

A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torrijano Morales (eds.), *Textual Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Studies in Honour of Julio Treballe Barrera. Florilegium Complutense* (JSJ.S 157), Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012. Pp. xxviii + 427. ISBN 978-90-04-21907-6, €155.-/\$212.-.

- [1] This volume is a tribute to the work of Julio Treballe Barrera. The essay topics vary widely but all deal with Textual Criticism and/or the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some articles are highly technical, some are thematic, and several offer reflections on important problems or concepts. Two significant threads can be traced throughout the volume. The first thread is the collection of books typically organized under the rubric “Deuteronomistic History.” Almost half of the essays in the volume deal with one or more books from the DtrH. The second thread is a methodological/theoretical one. Julio Treballe Barrera has long been part of a vanguard that questioned the strict distinction between textual (lower) criticism and literary (higher) criticism. He did so because the data he encountered in his work with manuscripts, especially those from Qumran, demanded a new approach. The roles of author/editor and scribe/copyist had been previously imagined to be distinct roles. But the Qumran material shattered that assumption and Barrera was one of the first and most articulate voices to call attention to the need for a paradigm shift. The majority of the articles in this volume explore Barrera’s new methodological paradigms in innovative ways. Since it is relatively clear from the organization of the volume that these two threads were not artificially set by the editors, both serve as testaments to the ongoing significance of Barrera’s work within cutting-edge scholarship in fourteen different countries and within several different schools of thought. The articles in this volume are of high quality from beginning to end and this quality represents yet another tribute to Barrera. It was a pleasure to read the volume and it is a pleasure to recommend it. All students of the Dead Sea Scrolls and textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible will benefit. The significance of the articles certainly extends further, but the technical nature of many of the articles may limit their accessibility beyond specialists in these two fields.
- [2] Florentino García Martínez opens the volume with a series of personal reflections about Barrera. I found it especially refreshing that García Martínez chose to highlight Barrera’s deep engagements with music and literature. It would be easy to imagine, given the quality and quantity of Barrera’s work in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, that he focused on this endeavor singularly. The depth of his engagement with literature outside of the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls is impressive and inspiring.
- [3] In the first proper article in the volume, Anneli Aejmelaeus investigates textual development in the MT of 1 Sam 1. She uses her study as an opportunity to highlight that, “the borderline between textual criticism and literary criticism cannot be drawn that sharply, and in fact needs to be defined anew” (3). In offering a view of what this new definition should be, she suggests that the aims of textual criticism cannot be to determine the original or correct readings of a given passage, but to accurately tell the histories of the texts. In order to illustrate this point she shows that while the textual variants of MT 1 Sam 1 might suggest a corrupt text when taken individually, they reveal a sophisticated network of editorial corrections when taken in the aggregate. Thus, textual criticism can actually reveal a layer of theological-literary development in the

text of 1 Sam that must have come extremely late (perhaps the end of the first century B.C.E.).

- [4] A. Graeme Auld engages the possible relationships between the accounts of David's census in 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21. He performs a careful analysis of the two accounts and suggests that while it is possible either of the texts is a rewriting of the other, it seems more likely that the texts in their current forms represent multiple expansions that are derived from interactions with each other in several different episodes.
- [5] Hans Ausloos investigates the rendering of Hebrew toponyms in the LXX for clues to the translation techniques used in LXX Numbers. He examines how the translator deals with the issue of etiologies embedded in Hebrew place-names. He finds that the translator deliberately and consistently opts for translation rather than transliteration when an etiology is found within a place-name. Other place-names are consistently transliterated. He suggests that this sophisticated strategy belies characterizations of LXX-Numbers as the weakest of the Pentateuch translations.
- [6] George Brooke offers a study of 4QGenesis^D that is, in the reviewer's opinion, a shot across the bow of much Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. Many of us, including myself, have grown accustomed to claiming that approximately 200 of the scrolls are "biblical." Beyond the issue that the very term "biblical" is anachronistic at Qumran (most now recognize this), Brooke demonstrates that we may very well be mischaracterizing some of our most significant data. He shows decisively that 4QGenesis^D never contained all or even most of what we describe as the book of Genesis. Its contents probably began with Gen 1:1, but ended somewhere between chapters four and six. So in what sense is the scroll a copy of Genesis? Brooke points out, with some irony, that 4QGenesis^D seems to have contained precisely the portions of Genesis that the sectarians at Qumran found least useful or meaningful.
- [7] Devorah Dimant analyzes the figure of Abraham in *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225), focusing on the text's apparent implication that Abraham was a diviner (astrologer). She suggests that the author of 4Q225 combines the three promises of offspring to Abraham found in Gen 13:16, 15:5, and 22:17 in a way that specifically implies that Abraham is instructed to perform astrological divination. She associates this rewriting of Genesis with larger theological and literary developments during Hellenistic times. For example, she notes that, "*Jubilees* links Abraham's observations of celestial bodies with his recognition of a single God, who controls and directs their courses" (80). Other similar traditions listed by Dimant combine to suggest the existence of a lively tradition about the patriarch as astrologer in Hellenistic times.
- [8] Florentino García Martínez and Marc Vervenne address a perennial problem in Qumran scholarship: how can we distinguish between what was considered scripture and what was considered interpretation at Qumran? They begin by laying out four premises accepted by most specialists: 1) "Jewish Scriptures" at Qumran cannot be taken to mean the contents of the present Jewish Bible, 2) The use of formulae such as "Moses and the Prophets" bear witness to a process by which some works began to acquire more authority and significance than others, 3) Some of the works that were considered authoritative at Qumran are not part of the current Jewish Bible (these works came to be regarded as interpretations of Jewish Scripture at a later time and in other collections, but at Qumran they were considered scriptural), and 4) Part of the process by which a

text acquired its authority was the presence of interpretations or rewritings of it. Even when treating these theses as undisputed, they conclude that it is not possible to delineate strictly between what constituted Jewish Scriptures and their interpretations at Qumran.

- [9] Ron S. Hendel revisits the problem of chronological differences between the MT and LXX of Kings. He suggests that textual criticism can solve the problem and proposes that the double chronology between MT and LXX derives from divergent understandings of the chronological implications of one verse: 1 Kgs 16:23. A scribe in the proto-G tradition chose to render 1 Kgs 16:23 in its literal sense and in light of this systematically adjusted the remainder of the historical sequence from Omri to Jehu. In other words, while the proto-M tradition contains an inherent ambiguity over whether or not Omri's reign years should be calculated from his partial or full accession over Israel, the proto-G scribe makes a clear choice of the latter and adjusts the rest of the chronology to suit this assumption (or, to remove imperfections or ambiguities he found in the text).
- [10] Philippe Hugo, Ingo Kottsieper, and Annette Steudel offer a series of methodological reflections on the use of epigraphy for producing critical editions of texts. They use 4QSam^A as their test case. While it is clear that they have respect for the authors of the DJD edition, it is equally clear that the article is a systematic methodological critique of the edition. Their suggestions strike the reviewer as crucially important for all those who critically edit manuscripts, but they also strike the reader as most easily appreciated from the vantage point of hindsight. Among the suggestions they make, the most important are these: 1) readings and reconstructions must be clearly distinguished, 2) material aspects of the text must be fully disclosed to the reader (i.e., did the manuscript use dry lines?), 3) when choosing to reconstruct a text, all possible reconstructions that also suit the epigraphic and material remains should be listed even if one is preferred by the editor (it is now obvious that many texts contain variants that do not concur with well-known textual traditions, so editors must account for this unpredictability).
- [11] Jan Joosten contributes a sophisticated study that analyzes doublets in the book of Kings viewed in light of parallel accounts in Chronicles. While most parallels between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are demonstrably the result of Chronicles rewriting Samuel-Kings, Joosten notes that there are exceptions to this rule. He proposes to illuminate one such exception on linguistic (syntactical) grounds. He argues that while 2 Chr 22:6 is based on 2 Kgs 9:16, 2 Kgs 8:29 is nevertheless based on 2 Chr 22:6. In other words, the influence does not move in one direction only. Joosten highlights how the use of subject-*qatal* clauses in narration of sequential events is practically unattested in Classical Biblical Hebrew, while it quite normal in Late Biblical Hebrew. One finds this syntactical construction in 2 Chr 22:6 and 2 Kgs 8:29, but not in the account of the same events in 2 Kgs 9:16. He thus suggests that 2 Kgs 9:16 forms the earliest account, which is altered by 2 Chr 22. Eventually, however, 2 Chr 22 becomes the basis for 2 Kgs 8.
- [12] Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold contribute a detailed study of the text of the *Shema Yisrael* as found in quotations and allusions to Deut 6:4–9. The importance of this type of project is underlined by several other contributions in the volume. For example, García Martínez and Vervenne's essay, which suggests that the border between text and interpretation cannot be neatly drawn at

Qumran, clearly implies that one cannot exclusively use scriptural base texts as the basis for textual criticism when scriptural base texts are still very much under negotiation. Lange and Weigold survey a wide range of texts including phylacteries, *mezuzot*, “biblical” texts such as the book of Zechariah, sectarian texts such as IQS, Greek texts such as Philo of Alexandria, and the New Testament. They discover a remarkable textual stability within Deut 6:4–5, despite the fact that in the consonantal Hebrew text, the *Shema* statement is not a monotheistic but monolatric one. Surprisingly, theological rewriting of the statement towards clear monotheism is rarely attested. The authors suggest that the liturgical use of the text explains its remarkable stability: its daily use allowed scribes to memorize it better than other passages.

- [13] Timothy Michael Law offers a case study in the use of the Syrohexapla for reconstructing the history of the LXX. He explores Syh 3 Kingdoms and the data he examines underlines a conclusion reached by others: Syh cannot be treated as a “translation of the fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla.” He also concludes that while Syh is not a reliable witness to the hexaplaric materials in 3 Kingdoms, it is nevertheless the *best available*.
- [14] André Lemaire’s brief essay represents an investigation into the relationship between textual criticism and historical criticism; a variant on the thematic thread running through the volume. Lemaire’s essay highlights the extent to which textual and historical criticism are mutually illuminating by considering three textual problems within the book of 2 Kings. In light of their mutual illumination he emphasizes the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to biblical texts.
- [15] Bénédicte Lemmelijn offers another look at the crossroad of textual and literary criticism by investigating the possibility of a Priestly redaction in the “major expansions” of the so-called “Plague Narratives” in Exod 7–11. Lemmelijn begins her essay with some methodological reflections in which she joins a growing chorus of text critics who reject the concept of an *urtext* as the goal of textual criticism. She also emphasizes that if scribes made literary and theological corrections to texts, then the distinction between author/redactor and scribe/copyist must be significantly downplayed. She goes on to suggest that P in the “Plague Narrative” should not be regarded as a separate narrative or source that has been added or incorporated, but as a systematic redaction. She shows that many of the “major expansions” are harmonistic expansions of the text that seek complete the sequences of command and execution-of-command within the text. Beyond this very clear purpose it must be noted that the figure of Aaron is added in almost all major expansions. If the presence of Aaron is a major characteristic of P-material, Lemmelijn avers that the otherwise clear process of textual harmonization may clue the reader in to a more complex role for P than “source.” If Lemmelijn is correct, then this proposed scribal activity provides another example of how it is difficult to differentiate between an author or editor and a copyist.
- [16] Johan Lust investigates the king of Tyre in the Hebrew and Greek traditions of Ezekiel 28:11–19. He concludes that the parent text of the OG must represent an earlier stage of Hebrew Ezekiel than does M. Since Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion show that OG preserves the reading of the proto-Masoretic text, the variants noticeable in MT must represent late strands in the development of Ezekiel – strands that the ancient translators did not know and could not incorporate.

- [17] Corrado Martone attempts to highlight the role of Zadokite interpolations within CD III 21–IV 4. He suggests that CD reworks Ezekiel 44:15 in a way that introduces two important changes. First, the role of the Zadokites is distinguished from the roles of other priests (giving Zadokites a more central role). Second, the role of Zadokites in Ezekiel is eschatologized: “The sons of Zadok, they are the chosen of Israel, the ones called by name, who are to appear in the last days” (CD IV 3–4). Martone offers several other sectarian texts that also eschatologize the role of the Zadokites and suggests that these passages reflect a situation in which disaffected Zadokites were absorbed into the Qumran community and became the dominant theological tradition.
- [18] Andrés Piquer Otero examines the ways in which Jewish translations of the Bible interpret necromantic terms. His analysis is broad and detailed and he argues that while the data uncovered is unlikely to tell us about how the terms functioned in their original contexts, they may very well illuminate conceptions and practices of magic in medieval times. While many of the conclusions are translation-specific, some overall conclusions include the following: the terms **אֹוֹב** and **יִדְעוֹנִי** are consistently treated as an inseparable pair, and the pair tends to be associated with the concept of 1) a medium who serves as a mouthpiece for a spirit and 2) the act of summoning the dead through incantation.
- [19] Émile Puech offers a series of epigraphic insights from the Proverbs and Job manuscripts found at Qumran, including the targumic manuscripts from cave 11. Most work of this type on the Qumran materials is now complete, but some diamonds remain hidden in the rough and Puech continues to work diligently on the readings. For example, he takes a reading proposed by Eshter Eshel as a correction to Maurice Baillet’s construction of 6Q30 involving a single letter. Since only twenty-three letters are present in the entire fragment, it is significant that Eshel’s suggestion of a cursive *shin* instead of Baillet’s *tet* occurs three times. Puech concludes that the cursive *shin* does not merely change the reading/meaning of individual words, but it has larger significance for the reconstruction of the text of Proverbs: 6Q30 does not preserve the stichometry of the text (unlike 4Q102 and 4Q103).
- [20] Adrian Schenker considers the possibility that the mention of a built altar in 1 Esd 5:49 could be the earliest reference to the Samaritan temple. As the text stands in the MT (Ezra 3:3), the altar in question appears to be built in Jerusalem by returned exiles. As Schenker points out, this scenario leads to the odd situation that the temple itself was subsequently built on a different site in Jerusalem. He uses the *Vetus Latina* together with the Peshitta to reconstruct a Greek version of 1Esd 5:49, which he maintains is earlier than the parallel version of the verse known from Ezra 3:3 and which would have been based on a different Semitic Vorlage. In his reconstructed original, the altar is built in the place of “all the peoples of the land” as an act of religious and political disapproval of the newly developing post-exilic infrastructure in Jerusalem. In other words, in light of the progress in Jerusalem, the Samaritans escalate by establishing a shrine for YHWH first.
- [21] Mark Smith investigates the relationship between text and interpretation in 7th–6th century Israel. It is difficult, as Smith well knows, to reconstruct what many of the “biblical” texts looked like at that time, but he finds an intriguing entre into the role of interpretation. In Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, one finds several examples of laws or commands that apparently have been previously attributed to YHWH, but which the writers reject with the expression, “which I

did not command.” Perhaps the most famous of these are those concerning child sacrifice in the book of Jeremiah – a practice that the book of Jeremiah implies has been regarded as divinely ordained (cf Jer 7:31, 19:5, 32:35). Smith argues that the use of the expression “which I did not command” is less an outright rejection of a fixed law as it is a reflection of the ongoing competition for authority to interpret scriptural texts. He finds parallel language and processes in contemporary Akkadian documents.

- [22] Pablo A. Torijano Morales considers the value of the Antiochean Greek text (LXX^L) for textual criticism of the book of Kings and, in doing so, revisits Alfred Rahlfs’ conclusions about the text. He takes as his test cases 1 Kgs 1:8, 36, 40, 41, 45 and he produces a new critical text for each case. He suggests that the Lucianic textual material is more valuable for establishing the LXX than Rahlfs allowed. He suggests, moreover, that in some cases the evidence suggests that the *kaige* recension is not an exclusively inner-Greek process. Revisions considered part of the *kaige* recension also seem to reflect a similar process of change within Hebrew textual traditions. In some of these cases, however, textual criticism is not sufficient to establish this process, literary criticism is also necessary.
- [23] Emanuel Tov offers a study of the chapter and section divisions in the book of Esther. He notes at the outset that chapter divisions originated in medieval times and were first applied to the Vulgate, not Hebrew sources. The practice of dividing the text into sections with the use of spaces is, however, an ancient practice that can be found in both biblical and non-biblical texts from Qumran as well as other, even earlier texts. Existing evidence leads Tov to characterize this process as somewhat individualistic, impressionistic, and *ad hoc*. Nevertheless, Tov expected the chapter divisions of Esther to coincide generally with the *petuchot* (open spaces marking large intervals) found in the Hebrew textual traditions. But in considering an array of medieval and modern editions of the text, this coincidence was nowhere to be found. Indeed, all systems of section and chapter division are subjective and reflect the exegesis of individual scribes or scholars.
- [24] Eugene Ulrich investigates a tiny variant with a potentially massive significance. At Deut 27:4 an Old Latin ms agrees with SP on the reading “Mount Gerizim.” The insertion of Gerizim has long been held as a trademark of the Samaritan textual tradition. But Ulrich offers considerable evidence that, in the case of Deut 27:4, the mention of Mount Gerizim should not have originated with SP and, moreover, that many readings in LXX mss that are attributed to Samaritan influence instead witness to a much more general Hebrew tradition that SP also used and reworked. One must concur with Ulrich that based on what we know of the OL, it is highly unlikely to have been translated from a Samaritan Hebrew or Greek ms. Ulrich combines textual and literary criticism to propose the following model of development based on the new evidence from 4QJosh^A: The original command to build an altar in Deut 27:4 did not specify a location, though Gilgal seems to have been assumed by narrative proximity. At a second stage, documented by SP, though not originating with SP, someone added the specific location “Mt. Gerizim.” At a third stage Gerizim was replaced with “Mt. Ebal” (an interpretative move that may have been every bit as sectarian as is normally assumed about Gerizim).
- [25] James VanderKam analyzes the text-critical value of a Greek quotation of *Jub* 46:6–12a; 47:1 in the *Greek Catena on Genesis* (critical edition published by

Francoise Petit as *La chaîne sur la Genèse*). The text of *Jubilees* is cited in the *Catena* as a way to exegete Gen 50:25–26. VanderKam’s careful clause-by-clause analysis reveals important information about the ancient text of *Jubilees*. In the first instance, VanderKam highlights changes that are best understood as products of the Catenist: *Jubilees*’ extended date formulas and the literary framework of second-person address to Moses. The reviewer agrees with VanderKam that there are compelling reasons why the Catenist might have found these features of the text unhelpful. But VanderKam also reaches two other important conclusions. First, he finds two readings in the quotation that he judges superior to readings found in Ethiopic textual traditions. Second, he is able to use the quotation to document the general quality of the Ethiopic translation.

Bennie H. Reynolds III
Millsaps College, Jackson MS

© Copyright TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism, 2014