Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1-9, 1 Kings 11:1-8, and Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G)

Sidnie White Crawford
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, scrawford1@unl.edu

Jan Joosten
Université de Strasbourg

Eugene Ulrich
University of Notre Dame

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub
Part of the Classics Commons

http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/98

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics and Religious Studies at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.
Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: 
Deuteronomy 32:1-9, 1 Kings 11:1-8, and 
Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G)

Sidnie White Crawford¹, Jan Joosten², and Eugene Ulrich³

¹) Lincoln, Nebraska  
²) Strasbourg  
³) Notre Dame, Indiana

Abstract
For abstract, see the accompanying article by Ronald Hendel.

Keywords
For keywords, see the accompanying article by Ronald Hendel.

The following sample editions illustrate the theory and method of the Oxford Hebrew Bible. The Deuteronomy sample, edited by Sidnie White Crawford, concerns a text with one ancient edition, while the Kings sample, edited by Jan Joosten, and the Jeremiah sample, edited by Eugene Ulrich, concern texts with two ancient editions. The arguments that justify the editorial decisions are presented in the apparatuses and text-critical commentaries. (The detailed introductory chapters are not included.) The critical texts, following the conventions discussed in the previous article, contain the following sigla: a superlinear circlet to indicate an entry in the apparatus where the critical text reproduces the copy-text, and a superlinear squarelet to indicate an entry in the apparatus where the critical text differs from the copy-text. Readings in the critical text that differ from the copy-text lack the vocalization and accents of the copy-text. For the sigla and abbreviations used in the apparatus, see the OHB website [http://ohb.berkeley.edu].
I. Deuteronomy 32:1-9

In the case of the book of Deuteronomy, we are fortunate to have a great deal of manuscript evidence from the ancient period. First, there are three complete ancient witnesses to the text of Deuteronomy: the Masoretic Text (M), the Septuagint (G), and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), along with their daughter versions. Second, there is now a wealth of new, fragmentary manuscript evidence for Deuteronomy from the Dead Sea Scrolls. These include thirty or thirty-one Hebrew manuscripts from the Qumran caves, one from the finds in Wadi Murabba‘at, one from Nahal Hever/Wadi Seiyal, and one from Masada. There is also one Greek Deuteronomy manuscript from Qumran, for a total of thirty-four or thirty-five.1

Lengthy Deuteronomy passages also appear in many “non-biblical” texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, most notably in the Temple Scroll and 4QReworked Pentateuch. Although these excerpts must be utilized with care, they can still be useful for the text critic. Finally, there are liturgical texts, such as phylacteries and mezuzot, which preserve passages from Deuteronomy. These texts constitute a witness to the text(s) of Deuteronomy in circulation in the Second Temple period.

Having made the claim in the article cited in footnote 1 that it is possible to produce an eclectic critical text of Deuteronomy, I have undertaken to do so in this sample edition of Deut 32:1-9. I chose this passage for a sample text because there were Qumran manuscripts that covered portions of it, it contains a well-known textual variant (32:8), and it is poetry, which brings its own set of challenges.

The manuscript evidence for the passage is as follows: the Masoretic text (here using Leningradensis); the Septuagint and its daughter versions; the Samaritan Pentateuch; 4QDeutb, 4QDeutc, 4QpaleoDeutd, 4QDeutf, and 4QDeutg.2 In the apparatus and text-critical commentary that follows I will

---

1) For the details of these manuscripts and the others mentioned in this article, and the passages from Deuteronomy which they contain, see S. W. Crawford, “Textual Criticism of the Book of Deuteronomy and the Oxford Hebrew Bible Project,” in Seeking out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, eds. R. Troxel, K. Friebel and D. Magary (Winona Lake, 2005), pp. 315-326.

2) The bibliography is as follows: Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia, ed. A. Dotan (Peabody, 2001); The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version, Part 1, fascicle 2; Part II, fascicle 1b, Leviticus-Numbers-Deuteronomy- Joshua, eds. D. J. Lane, A. P. Hayman, W. M. van Vliet, J. H. Hospers, H. J. W. Drijvers, J. E. Erbes (Leiden, 1991); The Bible in Aramaic, ed. A. Sperber (3 vols.; 3rd impression; Leiden, 2004); Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, Tomus 1,
guide the reader through the text-critical decisions behind the critical text as it is presented here.

The text as presented is laid out stichometrically, either by verse or half-verse. The most ancient manuscript evidence for this passage, 4QDeut\(^{c}\) and 4QDeut\(^{d}\), indicates that by the second century BCE the Song of Moses, of which these verses are a part, was arranged on the scroll stichometrically.

\[
\text{4QDeut, indicates that by the second century BCE the Song of Moses, of which these verses are a part, was arranged on the scroll stichometrically.}
\]
Text-Critical Commentary

32:2: Tout M | לוהי SP G (καὶ καταβῆτων) sim T′ S (+ conj, assim v 1a)

The textual history of Deuteronomy tends toward expansion, especially in the addition of the conjunction. This type of expansion also occurs in verses 3, 6, and 9.

32:3: שַׁם M G (ὄνομα) | בְּשָׁם SP T (בשמים) (theol)

The addition of the preposition ב in SP distances the speaker from the deity.

32:4: The G translation makes two theological changes from its Hebrew Vorlage, substituting θεός for הָצוּר and κύριος for הוא. The latter is also an explication.

32:5: שֶׁשֶׁהוֹרַת SP G (ἡμάρτοσαν) T (הדל) S (peccaverunt) | בֵּית M (assim num)

Verse 5 presents a text-critical challenge: its first clause is almost hopelessly corrupt. The reading of each version displays different errors and subsequent attempts to make sense of the result. M reads: שֶׁשֶׁהוֹרַת לֹא לְבֵי מְמוֹם, literally “He has dealt corruptly with him, not his sons their blemish.” G reads: ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά, indicating a Vorlage, “They have sinned (dealt corruptly), not his, blemished children.” SP also has שֶׁשֶׁהוֹרַת לֹא לְבֵי מְמוֹם, “They have dealt corruptly, not his, blemished children.” The minor versions attempt to make sense of this. The commentaries all make suggestions, reaching no consensus. The following examples give an indication of the variety of proposed solutions.
Dillman proposes, “His children have dealt corruptly towards him; there is a blemish in them.” He has chosen the plural verb of G and SP. Deciding that לא in whatever order, is a dittography, he chooses the preposition as a complement to the verb. Last, he tries to sort out the corruption at the end of the phrase by positing the loss of waw on the end of בני in G and SP, and the loss of a bet in all three versions, with subsequent loss of mem in G and SP.

Tigay suggests two possibilities:

1. אמן בניו לו שחתו “His children violate against him loyalty.”
2. אמן בניו לא לו שחתו “His non-children violated loyalty.” Both these possibilities posit an aleph-mem confusion, with further corruption, including dittography.

Craigie offers an imaginative reconstruction:

שחתו לא בניו מרהה “They destroyed him! Treacherous stones!” He suggests that “stones” as a metaphor for Israel contrasts with “Rock” in verse 4 as a metaphor for God.

I have adopted the reading suggested here—שחתו לא בניי—for the following reasons, the order of which is important. The phrase לא בניי, “not-my-children,” echoes similar phrases throughout the poem: חכם לא (“not-wise” (v. 6), אלה לא, “not-a-god” (v. 17), and אלה לא, “not-god” (v. 21). Once that phrase is retained, the verb must be plural (שחתו); the singular of M is assimilation to other singular verbs nearby (e.g. v. 7) or is a case of haplography. Since לא בניי is a “frozen phrase,” the order לא ולו must be correct; the order לא ולו displayed by SP G T S is the result of metathesis. Finally, the word מום or a form thereof is an explicating plus added to clarify the corruption; once it was added the construct phrase מום בני (SP G S) crept in, brought about by loss of ה by haplography (perhaps), then retained because it made better grammatical sense. There is, however, no versional support for the omission of המום.

Verse 6 presents differences in letter spacing; I have selected the one that represents ancient practice.

In verse 7 we have a difference in number in the verb in the various versions; the singular and plural alternate throughout this passage, and in this case I have retained the reading of the copy-text, suggesting that the secondary reading is by assimilation.6

In 1954 Patrick Skehan revealed אֵלֵי בְּנֵי אלהים as a Hebrew variant found at Qumran in 4QDeut (the correct reading is בֵּין אלהים), and suggested that this reading was the probable Vorlage for the Septuagint variant.7 The reading given here, אלהי בְּנֵי, while not occurring in any extant Hebrew witness, is preferred as making the best sense of the evidence. My reconstruction of what took place in the transmission of the text, resulting in the present variants, is as follows. First, the G reading, υἱῶν θεοῦ, may be retroverted as either אלהי בְּנֵי or הים (= 4QDeut). If the former is chosen, then it is easy to suppose that the Vorlage of M SP , wishing to change a polytheistic text to monotheistic orthodoxy, inserted the consonants ישוּר before אלהי, thus creating the reading אלהי בְּנֵי. Finally, 4QDeut’s אלהים is simply a scribal change, employing the more common term for “God.”

II. 1 Kings 11:1-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition A (≈ M)</th>
<th>Edition B (≈ G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָשִׁ֧ים הבָּ֣א שְׁלֹמ֗וֹ וְהַמֶּ֣לֶךְ</td>
<td>נָשִׁ֧ים הבָּ֣א שְׁלֹמ֗וֹ וְהַמֶּ֣לֶךְ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| וּפִֽלַגְשִֽׁים נַעֲלַ֣יִם מֵא֔וֹ שְׁבַ֣ע תַּ֣שְׁרוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּوּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּوּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּוּו
הברית הפנימית wage

(1) נברית 1)
2) נברית
3) נברית
4) נברית
5) נברית
6) נברית
7) נברית
8) נברית

1 Kgs 11:1

Text-Critical Commentary

The divergences between the Septuagint on the one hand, the MT and the other versions on the other hand, point to the existence of two distinct Hebrew editions of 1 Kings. It is not easy to determine which edition precedes the other. On the whole, M reflects an older stage than G, but there are many details where the relation seems to be the reverse. After the two editions branched off from one another, each one of them continued to be altered by scribes.8

1 Kgs 11:1 (ed A) M | אָהַב (ed A) M | (ed B) G (ϝιλογύναος) cf Tms (ῥας) (equal?)

While M states that Solomon loved many foreign women, G says he was a “lover of women”. Each reading fits its own context well, M proceeding to enumerate the foreign nations among which Solomon took wives, and G leading on to the information that S. had many wives.

The vocalization of the form as a participle in edition B is uncertain. One manuscript of Targum Jonathan vocalizes the form ירֶשִׁי, corresponding to הבא, as a participle (all other manuscripts vocalize as a perfect, in accord with M). The possible agreement of G with a T manuscript may be due to polygenesis.

8) The bibliography is as follows:
D. Barthélemy, Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, I Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther (OBO 50/1; Fribourg-Göttingen, 1982).
A. Schenker, Septante et Texte Masorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2-14 (CahiRB 48; Paris, 2000).
Edition B separates the issue of having many wives from that of marrying foreign women, by introducing into verse 1 the information on the high number of Solomon’s wives and concubines. In edition A, this information comes in verse 3, suggesting that all Solomon’s wives were foreign. Edition A does not separate the issues of many wives and foreign wives. Edition B is more rational than edition A on this point. Nevertheless, the Wiederaufnahme by means of the words נשים ויקח, which are lacking in edition A, suggests that edition B is secondary. Edition A is a mess, edition B an unsuccessful attempt to clean it up.

The absence of the adjective רבים, “many”, in G may reflect the earliest stage of the text. It is easier to imagine that the word was added by a later scribe to edition A than to explain why it was omitted in edition B. Possibly, however, G’s פילוגונאים reflects רבים נשים אהב (Talshir).

The addition of “Aramaic (women)” in G probably reflects a duplication of the word אדרים, “Edomite (women).”

With the omission of the Phoenicians and the addition of the Amorites, the list of forbidden nations is to some extent realigned with the prescription in the Torah (Deut 7:1). In Ezra 9:1 and Neh 13:1-3, 23 the interdiction of intermarriage is extended from the seven Canaanite nations to include other foreigners.

The use of 앞 in M, confirmed only by V (certissimo enim), is suspect, since the particle elsewhere invariably introduces statements that are contrary to expectation. If G, S and T do indeed reflect a Hebrew text reading 앞, this may be the original. Note that 앞 appears to have been edited out also in 2 Kgs 18:32, as a comparison with the parallel in Isa 36:17-18 will show. The reason for these changes may perhaps be found in the history of the
Hebrew language. In Late Biblical Hebrew, פן is practically unattested (exception: 1 Chr 10:4, taken over from 1 Sam 31:4). In Qumran and Ben Sira, פן is used, as a classicism, in specific text types only.

In this verse the masculine suffixes of M are rendered by feminine pronouns in some of the versions (Antiochene Septuagint, Peshitta, Vulgate). This is not a matter of text, but of exegesis.

11:3 שרה +שָׁרוֹת M (> G) (explic)

The absence of the word “wives” in G may again reflect the earlier stage of the text, as it is easier to explain its later addition in edition A than its omission in edition B (or in the process of translation).

11:4 אחרים . . . נשיו and אביו . . . ולא (ed A) M ] transp G (ed B) (exeg)

It is not impossible that edition B originally omitted the clause “and his heart was not perfect with Yhwh his God, as was the heart of David his father” from this verse, relocating it, as a proper conclusion to the section on Solomon’s sins, after verse 10 (see there). The clause may then have been restored to the present verse under the influence of edition A, while ending up in a slightly different position within the verse. There is, however, no manuscript evidence for this scenario.

11:5 The entire verse is omitted in edition B, probably because it was felt to add nothing to what was told in verses 7-8.
A theological correction is here reflected in the Antiochene Greek, which supplements the text of verse 5 on the basis of a Hebrew text. The variant in the Antiochene text is typologically later than the text of edition A (dysphemism). See below on a similar variation between M and S in this same verse.

The majority text of the Peshitta adds a third divinity, harmonizing with verse 7. The secondary nature of the addition is demonstrated by its absence in ms 9a1. Where this manuscript is closer to M than the other Peshitta manuscripts it usually reflects the original Syriac text (see M. Weitzman, “The Originality of Unique Readings in Peshitta MS. 9a1,” in The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History, eds. P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder [Leiden, 1988], pp. 225-258).

M is typologically later than the text reflected in S (dysphemism). Whether this means S preserves the older text is a different question, however. Once the equivalence between the terms “abomination” and “god”, when applied to gods of other nations, was established, scribes may have been led to change the text either way. From the point of view of textual history, the readings are equally valid (equal).

11:6 In edition B the verse follows verses 7 and 8 of edition A.

11:7 The absence of these words from edition B are hard to explain if they formed part of the original text. It is better, therefore, to suppose they were added in the M tradition (including S T V) on the basis of 2 Kgs 23:13.

Apart from this verse, the god of the Ammonites is always called Milkom in the Bible. The absence of mimination in the present verse may be due to a mistake or it may reflect an early variant form of this divine name.
On purely internal grounds one should have to say the Antiochene Text here represents the Old Greek, and the Old Greek the original text of the passage. One understands that a text accusing King Solomon of active idolatry should have been attenuated by later scribes, but the reverse development is hard to envisage. The Antiochene text is a narrow basis, however, for constructing the correct Hebrew text.

III. Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition A (≈ G)</th>
<th>Edition B (≈ M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27:1</td>
<td>בְּרֹאשֵׁית מַלְכֹּךְ וּזַחֲשֵׁת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>בְּרֹאשֵׁית מַלְכֹּךְ וּזַחֲשֵׁת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>מָצָא אַתָּה וַזַּחֲשֵׁת לָלֹאֵךְ מַלְכֹּךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>בְּרֹאשֵׁית מַלְכֹּךְ וּזַחֲשֵׁת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>לָלֹאֵךְ מַלְכֹּךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>בְּרֹאשֵׁית מַלְכֹּךְ וּזַחֲשֵׁת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>בְּרֹאשֵׁית מַלְכֹּךְ וּזַחֲשֵׁת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>בְּרֹאשֵׁית מַלְכֹּךְ וּזַחֲשֵׁת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As explained in the introduction, edition B is characterized by frequent additions sparked by a variety of principles, such as supplying additional information, expanding titles, inserting evolving traditions, attempting to make the text clearer, etc. Thus, whereas some individual ambiguous readings could be seen either as an omission in edition A or as an addition in edition B, when the latter is as likely as the former, the general tendency weighs in favor of the latter (see on v 5 below).9

9) The bibliography is as follows:
Editor B has inserted at the beginning of this chapter, as he did in 7:1 and 16:1, an introduction not found in G; in fact, this historical setting is repeated from 26:1 in virtually identical words. But it is demonstrably incorrect, since in vv. 3 and 12 the king is Zedekiah (see next). Chapter 27, rather than being connected with ch. 26, is to be connected with ch. 28, which does center on Zedekiah.

27:1 יהויאקימ (ed B) M ] ממלכות Mmss S (כְּפָרֶהמ) (corr)

The incorrect name supplied in the introductory setting by editor B, in turn, caused some scribes in the M tradition subsequently to correct “Jehoiakim” in v. 1 to “Zedekiah.”

27:3angelōn αὐτῶν ] כִים—M (crrp)

Both the odd syntax in M (מלאךוס ובהם, vs. -המל) and the context (explicit mention of the kings) suggest “their messengers.”

27:5את האורים ושם bornearth ממלכתו + (ed B) M (add, antic v 6?)

Whereas omission due to homoioteleuton הארץ...הארץ is possible (Jensen, p. 118), the fem. sing. suffix (ונתתיה) indicates that the M reading is intrusive (so Holladay, p. 112), perhaps in anticipation of הבירים נמוד בتراث in the next verse.

27:6עבדי + בבל (ed B) M (add, sim 25:9; 43:10); + עבדו (לעבד αὐτῷ) GArab (douλευειν σύν) (harm v 6fin)

The Hebrew Vorlage of the OG (= G5 Bo Aeth) did not contain עבדי. The B editor added עבדי, as he did in the only other two occurrences where


Nebuchadnezzar is called עבד in Jeremiah (25:9; 43:10); the view that Nebuchadnezzar is God’s עבד  is a characteristic expansion of editor B, whereas G lacks all three occurrences. G ABmss added δουλεύειν αὐτῷ, either on the basis of an early Hebrew ms which had עבד or by harmonization with the end of the verse. Though Ziegler includes δουλεύειν αὐτῷ as part of his critical text, G probably retains the preferable OG reading while G ABmss is secondary. Note that Ziegler’s characterization of G concludes that “gewöhnlich ist ihre Lesart als ursprünglich anzunehmen” (pp. 50-51).

27:7 > ed A (add ed B)

The B edition adds: ארצו אגץ אשת בנו בן ושא אל תעש חיים גוזו עבדו וגוים כל אתו עבדו.

Unlike v. 5 where there was the possibility of homoioteleuton, v. 7 has no triggers for omission; here the B editor simply expands.

27:8 (ed B) M (add)

Again, although homoiarkton, אישר לא עבדו אתו נכדנאו מלך בבל ואתו + והמלכה אישר לא אישר לא אישר לא אישר לא, could possibly explain a loss of material, expansion by the B editor is more likely; note that the extra material adds explicit (though unnecessary) information with the king’s name, and that the resumptive conjunction is ואת whereas there was no את in the preceding clause.