revue de Qumran* 23 (2007). The authors indicate an important way to revise DJD XVII. After a very careful paleographical analysis of three fragments in which they correct DJD editors' readings, they discuss the placement of the fragments in the column. As they present two possible reconstructions of column XI, they give important conclusions. I point out here that readings and reconstructions should be clearly distinguished, thus the presentation should make the distinction of edition and reconstruction clear.

Jan Joosten, in "Textual History and Linguistic Developments. The Doublet in 2 Kgs 8:28–29 // 9:15–16 in Light of 2 Chr 22:5–6," deals with the hypothesis that, on the basis of linguistic evidence (i.e., the use of subject—*qatal* clauses and the use of causal-circumstantial clauses with a participle), the earliest version is the one wrapped into the story of Jehu's revolt in 2 Kgs 9; next came the version in 2 Chronicles; finally, "the version in 2 Kgs 8:28–28 results from a kind of reflux from Chronicles to Kings" (137). The language of 2 Kgs 9 coheres with the Classical Biblical Hebrew of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, while the language of 2 Chr 22:5–6 and 2 Kgs 9:15–16 has features typical of the Late Biblical Hebrew of Chronicles. The Chronicler used the first member of the doublet and not the second, and the doublet can be traced back to secondary influence of the text of Chronicles on that of Kings.

Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, in "The Text of the Shema Yisrael in Qumran Literature and Elsewhere," study the textual history of Deut 6:4–9 as a result of their work on the quotations of and allusions to Jewish scriptures. They analyze the textual witnesses of the Shema Yisrael and give a list of variant readings; the analysis shows that the Hebrew textual tradition of Deut 6:4–5 was more stable in the Second Temple period than the one of Deut 6:6–9. The authors find a shorter textual tradition of 6:4–5, mostly attested by Hebrew tradition and more stable; and a longer one, mostly preserved through its Greek translation and more fluid. According to Lange and Weigold, on the basis of Nash Papyrus, Jews of the Second Temple period understood the Shema as a monotheistic statement. Furthermore, the textual stability of 6:4–5 was due to its daily liturgical use.

Timothy Michael Law's "An Often Neglected Witness to the Textual History of the Septuagint: The Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms" deals with the evaluation of the Syrohexapla as a witness to the hexaplaric materials in 3 Kingdoms. Law offers many interesting suggestions, including the possibility that Symmachus became the reviser of choice for Christians, while Aquila was for Jews, and the possibility that Antiochian manuscripts were used in the translation of the Syrohexapla. Furthermore, he affirms that the hexaplaric tradition is overwhelmingly preserved in the Syrohexapla when compared to the other witnesses, and the Syrohexapla is the best witness to the hexaplaric materials in 3 Kingdoms.

In "Critique textuelle et critique historique: Remarques méthodologiques et exemples," André Lemaire presents three examples from 2 Kings (23:29a; 24:2; 23:33a). He affirms that it is impossible to do textual criticism independently from historical criticism, and historical criticism can shed light on textual criticism. For example, the reading "Aram" in 2 Kgs 24:2 is an anachronism: West Semitic epigraphy helps us to understand the history of ancient Israel and accordingly the textual criticism.

Likewise Bénédicte Lemmelijn's "Influence of a So-Called P-Redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exodus 7–11? Finding Oneself at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism" deals with the relationship between textual criticism and literary criticism. She presents the so-called "major expansions" witnessed by SamP, 4QpaleoExod[m], and 4QExod[j] of the "Plague Narrative" in Exod 7–11. According to her, on the basis of the insertion of Aaron, the expansions are part of the activity of "P as redaction." P is to be seen as a "redaction" that also reworked, complemented, and integrated the existing material at hand. In conclusion, she writes: "Should we not ultimately accept the possibility that the work of scribes also comprised the further updating, recontextualization and evolution—in short, actual literary composition—of the text through their own redactional activity?" (221).

Johan Lust's "The King/Prince of Tyre in Ezekiel 28:11–19 in Hebrew and in Greek" deals with the difficult passage of the oracle in Ezek 28:11–19. Lust presents the suggestions of other scholars. Differences between LXX and MT are explained by Bogaert, and partly by Wilson, on the basis of literary criticism, whereas by Barr on the basis of textual criticism. The use of *arkōn* in the Old Greek for translating the Hebrew *melek* supports Bogaert's theory, "suggesting that the original oracle was addressed to the high priest-ruler in Jerusalem" (233). In conclusion, although the oracle in Ezek 28:11–19 remains enigmatic, Old Greek preserved the proto-Masoretic text, as read by Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion. MT represents a late stage in the development of the text.

In "Zadokite Interpolators at Work: A Note on *CD* III,21–IV,4," Corrado Martone discusses the distinction of the Zadokites from other priests according to the biblical quotation of Ezra 44:15 in the Damascus Document. Martone suggests that the attitude of the Teacher of Righteousness confirms that "in Second Temple times ideological polemics led to deliberate alterations in the biblical text" (238), as proposed by A. Geiger in 1857.

A long essay by Andrés Piquer Otero, "Who Names the Namers? The Interpretation of Necromantic Terms in Jewish Translations of the Bible," deals with the meaning of the Hebrew *ʾōb* that reflects ideas of interest on mantic and necromantic practices in the LXX, rabbinic sources, and versions. After a very thorough analysis, the author concludes that most versions and interpreters considered *ʾōb* and *yiddᵉʿōnî* a pair in which different meanings could be inserted. Two items seem to be associated with the pair: the mediumnic activity of a spirit, and summoning a spirit of the dead via incantation or "naming." Furthermore, the interpretation of *ʾōb* and *yiddᵉʿōnî* both in the LXX and rabbinic traditions seem to combine actualization and preservation of ancient elements of ancient Near Eastern culture.

Émile Puech's "Glanures épigraphiques: Le livre des Proverbes et le livre de Job à Qumran" presents some corrections of the readings proposed by previous scholars of 6Q30, 4Q99, 4Q100, and 11QTgJob. According to Puech, the unclassified fragment 6Q30 corresponds to Prov 11:2, 5–7, 10–11a, 12a and witnesses, as already proposed by H. Eshel in 2003, a third copy of the book of Proverbs. Furthermore, Puech presents here some remarks about the fragments of the book of Job (4Q 99–100) and 11QTgJob. The Targum of Job found at Qumran, according to Puech, contains "qumranian adjustments," possibly because of the background of the persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness by the opponents of the temple.

Adrian Schenker, in "Nach dem Exil wurden im Land Israel zwei Tempel errichtet: Ist der Bericht 1 Esdr 5:49 vom Tempelbau der Völker des Landes die älteste literarische

Erwähnung des Tempels in Samarien?” compares the deuterocanonical Greek text of 1 Ezr 5:49 with Vetus Latina and Peshitta. In MT 1 Ezr 5:49 is parallel to Ezr 3:3, but the Greek text of 1 Ezr 5:49 does not have the original form of the text. The “Textform” of 1 Ezr 5 is probably older and more original that the corresponding Hebrew text of Ezr 3:3.

Mark S. Smith’s “Textual Interpretation in 7th–6th Century Israel: Between Competition, Textualisation, and Tradition” deals with some passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel referring to prophecy given in the name of Yahweh as that “which I did not command.” According to Smith, at this time the distinction between text and its interpretation was not yet fully decoupled; thus, interpretation perhaps developed as an issue in these texts in combination with their production. A parallel is found in an Akkadian pseudonymous letter where divine authority “stands behind the human voice represented as asserting the claim” (322).

Pablo A. Torijano Morales, in “The Contribution of the Antiochean Text to Text Criticism in Kings: Rahlf’s Study of the Lucianic Recension Revisited (1 Kgs 1:3,36,40,41,45),” presents a preliminary edition of some verses of 3 Kingdoms that differs in several points from Rahlfs’s manual edition. As Rahlfs explained Lucianic readings as deviations from the standard text of LXX, Torijano Morales shows the necessity of reconsidering the Lucianic evidence and rethinking the text-critical approach to the Septuagint of Kings. The Lucianic text in some sections is the only surviving witness of a text very close to the Old Greek.

Emmanuel Tov’s “The Chapter and Section Divisions in Esther” deals with scribal systems for dividing the biblical books into section units. As the *setumah* and *petuhah* systems are recognized in ancient texts, the division reflected the exegesis of the scribes. Comparing different manuscripts, editions, and commentaries of Esther, Tov shows the different logic behind the chapter and section divisions. All these divisions are subjective, and in the case of the section divisions, they reflect the exegesis of one or more scribes.

In “The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh[a],” Eugene Ulrich deals with Deut 27:4. Here Old Latin, Samaritan Pentateuch, and a small scroll fragment of uncertain origin attest the reading “Mount Gerizim,” whereas MT and LXX witness the reading “Mount Ebal.” Furthermore, 4QJudg[a] presents perhaps the earliest extant witness to the locality of the first altar built in the newly entered land, and this scroll may not specify locality. Ulrich, criticizing the suggestions of Kristin De Troyer, proposes that at an early stage Deut 27 may not have mentioned a specific place for that first altar. At a second stage, someone added “on Mount Gerizim,” documented in the Samaritan Pentateuch. At a third stage, “Mount Gerizim” was replaced with the odd and problematic “Mount Ebal,” thus considering “Mount Ebal” a sectarian reading as well as “Mount Gerizim.”

James C. VanderKam's "Another Citation of Greek *Jubilees*" presents a comparison between the Greek catena on Gen 50:25–26 and the Ge'ez version of Jub. 46:6–12a, 47:1. The catenist calls upon Jubilees to clarify and amplify the situation and wording of the text. After a very thorough word-by-word analysis, VanderKam concludes that the Greek citation supplies two superior readings and documents what a careful translation the Ethiopic version is.

The volume contains valuable contributions. Scholars of Qumran and textual criticism will find many helpful suggestions in it.