

Emanuel Tov

## Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere

The LXX is a source of information for many fields of study. For the student of Hebrew Scripture, that version is a source of ancient exegesis and a treasure-trove of Hebrew readings that differ from MT. These readings are taken into consideration in the textual and literary analysis. Our study does not deal with individual secondary readings, but with *complete* books that may reflect a stage subsequent to that in MT. I believe that the Greek translations of 1 Kings (named Kingdoms γγ or 3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel (especially chapters 4–6) attest to such stages. To the best of my knowledge, there are no additional books or long stretches of text<sup>1</sup> like these within Greek Scripture.<sup>2</sup> Following Bickerman's monograph, *Four Strange Books of the Bible: Jonah, Daniel, Kohelet, Esther*,<sup>3</sup> we name these books "three strange books of the LXX," as they differ much from the remainder of Greek Scripture, and pose many challenges for researchers. The three strange books differ from books and segments in the LXX that probably preceded the literary development of their counterparts in MT and differed from it in major ways: 1 Samuel 16–18,<sup>4</sup> Jeremiah,<sup>5</sup> and Ezekiel.<sup>6</sup> These books also differ from

---

<sup>1</sup> An exception may be 1 Esdras which as a whole (and not partially as the three mentioned books) reshaped segments of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. Many of the details of the rewriting in that book are still not understood. See Z. TALSHIR, *1 Esdras – From Origin and Translation* (SCSt 47); Atlanta 1999; EADEM, *Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Editions*, in: *Yahwism after the Exile*, ed. R. ALBERTZ (Studies in Theology and Religion 5) Assen 2003, 199–218 = *Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Redactions: New Approaches to 1 Esdras*, in: *On the Border Line – Textual Meets Literary Criticism* (Hebr.); ed. Z. TALSHIR and D. AMARA (Beer Sheva XVIII); Beer Sheva 2005, 77–97.

<sup>2</sup> However, some scholars consider the Greek of 1 Samuel 16–18 to reflect such a secondary source. See the views quoted in n. 7 below.

<sup>3</sup> E.J. BICKERMAN, *Four Strange Books of the Bible: Jonah, Daniel, Kohelet, Esther*, New York 1967. Two of Bickerman's "strange books," Daniel and Esther, are included among the three books analyzed here.

<sup>4</sup> See J. LUST and E. TOV in D. BARTHÉLEMY et al., *The Story of David and Goliath, Textual and Literary Criticism, Papers of a Joint Venture* (OBO 73), Fribourg/Göttingen

Exodus 35–40<sup>7</sup> and Proverbs<sup>8</sup> since the *Vorlagen* of these two books differ mainly qualitatively in major ways from MT, not mainly quantitatively, as the three strange books.

In the case of the three strange books, the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts are among the greatest in the LXX. We suggest that, in all three cases, the LXX preserves a translation of Semitic texts other than MT, probably in Hebrew in the case of 1 Kings and Esther and Aramaic in the case of Daniel 4–6. The suggestion that these three books are later than the stage included in MT is not offered without a residue of doubt; indeed, in all three cases it has also been argued that the differences (1) were created by the Greek translators or (2) reflect stages in the development of the Hebrew books anterior to that included in MT.<sup>9</sup> Controversies of this nature cannot be settled in a brief study like this. If one of these alternative views is more convincing than the view presented here, my own analysis may well be irrelevant. If, for

1986. On the other hand, D. Barthélemy and D.W. Gooding writing in the same monograph ascribe the shortness of the LXX to the translator's revisional activities. This is also the view of A. ROFÉ, *The Battle of David and Goliath – Folklore, Theology, Eschatology*, in: *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. J. NEUSNER, Philadelphia 1987, 117–51.

<sup>5</sup> See my study “The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History,” in: *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J.H. TIGAY, Philadelphia 1985, 211–37. Revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible – Collected Essays on the Septuagint (VT.S 72)*, Leiden u.a. 1999, 363–84.

<sup>6</sup> See my study “Recensional Differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel,” *ETL* 62 (1986) 89–101. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 397–410.

<sup>7</sup> For a brief summary of the research on this unit, see my *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research (Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged; JBS 8; Jerusalem 1997)* 256. A. AEJMELAEUS, *Septuagintal Translation Techniques – a Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account*, in: *EADDEM, On the Trail of Septuagint Translators*, Kampen 1993, 116–30 (125) probably indicated the correct direction for a solution by pinpointing variant readings in the translator's *Vorlage* and by analyzing his translation technique. On the other hand, D.W. GOODING, *The Account of the Tabernacle (TS NS VI)*, Cambridge 1959 viewed the LXX as an inner-Greek revision. The discrepancies between the LXX and MT in these chapters probably constitute the greatest challenge for LXX scholarship. The problems may not be more vexing than those in 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel, but the difficult subject matter complicates the analysis.

<sup>8</sup> Tov entertains the possibility of a different Hebrew editorial layer, while Fox thinks in terms of individual Hebrew readings: E. TOV, *Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs*, in: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 419–31; M. FOX, *LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource*, *Textus* 22 (2005) 95–128. On the other hand, J. COOK, *The Septuagint of Proverbs – Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs (VT.S 69)*, Leiden/New York/Cologne 1997 ascribes the differences to the Greek translator. In the case of Proverbs and Exodus 35–40 the relation between MT and LXX is unclear.

<sup>9</sup> For references to these views, see below.

example, someone believes that it was the translator of 3 Kingdoms who created the greatly differing version, the view presented here with regard to that book is irrelevant. Longer studies of 1 Kings and Esther are being published elsewhere (see the notes below).

The discussion will focus on the rewriting in each of the three books (A–C), turn to parallels in the Qumran scrolls (D), and to matters of text and canon (E). Following the sequence of the books in Hebrew Scripture, we first deal with 3 Kingdoms. This is probably the most convincing case among the three books and, at the same time, the most unexpected one in Greek Scripture.

## A. 3 Kingdoms

3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)<sup>10</sup> poses a greater challenge for the researcher than the other three books of the Greek Kingdoms (1–2, 4 Kingdoms). The many problems discussed over the past half-century, relating to the *kaige*-Theodotion revision in 2 and 4 Kingdoms and the evaluation of the Hebrew text of 1–2 Samuel in the wake of the Qumran discoveries, are very complex. However, they are less complicated than the evaluation of the Greek translation of 1 Kings. From the many studies published in the past half-century, it has become clear that there is no consensus concerning the evaluation of that version.<sup>11</sup>

### 1. Background of the Discrepancies between 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms

The discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts resulted from changes made in either MT or the LXX, and therefore they cannot be described easily in neutral terms. The 2005 monograph by P. S. F. van Keulen, which includes an excellent summary of the previous research and of the issues themselves, describes the features of 3 Kingdoms as follows:<sup>12</sup> “The student of 3 Regum is not only struck by the high rate but also by the diversity of differences vis-à-vis 1 Kings that are contained in the book. Pluses and minuses are frequent, as well as word differences. Some of the pluses in 3 Regum consist of duplicate

<sup>10</sup> Modern research distinguishes between:

- (1) Kingdoms  $\alpha$  (1 Samuel)
- (2) Kingdoms  $\beta\beta$  (2 Samuel 1:1–11:1)
- (3) Kingdoms  $\beta\gamma$  (2 Samuel 11:2–1Kgs 2:11)
- (4) Kingdoms  $\gamma\gamma$  (1Kgs 2:12–21:15) to be referred to below as “3 Kingdoms”
- (5) Kingdoms  $\gamma\delta$  (1Kgs 22:1–2Kgs 24:15).

<sup>11</sup> See my paper “3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions,” *Festschrift F. García Martínez*, forthcoming.

<sup>12</sup> P.S.F. VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3Reg. 2–11 (VT.S 104)*, Leiden/Boston 2005, 1.

renderings of passages appearing elsewhere in the translation. One plus even involves a rival version of events already recounted in the preceding narrative (i.e., 3 Reg 12:24a–z). Furthermore, corresponding sections may appear at different positions in 3 Regum and 1 Kings, thus causing a different arrangement of narrative materials. Most of these sequence differences occur in the first half of the book. Another peculiar deviation from MT, typical of the second half of 3 Regum, pertains to the chronological data for kings following Solomon.” Van Keulen focused on the first half of the book in which these features are evident, but they also occur in the second half, albeit less frequently. Among other things, in the second half there are no parallels to the Summaries in chapter 2 or the “alternative version” in chapter 12.

## 2. *The Discrepancies between 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms Originated in Hebrew*

Since it is difficult to decide between the two opposing types of explanations regarding the nature of 3 Kingdoms, the decision as to whether the deviations were created at either the Hebrew or Greek level would limit the options.

The following types of arguments could support the suggestion that the discrepancies were created at the Greek level: (1) indication of original Greek; (2) lack of Hebraisms; (3) differences between the translations of parallel passages.<sup>13</sup> The following arguments could support the suggestion that the discrepancies were created at the Hebrew level: (1) presence of Hebraisms;<sup>14</sup> (2) reflection of Hebrew readings in the LXX differing from MT; (3) recognition of faithful translation technique.<sup>15</sup>

Turning to some or all of these criteria does not necessarily guarantee objective results, since every type of result may be interpreted in different ways. In my view, no compelling arguments have been presented in favor of the assumption of revision at the Greek level, neither by Gooding nor by van Keulen. The Greek renderings of parallel passages differ occasionally, but such inconsistency also occurs in translations produced by a single translator.<sup>16</sup> Besides, the various translations, even when differing slightly,

<sup>13</sup> See, however, notes 16–17.

<sup>14</sup> For the background, see TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 83–85.

<sup>15</sup> Analysis of the level of freedom and literalness in the translators’ approaches forms a key element in our understanding of them and their use as an ancient document in the study of Hebrew Scripture. In short, the argument runs as follows. If a translator represented his Hebrew text faithfully in small details, we would not expect him to insert major changes in the translation. Therefore, when we find major differences between the LXX and MT in relatively faithful translation units, they must reflect different Hebrew texts. These differing Hebrew texts are of central importance to our understanding of Hebrew Scripture. On the other hand, if a translator was not faithful to his parent text in small details, he also could have inserted major changes in the translation.

<sup>16</sup> See, for example, T. MURAOKA, *The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translation or Recensional Activity?* *Abr-Nahrain* 21 (1982–3) 28–49 (30–31).

share several unique renderings.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, there are compelling arguments in favor of a Hebrew source at the base of 3 Kingdoms: Tov<sup>18</sup> records Hebraisms in the Summaries (also known as “Additions” or “Miscellanies”),<sup>19</sup> which are described in greater detail by Polak<sup>20</sup> and Schenker (relating to all of 1 Kings),<sup>21</sup> and Tov<sup>22</sup> and Schenker<sup>23</sup> list variants reflected in the LXX. Even Gooding accepts the view that 3 Kingdoms has a Hebrew base.<sup>24</sup> The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the duplicate version of the Jeroboam story (1Kgs 12:24a–z) has been reconstructed by Debus<sup>25</sup> and Talshir,<sup>26</sup> while that of the Summaries in chapter 2 has been reconstructed in my own study.<sup>27</sup> Wevers<sup>28</sup> and Talshir<sup>29</sup> indicate that the translator of 1 Kings rendered his parent text faithfully.

As a result, there is sufficient support for the assumption that the Greek translation of 1 Kings was based on a Hebrew source. This text could have been anterior or subsequent to MT. Since the tendencies of the Greek 3 Kingdoms are easily recognized (see below), and since no overall reverse theory has been suggested for corresponding tendencies in MT,<sup>30</sup> we accept Talshir’s view<sup>31</sup> that the *Vorlage* of 3 Kingdoms reworked a text resembling

---

<sup>17</sup> For some examples relating to chapter 2, see TOV, The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2, Textus 11 (1984) 89–118. Revised version: Greek and Hebrew Bible, 549–70.

<sup>18</sup> TOV, LXX Additions, 568.

<sup>19</sup> 35g, k, l.

<sup>20</sup> F.H. POLAK, The Septuagint Account of Solomon’s Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension, in: X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998 (SCSt 51), ed. B.A. TAYLOR, Atlanta, Ga. 2001, 139–64 (143–8).

<sup>21</sup> A. SCHENKER, Septante et texte massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14 (CRB 48), Paris 2000. E.g. pp. 54 (relating to 10:23–25), 130–39 (chapters 6–8), 149.

<sup>22</sup> TOV, LXX Additions, 551–62.

<sup>23</sup> Septante, 5–9.

<sup>24</sup> D.W. GOODING regards 3 Kingdoms as a Midrashic version of 1 Kings. See his summarizing study “Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns,” Textus 7 (1969) 1–29 (18); ID., Relics of Ancient Exegesis, A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2 (MSSOTS 4), Cambridge 1976, 111.

<sup>25</sup> J. DEBUS, Die Sünde Jerobeams (FRLANT 93), Göttingen 1967, 55–65.

<sup>26</sup> Z. TALSHIR, The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z (JBS 6), Jerusalem 1993, 38–153.

<sup>27</sup> TOV, LXX Additions.

<sup>28</sup> J.W. WEVERS, Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43, OTS 8 (1950) 300–22 (300).

<sup>29</sup> TALSHIR, Image, 256.

<sup>30</sup> SCHENKER, Septante, 151 mentions some elements of supposed revision in MT, but they do not cover the large differences between the two versions.

<sup>31</sup> Z. TALSHIR, The Image of the Septuagint Edition of the Book of Kings, Tarbiz 59 (1990) 249–302 (302) (Hebr. with English abstract).

MT. Polak expressed a similar view.<sup>32</sup> Ultimately, this view is close to Gooding's theory, except that he believes that the rewriting activity was carried out in Greek by a reviser and not in the Hebrew text consulted by the translator.

### 3. Characteristic Features of 3 Kingdoms

The following features not only characterize the Greek 3 Kingdoms but are in most cases unique to it:

i. Addition in chapter 2 of two long theme summaries<sup>33</sup> (previously named Additions or Miscellanies) focusing on Solomon's wisdom. These summaries repeat various sections occurring elsewhere in the book (see further below).<sup>34</sup> To the best of my knowledge, this device is not used elsewhere in MT or the Greek Bible.<sup>35</sup> The closest parallel is the added summary before the LXX of Daniel 5 (see below), although that summary is not a theme summary.

ii. *Duplication* of sections based on the rewriting tendencies. Beyond the passages mentioned in section i, referring to summaries that constituted new literary compositions, the rewritten text of 3 Kingdoms repeated 1Kgs 22:41–51 (description of Jehoshaphat's activities) in 3 Kingdoms 16:28a–h and 1Kgs 9:24 in v. 9a of the same chapter in 3 Kingdoms. To the best of my knowledge, the device of repeating sections is not used elsewhere in the Greek Bible or MT.<sup>36</sup>

iii. Inclusion of an *alternative version*. A lengthy alternative history of Jeroboam extant only in the LXX (3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z) presents a rival story juxtaposed with the original one found in all textual sources including

---

<sup>32</sup> POLAK, Septuagint Account.

<sup>33</sup> To the best of my knowledge, only J. GRAY, *1 & 2 Kings – A Commentary* (OTL) London 1964, 45 has used this term.

<sup>34</sup> See below, paragraph 4. The location of these summaries is inappropriate since Solomon is not yet a central person in this chapter. Possibly the location was determined by the scope of the ancient scrolls. Summary 1, after 1Kgs 2:35, occurred at the end of a scroll containing the second half of 2 Samuel (Kingdoms βγ), while Summary 2, after 2Kgs 2:46, occurred at the beginning of the scroll of 3 Kingdoms (Kingdoms γγ).

<sup>35</sup> SCHENKER, Septante, 9 compares the theme summaries with Josh 10:40–42; 12:1–8; 13:2–7; Judg 2:11–3:6, even Judg 1–2:5, but these texts are of a different nature. Most of them indeed include an element of summary of previous stories or data (Judges 1 does not!), but they rephrase the earlier narratives, while most of the summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 simply repeat complete verses occurring elsewhere. MT contains many additional summaries (for example, summarizing historical accounts like Joshua 24 or historical Psalms like Psalm 106), but none of them creates a mosaic of verses like the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2.

<sup>36</sup> The case of the duplicated verses in the MT of Joshua–Judges, especially in Joshua 24 and Judges 1–2 is a different one, as these duplications resulted from the complicated creation process of these books. Possibly an initially combined book Joshua–Judges was separated into two different ones.

the LXX (1Kgs 11, 12, 14). The technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),<sup>37</sup> there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions appearing in one textual witness but not in the others.

iv. The transposition of verses to other environments in accord with the reviser's tendencies: For example, 1Kgs 3:1 and 9:16–17 are repositioned as 3Kgdms 5:14a,<sup>38</sup> 1Kgs 5:7–8 is repositioned as 3Kgdms 5:1 (see paragraph 4); 1Kgs 5:31–32 and 6:37–38 are moved to 3Kgdms 6:1a–d; 1Kgs 8:11–12 is placed in 3Kgdms 8:53a;<sup>39</sup> verses from 9:15–22 are placed in 10:22a–c;<sup>40</sup> etc. This technique is also evidenced elsewhere in the LXX and MT.<sup>41</sup>

#### *4. 3 Kingdoms as a Rewritten Version of 1 Kings*

Having established that 3 Kingdoms is based on a Hebrew source, and having described some special techniques used in that composition, we now focus on its nature. The techniques described in the previous paragraph leave no doubt regarding the direction of the changes. The content summaries in chapter 2 are very inappropriate in their context (see n. 34). They would not have appeared in an initial writing stage. By the same token, repetition of verses and the juxtaposition of an alternative account are secondary features. Further, the tendencies of this rewritten composition are clearly visible (see below). We therefore believe that, in the main, MT represents an earlier layer in the composition of 1 Kings, and that 3 Kingdoms reflects later rewriting.

The reshaping in 3 Kingdoms involves the addition, repetition, omission, reordering, and changing of large sections as well as small details. These

---

<sup>37</sup> In these chapters the originally short story of the encounter of David and Goliath as narrated in the LXX was joined by an alternative story in MT. See my analysis in “The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version,” in TIGAY, *Empirical Models*, 97–130. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 333–60; BARTHÉLEMY et al., *The Story of David and Goliath*.

<sup>38</sup> This transposition of the tradition about Pharaoh's daughter just before the beginning of Solomon's building activities shows that Solomon gave her a fixed abode only after he finished building the Temple.

<sup>39</sup> According to GOODING, *Text and Midrash*, 22–25 the transposition of these verses to v. 53a created a new text sequence in the beginning of the Greek chapter 8 in which Solomon is now portrayed in a more pious way. After the glory entered the Temple, the king immediately turned his face away. See also VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 164–80.

<sup>40</sup> The transposition possibly shows that Solomon's measures against the Canaanites are now presented as another token of his wisdom (thus VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 191–201).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. several transpositions elsewhere in the LXX, for which see my paper “Some Sequence Differences between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible,” *JNSL* 13 (1987) 151–60. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 411–18.

techniques are similar to those used in other compositions in the biblical realm, both within and beyond Greek and Hebrew Scripture. In the past, the techniques of 3 Kingdoms have been compared to those of the Midrash,<sup>42</sup> not only because the rewriting in 1 Kings sometimes resembles Midrash techniques, but also because Gooding located specific parallels with rabbinic literature in subject matter. This is not the place to analyze these parallels, not all of which are equally relevant, but it would perhaps be more appropriate to describe the technique as the rewriting of Scripture.<sup>43</sup> The Hebrew composition behind 3 Kingdoms rewrote a book resembling the composition contained in MT. The comparison with rewritten Bible compositions at Qumran and elsewhere is illuminating, but it also opens up a Pandora's box of problems, as pointed out by Bernstein in another context.<sup>44</sup>

The reshaped compositions, both within and beyond the Greek and Hebrew Scripture canons, were not intended to create new entities. The revisers wanted their new creations to be as close as possible to the old ones, thus ensuring that they would be accepted as authentic. The rewriting sometimes merely involved contextual exegesis, but at other times it included tendentious changes.

Some of the tendencies of the Greek version of 3 Kingdoms, already recognized by Thackeray,<sup>45</sup> were described well by Gooding and van Keulen. Gooding presents the simplest analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten around Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chapters 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chapters 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab.<sup>46</sup> For Gooding, 3 Kingdoms takes the

---

<sup>42</sup> Thus especially GOODING (note the name of his summarizing study "Text and Midrash"); TALSHIR, *Image*, 302; ead., *Alternative Story*, 277–91; V. PETERCA, Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel zugunsten Salomos. 1Kön 8, 12–13 – 3Re 8,53a, BZ 31 (1987) 270–75.

<sup>43</sup> TALSHIR, *Image*, uses similar terms. The group of rewritten Bible compositions forms a category in its own right described as follows by D.J. HARRINGTON, S.J., *Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies*, in: *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations*, ed. R.A. KRAFT and G.W. NICKELSBURG, Atlanta 1986, 242–7: "Because they paraphrase the biblical text, they have been called targumic. Because these books interpret biblical texts, they have been seen as midrashic. But careful literary analysis has demonstrated that they are neither Targums nor midrashim" (p. 242).

<sup>44</sup> M.J. BERNSTEIN, 'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?, *Textus* 22 (2005) 169–96 (p. 181: "One person's reworked Bible is another's Bible").

<sup>45</sup> THACKERAY, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 18. See also by the same author: "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–78; *A GRAMMAR of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, Cambridge 1909, 9–10.

<sup>46</sup> GOODING, *Text and Midrash*, passim.

form of a Greek commentary on 1 Kings.<sup>47</sup> Likewise, for van Keulen (p. 300), one of the main features of the first part of this rewritten composition was the presentation of a more favorable picture of Solomon and a rearrangement of the sequence of events (named “pedantic timetabling” by Gooding<sup>48</sup>).

### 5. *Why Only 3 Kingdoms or Why Only 1 Kings?*

Before turning to a comparison of the rewriting techniques in the Greek 3 Kingdoms with those in Qumran compositions, we turn to the question regarding why only the Old Greek of 3 Kingdoms or MT of 1 Kings was rewritten within 1–4 Kingdoms.<sup>49</sup> To the best of my knowledge, this issue has not been addressed in the literature.<sup>50</sup> The question can be posed in two different ways referring to either the Greek or Hebrew book.

i. Did the rewriting in the *Greek* 3 Kingdoms once cover also 1–2, and 4 Kingdoms? Since we do not know why 3 Kingdoms would have been singled out for content rewriting, it is possible that all four books of Samuel-Kings (or just the two books of Kings) were rewritten in Hebrew and that the rewritten versions were rendered into Greek. The issue is complex, since we have no access to the Old Greek translation of all of 1–4 Kingdoms any more. However, we do have the Old Greek translations of 1 Samuel (Kingdoms  $\alpha$ ) and the first half of 2 Samuel (Kingdoms  $\beta\beta$ ), and they do *not* reflect any rewriting such as in 3 Kingdoms. If these two segments were translated by the person who rendered 3 Kingdoms, as is likely,<sup>51</sup> we do not know why

<sup>47</sup> GOODING, *Text and Midrash*, 28.

<sup>48</sup> D.W. GOODING, *Pedantic Timetabling in the 3rd Book of Reigns*, VT 15 (1965) 153–66.

<sup>49</sup> Greek Scripture contains an amalgam of old and new, namely the Old Greek versions of Kingdoms  $\alpha$  and  $\beta\beta$  and  $\gamma\gamma$  (see n. 1) and the *kaige*-Th revision of Kingdoms  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$ .

<sup>50</sup> A related question has been posed, namely why does 3 Kingdoms start at its present place in 1Kgs 2:12, but no fully acceptable reply has been offered to that question. THACKERAY, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 18 merely distinguished between the Old Greek and revised sections (see previous note), but he did not realize that the Old Greek sections differ much among themselves. According to Thackeray, the sections that now contain the *kaige*-Theodotion revision “were omitted as unedifying by the early translators” (p. 18; similarly: *Greek Translators*, 263). Another related question was answered by BARTHÉLEMY, *Devanciers*, 140–41: why was section  $\beta\gamma$  (2Sam 11:2–1Kgs 2:11) revised by *kaige*-Th.? Barthélemy suggested that the translator wished to correct the chapters relating to the “failures and calamities of the house of David.” These chapters were not covered well in the Old Greek, and because there existed no Greek version of these chapters in Chronicles, their correction was an urgent task for the reviser.

<sup>51</sup> THACKERAY, *The Greek Translators*, produces some evidence for the distinction between the translations of 1 Samuel and 1 Kings, but the evidence (pp. 274–6) is not convincing. MURAOKA, *The Greek Texts*, assumes the unity of the Old Greek of

3 Kingdoms differs so drastically from 1–2 and 4 Kingdoms.<sup>52</sup> We therefore conclude that it is unlikely that a *Greek* rewritten text of all of 1–4 or 1–2 Kingdoms ever existed.

ii. Did a *Hebrew* version of 1–2 Samuel and 2 Kings that rewrote MT in a similar way to the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms once exist? This option is very well possible. The Hebrew 1 Kings was probably contained in one of the two scrolls of Kings. We suggest that the Old Greek translator mistakenly used a mixed set of Hebrew scrolls for his translation, one scroll of the rewritten type (1 Kings) and three unrevised scrolls.<sup>53</sup> This theory cannot be verified, since the Old Greek translations of Kingdoms βγ and γδ have been lost. Crucial to this scenario is the assumption of the use of scrolls of different types, which would have been understandable due to the scarcity of scrolls. Equally crucial is the assumption that at least the two Hebrew books of Kings were included in two separate scrolls. Support for this suggestion comes from the realm of the LXX, where a shift in translation character in some books has been ascribed to the use of different scrolls in the archetype of Greek Scripture.<sup>54</sup> There is no direct support from Qumran for the writing of the Hebrew book of Kings in two separate scrolls. The only (negative) evidence relates to the books 1–2 Samuel that are joined in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.<sup>55</sup> On the other hand, the great majority of the other Scripture books, including those of the Torah and the Five Scrolls, are contained in separate scrolls.<sup>56</sup> This evidence

---

Kingdoms α, ββ, γγ (p. 45), while focusing on the relation between these sections and the “Lucianic” manuscripts in Kingdoms βγ; γδ. D. Barthélemy describes the Old Greek as “composite,” but he only refers to the internal problems of 3 Kingdoms: “Prise de position sur les communications du colloque de Los Angeles,” *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 21), Fribourg/Göttingen 1978, 255–88 (258).

<sup>52</sup> It cannot be countered that the content of these two books differed from 3 Kingdoms, since also 1 Kingdoms and the first part of 2 Kingdoms provide sufficient occasion for rewriting, especially in the stories about Saul and David.

<sup>53</sup> The circulation of four different scrolls, although of different sizes and of a different nature, was also assumed by BARTHÉLEMY, *Prise de position*, 257.

<sup>54</sup> For the bisection of 2 Samuel, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel in the LXX scrolls, see E. TOV, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8), Missoula, Mont. 1976, 161–65. Likewise, in the classical world large compositions were subdivided into independent units (scrolls), often regardless of their content. See TH. BIRT, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Literatur*, Berlin 1882 (repr. Aalen 1974) 131–40; H.Y. GAMBLE, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*, New Haven, Conn./London 1995, 42–66 with references to earlier literature.

<sup>55</sup> However, the division of scrolls for Samuel was not necessarily identical to the one in Kings.

<sup>56</sup> A few Torah scrolls contained two books. For details, see my book E. TOV, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54), Leiden/Boston 2004, 74–9.

does support the assumption that 1–2 Kings would have been contained in two different scrolls.

## B. Esther

### 1. Background of the Discrepancies between MT and the LXX

An evaluation of the differences between Esth-LXX and MT poses many challenges.<sup>57</sup> The LXX is very free and sometimes paraphrastic; it also contains six large narrative expansions (the so-called Additions A–F) that are traditionally considered to be independent units. However, the use of the term ‘Additions’ gives a false impression of their nature and may lead to wrong conclusions. They are better described as narrative Expansions A–F, adding more than 50% to the amount of words in the Greek book.<sup>58</sup>

A correct understanding of Esth-LXX is relevant to the textual and literary analysis of the book. In as far as a consensus exists regarding the textual value of the Greek version of Esther, it is negative.<sup>59</sup> This view is challenged in the present study. We suggest that (1) Esth-LXX represents a free translation as is shown by an analysis of its translation technique, and (2) it sometimes paraphrases its Hebrew parent text. We add a new dimension to the analysis when asserting (3) that some paraphrases were triggered by the translator’s misunderstanding of the Hebrew. These issues are addressed in a separate study.<sup>60</sup> For the present analysis, it is important to note that Esth-LXX reflects some Hebrew variants, that the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F in the LXX was Hebrew, and that the Greek translations of the canonical

---

<sup>57</sup> While several monographs, some of them book-length, have been devoted to the “Lucianic” version, also named A-Text, in recent decennia little attention has been paid to the LXX version.

<sup>58</sup> Due to the uncertainty pertaining to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, a comparison of the length of the LXX and MT is little more than an exercise. According to the calculations of C.V. DOROTHY, *The Books of Esther—Structure, Genre, and Textual Integrity* (JSOT.S 187) Sheffield 1997, 16 the LXX added 77 % to MT, the AT text 45 %, and Josephus 32 %.

<sup>59</sup> This judgment was probably best formulated by Clines: “Almost everyone agrees, however, that no matter how free the Septuagint translator has been, it is essentially the Masoretic Hebrew text that was his *Vorlage*”: D.J.A. CLINES, *The Esther Scroll – The Story of the Story* (JSOT.S 30), Sheffield 1984, 69. A similar view had been expressed earlier by TH. NÖLDEKE, in: *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, ed. T.K. CHEYNE and J.S. BLACK, London 1899–1903, II.1406 *s.v.* “Esther”. “The tendency, so common at the present day, to overestimate the importance of the LXX for purposes of textual criticism is nowhere more to be deprecated than in the Book of Esther. It may be doubted whether even in a single passage of the book the Greek manuscripts enable us to emend the Hebrew text.”

<sup>60</sup> “The LXX Translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation of MT or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version?” *Festschrift P. van der Horst*, forthcoming.

sections and the Expansions were produced by the same person and reflect a rewritten Hebrew composition.

## 2. *Esth-LXX Reflects Some Variants in Small Details*

That Esth-LXX reflects Hebrew variants in small details hardly needs any proof, since all books of the LXX reflect such variants. Nevertheless, this point needs to be mentioned since most scholars assert that this translation is of little use for text-critical purposes (see n. 59).

## 3. *Expansions A, C, D, and F Were Translated from a Hebrew Source*

Most scholars believe that the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F was Hebrew or Aramaic,<sup>61</sup> and that Expansions B and E were composed in Greek.<sup>62</sup> Martin's linguistic study that identified the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F as Greek with the aid of seventeen syntactical features used as criteria to distinguish between 'Greek-original' and 'translation Greek' is especially valuable.<sup>63</sup> In addition, *καὶ ἰδοὺ* = *וְהִנֵּה* in A 4, 5, 7 and the wording of A 3, 17 also indicate that the Expansions were based on a Hebrew text.<sup>64</sup>

## 4. *Unity of the Greek Translation of the Canonical Text and the Expansions*

Determining the relation between the Greek versions of the canonical sections and the Greek Expansions is crucial to our understanding of Esth-LXX. Since Expansions A, C, D, and F were originally written in Hebrew, one's first

---

<sup>61</sup> See J. LANGEN, *Die beiden griechischen Texte des Buches Esther*, TThQ 42 (1860) 244–72, especially 264–6; A. SCHOLZ, *Commentar über das Buch "Esther" mit seinen "Zusätzen" und über "Susanna"*, Würzburg 1892, xxi–xxiii; C.A. MOORE, *On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther*, JBL 92 (1973) 382–93; idem, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions (AncB 44)*; Garden City, N.Y., 1977, 155. Nevertheless, some scholars maintain that the Expansions were written in Greek, without providing detailed philological arguments. Thus S. JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford 1968, 295 asserts "It is generally agreed that the additions to Esther are based on no Hebrew or Aramaic original, but are additions in the interests of piety."

<sup>62</sup> These two Expansions are close in style and content to 3 Maccabees, see MOORE, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 195–9.

<sup>63</sup> R.A. MARTIN, *Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther*, JBL 94 (1975) 65–72.

<sup>64</sup> In other instances the assumption of Hebrew diction is less convincing since the wording could also have been influenced by the canonical sections: A 1 *ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμιν* (= *משבט בנימין*) equals the description of Mordecai in 2:5 LXX as opposed to MT *איש ימיני*, a Benjaminite. Presumably LXX 2:5 reflects the same reading as A 1. A 2 *ἐν Σούσοις τῆ πόλει* = *בשושן הבירה* (= 1:2; 9:12) and A 13 "Artaxerxes the king" (= 2:16,21; 3:12).

intuition would be that they belonged to the same composition as the canonical sections. The segments originally written in Greek (Expansions B, E) were probably created by the translator.<sup>65</sup>

There is no reason to distrust the ancient evidence of all manuscripts according to which all the elements of Esth-LXX indeed represent one integral unit. We should not be influenced by Jerome's removal of Expansions A–F from their context, thereby mutilating the translation.<sup>66</sup> His action was arbitrary and inconsistent since by the same token one could excise equally large segments from the Greek translation of 3 Kingdoms (for example, 3Kgdms 2:35a–o, 46, a–l; 12:24a–z) and place them at the end of the book.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, the canonical segments and the Expansions are intertwined in an organic way in chapters 4 and 5, making it impossible to mark an uninterrupted group of verses as constituting 'Expansion D.'<sup>68</sup> The unity of

---

<sup>65</sup> MOORE, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah, 166 recognizes the Hebrew background of most of the Expansions, but treats them as an entity separate from the translation of the canonical segments. Moore does not discuss evidence such as adduced in this paragraph, so that the possibility that these Expansions derive from the translator himself is not even mentioned by him.

<sup>66</sup> W.H. BROWNLEE, *Le livre grec d'Esther et la royauté divine*, RB 73 (1966) 161–185 (162) uses this term.

<sup>67</sup> By doing so one would "improve" the Greek translation of 3 Kingdoms, since these sections are clearly secondary in the context. See above, A.

<sup>68</sup> The scope of D is presented in different ways in the text editions. The edition of A. RAHLFS, *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart 1935) indicates the different origin of the sixteen verses of Expansion D by distinguishing in its numbering system between the canonical text and Expansion D. However, the edition of R. HANHART, *Esther, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum*, VIII, 3 (2nd edition; Göttingen 1983) and the NETS translation by A. PIETERSMA and B.G. WRIGHT (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (Oxford, forthcoming) present these verses in the traditional way as "Addition D." By doing so they conceal the canonical status of 5:1–2 that form part of that expansion. These two editions present the text following 4:17 as Addition C ("Prayers of Mordecai and Esther") immediately continued with Addition D ("Esther's Audience with the King") including the canonical verses 5:1–2. In these two editions 5:1 is named D 1 (that is, the first verse in the "apocryphal" Addition D), and 5:2 is named D 12 located in an expansion counting 16 verses. These complications come to light even more so in the Vulgate where these verses are duplicated. The main text of V translates the Hebrew, including 5:1–2, while these verses are repeated in the so-called Additions (based on the LXX) that are placed at the end of the book. Addition D is named here "chapter 15."

The verses are thus indicated as follows in the editions:

Canonical verse 5:1 Rahlfs = D 1 Göttingen

Added verses 1:a–f Rahlfs = D 2–11 Göttingen

Canonical verse 5:2 Rahlfs = D 12 Göttingen

Added verses 2a–b Rahlfs = D 13–15 Göttingen

Canonical verse 5:3 Rahlfs = 5:3 Göttingen.

the canonical text and the narrative Expansions is further supported by several close connections between the two segments.<sup>69</sup>

In light of the preceding analysis, it is suggested that the *Vorlage* of Esth-LXX included the so-called Expansions A, C, D, and F.<sup>70</sup> The royal edicts in Expansions B and E were probably added by the translator himself.<sup>71</sup>

##### 5. *Esth-LXX Reflects a Rewritten Version of a Hebrew Composition Similar to MT*

If the premises of §§ 1–4 are correct, the *Vorlage* of Esth-LXX reflects a Hebrew<sup>72</sup> composition that rewrote a book similar to MT. Conflicting features

---

<sup>69</sup> See TOV, *The LXX of Esther*. The translation of Daniel includes several long additions now considered “apocryphal.” However, those additions do not form an integral part of the story, as in Esther. Furthermore it is unclear whether there ever existed an expanded Semitic book of Daniel on which the Greek translation would have been based. By the same token, there never existed an expanded Semitic book of Jeremiah that included Baruch even though one translator rendered both Jeremiah and Baruch. See TOV, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*.

<sup>70</sup> The basic unity of the translation and the “apocryphal” Additions is maintained also by E.J. BICKERMAN, *Notes on the Greek Book of Esther*, in: E.J. BICKERMAN, *Studies in Jewish and Christian history. Part One 1. (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 9)*. Leiden 1951/1976, 246–274 (246), but for him this unity pertained to the book in its Greek shape: “The Greek Esther, of which the “Rest Chapters” are integral and essential parts, is not the *Megillath Esther*, couched in Greek language and letters, but its adaptation designed for the Diaspora.” The following critical commentaries of the Hebrew book of Esther incorporate the six Expansions of the LXX in their natural contexts so as to cater to different audiences: L.B. PATON, *The Book of Esther (ICC)*, Edinburgh 1908; J.D. LEVENSON, *Esther, A Commentary, OTL*; London 1997 (see p. 28).

<sup>71</sup> Therefore, the view of MOORE, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 155 “All six of the Additions to Esther are secondary, i.e. they were supplied after the Book of Esther had been written” cannot be substantiated. This view, shared by many scholars, is probably influenced by the position of the Expansions at the end of the book. By the same token, the suggestion that these Expansions, or some of them, were rendered from Aramaic is without base since it is based on the assumption that the Expansions had a separate existence. For this suggestion, see A. SUNDBERG, *The Old Testament of the Early Church (HTS 20)* Cambridge/London 1964, 62; MOORE, *Origins*, 393 (regarding Addition C). Clines, who describes the development of the various texts in a diagram (p. 140), suggests that the original translation of Esther was made from a Hebrew original that did not contain the Expansions. However, elsewhere (p. 186, n. 3 relating to p. 71) he admits, “I must confess that I cannot prove this nor can I reconstruct the process by which the LXX acquired Additions from two sources.”

<sup>72</sup> Bickerman considers Esth-LXX a *Greek* Midrash, but in spite of the thoroughness of his study “Notes,” he does not prove the following statements: “... the translation reflects an adaptation designed for the Diaspora.” (Notes, 246) ... “Further, being read in the Synagogue and describing the origin of a feast, the story of Esther naturally attracted haggadic embellishments.” (Notes, 255) ... “The Hebrew Esther being no

recognized in the translation complicate the reconstruction of the parent text of Esth-LXX:

- a. Esth-LXX reflects a free translation of its source.
- b. The source text reflects a Hebrew composition different from MT (§§ 2–4).

These features may require the revision of some of our earlier assumptions:

- i. It is not impossible that some of the features ascribed to the free translation character of Esth-LXX in §§ 1–2 derived from its deviating Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus, some short LXX readings in small details vis-à-vis MT as well as some of the presumed clarifications could have derived from a different *Vorlage*.

- ii. By the same token, some of the features ascribed to the translator's deviating parent text could be assigned to his freedom.<sup>73</sup>

It seems to me that we can still maintain the view that the translation is free, while at the same time embarking on the reconstruction of some elements in the Hebrew parent text of the translation. My point of departure is that the Greek translation forms an integral unity that includes the Expansions, that Expansions A, C, D, and F are based on a Hebrew source, and that this composition reworked MT rather than *vice versa*. The reverse process is not likely, the main argument being the revisional tendencies visible in Esth-LXX, such as the addition to the story in the LXX of a religious background, also known from the Midrash (see n. 74). We assume that this composition inserted the phrase *wa-yehi ahar ha-debarim ha-'eleh* in v. 1 to accommodate for the addition of Mordecai's dream (Expansion A) before the beginning of the canonical book.

Therefore, we regard Esth-LXX as a free translation of a rewritten version of MT rather than a paraphrastic translation.

#### 6. Characteristic Features of the Hebrew Source of Esth-LXX

The following features characterize the rewriting in the Hebrew source of Esth-LXX:

1. The addition of large *narrative expansions* at key points in the story: A

---

sacred writing, Lysimachus <i.e. the name of the translator of Esth-LXX according to the colophon of the book, E. T.> was free to adapt the original to the needs and requirements of the Greek-speaking Jews" (257).

<sup>73</sup> *BHQ* ascribes many instances to the freedom of the translator that in our view reflect Hebraistic renderings or Hebrew variants. Among other things, most instances described in *BHQ* as "abbr" probably reflect a shorter Hebrew parent text. For example, 1:1 "to Nubia," 1:13 "learned in procedure," 2:6 "in the group that was carried into exile along with King Jeconiah of Judah," 2:19 "when the virgins were assembled a second time," 2:21 "Bigthan and Teresh," 3:10 "son of Hammedatha the Agagite, the foe of the Jews," 3:13 "on the thirteenth day," 6:8 "and on whose head a royal diadem has been set," 8:7 "and to the Jew Mordecai," etc.

and F before the beginning and after the end ('Mordecai's Dream' and its 'Interpretation'), as well as C ('Prayers of Mordecai and Esther') and D ('Esther's Audience with the King') after the last verse of chapter 4.

2. Probably the most characteristic feature of the LXX is the addition of a *religious background* to the earlier MT version that lacks the mentioning of God's name. These details are added not only in the large Expansions but also in small pluses such as 2:20; 4:8; 6:13. Likewise, God's involvement is mentioned everywhere in the Midrash.<sup>74</sup>

3. The addition of *new ideas* in small details. For example, the identification of Ahashuerus as Artaxerxes; the description of the first banquet as a wedding feast for Vashti (1:5, 11); length of the second banquet (1:5); the description of the opulence at the banquet (1:5–6); the identification of Mehuman as Haman (1:10); the king's active participation in the hanging of the two eunuchs (2:23) and of Haman (8:7); the king's placing the ring on Haman's hand (3:10); the naming of Haman as a Macedonian (E 10; 9:24); Esther's concern for her own safety (8:6).

4. The *removal* of some phrases that may have been considered verbose or less important (e.g. 3:12, 13; 5:6) as well as the *addition* of some clarifications. Admittedly, it is hard to distinguish between changes made at the Hebrew level and similar changes made by the Greek translator.

### C. Daniel 4–6

The relationship between many details in MT and LXX in Daniel 4–6<sup>75</sup> cannot be determined, but most scholars believe that the LXX reflects a later reworking of a book resembling MT, while occasionally LXX reflects an earlier form.<sup>76</sup> Some scholars go as far as to argue that the LXX of Daniel as a

<sup>74</sup> Thus Esther's concern for dietary laws in C 27–28 should be compared with *b. Meg.* 13a, *Targum Rishon*, and *Targum Sheni* 2:20. See B. GROSSFELD, *The Two Targums of Esther, Translated with Apparatus and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible vol. 18) Edinburgh 1991. For LXX Esth 2:7 "he trained her for himself as a wife" (MT "Mordecai adopted her <Esther> as his own daughter") cf. *b. Meg.* 13a "A Tanna taught in the name of R. Meir: Read not "for a daughter" [*le-bat*], but "for a house" [*le-bayit*] <that is, a wife>." For a different view on the relation between the LXX and the Midrash, see M. ZIPOR, "When Midrash Met Septuagint: The Case of Esther 2,7," *ZAW* 118 (2006) 82–92.

<sup>75</sup> It remains puzzling why the two sources are so divergent in chapters 3 and 4–6, and not in the remainder of the book. J.A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1964, 36 and J. COLLINS, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 1994, 7 suggested that these chapters may have circulated separately.

<sup>76</sup> For example, in 4:3–6 MT describes a competition between Daniel and the magicians not found in the LXX. MT is problematic, since the magicians are found unable to interpret a dream before its content is described.

whole preceded MT.<sup>77</sup> Because of complications like these, the two versions could also be presented as two independent works that revised an earlier composition.<sup>78</sup> Be that as it may, in the main, the parent text of the LXX revises an earlier text resembling MT.<sup>79</sup> The Semitic substratum<sup>80</sup> of the Greek text is often visible.<sup>81</sup>

Three examples of the rewriting in the LXX follow:

i. A composition very similar to the MT of chapter 4<sup>82</sup> has been reworked in the LXX. The LXX changed, added, and omitted many details.<sup>83</sup> Among

---

<sup>77</sup> Thus R. ALBERTZ, *Der Gott des Daniel*, Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches (SBS 131), Stuttgart 1988; O. MUNNICH, *Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel*, in: *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible. The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuaginta Reconsidered*, ed. A. SCHENKER (SCSt 52), Atlanta 2003, 93–120.

<sup>78</sup> Thus, according to Ulrich, the *parallel* editions of both MT and the LXX (OG) expanded an earlier text form in different ways: E. ULRICH, *Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated*, in: *Perspectives on the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Walter J. Harrelson*, ed. J.L. CRENSHAW, Macon, Ga. 1988, 101–16 = id., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, UK/Leiden/Boston/Cologne 1999, 34–50, esp. 40–44. This view was developed on the basis of the Notre Dame dissertations by D.O. Wenthe and S.P. Jeansonne mentioned there.

<sup>79</sup> The revisional character of the LXX is described in detail by R. GRELOT, *La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique*, RB 81 (1974) 5–23; id., “*La chapitre V de Daniel dans la Septante*, Sem 24 (1974) 45–66. COLLINS, *Daniel*, 4–11, 216–20, 241–3 makes many judicious remarks on the relation between the two texts.

<sup>80</sup> MONTGOMERY, *Daniel*, 37, 248 argued for an Aramaic substratum, while GRELOT, “*Daniel IV*” assumed a Hebrew parent text.

<sup>81</sup> According to ULRICH, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 43, the Greek translation was “a consistent, unified document with a consistent translation technique. Therefore, the significant variation between the OG and the MT in 4–6 seems to indicate that the OG is a faithful translation of a different literary edition of these chapters.” If this judgment is correct, we have good insights into the Aramaic parent text of the LXX. Even if this judgment about the translation technique is only partially correct, at least major aspects of the Aramaic text underlying the LXX can be reconstructed.

<sup>82</sup> The MT of this chapter tells of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of an enormous tree that provides shelter and food for many. By divine decree, the tree is felled with only its stump left remaining in the ground (vv. 1–14). Daniel’s interpretation indicates that the dream referred to the king and he tries to convince him to atone for his sins (vv. 15–24). However, the king’s subsequent behavior attests to arrogance and madness (vv. 25–30). Finally, the king turns to God, is fully rehabilitated, and is returned to power as king (vv. 31–34).

<sup>83</sup> The exegetical expansions of the LXX depend much on the language and imagery of the stories and dreams in chapters 2–3 and 5–7. The LXX reflects various theological interpretations that may derive from either the translator or the rewritten Aramaic composition. Thus, all verses referring to Daniel possessing a “spirit of the Holy God” are lacking in the LXX (4:5–6; 5:11, 14), the phrase “Most High” is added to MT (vv. 11, 21), and the king’s mania is described as resulting from his destruction of Jerusalem (vv. 1, 19).

other things, the Greek text places the opening verses of chapter 4 (3:31–33 in MT) later in the chapter, in a greatly expanded form, as v. 34c.<sup>84</sup> The story in MT starts with these verses, which contain the king's confession of guilt and his recognition of God's greatness, while in the LXX they are found at the end of the account in the form of a doxology, as in 6:26–27 and elsewhere.

ii. MT has a tendency to change details in the wording of the dream in chapter 4 to agree with the subsequent description of its interpretation. The LXX goes one step further by reporting the fulfillment of the command within the dream itself, in the added verse 14a (17a). This long verse, which repeats the wording of the earlier verses, reports the cutting down of the tree and its metamorphosis, now symbolizing the king, into a beast: "He ate grass with the animals of the earth ..." (for the wording, cf. v. 12).

iii. Preceding the beginning of chapter 5 (King Belshazzar's banquet and the writing on the wall), the LXX inserts a summary of the chapter that is neither matched by MT nor Theodotion's version. This summary includes the transliterated inscription written on the wall (v 25), which is not included in the LXX version. The summary partially duplicates the content of the chapter since it begins with the same words as v. 1 that introduce the king's feast. There are also differences in details between the summary on the one hand and MT and the LXX on the other. Therefore, this addition must have summarized a slightly different form of the chapter.<sup>85</sup> The underlying text of the summary was Aramaic.<sup>86</sup> The summary may be compared to the theme summaries in the LXX of 3Kgdms 2 (see above, A). The summary in Daniel recaps the events, while the LXX of 3 Kingdoms duplicates verses around a common theme.

#### D. Comparison of the Three LXX Books with Rewritten Bible Compositions in Hebrew

The Hebrew sources of the translations of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel freely rewrote their source texts in a manner resembling other rewritten Bible compositions. It remains unclear why these three books<sup>87</sup> were singled out for

---

<sup>84</sup> The position of these verses at the end of the Greek chapter is probably secondary as they refer to the future, although the events themselves have already been described in the preceding verses: "And now, I *will* show to you the deeds that the great God has done with me (v. 34c)."

<sup>85</sup> Thus J. LUST, *The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5*, in: *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETHL 106), ed. A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, Leuven 1993, 39–53 (40); ALBERTZ, *Daniel*, 81.

<sup>86</sup> GRELOT, *La chapitre V*; COLLINS, *Daniel*, 241.

<sup>87</sup> To the best of my knowledge, the only scholar who recognized parallels between these three books is Z. Talshir in a brief note in her paper "Synchronic Approaches," 78, n. 2 (Hebrew).

reworking. The Hebrew/Aramaic versions of Esther and Daniel share certain features at the content and language level,<sup>88</sup> but these features are not shared with 1 Kings. One possible reason may be the similar milieu in which these translations were created. Another possibility would be the assumption that the three translations were created at a later stage than most other Greek translations. At that time such rewritten Hebrew/Aramaic books were circulating, and less so in earlier periods.

We now expand our observations to other rewritten Hebrew Bible compositions as found among the Qumran scrolls and in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The Samaritan version of the Torah rewrote a composition like MT. The rewriting is partial, as all rewriting, but it is manifest. In the main, the rewriting in the SP does not bear a Samaritan character, since earlier non-sectarian texts from Qumran (named pre-Samaritan)<sup>89</sup> carry the exact same content as the SP. However, the SP contains a small number of Samaritan sectarian readings. Together these texts are named the “SP group.”

Some of the Qumran compositions likewise resemble the rewriting in the LXX books, even more so than the SP group. The best preserved rewritten Bible texts<sup>90</sup> from Qumran are 11QT<sup>a</sup> cols. LI–LXVI, 4QRP (4Q158, 4Q364–367), the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), and Jubilees.<sup>91</sup> These parallels strengthen our aforementioned assertions relating to the rewriting in some LXX books and reversely the LXX helps us in clarifying the canonical status of the Qumran compositions.

The main feature these compositions and the SP group have in common with the reconstructed sources of the LXX translations relates to the interaction between the presumably original Scripture text and exegetical additions. All the Qumran compositions present long stretches of Scripture

---

<sup>88</sup> See COLLINS, Daniel, 40.

<sup>89</sup> Especially 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and 4QNum<sup>b</sup>; see TOV, *Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch*, DSD 5 (1998) 334–54.

<sup>90</sup> For the evidence and an analysis, see G.J. BROOKE, “Rewritten Bible,” in: *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. L.H. SCHIFFMAN and J.C. VANDERKAM, Oxford/New York 2000, 2:777–81; E. TOV, *Biblical Texts as Rewritten in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen–Exod*, in: *The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. E. ULRICH and J. VANDERKAM (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10), Notre Dame, Ind. 1994, 111–34; M. SEGAL, *Between Bible and Rewritten Bible*, in: *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature)*, ed. M. HENZE, Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge 2005, 10–29; HARRINGTON, *Palestinian Adaptations*.

<sup>91</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* and Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* also provide valuable parallels, but they are less relevant since they are more remote from the biblical realm.

text, interspersed with short or long exegetical additions, especially 4QRP (4QReworked Pentateuch). Among the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions this text exhibits the longest stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture as found in either MT or the pre-Samaritan text.<sup>92</sup> As far as we can tell, it has a relatively small number of extensive additions. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several pluses comprising 1–2 lines and in some cases more than 8 lines.<sup>93</sup> This composition also rearranges some Torah pericopes.<sup>94</sup> 11QT<sup>a</sup> cols. LI–LXVI (constituting a paraphrase of the legal chapters of Deuteronomy)<sup>95</sup> changes the text sequence more frequently than 4QRP and also adds several completely new sections (for example, cols. LVII:1–LIX:21, providing the statutes of the king).<sup>96</sup> The SP group likewise inserts a number of extensive additions.<sup>97</sup>

The recognition of a group of rewritten Bible compositions at Qumran and elsewhere is accepted among scholars, even though they disagree with regard to the characterization of specific compositions<sup>98</sup> and the terminology used for the group as a whole.<sup>99</sup>

In the past, the LXX translations were not associated with the Qumran rewritten Bible texts. When making this link, we recognize the similarity in the rewriting style of Scripture books. More specifically, the LXX translations meet some of the characterizing criteria that Segal set for rewritten Bible compositions: new narrative frame, expansion together with abridgement, and

<sup>92</sup> The underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364 is clearly pre-Samaritan, that of 4Q365 possibly so (see *DJD* XIII, 192–6). See n. 89 above.

<sup>93</sup> The most clear-cut examples of this technique are the expanded “Song of Miriam” in 4Q365 (4QRP<sup>c</sup>), frgs. 6a, col. ii and 6c counting at least 7 lines. By the same token, the added text in 4Q158 (4QRP<sup>a</sup>), frg. 14 counts at least 9 lines. 4Q365 (4QRP<sup>c</sup>), frg. 23 contains at least ten lines of added text devoted to festival offerings, including the Festival of the New Oil and the Wood Festival. Further, if 4Q365a, published as “4QTemple?”, is nevertheless part of 4Q365 (4QRP), that copy of 4QRP would have contained even more nonbiblical material (festivals, structure of the Temple) than was previously thought.

<sup>94</sup> In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP. In the case of juxtaposed laws on a common topic (*Sukkot*) in 4Q366 4 i (Num 29:32–30:1; Deut 16:13–14), one does not know where in 4QRP this fragment would have been positioned, in Numbers, as the fragment is presented in *DJD* XIII, or in Deuteronomy.

<sup>95</sup> The close relation between that scroll and Hebrew Scripture is reflected in the name given to the scroll by B.Z. WACHOLDER and M. ABEGG, *The Fragmentary Remains of 11QT<sup>a</sup> (Temple Scroll)*, HUCA 62 (1991) 1–116.

<sup>96</sup> For additional material supplementary to the Pentateuchal laws, see the list in Y. YADIN, *The Temple Scroll*, vols. 1–3, Jerusalem 1983 1.46–70.

<sup>97</sup> For a detailed analysis, see TOV, *Rewritten Bible Compositions*.

<sup>98</sup> See n. 119 below with regard to 4QRP.

<sup>99</sup> See M.J. BERNSTEIN, *Rewritten Bible*.

a tendentious editorial layer.<sup>100</sup> In all these matters, the “three strange books” in the LXX resemble several rewritten Bible texts from Qumran and elsewhere, including the SP. We will now review the similarities in techniques:

### *3 Kingdoms*

Two of the central techniques used in 3 Kingdoms, not known from MT or Greek Scripture, were used in the SP group, viz., the duplication of various sections in 3 Kingdoms and the insertion of theme summaries in chapter 2.

a. *Duplication.* Central to the literary principles of the SP group is the wish to rewrite Hebrew Scripture based on its editorial principles without adding new text pericopes. The addition of new passages would have harmed the authenticity of the rewritten Bible compositions, and therefore the SP group limited itself to copying passages. For this purpose they duplicated all the segments of Moses’ first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 in Exodus and Numbers as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy.<sup>101</sup> In both texts, the duplications have a different purpose. In 3 Kingdoms, they serve an exegetical or chronological purpose, while in the SP group the duplication of segments from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers is meant to make the earlier books comply with Moses’ speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.<sup>102</sup>

b. *Theme summaries.* The two collections of verses in 3 Kingdoms 2 summarize in the beginning of the Greek book verses relating to the central theme of the first ten chapters, Solomon’s wisdom. By the same token, the added tenth commandment of SP (not found in the pre-Samaritan texts) is a theme summary of verses describing the sanctity of Mt. Gerizim. The added<sup>103</sup> tenth commandment of SP in both versions of the Decalogue describing and prescribing the sanctity of Mount Gerizim is made up of verses occurring elsewhere in Deuteronomy.<sup>104</sup>

### *Esth-LXX*

The Hebrew source of Esth-LXX rewrote a composition very similar to MT. The most salient technique used in the course of the rewriting is the addition of the large Expansions A, C, D, and F. These Expansions expand the story in

<sup>100</sup> SEGAL, *Between Bible and Rewritten Bible*, 20–26.

<sup>101</sup> For a detailed analysis, see TOV, *Rewritten Bible Compositions*.

<sup>102</sup> A similar duplication is found in 4QDeut<sup>n</sup> V 5–7 where the motive clause for the Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:11 has been added after the motive clause of Deuteronomy. See J.H. TIGAY, *Conflation as a Redactional Technique*, in: TIGAY, *Empirical Models*, 53–96 (55–7).

<sup>103</sup> The Samaritans consider the first commandment of the Jewish tradition as a preamble to the Decalogue, so that in their tradition there is room for an additional commandment.

<sup>104</sup> Deut 11:29a, 27:2b–3a, 27:4a, 27:5–7, 11:30 – in that sequence.

a meaningful way. The interaction of the previous Bible text and the long expansions may be compared with the relation between the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions and their presumed sources. These compositions exercise freedom towards their underlying text by adding large expansions wherever their authors wished.

### *Daniel*

a. *Command and execution.* The technique used in the LXX addition in 4:14a (17a), which relates the execution of God's command of vv. 11–14 (14–17), is known from several other compositions. The closest parallel is the story of the Ten Plagues in Exodus 7–11 in the SP group. In this story, the SP group expanded the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague by adding a detailed account of their execution.<sup>105</sup> That these additions are not only typical of these texts is shown by the similar addition of Kish's command to Saul in 1Sam 9:3 in LXX<sup>Luc</sup> and the Peshitta.

b. *Summaries.* The summary description of the events of chapter 5 that is placed at its beginning reminds us of the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 and in the SP.<sup>106</sup>

In short, in their major features the “three strange books” in the LXX resemble several rewritten Bible texts from Qumran and elsewhere.

## E. Text and Canon

The recognition that the Greek versions of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel represent rewritten versions of MT has important implications for our understanding of the canonical status of these books and of canonical issues in general. All three Greek books were considered to be authoritative by ancient Judaism and Christianity alike. In due course, they were rejected within Judaism, but for Christianity they remained authoritative in different ways.

---

<sup>105</sup> For example, after Exod 8:19 the SP and 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, following the formulation of vv. 16ff. add: “And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him: “Thus says the Lord: Let my people go that they may worship Me. For if you do not let my people go, I will let loose ...” Similar additions are found in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and SP after 7:18, 29; 9:5, 19.

<sup>106</sup> The nature of the rewriting has been described in the studies listed in n. 90, but whether the rewriting in 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel is adequately covered by these descriptions still needs to be examined. Attention also needs to be given to the question of whether or not the rewritten editions were intended to replace the older ones. We believe that this was the intention of the three mentioned rewritten books. The rewritten ed. II of Jeremiah (MT) likewise was meant to replace the earlier ed. I (LXX, 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>), see n. 5.

It is no coincidence that two of the three books (Esther, Daniel) suffered a similar fate within the Christian canon, since they have much in common. They share large expansions that were considered disturbing and therefore were ultimately removed from the running text in the case of Esther. The large expansions of Esth-LXX now have a deuterocanonical status in the Catholic Church even though they never existed separately. At the same time, the medium-sized expansions were left in the text. The medium-sized expansions of Daniel were likewise left in the text (4:17a, 33a–b, 37a–c). However, two book-sized appendixes were placed at the beginning or end of the book (Susanna, Bel and the Serpent), while the large Expansion named the “Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men”<sup>107</sup> was left in the text between 3:23 and 3:24 but given deuterocanonical status. 3 Kingdoms could have undergone the same fate, but all the expansions including the large ones in chapters 2 and 12 were left in the text.

When the LXX translation was produced, the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms was considered to be as authoritative as 1 Kings, at least in some circles. Otherwise it would not have been rendered into Greek. This pertains also to the assumed Hebrew (Aramaic?) sources of Esther and Daniel.<sup>108</sup> The Greek translators and the Alexandrian Jewish community considered the original Hebrew and Aramaic versions, as well as their Greek translations, as authoritative as Baruch<sup>109</sup> or any other book included in those collections.

Several scholars assume that the canonical conceptions behind the “Alexandrian canon” reflect the views of the mother community in Palestine.<sup>110</sup> The link with Palestine is even closer for Esther, as there is strong evidence that this book was translated in that country.<sup>111</sup>

The Greek canon includes 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel, constituting rewritten versions of earlier books such as now included in MT. The rewritten

---

<sup>107</sup> Although placed in the text itself, this added text is usually believed to have enjoyed a separate existence. This Addition is composed of three or four separate compositions: the Prayer of Azariah (vv. 1–22), the prose narrative (vv. 23–28), the Ode (vv. 29–34), and the Psalm (vv. 35–68). See MOORE, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah, 40–76.

<sup>108</sup> See COLLINS, Daniel, 195–207, 405–39.

<sup>109</sup> The book was translated by the same translator who rendered Jeremiah into Greek and was revised by the same reviser who revised at least the second part of the LXX of Jeremiah. See my study *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*.

<sup>110</sup> Especially SUNDBERG, *The Old Testament*, 60–65.

<sup>111</sup> The main manuscripts of the LXX contain a note at the end of the book, the only such note in the LXX, translated by BICKERMAN, “Notes,” 245 as follows: “In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra <78–77 BCE>, Dositheus –who said he was a priest,– and Levitas, and Ptolemy his son deposited the preceding Letter of Purim, which they said really exists and had been translated by Lysimachus (son of) Ptolemy, (a member) of the Jerusalem community.” The implication of this note is that the Greek version of Esther was produced in Jerusalem and deposited (*eisfero*) in the year 78–77 BCE in an archive in Egypt.

books were considered authoritative in their Semitic as well as Greek forms, although by different communities. The SP, likewise a rewritten version of MT, as well as its pre-Samaritan forerunners, enjoyed similar authority. Rewritten versions, as well as the earlier versions on which they were based (for example, the MT of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel), were considered equally authoritative, by different communities and in different periods.

This brings us back to the rewritten Bible compositions found at Qumran. We do not know to what extent these compositions were accepted at Qumran or elsewhere, if at all, but probably at least some of the “non-canonical” books were accepted as authoritative by that community.<sup>112</sup> Jubilees, represented by 15–16 copies at Qumran, may have had such a status.<sup>113</sup> The same may be said about 4Q–11Q Temple, but several types of evidence need to be taken into consideration.<sup>114</sup> The decision is very difficult since no group has survived, like Judaism, Christianity or the Samaritans, that endorsed some of these compositions. Because of the lack of convincing evidence relating to all the rewritten compositions we turn to the one composition which from the point of view of its contents is so close to Hebrew Scripture and to the rewritten works within Greek Scripture that it probably enjoyed the same authoritative status as Greek Scripture. We refer to 4QReworked Pentateuch.<sup>115</sup> This composition, published as a non-biblical composition, now has to be reclassified as a Bible text similar in character to some of the rewritten LXX books like 3 Kingdoms.<sup>116</sup> Among the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions this text exhibits the longest stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture as found in either MT or the pre-Samaritan text.

<sup>112</sup> For an analysis, see G.J. BROOKE, *Rewritten Bible*.

<sup>113</sup> Jubilees is quoted expressly in CD 16:2–3: “As for the exact determination of their times to which Israel turns a blind eye, behold it is strictly defined in the *Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks*.” The book is written as authoritative Scripture, with God announcing Israel’s future to Moses on Sinai. For an analysis, see J. VANDERKAM, “Jubilees,” in: *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:437.

<sup>114</sup> In this composition Israel’s laws are rewritten, especially in cols. LI–LXVI that follow the sequence of Deuteronomy, albeit with many differences. God is mentioned in the first person. This composition is known from five Qumran manuscripts (three from cave 11, and two from cave 4), a number that is probably large enough to assume its popularity at Qumran. It is less clear whether this composition is quoted in the Qumran writings, unless the enigmatic *Sefer he-Hagu* refers to this work.

<sup>115</sup> E. TOV/S.A. WHITE, 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>b–e</sup> and 4Q Temple?, in: H. ATTRIDGE et al., in consultation with J. VANDERKAM, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII), Oxford 1994, 187–351, 459–63 and plates XIII–XXXVI.

<sup>116</sup> S. WHITE CRAWFORD, who published 4QRP together with me, recognizes the possibility that this text possibly was an authoritative Bible text, but decides against it: “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in: *The Hebrew Bible at Qumran*, ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH; N. Richland Hills, Tex 2000, 173–95; eadem, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, forthcoming.

This composition also rearranges some Torah pericopes.<sup>117</sup> As far as we can tell, 4QRP has a relatively small number of extensive additions. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several pluses comprising 1–2 lines and in some cases more than 8 lines.<sup>118</sup> For a more detailed analysis of the issues involved, see elsewhere.<sup>119</sup>

In conclusion, our analysis focused on complete Bible books that may reflect a stage subsequent to that in MT. We believe that the Greek translations of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel 4–6 attest to such stages. All three books were based on Semitic texts and their underlying texts rewrote texts resembling MT. We found several characteristic features in these three compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran, especially 4QRP. These findings have implications for the LXX translations, the Qumran scrolls, and canonical conceptions.

---

<sup>117</sup> In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP. In the case of juxtaposed laws on a common topic (*Sukkot*) in 4Q366 4 i (Num 29:32–30:1; Deut 16:13–14), one does not know where in 4QRP this fragment would have been positioned, in Numbers, as the fragment is presented in *DJD* XIII, or in Deuteronomy.

<sup>118</sup> The most clear-cut examples of this technique are the expanded “Song of Miriam” in 4Q365 (4QRP<sup>c</sup>), frgs. 6a, col. ii and 6c counting at least 7 lines. By the same token, the added text in 4Q158 (4QRP<sup>a</sup>), frg. 14 counts at least 9 lines. 4Q365 (4QRP<sup>c</sup>), frg. 23 contains at least ten lines of added text devoted to festival offerings, including the Festival of the New Oil and the Wood Festival. Further, if 4Q365a, published as “4QTemple?”, is nevertheless part of 4Q365 (4QRP), that copy of 4QRP would have contained even more nonbiblical material (festivals, structure of the Temple) than was previously thought. In all these pluses 4QRP resembles 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel in the LXX.

<sup>119</sup> “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” forthcoming. M. Segal and E. Ulrich were ahead of us when claiming in 2000 that this text is Scripture: M. SEGAL, *4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?*, in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Fifty Years After Their Discovery – Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. L.H. SCHIFFMAN et al., Jerusalem 2000, 391–99; E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism*, in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, ed. T.H. LIM et al., Edinburgh, 2000, 67–87: 76.