

Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism in Joshua 1:7 (MT and LXX)¹

Michaël N. van der Meer

Abstract: In this paper the relationship between textual and literary criticism in the book of Joshua is examined with the plus in MT *vis-à-vis* LXX of the words כל־החזרה in Josh.1:7 as a special case. The background of this examination is provided by recent theories of E. Tov, A. Rofé and others, who hold that variant readings from the oldest textual witnesses of Joshua (the LXX and 4QJosh^{a,b}) (may) reflect an edition of this book that precedes the edition attested by MT. These theories give rise to a number of methodological questions concerning the evaluation of the character of the Greek translation and the question of priority as far as the methods of textual and literary criticism are concerned. It is argued that a theory concerning the literary development of the book based on textual data should be preceded by both a literary-critical study of the MT on its own terms and a study of the Greek text within its own context. Applied to the case in Josh 1:7, a literary-critical analysis of the MT leads to the conclusion that all of verses 7 and 8 are a secondary nomistic (DtrN) addition. The absence of a rendering of these words in the LXX does not point to yet another stage in the development of the Hebrew text, but is the result of a specific interpretation by the Greek translator of vv 1-9.

1. Introduction

In the eighth chapter of the revised edition of *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint* Emanuel Tov discusses a number of Biblical

¹I would like to thank prof. A. van der Kooij (Leiden), dr. K. Spronk (Kampen / Amsterdam), mr. C. de Vos (Groningen), prof. E. Noort (Groningen), mr. S. Sipilä (Helsinki) and prof. A. Rofé (Jerusalem) for their valuable comments on previous drafts of this paper. The present contribution is part of my research on the redaction of the book of Joshua in the light of the oldest textual witnesses (LXX and 4QJosh^a). See my forthcoming dissertation "Formation and Reformulation. The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses" where I deal with this passage (Josh 1:7) in section I.1.3.6.

passages in which the Septuagint can be used for *redaction-critical* purposes. For example in the case of the book of Jeremiah, the Septuagint version with occasional support from two Qumran scrolls reflects a stage in the process of literary formation of that book preceding the edition that has become the authoritative version as we find it in MT.² Besides this well-known example, Tov mentions the Septuagint version of the book of Joshua which shares the two main features of the Septuagint to Jeremiah: variation in order of the passages, and a large number of pluses in the MT *vis-à-vis* LXX throughout the book which in his view should not be regarded as individual interpolations³ but as elements of a comprehensive re-edition of that book.⁴ A convincing example of how textual and literary-critical or redaction-critical data may overlap is posed by the longer version in MT of Joshua 20 in which Deuteronomistic (as well as Priestly) prescripts concerning the cities of refuge are added to a purely Priestly descriptive text reflected in LXX.⁵

²E. Tov, *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Simor Ltd, 1997), 237–263, and his *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, Assen, Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1992), 313–349.

³E. Tov makes a distinction between *interpolations* defined as exegetical additions to the main body of the text and *glosses* defined as “marginal or interlinear interpretations of difficult or obsolete words,” to which the short phrases explaining geographical names in Josh 15:8 and 18:13 may be reckoned, “Glosses, Interpolations, and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible,” in: S. E. Balentine, J. Barton, eds, *Language, Theology, and The Bible. Essays in Honour of James Barr* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 40–66.

⁴Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 245–249. See also his article “The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation,” in: S. Japhet, ed., *Studies in Bible, Scripta Hierosolymitana* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986), 321–339, and his *Textual Criticism*, 327–332, as well as the (unpublished Hebrew) dissertation carried out under his supervision by L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua* (Hebrew University Jerusalem, 1994), of which an English abstract has appeared in *BIOSCS* 27 (1994) 29–38.

⁵See A. Rofé, “Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated,” in: J. H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Uni-

Whereas this second edition of Joshua 20 is easily recognizable because of the relative length and the distinctive vocabulary of the plus in MT, most of the other elements that constitute Tov's second edition of the book of Joshua pertain to short elements added to the first edition of the book as reflected by LXX in its original form.⁶ However, reconstructing a penultimate editorial layer on the basis of these smaller elements is a complicated and problematic matter, and it is this issue I want to address in this paper. For one thing, the LXX of Joshua reflects not only a number of obvious scribal errors,⁷ but also a significant number of readings that reflect exegesis and reorganization of the Hebrew text on the part of the Greek translator.⁸

Unlike the textual evidence in the case of the book of Jeremiah, the other oldest textual witnesses of the book of Joshua, i.e.,

versity of Pennsylvania Press 1985), 131–147. Compare also J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth* (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zu dem Oster-Programm des Gymnasiums zu Moers: J.C. Edner, Moers, 1876) 15, and A. van der Kooij, "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik," in: J. A. Emerton, ed., *Congress Volume. Cambridge 1995*, SVT 66 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 185–202.

⁶I consider Rahlfs' manual edition to be the best approximation of the original Greek text, pending the more definitive Göttingen edition which is being prepared by U. Quast. The well-known masterful edition of M. L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek* (Paris: Gruether 1931[–1938], Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1992; Part V ed. E. Tov) has been consulted throughout (as well as the diplomatic edition of A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek I/IV* [Cambridge: At the University Press, 1917]), but this edition unfortunately contains many conjectural reconstructions of the original Greek text on the basis of MT, see, e.g., C. G. den Hertog, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua* (dissertation Gießen: Köhler KG, 1996) who also offers a valuable discussion of all differences between the two eclectic editions.

⁷Some generally accepted sizeable variants resulting from parablepsis are the omissions in LXX-Josh 14:2a and in MT(–Leningradensis) of Josh 15:59a and 21:36–37.

⁸See Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 45–50, as well as his earlier article "Midrash-type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," in *RB* 85 (1978). J. Moatti-Fine, *Jésus (Josué)*, *La Bible d'Alexandrie* 6 (Paris: Cerf, 1996) makes many interesting observations about the rich vocabulary employed by the Greek translator.

the fragments of the two scrolls of the book from the fourth Qumran cave, do not unequivocally support the quantitative divergencies between MT and LXX. With the final publications of the Qumran scrolls of Joshua,⁹ it has become clear that as far as the position of MT Josh 8:34–35 in 4QJosh^a before Josh 5:2 is concerned,¹⁰ there is now incontestable proof for editorial reworking of the book of Joshua on the Hebrew level. However, as far as the presumed minor expansions are concerned,¹¹ with the possible exceptions of Josh 8:11–17 in 4QJosh^a¹² and Josh 4:1–3 in 4QJosh^b¹³ the text of the two scrolls can hardly be held to be “systematically ‘Septuagintal’ in character” as Cross once claimed.¹⁴ Besides that, the scrolls have been preserved in a very fragmentary state¹⁵ and

⁹See E. Ulrich, “4QJosh^a” and E. Tov, “4QJosh^b,” *Qumran Cave 4.IX. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (eds. E. Ulrich, F.M. Cross, S. W. Crawford, J. A. Duncan, P. W. Skehan, E. Tov, J. Trebolle Barrera; DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 143–160. See also my forthcoming dissertation “Formation and Reformulation” (fn. 1), section II.3.C.

¹⁰See E. Ulrich, “4QJoshua” and Joshua’s First Altar in the Promised Land,” and A. Rofé, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a,” in: G. J. Brooke, F. García Martínez, eds., *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 89–104 and 73–80.

¹¹See L. J. Greenspoon, “The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?,” in: G. J. Brooke, B. Lindars, eds., *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 159–194, and K. Bieberstein, *Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch. Mit einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Hirbet Qumrān*, *Biblische Notizen Beiheft 7* (München: K. Urlaub, 1994).

¹²See Ulrich, “4QJosh^a” (DJD XIV) 145, 150, Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 245, and especially L. Mazor, “A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8,” in: S. Japhet, ed., *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1994) 73–108 (Heb.).

¹³See Tov, “4QJosh^b” (DJD XIV), 156–157.

¹⁴F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (2nd ed.; New York: Doubleday, 1961), 151. For similar conclusions see Greenspoon, “The Qumran Fragments of Joshua,” esp. 164, 176.

¹⁵According to a very rough calculation, 4QJosh^a preserves no more than 0.25 % of the whole text of Joshua, while in 4QJosh^b even less than 0.14 % of the complete Joshua text has remained.

are for these reasons of only limited value in determining the editorial layer attested by the textual data.¹⁶

The question thus arises how to recognize among the divergencies between MT and LXX those elements that form the layer of additions introduced at the literary stage and how to distinguish between these editorial elements and variants resulting from scribal corruption, incidental interpolation, or interpretative translation?¹⁷ Overall studies on the *translation technique* employed by the Greek translator of Joshua are still relatively modest in number, usually select only a few aspects of the translation and, moreover, come to diverging results, depending on the focus on either syntax or vocabulary. On the one hand studies that concentrate on the renderings of syntactical phenomena tend to classify the Greek translation as relatively faithful,¹⁸ while on the other hand an investigation on the lexical level reveals the rich vocabulary used by the Greek translator of Joshua as well as several important stylistic, midrashic, and theological tendencies.¹⁹ Besides that, even if the Greek translation can be qualified as a faithful ren-

¹⁶Thus Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 245, and "The Growth of the Book of Joshua," 321-322.

¹⁷Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 261-263, and *Textual Criticism*, 347-349, "Textual and Literary Evaluation of the Evidence," states the problem, but does not provide criteria that may help to distinguish between the readings created at either the stage of literary formation or transmission.

¹⁸See, e.g., S. Sipilä, "The Renderings of וַיִּהְיֶה and וַיְהִי as Formulas in the LXX of Joshua," in: L. Greenspoon, O. Munich, eds., *VIII Congress of the IOSCS. Paris 1992* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 273-289 and recently C. G. den Hertog, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua*, 160-180, part of which has been published in *IOSCS 29* (1996), 22-52.

¹⁹See the numerous accurate, but unfortunately often disregarded observations made already by Hollenberg in 1876 (note 4), and the lexical investigations by J. Moatti-Fine (note 7). The ambiguity was also noted by J. Bajard, R.-F. Poswick, "Aspects statistiques des rapports entre la Septante et le texte massorétique," in: C. E. Cox, ed., *VII Congress of the IOSCS. Leuven 1989* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 123-156, who noted on the one hand a very high consistency in rendering the Hebrew paratactic *waw* with *καί* (96.6 %), while on the other hand the lexical richness exceeds that of all other translated books.

dering of a Hebrew that differs significantly from MT, we still can not be sure whether the short variant elements are part of a comprehensive re-edition or individual instances of scribal activity.

For these reasons, I believe a redaction-critical study of the literary development and growth of Joshua based *purely* on text-critical data is problematic if not impossible. Therefore, I propose to confront the textual data with arguments obtained from a literary-critical or redaction-critical analysis in its own right,²⁰ before text-critical data are placed into a redaction-critical model of literary growth. If one arrives on the basis of an interpretation of the textual data at conclusions with respect to the literary formation of the work, it would only be logical that one would reach the same or at least similar results, if one argues from the reverse direction, that is to say: if one takes literary-critical observations and existing theories concerning the formation of the book independent from the textual data as point of departure.

This procedure is not without difficulties either, since the question of the literary formation of a book such as Joshua is a matter of much discussion. Nevertheless, there is nowadays among redaction-critical scholars a widespread consensus about the Deuteronomistic character of the basic narrative (DtrH)²¹ and the existence of at least one second Deuteronomistic stratum (Dtr₂ or alternatively DtrN) and a possible Priestly literary stratum (RedP).²² I believe it will be helpful and illuminating to bring into

²⁰Thus A. van der Kooij, "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik."

²¹See, e.g., R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989), 110–125; A. H. W. Curtis, *Joshua* (Old Testament Guides, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); V. Fritz, *Das Buch Joshua*, HAT I/7 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994); K. Bieberstein, *Josua-Jordan-Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6*, OBO 143 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), esp. 35–54; and E. Noort, *Das Buch Josua. Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder*, EdF 292 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998).

²²Literary layers in the book of Joshua, which in the classical Kuenen-Graf-Wellhausen source-division school with S. Mowinckel, *Tetrateuch-*

contact these theories concerning the history of the Book with those of the textual history. More important than taking as point of departure this minimal model for describing the literary layers in the book of Joshua and its editorial development are the criteria by which a distinct redaction is defined. In the formulation of E. Ulrich:

a revised literary edition of a sacred composition...is an intentional reworking of an older form of the book for a specific purpose or according to identifiable editorial principles.²³

In a slight modification of this definition I would propose to regard only those divergencies between MT and LXX in the book of Joshua as elements of an editorial reworking of the book that belong to a comprehensive and consistent pattern of variants that share a distinctive and identifiable terminology that serves to express ideas distinguishable from the original composition or preceding literary stage.²⁴ Thus, if we are able to discern on the basis of these criteria of distinctive ideology and vocabulary a Deuteronomistic stratum within the book of Jeremiah or a Priestly stratum within the book of Joshua, then we should be able to apply the very same criteria

Pentateuch-Hexateuch, BZAW 90 (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964) as its last representative, was held to be a remnant of an independent document (P^G), is now generally regarded as an intentional addition to the older Deuteronomistic strata (P^S according to E. Cortese, *Josua 13-21. Ein priester-schriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, OBO 94 [Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990] or "postpriesterschriftliche Redaktion" in the formulation of Bieberstein, *Josua-Jordan-Jericho*, 397-418, with presentation of previous opinions).

²³E. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in: J. Trebelle Barrera, L. Vegas Montaner, eds., *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, STDJ 11/1 (Leiden: Brill, Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1992), 23-41, esp. 32. See for a similar definition H. Barth, O.H. Steck, *Exegese des Alten Testaments. Leitfaden der Methodik* (9th ed.; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), 50-53.

²⁴Tov, "Scribal Additions in the Hebrew Bible," 58-59, makes similar remarks: "If a number of exegetical additions seem to be connected with each other in a coherent way, they probably constituted a layer of additions, created in the course of the literary growth of the biblical book."

to the variants between these oldest textual witnesses in order to be able to speak of a distinct edition of that Book instead of a number of incidental interpolations, and to distinguish these editorial elements from the interpolations, scribal errors and translational reinterpretations.

2. The case: Joshua 1:7 (MT and LXX)

So far for the prolegomena. I now want to test these methodological statements on a small but significant variant posed by the words $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\eta\tau\omega\upsilon$ in MT Josh 1:7, which lack equivalents in the original Greek text.²⁵ Joshua 1 relates the divine installation of Joshua (1:2–9) in which Yhwh charges Joshua to cross the Jordan (vs.2), to conquer and to allot the promised country (vs.3–6); Joshua's instructions to the people (vs.10–11), followed by a pledge of loyalty by the Transjordanian tribes (vs.12–18). After Yhwh's admonitions to Joshua to be strong and firm (חזק ואמין 1:6), Joshua is encouraged to observe the Law (1:7) and to study it daily (1:8) as prerequisite for success.

1:7	a	ἴσχυε οὖν	רק חזק	a	1:7
	b	καὶ ἀνδρίζου·	ואמין מאד	b	
	c	φυλάσσεσθαι	לשמר	c	
	d	καὶ ποιεῖν	לעשות ככל התורה	d	
	e	καθότι ἐνετείλατό σοι Μωυσης ὁ παῖς μου,	אשר צוך משה עבדי	e	
	f	καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς δεξιὰ οὐδὲ εἰς ἀριστερά,	אל תסור ממנו ימין ושמאול	f	
	g	ἵνα συνῆς ἐν πάσιν.	למען תשכיל בכל	g	
	h	οἷς ἐὰν πράσσης.	אשר תלך:	h	

Whereas most scholars dismiss the plus in MT (1:7d) as a gloss on the basis of the fact that there is a syntactical incongruity between the masculine suffix in the prepositional phrase ממנו and this femi-

²⁵Origen adopted the reading of the *recentiores* (attested in the margin of M.85.344) and added * κατὰ πάντα τὸν νόμον <. Targum Jonathan (למעבד), Peshitta בל תלכבב בל תלכבב , and Vulgate (*et facias omnem legem*) support MT. The text of chapter 1 has not been preserved in one of the Qumran scrolls.

nine antecedent,²⁶ Tov considers the plus to be part of the second edition of the book.²⁷ He points to the fact that the plus is but one of the many small pluses of MT *vis-à-vis* LXX in chapter 1 of the book which in different constellations can be qualified as "contextual additions," "(additions for the sake of) emphasis" (such as the word מֵאֵד in 1:7) or the "influence of Deuteronomy," to which he reckons this variant as well as the plus עֲבַד יְהוָה in 1:1.15 (12:6 and 22:4) and לְרִשְׁתָּהּ in 1:11.²⁸ Although this list of small elements absent from LXX Josh 1 could easily be multiplied, one wonders what constitutes the binding ideological factor between these isolated elements and the distinctive vocabulary

Instructive is the "Deuteronomistic" plus in 1:11 לְרִשְׁתָּהּ. No doubt this phrase can be termed Deuteronomistic,²⁹ but since the same qualifications apply to the whole of the Hebrew text of chapter 1,³⁰ and moreover, almost the same phrase is used only two clauses earlier, the distinctive character of this Deuteronomistic plus to an already Deuteronomistic text is more or less reduced to the category of amplification. When viewed in its context, the variant could easily be ascribed to the translator's intention to avoid the redundant Hebrew formulation:

²⁶See, e.g., the critical apparatus of R. Meyer in *BHS*: "Ὁ καθότι Ι. ΚΑΨΑΡ (cf. מֵאֵד)" and the commentaries to Joshua, including the most recent one of R. D. Nelson, *Joshua*. OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997); and the French commentary to LXX-Joshua by J. Moatti-Fine, *Josué*, 95. Bieberstein, *Joshua-Jordan-Jericho*, 89–90, offers a detailed discussion and an extensive review of previous research.

²⁷Tov, "The Growth of the Book of Joshua," 331, 336.

²⁸Tov, "The Growth of the Book of Joshua," 331–336; idem, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 328.

²⁹See the list of Deuteronomistic phraseology with respect to the inheritance of the land in M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 341–343.

³⁰See the commentaries to Joshua and K. Bieberstein, *Joshua-Jordan-Jericho*, 81–83, 100–101. MT Josh 1:3–5 is almost identical to MT Deut 11:24–25 and MT Josh 1:13–15 is almost identical to MT Deut 3:18–20.

1:11	a	<u>Εἰσέλθατε</u> κατὰ μέσον τῆς παρεμβολῆς τοῦ λαοῦ	עברו בקרב המנה	a	1:11
	b	καὶ ἐντείλασθε τῷ λαῷ	וצו אתהעם	b	
	c	λέγοντες	לאמר	c	
	d	Ἐτοιμάζεσθε ἐπισιτισμόν,	הכינו לכם צידה	d	
	e	ὅτι ἔτι τρεῖς ἡμέραι	כי בעוד שלשת ימים	e	
	f	<u>καὶ ὑμεῖς διαβαίνετε</u> τὸν Ιορδάνην τοῦτον	אתם עברים אתהירדן הזה	f	
	g	εἰσελθόντες	לבוא	g	
	h	<u>κατασχεῖν</u> τὴν γῆν,	לרשת אתהארץ	h	
	i	ἦν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν.	אשר יהוה אלהיכם נתן לכם לרשתה:	i	j

The possibility that the absence of this phrase from the Greek translation is due to a special intention of the Greek translator finds support in some modest initiatives from the Greek translator in this verse and chapter, such as the hypotactic rendering of the two consecutive infinitives (1:11g–h), the avoidance of an asyndetic construction by the introduction of the Greek conjunction *καί* (1:11f),³¹ the variation in rendering the Hebrew verbs עבר with either the Greek verb διαβαίνω (1:11f, as well as in 1:2, 1:14) with respect to the crossing of the Jordan and εἰσέρχομαι in 1:11a,³² and the variation in the translation of the Hebrew verb שר with either the stereotyped equivalent κληρονομέω (1:15) or the rather unique equivalent κατέχω as has been used here in 1:11h.³³ In the light of

³¹See F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (14th. ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), § 458.1.

³²In the following chapters of the book of Joshua we find in the Greek translation besides the standard and unique equivalents, no less than 13 different other equivalents for the Hebrew verb עבר *qal*, i.e., διεκβάλλω (15:7), compounds of ἐρχομαι: ἀπ-ἐρχομαι (10:29.31.34), δι-ἐρχομαι (3:2, 18:13.18), παρ-ἐρχομαι (4:23, 6:8, 15:10.11, 16:2.6, 24:17), and περι-ἐρχομαι (6:7, 19:13), further ἴστημι (3:16), παρα-βαίνω (7:11.15, 23:16), προσάγω (4:5), πορεύω (3:4, 15:4) and its composites ἐκ-πορεύομαι (15:3), προ-πορεύω (3:6), παρα-πορεύομαι (6:1, 15:6) and finally the verb χωροβατέω (18:9).

³³Only in LXX-Ez 33:24 this rather infrequently occurring verb is used again as rendering of שר. J. Moatti-Fine, *Josué*, 57–58, points to the various renderings of שר and נחל, and suggests that this unusual translation as well as the use of the verb ἐμβατεύω in Josh 19:49.51, which occurs only here in the

these observations, I doubt whether such sophisticated and hardly distinctive tendencies such as clarification, emphasis, and deuteronomicizing of a Deuteronomistic text really would have motivated a reworking of an authoritative, if not canonical book such as Joshua, and whether such intentions should not rather be ascribed to the persons who undertook the unprecedented project of presenting the venerated Hebrew books into a completely different language and culture.

However, a more distinctive theological motive and religion-historical background could be adduced for the plus כל-החורה in Josh 1:7 in the sense of a "nomistic correction" as A. Rofé has proposed.³⁴ In his view this alleged addition forms part of a comprehensive pattern of alterations of the biblical text (both additions and omissions) in order to accentuate the pious character of important biblical heroes such as Moses, Joshua, and Samuel, a movement which should be seen against the background of the increasing importance of the Torah in Second Temple Judaism. According to Rofé, the quantitative variant has an analogy in the qualitative variant of the transposition of the passage in which the reading of the Torah also plays a dominant role, from its position in MT Josh 8:30–35 to its position in 4QJosh^a.³⁵ Although Rofé speaks with respect to Josh 1:7 of a phenomenon that has affected various (Hebrew) manuscripts (both MT Josh, 4QJosh^a and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Josh), rather than of a distinct re-edition according to the model of Tov, this qualification of the plus in MT Josh 1:7d

whole corpus of translated Greek, points to the intention of the Greek translator to mark the first occurrence of the notion of land division and the conclusion of the land-division chapters.

³⁴A. Rofé, "The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and Its Occurrence in 4QSam^a," in *RdQ* 14/2 (1989) 247–254, idem, "The Piety of the Torah-disciples at the Winding-Up of the Hebrew Bible: Josh 1:8; Ps 1:2; Isa 59:21," in: J. Maier, et. al., eds. *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition*. (Frankfurt am Main: A. Hahn, 1993), 78–85; and recently "From Tradition to Criticism: Jewish Sources as an Aid to the Critical Study of the Hebrew Bible," *Congress Volume. Cambridge 1995* (see note 4), 235–247.

³⁵A. Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua" (note 9).

would meet the redaction-critical requirements of distinctive motives and vocabulary better than the more general qualifications as “amplification” and the “influence of Deuteronomy”

Paradoxically, from the point of view of a redaction-critical analysis of the MT Joshua on its own terms, there are good reasons to assume that the words כל־התורה are an integral part of their context. For one thing, there is no analogous quantitative variant in the book of Joshua or within the whole complex of Genesis to 2 Kings where we find similar additions of the word *torah* or similar nomistic concepts. But what is more important is that we find the theme of observance of the *torah* fully elaborated in verse 8, where we find no minus in the LXX (or any other textual witness). Likewise, the other concepts of verse 7, such as “careful observance” and “success,” are present in LXX Josh., both in verses 7 and 8:

1:7 לשמר לעשות ככל־התורה אשר צוך משה עבדי ... למען תשכיל בכל אשר חלך
 1:8 למען תשמר לעשות ככל־הכתוב בו כי־אז הצליח את־דרכך ואז תשכיל

1:7 φυλάσσεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν καθότι ἐνετείλατό σοι Μωυσης ὁ παῖς μου,
 1:8 ἵνα συνῆς ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα.

1:7 ἵνα συνῆς ἐν πάσιν, οἷς ἐὰν πράσσης.
 1:8 τότε εὐδοωθήσῃ καὶ εὐδώσεις τὰς ὁδοὺς σου καὶ τότε συνήσεις.

This parallel formulation most probably also accounts for the unusual, though by no means impossible, incongruity³⁶ in MT Josh 1:7 between כל־התורה and the masculine suffix in ממנו, if we assume that the author (or a copyist) had in mind the longer expression of verse 8 כל־הכתוב or the synonymous הוזה התורה הוזה as (masculine) *ad sensum* antecedent.³⁷ I agree with Rofé that there is a shift in the

³⁶See W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* (27th ed.; Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogl Verlag, 1902) § 135o, and § 145.

³⁷Thus after an extensive discussion of the problem C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Josua und Salomo. Eine Studie zu Autorität und Legitimität des Nachfolgers im Alten Testament*, SVT 58 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 192–193. Similar views have been expressed already by mediaeval Jewish commentators such as rabbi David Qimchi: אל חסור ממנו—שב אל משה ופירושו מדרכו הטובה או מספר התורה—מספר התורה Ibn Kaspi, the humanistic scholar Andreas Masius in

presentation of Joshua from military leader to a *talmid-ḥakamim* as presented in Psalm 1:2, but this shift is not restricted to the plus in verse 7 or the whole of verse 8, but occurs already at the beginning of verse 7, where the meaning of the two imperatives חזק ואמץ from verse 6 has been bent from military admonitions towards the keeping of the *torah* by the introduction of the particles רק and מאד.³⁸ The same ideas, formulations and tensions with the context can be found at other strategic points in the Deuteronomistic History, i.e. Josh 22:5, 23:6, 1 Kgs 2:2b–3 and 2 Kgs 21:8.

1:7	<u>רק חזק ואמץ מאד לשמר לעשות ככל-התורה אשר צוך משה עבדי</u> אל-חסור ממנו ימין ושמאל למען תשכיל
22:5	<u>רק שמרו מאד לעשות איתם-מצוה ואת-התורה אשר צוה אתכם</u> משה עבדי-יהוה
23:6	<u>וחזקתם מאד לשמר ולעשות את כל-הכתוב בספר תורת משה</u> לבבתי סור ממנו ימין ושמאל
1 Kgs 2:2–3	וחזקת ... לשמר חקתיו ... ככתוב בתורת משה למען תשכיל את כל-אשר תעשה
2 Kgs 21:8	<u>רק אם-ישמרו לעשות ככל אשר צויתם ולכל-התורה</u> אשר-צוה אתם עבדי משה

Rudolf Smend has also designated this more extensive literary layer that covers the whole of the DtrH as a nomistic edition, but in his view these nomistic texts are not the result of scribal correction from the Late Second temple period as Rofé holds, but part of a far more sizeable nomistic editing of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrN) at a far earlier, exilic or early post-exilic period, in which the *torah*, which is the Deuteronomistic Law, functions as an Israelite identity marker over against the threatening non-Israelite foreign people.³⁹ On literary-critical grounds I find it likely that the

his commentary, *Josua imperatoris historia illustrata atque explicata*. (Antwerp 1574), and J. H. Kroeze, *Het boek Jozua* (COT, Kampen 1968) 30. Bieberstein's objection (90, note 39) to the latter that a suffix never has a cataphoric reference is vitiated if we assume a *constructio ad sensum* as proposed above.—

³⁸Bieberstein, *Josua-Jordan-Jericho*, 95–97, adduces stylistic observations as well.

³⁹R. Smend jr., "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," *Probleme biblischer Theologie*. FSG. von

words כל-התורה, expressing the leading idea of this editorial reworking of the older DtrH, formed an integral part of this secondary editorial addition.

Moreover, I believe these literary-critical observations can provide an answer to the remaining question, why a Greek translator would have left such theologically important words untranslated. If we take a look at the place where in the Hebrew text the nomistic (DtrN) editor takes his departure from the older DtrH text by repeating the imperatives of verse 6, but modifying them with both קר and באר, we find that the second particle is absent from the Greek text, while the transition of verse 6 to 7 is marked in the Greek text by the co-ordinate conjunction οὐν. The use of this word points to an initiative of the Greek translator, since it lacks a Hebrew equivalent.⁴⁰ The renderings of the same Hebrew particle at the end of the chapter with either πλήν (vs.17) or ἀλλά (vs.18) attest not only to the translator's knowledge of the meaning of this particle, but also to his wish to bring some variation in the repetitive text.

1:17	κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν Μωυσῆ, ἀκουσόμεθα σοῦ, πλήν ἔστω κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν μετὰ σοῦ, ὄν τρόπον ἦν μετὰ Μωυσῆ.	ככל אשר שמענו אל-משה כן נשמע אליך רק יהיה יהוה אלהיך עמך, כאשר היה עם-משה	1:17
(1:18)	<u>ἀλλὰ</u> ἴσχυε καὶ ἀνδρίζου.	רק חזק ואמץ	(1:18)

Rad (ed. H.W. Wolff; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971), 494–509, *idem*, “Das uneroberte Land,” *Das Land Israel in biblischer Zeit* (ed. G. Strecker; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 91–202, and *idem*, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*. Smend's ideas are now widely accepted. Without referring to Smend, P. Sacchi, “Giosuè 1,1–9; Dalla Critica Storica a quella Letteraria.” *Storia e tradizione di Israele. Fs. J.A. Soggin* (eds. D. Garrone, F. Israel; Brescia: Paideia, 1991), 237–253, comes to a similar distinction between a layer reflecting a “teologia della Promessa” (vs.1–6) and a secondary layer reflecting a “teologia del Patto” (vs.7–9).

⁴⁰A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint*. (AASF 31; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982) 59.

Thus, whereas the Hebrew text with the two particles makes sense as a restriction that introduces the DtrN-proviso, the absence of the second particle in the Greek text and the presence of the Greek conjunction οὖν likewise serve a common purpose, albeit contrary to that of the Hebrew text, viz., to present the instructions of verse 7 as a logical sequence of verse 6. As a consequence, the instruction φυλάσσεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν καθότι ἐνετείλατό σοι Μωϋσῆς does not refer to the study and strict execution of the Torah, but to the exhortations to have no fear for the enemies, to cross the Jordan, to enter the land and to divide it, which is not only in accordance with the preceding verses and the final verse of chapter 1, but also corresponds to the Moses-Joshua succession passages in the book of Deuteronomy, especially Deut 31:7–8:

3:22	לא תיראום כי יהוה אלהיכם הוא הנחלם לכם:
3:28	וצו את־יהושע וחזקתו ואמצתו כי־הוא יעבר לפני העם והוא ינחיל אותם את־הארץ אשר תראה:
31:7–8	ויקרא משה ליהושע ויאמר אליו לעיני כל־ישראל חזק ואמץ כי אתה תבוא את־העם הזה אל־הארץ אשר נשבע יהוה לאבתם לתת להם ואתה תנחילנה אותם: ויהוה הוא ההלך לפניך הוא יהיה עמך לא ירפך ולא יעובך לא תירא ולא תחת:
31:23	וצו את־יהושע כבננו ויאמר חזק ואמץ כי אתה תביא את־בני ישראל אל־הארץ אשר־נשבעתי להם ואנכי אהיה עמך:

Although the *torah* is not absent from the text following these passages that relate the installation of Joshua (Deut 4:1, 31:9ff., 31:24ff.), Moses' and Yhwh's commandments to Joshua are not described as some sort of special Torah of Moses given exclusively to Joshua,⁴¹ nor do they include instructions as we find in Josh 1:7–8, but only relate to the DtrH-themes of the conquest and division of the promised land.

⁴¹See already the remarks made by A. Masius, *Josuae imperatoris historia illustrata atque explicata*, reprinted in the series *Scripturae Sacrae Cursus Completus* 7 (Paris 1838), col. 898: "Sed enim quid sibi vult, quod ait Deus, *quam imperavit tibi Moses?* Non enim lex singulariter Josuae, sed universe populo Israelitico imperata est."

Thus, the Greek translator who had before him the text of Joshua with the DtrN-addition of verses 7–8 to the older DtrH-narrative sequel to Deut 31:7–8, including the words כל־התורה, read and interpreted the whole of this layered text in a synchronic way, and consequently rendered verse 7 faithfully according to this interpretation. Since the introduction the term νόμος would only have disturbed this interpretation, and since, moreover, the themes connected to the observance of the Torah would be expounded immediately after this verse 7, the Greek translator could afford to render the first half of verse 7 in a condensed *ad sensum* manner,⁴² and present the command to study the Torah as an additional instruction introduced by the conjunction καί, where in the Hebrew text verse 7 is followed asyndetically by verse 8.

Although one could easily reconcile the two nomistic theories of Smend and Rofé by adopting a sophisticated *Fortschreibungs-*model by which the DtrN addition of verse 7 evoked the secondary addition of verse 8 which in turn resulted in the addition of the words כל־התורה in 1:7, as advocated by both Smend⁴³ and Rofé,⁴⁴ I believe such an erosion of the DtrN-thesis is unnecessary and unlikely when both the Hebrew and the Greek texts are studied in their own contexts.

3. Concluding remarks

At the beginning of Tov's second edition of *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint*, we find the cautionary remark that

⁴²Thus already J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung*, 8, who classified this passage without further argumentation as an example of his category "Zusammenfassung des breiten Ausdrucks" (that is of the Hebrew text).

⁴³Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker," 494, n.3.

⁴⁴Rofé, "The Piety of the Torah-Disciples," 78–79. Rofé argues that the shorter version of LXX Josh. 1:7 corresponds to the (Hebrew and Greek) text of Josh. 11:15: כאשר צוה יהוה את־משה עבדו כִּצְוֵה מֹשֶׁה אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. However, the contents of this command perfectly fits the DtrH conquest theme.

the text-critical use of data in the LXX can proceed profitably only if *the analysis of the translation technique ... is taken into account*⁴⁵

and I believe such a proviso should be applied to the variant in Josh 1:7 as well. What is more, however, is that another methodological rule should be applied as well if data from the LXX of Joshua are used for redaction-critical purposes. In cases where the Greek text is held to reflect an older editorial stratum of that book, both the Hebrew and Greek texts should be studied within their own contexts and on their own terms. And: literary-critical observations and existing theories about the formation of the book should be confronted with observations regarding the manner of translation and interpretation of the Greek translator, before new literary-critical models based purely on the textual data are construed. If text-critical and literary-critical observations do not confirm one another in all cases, or perhaps even only in exceptional cases such as Josh 20, they at least can be mutually illuminating, as has been demonstrated.

⁴⁵Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 18.