DOUBLE READINGS IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

SHEMARYAHU TALMON

I

The variant readings brought to light by comparing the extra-massoretic versions of the Old Testament, such as Sam. and G, (to which must now be added the Biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert), with the MT, have usually been classified into three main archetypes:

a) Deliberate corrections and emendations of the text.
b) Variants arising from scribal routine.
c) Textual corruptions resulting from visual (graphic) and aural mistakes, or from the faulty memories of scribes and copyists.

Hence, for example, the accepted axiom of Septuagint studies (usually associated with the name of de Lagarde, though he was not the first to propound the doctrine) that it is possible for scholars to reconstruct the "Utext", or prototype, of G from which are derived all the Greek versions and sub-versions still extant. The same reasoning is also applied to the Hebrew text: originally there was only one Hebrew version, and all the divergent readings such as those preserved, for example, in Sam. or in MSS of the Massoretic text itself, are simply freaks resulting from scribal errors or from tendentious alterations of the original made by scribes belonging to dissident sects.

Usually each of the extra-massoretic versions is subjected to a separate comparison with the MT, which has come to be accepted as the touchstone in all matters of comparative textual criticism. A corollary of this method is that many of the textual divergencies from MT found in a given non-massoretic version are explained as the peculiar characteristics of that other textual tradition.

However, on closer examination it becomes evident that most of the variants in the extant non-massoretic versions may be classified in common categories and are therefore not to be construed as exclusive indications of a particular textual tradition. Furthermore, some of these textual variations are of the very same type that has also given rise to groups of intra-massoretic variants, like those revealed by contrasting different MSS of the MT or by comparing the qere with the kethib, and above all by collating two different redactions of the same text which have been preserved in parallel traditions in the O. T., such as are found, e. g. in the Former Prophets and Chronicles. The character of such variants cannot be properly understood if the study of them is limited to the comparison of only two versions. What is called for here is an adequate presentation of the full extent to which these phenomena are found in the textual traditions of the O. T., and of all the variant forms which they take. To the "vertical" examination of the versions by pairs we must now add a "horizontal" examination of all textual witnesses extant. In other words, we have to undertake a synoptic comparison of the various textual traditions of the O. T. that alone will reveal the similarity of the literary processes which underlie textual variants as well as the common origins of these processes.

This similarity will appear most strikingly in a fourth variational archetype, which is not included in the standard classification given above. All the versions of the O. T. contain a plentiful crop of variants which are the result of scribal errors or of deliberate emendation. But, beside these, the versions — each one of which probably came to be regarded as sacred by some clearly defined social group — also preserve ancient traditions established by the scribes of the groups in question and passed on by them from generation to generation. The fact that these textual traditions were sometimes handed down in the same wording within different social units, between whom there existed no discernable historical connection, such as the Samaritan community and the Sect of the Judaean Desert⁴, indicates the antiquity of the sources underlying them. These sources were common Jewish heritage, but they have left a deeper mark on the literature of dissident groups than on that of normative Judaism. This explains why Sam. occasionally represents a textual tradition which, while diverging from that embedded in the MT of the Pentateuch, is nevertheless identical with the parallel reading preserved in the MT of Chronicles.⁵ The same is true of the fragmentary MS of the Book of Samuel found in the fourth

Qumran cave (4Q Sam) which "preserves a text much closer to the text of Samuel used by the author of the book of Chronicles than to the traditional text of Samuel surviving in the Massorah".6

We propose to refer to such variants as *synonymous readings*, on the analogy of the term *synonymous parallelism* which is a basic feature of Biblical stylistics.

Variants in our sources will be classified as synonymous readings if they display the following characteristics:

a) They result from the substitution of words and phrases by others which are used interchangeably and synonymously with them in the literature of the O. T.

b) They do not affect adversely the structure of the verse, nor do they disturb either its meaning or its rhythm. Hence they cannot be explained as scribal errors.

c) No sign of systematic or tendentious emendation can be discovered in them. They are to be taken at their face value. Synonymous readings cannot be explained as variants with a clearly defined ideological purpose. They are characterized by the absence of any difference between them in content or meaning.

d) If, as far as we can tell, they are not the product of different chronologically or geographically distinct literary strata.

From these distinguishing features of synonymous readings it follows that they have no direct bearing on the criticism and emendation of the text, since by definition it is impossible to decide that any one of them is intrinsically preferable to the others. These readings go back to a very early stage in the history of the O. T. text, prior to that authoritative assessment of the different existing literary traditions which was the work of later generations.

II

The actual existence of readings divergent from those incorporated in the *textus receptus* is explicitly vouched for by Jewish tradition. Not only do we learn of the appointment of official recensionists in Jerusalem, "who received their payment from offerings paid into the Temple offices" (B. T. *Kethuboth* 1C6a), but reports have also been preserved of the debates that took place to decide the exact wording of certain readings in Scripture.7 This process of


7. P.T. Taan. iv, 2 (68a); *Sifre Deut. xxxiii, 27*; *Soferim vi, 4; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan*, Version B, xlvi.
selection and classification, of authorization and rejection, has undoubtedly a long history. It is in the nature of a sacred popular literature to tend towards rigidity, towards the creation of fixed linguistic patterns that are handed down unchanged from generation to generation. This centralizing and limiting process is spontaneous and unofficial and is, in its initial stages, not directed by any appointed authority. Not being activated by any conscious motives, it is entirely unscientific and unsystematic. Hence this same centripetal tendency acts as a restraint on the narrator’s or writer’s natural inclination to give an individual flavour to his words by embellishing his stories with new stylistic adornments. It holds the balance and prevents a popular tradition from running off into innumerable literary channels. But, at the same time, it is not powerful enough to mould the tradition to a simple, uniform pattern; nor, indeed, is that its intention. As a result “the book of the Pentateuch was preceded by a long period of the Pentateuchal literature, which was developed and diversified in various circles of priests and of men cognizant of God’s words. The crystallized form is the culmination of a prolonged growth and development of oral and written tradition”.

The small number of those permanently engaged in the work of transmitting the traditions and in copying them, once they had begun to be committed to writing, was also a factor in limiting the proliferation of readings right from the start. Presumably groups of traditionists came into being, each with its own centre, in which the various traditions were preserved and handed down.

The emergence of such local schools of tradition played its part in the ensuing prominence of some selected versions of the sacred stories that had established themselves in these circles and were disseminated by them. Of these traditions, which at times differed only slightly from each other and at others a great deal, only those versions persisted which were adopted by influential bodies with a stable organization, such as priestly associations or groups of sages. As the social framework grew wider and there was ever-increasing contact between different geographical regions, purely local traditions sank into oblivion, while those accepted in circles which had a nation-wide orientation gradually rose to pre-eminence. Thus, there was all the time an automatic consolidation of certain, relatively few, versions of the sacred stories. In short, the privilege of variation and the freedom in the choice of style enjoyed, according to this theory, by the individual narrator while the literature of the O. T. was still inchoate, were kept within bounds and prevented from splintering the national traditions into countless textual formations by largely spontaneous

centripetal forces which checked the diversifying process by acting as focal points for incipient central traditions.

These centripetal forces were adequate to keep the national traditions within a more or less uniform framework as long as the influence of the other, centrifugal forces was also haphazard and unorganized. However, this balance was dangerously disturbed by the appearance in the body politic of heterodox opinions and doctrines for which authority was sought in the oral and still more in the written tradition. It was this new development that necessitated the formation of a clear-cut, authoritative text of the national lore.

The beginning of this movement towards centralization is to be sought in impulses of a social and political nature and should not be attributed to scholarly motivations. The requirement of inner unity and the quest for clear demarcations against outsiders simultaneously obliged the leaders of both the normative community and of the dissident sects to undertake a recension of the various readings in circulation. From then onwards this work became the primary occupation of generations of traditionists. This sifting of readings was not an aim in itself, but served the normative community as a measure of self-defence against various groups of dissidents. It was intended, first and foremost, to create a stable textual tradition in those parts of the O. T. which were used as proof-texts in the religio-social controversies of the time.

This recension bestowed the authority of religious sanction on readings which had in fact already been adopted by the Rabbis; and it may therefore be considered a matter of mere formality that the decision between extant readings was made on grounds of numerical majority. No collation of all the available MSS was undertaken for this purpose: it was enough for the decision to be based on a number of codices that were regarded as particularly holy, on account of their being placed for safe-keeping in the Temple court (P. T. Taanith, iv, 2; 18a). Hence when, as sometimes happened, the authorities on either side were equally balanced, a deadlock occurred. When the variants in question were purely stylistic, without any ideological significance, and the number of books supporting each of the parallel readings was equal, there was not even any formal justification, let alone any considerations of intrinsic value, for rejecting one reading and upholding another. It was this recensial dilemma that gave rise to the preservation of synonymous readings, because “these and these alike are the words of the living God”.

DOUBLE READINGS IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

Apparently, then, the editors and redactors refrained from imposing linguistic uniformity on verses which are repeated in different books of the O.T., in order not to suppress one reading and uphold another where no decision could be taken between the two. In this way synonymous readings have been preserved in parallel literary units in the O.T., as in the Former Prophets and in the Books of Chronicles, or sometimes in different traditions embodied in the *Kethib* and the *Qere*. The presence of such synonymous readings in the extra-massoretic versions can be similarly explained. In this case we are confronted with very old variants which were excluded from the text canonized by the Rabbis, either because they had become part of the tradition of dissident groups, such as the Samaritans, or because they were incorporated in unauthorized texts, such as the translation “that was written for King Ptolemy” (B. T. Megillah 9a; *Soferim*, i. 8). In other words, a reading was sometimes rejected in favour of an alternative one on account of the latter’s being accepted by a heterodox group. The sole purpose of this was to promote social segregation, even though no decision between the two could be arrived at on internal grounds or by a count of codices. Conversely, it sometimes happened that a reading rejected by the Rabbis on the basis of a (fortuitous) majority decision was accepted by anti-rabbinical sects, for no other reason than its having been proscribed by the body whose religious authority they refused to recognize. This means that sometimes the difference between parallel readings in MT and extra-massoretic versions is due solely to the antagonism that sprang up in the time of the Second Temple between normative Judaism and various dissident groups.

The origins of such readings go back to the period before these ideological and sociological divisions, when there still had not crystallized a single uniform version of the Scriptures. These synonymous readings present elements of extremely ancient traditions of the Biblical text, relics from the formative period of the literature of the O.T., in which the stories were still to be found in varied linguistic and stylistic frames. The accepted technical terms of modern scholarship — “variants” or “substitutes” — are inapplicable to these readings, since they go back to a stage in the development of O.T. literature when there was as yet no *textus receptus* from which it was possible to diverge accidentally, or whose definitive readings could be consciously replaced by others.

This method of according formal recognition to synonymous readings in the framework of the MT by incorporating them in parallel versions of the same subject matter in different books of the O.T., was open to the redactors only in the case of those — relatively few — verses and passages which appeared at least twice in the O.T., such as the sections of Samuel-Kings that are repeated in Chronicles, prophetic utterances that are found in the books of more than one prophet, and certain psalms. It could not be adopted to solve the problem raised
by synonymous readings embodied in the textual tradition of those books and passages — the majority — that were included in the Scriptures in a single form only: the Pentateuch, Joshua-Judges, most of the Later Prophets, and the Hagiographa. In the case of these unduplicated parts of the O.T., another way of preserving equally valid readings had to be sought by the redactors. It was found in the technique of double readings, a kind of modification of synonymous readings, which made it possible for alternative wordings of the same text to be incorporated in a single verse.

III

The conflation of alternative readings is a well-known feature of the textual tradition of the Versions. The later redactors and editors of G, as also those of other translations, used to combine variant readings whenever the MSS before them showed different readings of a given passage. This penchant for conflating readings is particularly noticeable in Lucian, as has been remarked by S. R. Driver: “When Lucian found in MSS two divergent readings of a passage, he systematically combined them, producing thereby what would be called in the terminology of N.T. criticism ‘conflate’ readings.” According to Driver (ibid): “This method of combining different readings is characteristic of the Syrian school of critics, from whom the modern ‘Textus Receptus’ of the N.T. is essentially derived.” However, the conflation of variants is not unknown in the textual tradition of G either, and must therefore be rooted in earlier scribal technique. Here are two examples:

a) Ju. xx, 15 MT: לֵבֶרֶס מְשׁוֹרַת הַתְּפִקָר שֵׁבֶט פָּעַם מַשָּׁא אַי שׁ בֵּית ר י

G (A): ἤνδης ἐκλέκτοι
G (B): ἤνδης νεανίσκοι ἐκλέκτοι

The pleonastic νεανίσκοι in B is undoubtedly parallel to the word ἤνδης which has been preserved in A as a translation of הֶבֶץ in the Hebrew original. The scribe of B, confronted by the two synonymous renderings and not knowing which to prefer, incorporated them both side by side in his copy.

b) Sometimes the doublet in G is derived from two different redactions of the same verse which have both been preserved in MT. Thus, in

II Sam. vi, 2: καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἐπορεύθη Δαυὶ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὁμητὸς αὐτῶν ἀπό τῶν ἀρχόντων Ἰουδα ἐν ἀναβάσιν τοῦ ἀναγαγεῖν τὴν κιβωτίν του θεοῦ

Instead of the complete line ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰουδα ἐν ἀναβάσει we find in the MT only the words בֶּנֶל יִוָד. It can easily be shown that בֶּנֶל יִוָד has been twice translated in G: once in the meaning that is usually accorded to it in the Former Prophets, “citizens of Judah” (on the analogy of בֶּנֶל יִוָד Ju. ix, 2; ibid. xx, 5 et sim.); and again as a derivation from the root 실 — ἐν ἀναβάσει — in the sense of “in the ascent”. This second reading was obtained from the parallel redaction in I Chron. xiii, 6, where the MT reads: יָעַל רְדֵּי בֶּנֶל יִוָד, i.e. “to Baalah” which is Kiriath-jearim (Josh. xv, 9). This is the correct reading. However, the Greek translator wrongly took the word as a gerund from the root 실 and combined his translation of it as such with a translation based on the reading in II Sam. It should be stressed that the Greek redactor of II Sam. vi, 2 did not base his rendering on the Greek translation in I Chron. xiii, 6, since there we find a free paraphrase: καὶ ἀνήγαγεν ἀνήγαγεν Δαυὶ שִׁלֵּךְ לֹא נָאֲגַד אֵלֶּךְ. It is therefore highly probable that the Greek translator of II Sam. still had in front of him a Hebrew version which read בֶּנֶל יִוָד, as in the parallel passage in Chron.

These examples show that the conflation of parallel readings was already practised by translators of the O. T. before Lucian, and is older than the Syrian school of redactors of the N. T. It is therefore necessary to look further for the origin of this method. Is it peculiar to the translators and derived from a Greek or Syrian, i.e. non-Hebrew tradition? Or did it perhaps originate in an ancient Hebrew tradition subsequently taken over by the translators?

To answer these questions, we must first distinguish various categories of double readings in the translations, and above all in G, and then examine the origin of each category separately. We suggest the following threefold classification:

a) Double translations. These are usually the work of copyists who combined alternative renderings of a single Hebrew word or a single Hebrew expression found in different MSS of the version in question. This phenomenon, as has been remarked, is especially characteristic of the Lucianic recension, but it also occurs in basic translations, such as MSS of G and the Aramaic versions.

b) Conflate translations of synonymous readings. In these cases the translator had recourse to a doublet to preserve two alternative Hebrew traditions which he found in different MSS of the original, because he would not presume to prefer one to the other.

c) Translations of double readings which had already been incorporated as such in the Hebrew MS used by the translator and whose conflate character escaped his notice; or if he noticed them, he did not presume to correct them.
The double translations in the first two above categories came into being as part of the versional tradition itself; whereas double readings in the third category are derived from the Hebrew original. The double translations in category (a) are the work of copyists. The conflate translation of synonymous readings and the translation of double readings in the original are due to translators. While the double translations (a) are not based on a Hebrew original, the textual phenomena related to categories (b) and (c) go back to an ancient Hebrew tradition or traditions.

For our present study of synonymous readings in the textual tradition of the Hebrew original of the O. T., the most important are the double readings in the two last categories. But it will not be easy to draw the dividing line between them.

In contrast to Driver (op. cit. p. lvi), the present writer assumes that many of the doublets in the basic translations will be found to be derived from double readings in the Hebrew original, since the translator’s primary task was merely to render into his own language a given reading. It was only in the later stages of the redactional process that the translators busied themselves with the sifting of variant readings and based their versions on more than one MS. The fact that double readings in the translations have sometimes not been preserved in Hebrew sources, and that for the most part only one of their components survives in Hebrew texts, is to be explained by the paucity of extra-massoritic Biblical MSS that have come down to us. It may be assumed that, as the number of such witnesses increases, there will be brought to light the Hebrew original of many double readings that have till now been regarded as specific to the versions. Proof of this assumption can be found in the scrolls from the Judaean Desert. The second of the categories of doublets listed above — that derived from the translator’s conflate rendering of synonymous readings — may well lose its significance in many cases and turn out to be no more than a provisional definition.

It follows that often we shall be unable to decide definitely whether the doublet in the translation really arose at the versional level, i. e. is a combination of two different renderings of one and the same Hebrew word (a); or whether the translator tried, in his doublet, to represent two synonymous Hebrew readings which he found in his MSS (b). Let us take as an example

I Sam. iii, 17, G: ἐὰν κρύψης ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ ἐγέμα ἐκ πάντων τῶν λόγων τῶν λαλήθηστων ἐν τοῖς ὀφαίν σοι.

Here the last words of the verse, ἐν τοῖς ὀφαίν σοι, have no equivalent at all in MT: אֶֽמֶ֣ךְ מְמֵֽשׁ דֶּבֶר מָֽכַל דִּבְרָֽךְ אָשֶׁר דִּבְרָךְ אָלִיךָ. They may
simply be a second Greek rendering of the word אֶלֶף. But a similar example makes it more probable that here, too, we have a combination of two primary Hebrew readings. A similar phenomenon is found in the parallel passages:

II Sam. xxxii, 7 MT: וַשְׁנָתָהוּ בַּגֵּיאוֹר [G]  
T: בְּבֵיתָהוּ קֶרֶם הָמִיתֶבוֹדָא  
Ps. xviii, 7 MT: וַשָּׁנָתָהוּ לְזוּבִיָּהוּ בַּגֵּיאוֹר [G. T]

This technique of conflating two renderings is especially noticeable when the components of the doublet are derived from two different interpretations of the same word in the Hebrew original. For example:

Is. xvi, 5 MT: וַיִּפְקַד הָאָשָּׁךְ כַּפְרוֹן וַחֲרוֹרָה שְׁבִילֵי קֵינָר G (BQS): καὶ σπέρμα σταγιῶν ἀντοὐ ἀμής

This Greek tradition derived from the word οὐρα — σπέρμα and not from ὀρθό as did MT, a phenomenon which can be observed also in other instances. But in this particular verse the reading ὀρθό was apparently also preserved in DSla, as testified by the defective spelling of the word there, ὀρθῶρ. For in every other passage in Isaiah where the word οὐρα is pointed ὀρθό (or ὀρθός) in MT, it is written plene (οὐρῆ) in DSla. Hence the exception in our verse makes it probable that the scribe of the Scroll, like some Greek witnesses, read here οὐρα (σπέρμα). Now these two interpretative readings were combined in one branch of the Greek tradition:

G(A+): καὶ σπέρμα σταγιῶν ἐν τῷ βραχίων αὐτοῦ ἀμής.

IV

The technique of conflation is not confined to the Greek versions, but it is also found in the Aramaic translations. This provides further support for the theory that it goes back to a Jewish scribal tradition.

A doublet originating in the conflation of two different pointings of a word

12. Sigla in square brackets indicate versions whose text runs parallel with the text of the main quotation.
13. Cf., e.g. I Sam. ii, 31; Is. xlvi, 14; Ezek. xxii, 6; xxxi, 17; Dan. xi, 6, (Th.) etc.
14. Is. ix, 19; xxx, 30; xi, 10, 11; xlv, 12; xlvii, 14; li, 5 (twice), 9; lii, 10; liii, 1; lx, 16; liii, 8; liii, 5; — The spelling of אֶלֶף is identical in MT and in DSla in all the 25 occurrences of the word in Isaiah.
15. The same holds true for Is. xxxii, 2 — MT וַיִּפְקַד בְּבֵית הַקָּרָה. G σπέρμα κατωθו.
written defective has been preserved in the Aramaic translations of Deut. xxiv, 14:

TY: לא תרען אעז דאיגרא מכסה נורים מז א хаוכך

TJ: לא תטשמע ס-peer עז-multi מעבר מז א хаוכך מז [TO]

MT; Sam.: לא חטשנ ש-peer עז אבין מז [S]

Qumran: אלא חטשנ ש-peer עז אבין 17

Here TJ and TY have combined the readings ס-peer and ס-peer, each of which appears separately in the other versions, ס-peer in the MT and ס-peer in Qumr. and G.18 The Targums have here preserved an ancient Jewish tradition, reflected in the Rabbis’ remarks on this passage19 and also in Rashi’s commentary.20 We might suppose that the Targums merely harmonized the reading of this verse with that of similar verses in the Pentateuch which treat of the same subject, such as Lev. xix, 13 and Deut. xv, 18.21 But it is also possible that the Aramaic versions were based on an original Hebrew doublet ש-peer ש-peer, which is echoed in the words of a late prophet:

Mal. iii, 5, MT:22 ושתית על מאה מאבכשומ ... ובשתית ש-peer ש-peer

T: ובשתית ש-peer ש-peer

G: και ἐπὶ τοῦς ἀποστέροντας μοιδον μοιδον.

V

The conclusion to be drawn, in the present writer’s opinion, from some of the examples so far adduced is that some of the double readings found in the versions were derived from a Hebrew tradition of the text of the O. T. We shall now attempt to corroborate this assumption by recording some cases of double readings preserved in their original Hebrew form which are beyond doubt.

First, extra-massoretic sources. Here we shall begin with doublets from biblical texts found amongst the DSS.

17. Cf. Q I, p. 58. Here we find the Hebrew original from which were derived the translations of G and S.

18. This double reading has left its traces in B. T. Baba Meš‘a 11b: “Of thy brethren etc. This concerns only a man’s wages (שם ש-peer), etc.”


20. “Thou shalt not deprive of his wages a hireling who is poor and needy.”

21. Steuernagel (Deuteronomium, ad loc.) surmised a ditography.

22. It is only in this verse that we find in the O. T. the combination ש-peer ש-peer. More frequent are the following combinations: מז ש-peer (Prov. xiv, 31; xxii, 16; xxviii, 3); ש-peer ש-peer (Eccl. v, 7); מז ש-peer ש-peer (Jer. vii, 6; Ezek. xxii, 29; Zach. vii, 10); ש-peer ש-peer (Lev. v, 21) etc. Cf. also Job x, 3.
A. Is. xxxvii, 9 G: καὶ ὁ λαὸς σάς ἀδεσποτεύει καὶ ἀδεσποτείλεν ἄγγέλους

DSIa: [T]
MT: ὁ λαὸς σάς ἀδεσποτεύει [G]

II Kings xix, 9 MT:

Seeligmann still designated G’s version of Is. xxxvii, 9 as an internal Greek conflation. However, the newly-discovered Scroll of Isaiah makes it probable that this combination of parallel readings, each of which occurs separately in one of the two different recensions of the verse in MT (in Kings and in Isaiah), was already found in the Hebrew original on which the Greek translation was based.

B. The text of the Scroll in Is. xiv, 2 is also to be understood as a double reading:

DSIa: הלוקטוט טמיין רבי המבאות של אדמאמנ לה מקדום
MT: מקדום אל רחבא
G: elצ תוטו אתרכו
T(P): רחבאנה
T(R): רחבאנה לאריכיה

The terms זארמה and מקדום, which are conflated in the text of DSIa, were used in the language of the O. T. as synonyms to denote a man’s heritage or a nation’s territory. Thus, for example, a people is described as being exiled either מטלי אדמאמנ (II Kings xvii, 23; xxv, 21; Jer. lii, 27; Am. vii, 11, 17) or מקדום (Ezek. xii, 3). Similarly, the return from exile is depicted in both these terms (Ezek. xxxiv, 13; xxxvii, 21; cf. further Num. xxxii, 17). Hence these words were sometimes employed synonymously in two alternative readings of the same verse. In the case under discussion here, the one is preserved in the Codex Reuchlinianus of T, which was edited by de Lagarde, while the second found its way into MT, G and another MS of T (Bibliothèque Nationale MS 1325).

C. Is. xxxv, 9. DSIa:

MT: תמרים ויתו בך אלו וירלה
G: oב μη ἀναβῇ

24. J. F. Stenning, The Targum of Isaiah (1953). We prefer the assumption that in DSIa two readings were conflated to Gottstein’s supposition that originally also T had the compound reading תמרים ויתו בך, and that at a later stage it broke up into two alternative readings which were preserved separately in different MSS (Biblica 35, 1954, p. 35).
25. With the doublet תמרים ויתו בך compare the conflation of בְּּוֹדָה in I Sam. xx, 26 MT (infra p. 173).
D. I Sam. ii, 24. MT:

אֵל בָּעֵר כִּי לוֹ אָדָם חַשְׁמַע אֶשְׂרֵי אַבְדִּים.

G:

μη τέκνα δτι σοι ἐγαθῇ ἢ ἀκοῇ ἢν ἐγὼ ἀκοῶν

μη ποιεῖτε οὕτως δτι σοι ἐγαθαι αἰ ἀκοᾶ ας

ἐγὼ ἀκοῶν

Qumr. 26:

אֵל בָּעֵר כִּי לוֹ אָדָם חַשְׁמַע אֶשְׂרֵי אַבְדִּים.

Although the Qumran text of this sentence is very fragmentary, it almost certainly represents a Hebrew reading that is virtually identical with the one followed by the Greek translator. In other words, the doublet in the translation is derived from a doublet in the Hebrew original in which the parallel readings were conflated. One of the readings has the object in the singular — שְׁמַעְתֶּן — and the pronoun of the first person in the form אֱלֹהִים. In the second, the plural was preferred — שְׁמַעְתֶּהָ — and the pronoun אֵל.

VI

So far we have examined the conflation of synonymous readings in the ancient versions of the O. T. and in the DSS. We shall now show that the same textual phenomenon can also be found in MT. When the ancient scribe had no trustworthy criteria for deciding between two variants in the MSS before him, he worked them both into his own copy by combining them together. This “conflation”, so far from being an exceptional phenomenon, has left its mark on quite a number of passages.

It is relatively easy to detect a double reading when each of its components has been preserved separately in parallel versions. However, it must be remembered that, on account of the paucity of extra-massoretic texts that have come down to us, instances of this type will be comparatively rare.

Occasionally the double readings are derived from parallel historical traditions. In such a case the redactor tried to do his duty by both readings by conjoining them. Here are two examples:

A. Two parallel versions have been combined in the story relating the transportation of the Ark at the occasion of David’s flight from Absalom (II

Sam. xv, 24–29. In the main version the honour of carrying the Ark is assigned to Zadok the priest:

ונת אלמליח את אברים ואת אבירים

והלכאת העץ ואת האלילים (והלכאת אברים) דר央行 על משך לעבר ומעיר

(ibid. v. 24, cf. vv. 25, 27). But the redactor also had before him another tradition in which this same act was attributed to Zadok’s rival, Abiaathar, who also officiated as priest to David (I Sam. xxii, 21–23; xxiii, 9; xxx, 7). The redactor blended the two traditions by inserting into his text the words ישל אברים. These words are in effect a parallel reading to the opening expression והלכאת העץ מדר央行. G translated the phrase as it stands — kal ἐγένετο τ’ ‘Aḇiʿaṭhār. We propose to reconstruct the two parallel readings of the verse as follows:

והלכאת העץ את אברים וישראל

At the end of the story, instead of merely setting down the parallel traditions side by side, the redactor actually merged them into one:

עץ אברים אבירים

והלכאת העץ ואת האלילים וישראל שים (cf. vv. 35–36).

We are dealing here, as already stated, with parallel traditions, only one of which can in fact be primary in the strictly historical sense. Nevertheless, in the absence of adequate textual and historical criteria, the scribes of the Books of Kings were obliged to accept both of them.

B. After the establishment of the monarchy in Israel, Saul’s city Gibeah rose to the status of a political and juridical centre rivalling Ramah, which had fulfilled this function in Samuel’s day. The simultaneous existence of two “capitals” is reflected in the fact that some traditions place certain of Saul’s acts in Ramah, while others locate the same acts in Gibeah. Two such traditions have been conflated, in the writer’s opinion, in I Sam. xxii, 6, where MT reads:

יאשrael ישב בבני גזע האשה ברקמה וmah נתן בריד

It is not stated precisely where this assembly of notables, which had far-reaching effects on the fate of both the local priesthood at Nob and of the Israelite priesthood as a whole, took place,

29. Some of the textual difficulties of this passage result from the conflation of alternative readings, e.g. vv. 17 and 23.
30. II Sam. xvii, 15; xix, 12; x, 25; I Chron. xv, 11.
31. שור should be translated “and Abiaathar went up”, as in RV, and not “and he offered (sacrifices)” as suggested by H. P. Smith, who moreover suspects these words of being an interpolation, since they are missing in some MSS of G (Samuel, ICC, 1912, p. 345).
32. The plural form of the verb in this verse is contradictory to the sing. employed in v. 25. Smith proposes to read in v. 24: רוח מת אברים ואת אבירים וישראל, thus bringing this verse in line with v. 29 (ibid., p. 334).
33. Witness to this process are the remnants of a fortress from Saul’s times discovered by Albright at Tell-el-Ful, the site of ancient Gibeah.
whether at Ramah, the old centre, or at Gibeah, Saul’s “capital”. The redactor had both traditions in front of him and interwove them:

The doublet in this verse passed unnoticed by the Greek translators since, in their usual manner, they did not take רַמְא as a place name, but as referring to an actual hill. They therefore rendered ἐν τῷ βουνῷ ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀπολύα τῇ ἐν Ραμήμα, thus making the incident occur on some hill near the city of Ramah. Kimchi, who found the wording of the verse surprising, as did Rashi, consciously chose a similar interpretation, with the difference that he kept the identity of Gibeah as a place name and took רַמְא to mean a height: “There was a spot in Gibeah of Saul which, being high, was called ‘the height’. And this cannot be Samuel’s Ramah, since he (i. e. Saul) was in Gibeah.” These two solutions of the crux have been fused in G(B) and in the Lucianic recension, both of which read Ραμία for Ραμήα. By this reading both names alike are deprived of their geographical significance, and the assembly of ministers summoned by Saul is made to take place on one of the high places situated on one of the hills of Palestine, presumably in the territory of Benjamin.

VII

However, our main concern in this paper is with double readings that are conflations of two variants between which there is nothing to choose on grounds of subject-matter or primacy. This particular phenomenon is well represented in MT. Here it will suffice to give a limited selection of illustrations, classified according to the following three criteria:

A. Types of synonymity — the sources of double readings.

Each of the different parts of speech may give rise to a double reading, within the limits of the capacity of the Hebrew language to express the same idea in various ways. The great majority of double readings originated in the combi-

34. Cf. Ju. iv, 5. The alternative readings in I Sam. xxiii, 6 could also be:

35. E. g. in I Sam. x, 10; xiii, 3; xxiii, 19; xxvi, 1. This led to the assumption that the translation of G of I Sam. x, 13, εἰς τὸν βουνόν, reflects a Hebrew נַעֲרָא, instead of נַעֲרָא, in MT (cf. Seeligmann, Tarbiz 25, p. 135). It should be stressed that usually G transcribes the Hebrew נַעֲרָא βαια (I Sam. ix, 12, 13, 14, 19, 25) even if the word was misread for מַעֲרָא (Ju. iv, 5; I Sam. xxiii, 6).

36. It cannot be decided whether the interchange of letters originated in the Hebrew Vorlage or whether it is an internal Greek mistake. Graphically both possibilities are open.
nation of words which, as a result of their having the same or a very similar meaning, had become interchangeable and thereby gave rise to alternative readings. Sometimes the doublet results from the conflation of two different spellings (plene and defective), or from an abbreviated spelling of the word recorded side by side with its full form. Sometimes the verse was preserved in two parallel sources, once in a shortened version and once in a more elaborate form, and some scribe combined the two.

B. The extent of the duplication. The technique of preserving synonymous readings in the frame of a doublet is not uniform. There are various methods of conflation; moreover the alternative readings are not given with equal fullness in every instance. Sometimes the second reading extends to a whole sentence and is a word-for-word equivalent of the first.

At the other extreme there is no more than a hint of an alternative reading, either in the form of a single word or two, or in a hybrid reading which is a conflation of two synonymous grammatical forms. These isolated words perform the function of a custos: they, so to speak, preserve the memory of a reading which the scribe knew of, but which he did not copy out in full. The extent of the doublet does not depend solely on the contents of the passage or on the degree of difference between the alternative readings, important though these factors are. This means that the abbreviated form of a double reading cannot be explained by the argument that in some cases a single word sufficed for the preservation of all that had to be preserved, while in others a whole verse was required for the purpose. It would seem that the extent of the doublet was less determined by considerations of subject-matter than by the inclinations of a particular scribe or by scribal conventions that are unknown to us. We do not possess sufficient information to be able to formulate any rules for the development of the various methods of recording alternative readings. We cannot decide whether the second reading was first of all recorded in full, and then in course of time began to be whittled down, or whether both methods — that of recording the reading in full and that of merely alluding to it by a custos — were employed simultaneously.

However, it would seem logical to assume that the recording of the alternative in full preceded the systematic abbreviation of it to a single key-word. After all, the recording of an alternative reading without any alteration and without any attempt at syntactical coordination was little more than a mechanical process, whereas the compression of its full significance into no more than a single word, calling as it does for careful deliberation and weighing of possibilities, is a sign that the scribe already had considerable experience in this type of work. Especially the hybrid readings are evidence of a highly developed technique which, it may be presumed, was not perfected without
intensive study, and which raised the combination of alternatives from the level of a purely mechanical performance to that of an intellectual accomplishment.

C. The methods of conflating alternative readings and the location of doublets in the sentence.

Sometimes the readings are placed side by side in the middle of a sentence, without any attempt to join them syntactically. In other instances, where the synonymous words are in the construct state, they have of their own accord, as it were, come to form a single syntactical whole. In some cases, where the doublet disturbs the normal grammatical structure of the verse, the scribe has seen fit to iron out the resulting difficulties by easing the transition from one alternative reading to the other with the aid of connective words, such as the copulative waw, the conjunctions רָאָץ הָיָה, and the like.

There are many double readings in which one of the alternatives is placed outside the syntactical context and stands either at the end of the sentence or next to the caesura. It seems probable, to judge from the instances of this phenomenon that this was the method chosen by the scribes to mark a reading which, though not included in the established text, was considered worthy of being recorded and preserved.

VIII

The examples of double readings given below are grouped under the following headings:

I. Readings recorded side by side in the middle of the sentence, without syntactical co-ordination.

II. Readings recorded side by side in the middle of the sentence with the addition of connective words.

III. Doublets in which one of the alternative readings is appended at the end of the sentence outside the syntactical framework.

IV. Doublets in which one of the alternatives is appended at the end of the sentence outside the syntactical framework but with the addition of connective words.

V. Hybrid readings.

A. The alternative readings are distinguished by the employment of different ways of writing one and the same word:

a) through dropping of consonants caused by blurred pronunciation

b) through interchange of similar consonants

c) through inversion of letters

37. Though the massoretic sign for the caesura is of late origin, the division of the sentence into hemistichs was undoubtedly known to the ancient scribes.
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d). on account of abbreviations and shortened forms as against the full spelling.

B. Words of synonymous meaning:
   a) verbs
   b) nouns
   c) adjectives
   d) particles.

C. Grammatical forms of synonymous significance in a given context:
   a) formations
   b) tenses
      1) infinitive absolute and finite tense
      2) participle and perfect tense
      3) imperfect with waw consecutive, and perfect
      4) imperfect, and imperfect with waw consecutive
   c) suffixed and separate pronouns
   d) prepositions
   e) determination by means of the definite article or by means of the possessive suffix.

D. Synonymous syntactical constructions:
   a) relative clauses.

E. Shortened reading and expanded reading.

F. Complex doubles.

IA. Different spellings of a word recorded side by side in the middle of the sentence, without syntactical co-ordination.38

a. 1. Ju. xx, 38 MT: יְהֵשׁוֹעַ הָאֱלֹהִים יְשַׁעַל וְיִשָּׂרָאֵל וּלְלַעֲלָהוֹן מְשַׁאֵתֵו וְעַשְׂנָן מְן הוֹנוּר.

G (A): וַיֵּשֶׁב אֵלֹהִים בְּבֵית יִשָּׂרָאֵל וְלֹא יָבֹא עִמָּו וַיִּשְׁלָחֶנּוּ וַיָּצָאוּ מִן יִשָּׂרָאֵל.

Here the word verb, which is simply a variant, in scriptio defectiva, of the word יְשַׁעַל, has rightly been omitted in G(A).39 The omission of the aleph in the very same root is found in 1 Sam. xv, 5, where MT reads יְשַׁעַל בְּבֵית יִשָּׂרָאֵל and G renders: וַיֵּשֶׁב גְּרָנָאָשֶׁג, showing that the true reading is יְשַׁעַל יִשָּׂרָאֵל.

38. Cf. supra p. 154, יְשַׁעַל (Deut. xxiv, 14).
39. The elision of radical aleph is no rare occurrence. To the examples adduced by A Sperber (op. cit. §38 a, p. 25) may be added the following instances: II Sam. xi, 1: וַיְשַׁעַל; I Chron. xx, 1: וַיִּשָּׂרָאֵל; II Kings vi, 32-33: וַיִּשָּׂרָאֵל - ib. vii, 17-18: וַיִּשָּׂרָאֵל; Is. xiv, 32 MT וַיִּשָּׂרָאֵל - DSl (G): וַיִּשָּׂרָאֵל. Cf. further G to Prov. xiii, 17.
The doublet in MT is reflected in other Greek versions of Ju. xx,38. The translators were puzzled as to the meaning of הֵרָדָב and wrongly emended it to μάχανον, apparently under the influence of the word הֵרָדָב at the end of the preceding verse. O also had the doublet in front of him, but understood it correctly and therefore repeated the words ποδός τοῦ ἐνδογον, marking them with an asterisk. Here then is our reconstruction of the readings:

In this form, the verse provides a smooth connection between what is related in v. 37 about the attack from the ambush and the consequence of this action for the Benjaminites, as described in v. 39.

IAb. 2. Is. xvi,12. MT: ויהי כי נראת כ לַלַאֶה מַמְאַ בַּעַ מַמְאַ רָבָא אֵלְמָאשׁ

T: והרי אֵאֵי תֶלַל אֵי לַלַאֶה מַמְאַ G: δι᾽ ἐκοινωνίας Μοαβ

DSIa: והרי כי נראת כ אֵי לַלַאֶה מַמְאַ

We presume that the words כ לַלַאֶה יְרַאַ are simply a doublet of כ לַלַאֶה יְרַא. The replacement of the *lamedh by resh, as a result of blurred pronunciation, gave rise to two readings which were combined by a redactor. This conjecture is corroborated by T, which contains two translations of לאלהי, and by G, where the words have no equivalent at all.

In the text of DSIa an interesting development has taken place. The verb יְרַא which, on our assumption, is the original reading, has been replaced by the verb אֵלְמָא, while the secondary reading הֵרָדָב has been kept.

IAc. 3. Ex. xxx,6. MT: ונַתֹּת אֶשֶּׁר לַאֲשֶׁר פַּתַּחְתָּ אֶשֶּׁר עַל אֶשֶּׁר הָעָדוּת

G does not translate the second line, which is also missing from several MSS of MT and of Sam. One parallel reading is distinguished from the other by the omission of the word יְרַא and the use of the form מַמְאַ, which is

40. LN*. This translation probably gave rise to the reading of G(B): τοῖς μαχανές.
41. This was not recognized by Rahlfs, who explains: Α) habet per errorem ποδός τοῦ ἐνδογον pro μάχανα sub * (Septuaginta, ad. loc).
42. For the interchange of יְרַא — ḫ cf. II Kings xix, 23: יְרַא — Is. xxxvii, 19: יְרַא (==DSIa); Ezek. xix. 7: יְרַא for יְרַא, אַל יְרַא.
43. See Stemberg's edition. Comp. Is. xlii, 4, MT: The reading מֵאָשֶׁר יְרַא in T (P) Is. xvi, 12 resulted most probably from a late attempt at harmonization with MT.
the equivalent of דָּרְכָּה with the letters inverted. Later copyists endeavoured to establish a proper syntactical relation between the alternative phrases by adding וָוָו at the beginning of the second line — דָּרְכָּה, as if the verse were dealing with two quite separate matters.

IAd. Abbreviations and shortened forms inserted alongside full forms in the middle of the sentence.

4. Is. xii,2 MT: דְּנֵי תְּרוֹם יְהוָה וְלָּלֵּקָהָה; DSia: דְּנֵי תְּרוֹם יְהוָה וְלָּלֵּקָהָה; Ex. xvi,2 MT: דְּנֵי תְּרוֹם יְהוָה וְלָּלֵּקָהָה

The full spelling of the tetragrammaton given in DSia xii,2 and the shortened form given in the MT of Ex.xvi,2 have been conflated in MT of Is. xii,2.

5. Ezek. xxi,20 MT: עַל כָּל שְׁפִירֵיהָו הֲוָא בָּקָהָה וּרְבָּהָה אֲשֶׁר שֵׁרֵדָה לָבָךְ.

The word שַׁפִּירֵיהָו is not translated in G, and is interpreted in T as שַׁפִּירֵיהָו. As proposed by Reifman, it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of בְּשַׁפִּירֵיהָו (שַׁפִּירֵיהָו) inserted in the verse alongside the full spelling.

IBa. Synonymous verbs recorded side by side in the middle of the sentence, without syntactical coordination.

1. Hos. vii,15 MT: וַעֲמַר יְסִירֵהוּ הֹלְכָה וּרְעֵהוּ; G: καθὼς κατάρχειν τοὺς βερσίριας αὐτῶν

The word יְסִירֵהוּ is not translated in G. By taking it as an alternative reading to מַסְרֵהוּ, we obtain a verse of two parallel members, each having three beats. מַסְרֵהוּ as a synonym for מַסְרֵהוּ in parallel sections of a verse is found in Job iv,3.

2. Jer. xlii,3 MT: מְסִים רַעְשָׁא אֵשׁ עָלֵיתָא לְקַלֵּךְ לְקַלֵּךְ; [T] עָלֵיתָא לְקַלֵּךְ עָלֵיתָא לְקַלֵּךְ.

G: πορευθήσεται θνημάν θεοὶ θέρεις

45. Comp. Ex. xi,3 MT: סֵדָה; ib. xxvi,34 MT: בֵּין; ib. xxvi,2 MT: בֵּין. See Stenning’s edition. BH records approximately 85 MSS of MT which show the same feature.

46. The corrector of DSia inserted a הָאָה above the line — מַסְרֵהוּ in order to harmonize the text of the scroll with MT. Cf. Kutscher, op. cit., p. 446. A detailed analysis of the verse under review may be found in S. Talmon, “A Case of Abbreviation Resulting in Double Readings”, VT 4 (1954), pp. 206-207.


G translates only the verb לָכַֽה. The word represents an alternative reading. The basic readings may therefore be reconstructed as follows:

לָכַֽהּ לַעֲבֹר לַעֲבֹר

III Ba. One of two synonymous verbs appended at the end of the sentence outside the syntactical framework.

1. I Chron, x, 13 MT: על דרר ח. אֶשֶׁר אל שמֶר וַגֶּשׁ לְשָׁמְאֵל באֹב לָדָרְשׁ

G: διὰ ἐρήμων Σαμουὴλ εν τῷ ἐγγαμασίαμον τοῦ ζητῆσαι

Here the main part of the verse consists of the two alternative readings

לָכַֽהּ לַעֲבֹר

וַגֶּשׁ לְשָׁמְאֵל באֹב

One of these readings is an echo of the basic version of the story found in I Sam. xxviii, 7: הֲגָלַּל Atatürk אָאָרֵה (G: καὶ ζητῆσω)). The other is a synonymous rendering based on the analogous use of the two verbs in parallel texts.51

The Greek translators, unaware of the true nature of the reading, imagined that it contained syntactical difficulties which they tried to resolve by subordinating נָבַר to לָדָרְשׁ and adding καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ Σαμουὴλ διὸ προφητῆς.

IBb. Synonymous nouns placed side by side without syntactical coordination.

1. Obadiah 9–10 MT: לאֲנֵה יִרְדָּר אֲשֶׁר מָרָה שֶׁמֶךָ מְתֵמַמְתִּים אַתָּן יִצְכֶּר יִצְכֶּרְכֶנָּה נְכוֹנִים לַעֲבֹר

The last word in v. 9, מְתֵמַמְתִּים, is to be understood as a synonym of מַסְחָּר at the beginning of v. 10. The resulting reading — מַסְחָּר אֲנֵה — is alluded to in Joel iv, 9: הוֹדֵם לְמִדְבַּר וְחֵרֵם מְתֵמַמְתִּים בַּיִת יִרְדָּר (G: εἰς ἀδελφὸν νῦν Ἀβδα). The Greek translator of the passage in Obadiah noticed the difficulty in the reading there and tried to gloss it over by attaching מְתֵמַמְתִּים to the following verse, connecting it with מַסְחָּר by the addition of καὶ: διὰ τὴν ὁφαγήν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφείαν τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σοι Ἰακώβ.

2. II Kings xi, 13 MT52: תָּפְסַמִּיתָנִי אוֹלִי הַרְעִיצָנָה שֶׁךָ

Here there is a conflation of the readings: תָּפְסַמִּיתָנִי אוֹלִי הַרְעִיצָנָה שֶׁךָ

50. שֶׁכַּלֶּב remains untranslated in P.
51. Cf. e. g. Deut. xviii, 11.
52. Cf. Ju. x, 18; xx, 22, 26.
According to the one it was “the runners” who announced the palace revolution
(II Kings xi, 4, 6, 11). In the other, the deed is attributed to “the people of the
land” (ibid. 14), called “the people” for short in v. 13.

G. emended the asyndetic construction of רֶעְצִי יְהֹוָה by placing the two
words in a genitival relation: τὴν φωνῆν τῶν τρεχόντων τοῦ λαοῦ.

A similar course was adopted by the Chronicler. He gave רְעֵצִי a verbal
force by inverting the word order, קֹל יוֹשְׁבֵי רְעֵצִי (II Chron. xxiii, 12), and then
completed his reconstruction of the verse by adding another verb: καὶ ἔσκυψεν τὸν
πασίγνωσμα καὶ ἤφθασεν τὴν βασιλείαν.

The Greek translator of Chron. went still further and rendered this addition by a double translation: τὸν λαοῦ τῶν τρεχόντων καὶ ἔσκυψεν τὸν βασιλείαν.

3. Jer. lii, 34 MT: וארחותו... יָדֵיהו יָדָיו... וְדָרוּ יְם בֵּיתוֹ דָּעַת... [T]

G: εἰς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέρας δέκα ἡμέρας ἦς ἀπέβανεν

II Ki. xxv, 30 MT: דָּרוּ יְם בֵּיתוֹ... כְּלֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל [G, T]

Each of the synonymous expressions דָּרוּ יְם בֵּיתוֹ... is rendered
separately in the Greek version of Jer. and in MT of II Kings. The redactor
of MT of Jer. knew of both readings and conjoined them.

Sometimes the conflation of alternative readings resulted in an apparent
syntactical co-ordination because the doublet could easily be taken for a con-
struct state. For example:

4. Josh. ii, 18 MT: יָדְעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל יָדְעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל... [T]

G: τῷ σπαρτῖν τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦτο 53

The parallel passage, ibid. ii, 21, refers only to יָדְעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל. We may therefore
assume that יָדְעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל and יָדְעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל are synonymous expressions which were conflated
in Josh. ii, 18.

5. II Sam. xxiii, 20 MT: יִבְשָׁל בָּנֵיהֶם יִבְשָׁל בָּנֵיהֶם... [T]

55 יִבְשָׁל בָּנֵיהֶם: K

G: καὶ Βασανὸς νῦν ἤλθεν ἀνὴρ αὐτός

6. I Sam. ix, 1 MT: יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל... [T]

G: τῷ άνδρὶ Ιωναὶοῦ ἀνὴρ δύνατός

53. The same translation is employed in Cant. iv, 3: יִבְשָׁל בָּנֵיהֶם. It is possible that
the translator of Josh. ii, 18 failed to understand the word יִשְׂרָאֵל and therefore did not
render it at all. Cf. G to Zach. ii, 12; Job xix, 10 (xvii, 15).

54. This reading is reflected in T. G omits the second half of the verse, possibly due to
homoiotaktion.

55. In the parallel reading in I Chron. xi, 22, G translates the full text of MT.
In the first of these two cases, G does not translate the word ג and renders only the expression (יִשָּׂא). The Lucianic recension has been brought into harmony with MT and translates וָלֹא יִשָּׂא for יִשָּׂא (cf. I Chron. ii, 13). At the same time, it omits the puzzling word (יִשָּׂא), thus obtaining a seemingly satisfactory sentence. This translation is based on an incorrect interpretation of the word ג which was taken in its literal meaning as a synonym of לֵיל, whereas actually it is employed here in a derived sense to indicate the possessor of a certain skill or quality. Our verse contains accordingly a conflation of two synonymous readings — נְבֶרי אָשֶׁר.

The case of I Sam. ix, 1 is similar. Here G renders the Hebrew text in full, having apparently failed to notice the doublet וְאָשֶׁר מִנְגִּיסָה since the word ג was taken in its literal sense and אָשֶׁר מִנְגִּיסָה was referred — like in MT and T — to the unnamed father of Aphishah, the ancestor of the house of Kish.

Actually, however, the doublet וְאָשֶׁר מִנְגִּיסָה echoes the expression נְבֶרי ג in the first part of the verse and was added to make it quite clear that נְבֶרי ג applies to the first name in the list and not to the last.

Syntactically, the nouns ג and אָשֶׁר in II Sam. xxiii, 20 are each separately dependent on the nomen regens לֵיל in a genitival relationship of adjectival significance. A similar sense is achieved in I Sam. ix, 1 by the combination of these nouns with the adjective מִנְגִּיסָה. A distinction must be drawn between the apparent construct אָשֶׁר ג in these two cases and the true construct אָשֶׁר ג in the following sentences, where the word ג is used in its original sense:

I Sam. xvii, 12: נְבֶרי ג אָשֶׁר מִנְגִּיסָה לֵיל בֶּית אָבִי שלֹה אֱלֹהִים שֶׁמֶשׁ אָשֶׁר
II Sam. xvii, 25: נְבֶרי ג אָשֶׁר מִנְגִּיסָה

While the two terms אָשֶׁר ג are synonymous when used metaphorically, they are quite distinct in their original meaning. However, even in their primary sense these words have in one passage been combined into a double reading:

4. II Kings x, 6 MT: קַחָה אָשֶׁר ג נְבֶרי ג [T] נהֲרָא ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג

G (A): הָדָבֵאתָ ?ֵעָלֵם נֵפָּל בֵּל הָאֲמִילִים וְאָבָּא ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג

According to the context, the narrative here describes the killing of the sons of Ahab who were mentioned in vv. 1–3. They are again referred to in what follows: נהֲרָא ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג נְבֶרי ג (8, cf. 7). But in G (A) a parallel reading is preserved

56. In the occurrences of this composite expression the synonymous readings employ alternately only one of the components a) (יִשָּׂא) ג b) (יִשָּׂא) אָשֶׁר.
57. The passage xvii, 12–31 is missing in G and was restituted in OL, where אָשֶׁר ג was translated properly — וָלֹא אָבָּא ג.
which designated the victims that were killed at Jehu's order as "the King's men" (צוז הלילה)\(^{58}\), and not the King's sons (צבים הלילה).\(^{59}\) The two readings were conflated in MT — וְהַמֵּאֶדֶּשׁ בּוֹ הַמֶּה רַע בּוֹ The two readings were conflated in MT — וְהַמֵּאֶדֶּשׁ בּוֹ הַמֶּה רַע בּוֹ

5. II Sam. v, 11 MT:
I Chron. xiv, 1 MT: 60
II Sam. v, 11 G: καὶ τέκτονας ξύλων καὶ τέκτονας λίθων\(^{61}\)

From the rendering of G in II Sam. v, 11 it may be deduced that the basic Hebrew reading in this verse was (צוז הלילה) וְהַמֵּאֶדֶּשׁ בּוֹ הַמֶּה רַע בּוֹ. But the copyist had before him also the reading וְהַמֵּאֶדֶּשׁ בּוֹ הַמֶּה רַע בּוֹ, which had not yet been exclusively attached to the parallel in I Chron. xiv, 1. Since he could see no good reason for preferring one to the other he combined them, thus producing the doublet וְהַמֵּאֶדֶּשׁ בּוֹ הַמֶּה רַע בּוֹ.

II Bb. Synonymous nouns placed side by side in the middle of a sentence with an added connective word.

The syntactical co-ordination of two synonymous readings conflated in a doublet, achieved inadvertently when one of the components happened to be in the construct state, apparently served the scribes as a model on which they patterned their attempts to combine synonymous readings by transforming one of them from the absolute to the construct state.

1. Dan. xii, 2 MT: רְבִּין מִשְׁפָּר אֶמֶת עַפּוֹר קֹּצֶה

The Greek translators tried to get round the difficulty of the construct רְבִּין מִשְׁפָּר by inverting the cases of the two nouns, thus making the construct absolute and the absolute construct. Theodotion followed the same course, but tried to preserve the word order of the Hebrew text: τῶν καθευδότων ἐν τῷ γῆς χῶματι.\(^{62}\) Ibn Ezra in his commentary quotes the verse without the word המֵאֶדֶּשׁ. Possibly, however, this is simply a free quotation. In any case, it would seem that MT contains a conflation of the two readings רְבִּין מִשְׁפָּר וְהַמֵּאֶדֶּשׁ בּוֹ הַמֶּה רַע בּוֹ.

---

58. Cf. ib. v, 11.
59. G (BC) add τῶν πρῶτον before τῶν κυμίον.
60. The version of I Chron. is marked by three criteria which often distinguish an alternative reading. The employment of 1) an ad hoc synonymous expression רַע בּוֹ, instead of the רַע of II Sam.; 2) the plural (םִשְׁפָּר) as against the collective sing. (םִשְׁפָּר); 3) the inversion of the word order in the sentence.
61. Orig. has already harmonized his reading with MT: καὶ τέκτονας λίθων τοῖχον. This translation found its way into L with an essential alteration: καὶ τῶν τοῖχον λίθων.
“Sleep” as a euphemism for death is found in Jer. ii, 39, 57 and in Job xiv, 12. There the word is not combined with either נפש or רוח. This figure of speech is peculiar to Dan. xii, 2. The terms נפש and רוח are, however, used in other combinations as symbols of the world of the dead, in Ps. cxlvii, 4 and Job xx, 11. The two terms are employed side by side in the verse which is the origin of this metaphorical image, Gen. iii, 19: נפש אבר וחולו ויאמר adress נפש אל אבר לא יהיה נפשו.

2. A variation of the same method can be found in the following example, where the scribe has disguised the doublet by co-ordinating each of its components with the different elements of a construct state.

II Chron. xxx, 18 MT: יכ מפריך המוכן להר יותר המ)getoca
tובכל לא שומרי

G: יכ תח פלאיסיון רע לאוות און אָּוּיַּוֹ אֵפָּאָּוֹ

The supposed alternative readings are: יכ מפריך
c. מפריך

The use of the noun בר, in the sense of “majority”, occurs in the preceding verse: יכ ברה בַּמֶּלֶק האַּל לאו התוקדש. Other synonyms in this passage are the expressions קהל לבר and בר בַּמֶּלֶק (v. 13).

The commonest and simplest way of concealing the doublet is by connecting the two parallels with the conjunctive waw, as in:

3. Deut. xv, 2 MT: לא י蹿 את רעמה ויאחרי יכ כה שמתה לה. [T]

MT is a combination of two readings, each containing an alternative element of the pair of synonymous expressions — רע — which appear side by side in the very passage under discussion:

 xv, 2: שמה כל אדם המשי רד ושתי בַּמֶּלֶק [T; Sam.; T. Sam.; G]
 xv, 3: ויאשים היה ילוא לאו חָוָּר שמה יָדך [T; Sam.; T. Sam.; G]

In Sam. and T. Sam. (as also in some MSS of MT) the alternative readings in v. 2a still appear without any connective: לא י蹿 את רעמה ויאחרי.

In G the parallel אַּת תח is not rendered at all: י蹿 תוכי אָנָלָה שמאע אָּוָּה אִדּאָןָּס משמעש. 66

4. Is. xxxv, 8 MT: היח והיר אָּהָלָה לָה [T]

DSIfa: היח והיר אָּהָלָה לָה [MS Ken]

G: הָיֵה לָוָּה לָה לָה לָה לָה כָּהָּלוֹ אָּוָּה אִדּאָןָּס

63. It is quite possible that Dan. xii, 2 alludes intentionally to this verse which echoes Gen. ii, 7. However this direct dependence cannot be established for certain.

64. Cf. I Sam. ii, 33; I Chron. xlii, 30 (II Chron. ix, 6).


66. 2 pers. sing. instead of 3 pers. sing. OL have adapted their translation to MT.

It might easily be supposed that רּוֹדֵר in MT is simply a case of dittography, were it not apparent that DSIA and G preserve separately the two readings conflated in MT. In the Scroll, the first half of the verse contains the word מַסְכָּל (Maschil) and the second its synonym רָכַּד, G, on the contrary, employs in both halves of the verse the word דֹּדֵס, which points probably to a Hebrew original containing רָכַּד twice in the sentence and without a trace of its synonym מַסְכָּל. MT of Is. xxxv, 8a seems therefore to be a conflation of the two synonymous readings וַתִּשְׁכֵּרֵה שֶׁהָיָ֣ה דֹּדֵס (Vd 17) מַסְכָּל (Dor. hadash yirm. I, 164) רָכַּד, which were conjoined by the addition of וַתִּשְׁכֵּרֵה.

5. Ju. xx, 26 MT:

This would appear to be a combination of two alternative readings, כל בֵּית שִׁירֵי שָׁם, joined by waw conjunctive. Cf. Ju. x, 18, where MT reads всем בֵּית שִׁירֵי שָׁם. It may also be conjectured that a similar doublet has been preserved in Ju. xx, 22: זִהְבָּח שִׁירֵי שָׁם. In this last case one of the parallels — זִהְבָּח — is not translated in G.

6. II Kings xix, 17 MT:

MT of II Kings xix, 17 has conflated two synonymous designations of the enemies of Assyria, which are found separately, one in the Greek translation of the passage — וַיְשַׁמֵּר — and the other in the parallel passage in Isaiah in the version of DSIA — אֲשֶׁר (ךָךָךְ). A proper syntactical structure was maintained in MT II Kings xix, 17 by the insertion of a waw conjunctive between the alternative readings that constitute the doublet and by the addition of the possessive suffix in אֲשֶׁר, which brings the original doublet אֲשֶׁר into closer connection with זִהְבָּח.

It is probable that the scribe of MT Is. xxxvii, 18 originally had before him only the reading אֲשֶׁר, preserved in DSIA. However, having seen fit to bring his version into line with the parallel passage in Kings, he proceeded...
to copy from it the words 'אלו עצמאים, thus creating a nonsensical wording: שמשאול עלון חאיריו וברח.Client 1.2A MT: $E$-אגדא (ῥαγα) $E$-אגדא אדוותך
  \(G\) (\(A^+\)) \(V\): \(אגדא \text{ (ῥαγα)} \text{ אגדא אדוותך}
  \(T\): \(אגדא \text{ עלון חאיריו וברח}

\(G\), as also several Hebrew MSS, tried to remove the awkwardness of the verse by omitting the conjunctive \(ו\), thus placing the Hebrew ברייר in apposition to each other. \(T\) went still further and rounded out the pleonastic ברייר into a whole sentence, parallel to ברייר חאיריו וברח.

Possibly this process was completed in the parallel passage where, in both the Versions and in MT, the somewhat unsuited word \(עיר\) has been replaced by ברייר and a satisfactory syntactical connection has been obtained by inverting the order of the synonyms, I Sam. xxv, 1: \(עיר\) פלא왔다 \(לברח\) פלאוו סעודי עלון חאיריו וברח.

A similar inversion may be observed in MS Munich of \(A\) both de-Rabbi Nathan\(^{70}\), where I Sam. xxviii, 3 is quoted in the form ברייר דרומ פלאוו

8. Gen. xxvii, 46 MT: \(אכ ליה יניקא אשו מנהח הח白癜风 מלצהל ממעות אדם\)

\(G\): \(γνωσεις απευ \text{ του θησαυρος της γης των οχου}\)

The omission of the words in \(G\) strengthens the assumption that the reading מנהח in \(G\) is a conflation of the readings מנהח ממעות \(אשו\) which were joined together by the addition of the demonstrative pronoun \(אשלא\).\(^{71}\)

\(III\). \textbf{Doublets in which one of the alternative readings is appended at the end of the sentence outside the syntactical framework}.

I Kings xi, 20 MT: \(וַחֲמָלָה וַחֲמָלָה בְּקֵךְ בְּקֵךְ וַחֲמָלָה בְּקֵךְ בְּקֵךְ וַחֲמָלָה בְּקֵךְ וַחֲמָלָה בְּקֵךְ וַחֲמָלָה בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּкֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ B

\(G\) does not translate בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ כְ בְּקֵכְ בְּкֵкְ בְּקֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּקֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּקֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ B in the second part of the sentence, and renders בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּקֵכְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵקְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ בְּкֵкְ B at the end of the first hemistich as well as the second:

69. The present author has discussed this reading in detail in "A Case of Faulty Harmonization", VT 5 (1955), pp. 206-208.
71. It is possible that the pleonastic \(ταυτης\) in \(G\) is a paraphrastic rendering of \(θεος\). In Gen. Rabba 67, 11 the word \(θεος\) is referred to Esau's wives: "If Jacob should take (wives) from among the daughters of Heth then shall (Rebecca) bang (their heads) together".

\(\)
DOUBLE READINGS IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

καὶ ἐξῆθησαν αὐτῶν θεοματα ἐν μέσῳ νόμων Φαραώ καὶ ἦν Γανηβαά ἐν μέσῳ νόμων Φαραώ. Οριγένες ἔθησε στὸν ὸρακ Ἰονᾶς ὁ Πρόφητας. Μεταφράσατε τοῦτο ἀναφέρθηκε καὶ τὸν ἰσότονον τῷ Οριγένει μεταφράσατε, ὡς τὸν Πρόφητα τῆς Θεοματᾶς.

It is only natural that words which are most likely to be interchanged on account of the similarity of their meanings should more than once be the source of a double reading. In such cases we shall be able to gain a clearer understanding of the various methods employed by scribes and translators in disguising the doublet or in interpreting it away. To illustrate this point, we shall take the pair of synonyms הַמֶּגֶדֱשְׁתֵּים, פֶּטֶאֶה, both of which designate a certain period of time.

1. Ezek. xxxviii, 17 MT: הָעַהֲנָה תֹּא יְשֵׁר דָּבָר הָרָמָה קֻדְמָוֵת בִּרְצֹּכִי בּוֹיִר אֶבֶּרָא שֶׁלָּמָה הָֽהָֽשָּׁמָּא.

The synonymous expressions בּוֹיִר אֶבֶּרָא שֶׁלָּמָה הָהָֽשָּׁמָּא (קֻדְמָוֵת בּוֹיִר אֶבֶּרָא שֶׁלָּמָה הָהָֽשָּׁמָּא) which are juxtaposed in MT asyndetically, have been joined together in G by the addition of καὶ: εἰς τοὺς ἡμέρας ἑκατέρων καὶ ἔτειν. T completely obliterated all trace of the doublet by adding explanatory words: בּוֹיִר אֶבֶּרָא שֶׁלָּמָה (סְלֵדָדְמָה שֶׁלָּמָה) שֶׁלָּמָה (סְלֵדָדְמָה שֶׁלָּמָה).

2. I Sam. xix, 3 MT: אֶשֶּר הוֹחֵל אֵל הַיָּמִם אֲחֵא הָוָה שְׁמִי [T] G: ἡμέρας τοῦτο δεύτερον ἔτος

We conjecture that the Hebrew scribe conjoined the synonymous expressions אֲחֵא הָוָה שְׁמִי by adding the copula ו, which has here the force of וֹא (conjunctive).72 The Greek translators omitted the apparent alternative particle ו altogether and interpreted the pleonastic word שְׁמִי as meaning “the second year”. L took the whole expression to mean: “nunc his diebus per biennium”.

A similar solution of a crux-reading of שָׁנִים in a doublet as תָּשִׁים — is found even in MT itself, in a verse, relating the death of Jehoram, which appears to be full of doublets:

3. II Chron. xxi, 19 MT: רֹאֵי לִמְדִים מִרְבִּים אֲשֶׁר אֶרֶץ לִמְדִים לִמְדִים גֶּנֶפֶּה סְעַל בֵּית הַרְחָבָא שִׁםָּא סְעַל בֵּית הַרְחָבָא שִׁםָּא רֵעִימ G: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐξ ἡμερῶν ἐξ ἡμέρας καὶ δός ἡλθεν καιρός τῶν ἡμερῶν ἡμέρας δόσο…

72. In this case no real choice is implied, as e. g. in Gen. xxiv, 55. The use of conjunctive וֹא instead of ו, or else with the meaning “or”, may be observed, e. g., in Jer. xliii, 3; xlv, 28. In some cases this interchange is the basis of variants in Sam. (Gen. xxiv, 50; Ex. xxii, 9) and in G (I Sam. xxv, 36).
G translated here the MT almost word for word, while V, S render "two years". However, this again would seem to be a case of two synonymous readings, לְמִשְׁמְךָ (לְמִשְׁמְךָ), which the Massoretes who pointed the Hebrew text had already tried to combine. Moreover the word לְמִשְׁמְךָ appears to be simply a doublet of לְמִשְׁמְךָ at the beginning of the verse which is followed by another synonym, מִשְׁמָה. Similarly, we would explain the word בֶּן as a parallel reading to בֵּן. Accordingly, the alternative versions of the verse should be reconstructed as follows:

לְמִשְׁמְךָ 77 בֶּן נִקְנָה 74 נַעֲרָה 75 מִשְׁמָה 74, 75 בֵּן מְלֹא חַלֹל וְרָם 77

The repetition of לְמִשְׁמְךָ before the parallel בֶּן, outside the syntactical framework of the verse, was intended to facilitate the pointing בֶּן and is therefore to be regarded as a secondary development.

IBe. Synonymous adjectives juxtaposed in the middle of the sentence.

1. Ezek. xi, 1 MT:

אֶל נַעֲרָה בֶּן נִקְנָה וְהָקָדְמוֹר הָעָה יִרָאוּ [G; T]

In this verse two designations of the eastern gate were conflated, one of which is employed only in one other passage (x, 19)76, while the other is extremely common in the book of Ezekiel.77

IBd. Synonymous particles juxtaposed in the middle of the sentence.

1. Ps. cxxxv, 17 MT:

אָנוֹמ לֹא אָנוֹמ אֲחָא אָחָא אֵין חוֹר בְּפָהוֹת

Ps. cxv, 6 MT: 78 אָנוֹמ לֹא אָנוֹמ אֲחָא אָחָא אֵין חוֹר בְּפָהוֹת

There are two possible ways of demonstrating the nothingness of idols: One is by explicitly denying that they have any spark of life in them: אֵין חוֹר בְּפָהוֹת (cxxxv, 17), which is more or less a paraphrase of the parallel verse:

73. G removed the difficulty by resorting to inversion.
74. Could מִשְׁמָה be just a synonymous reading of מְלֹא חַלֹל? We may suspect a similar doublet in MT in the following instances: Ezek. xxi, 30, 34; xxxv, 5; Dan. viii, 17; xi, 35; xii, 4, 9; xi, 40. מִשְׁמָה carrying the connotation of time is well attested for in the DSS, cf. E. L. Sukenik, Megilloth Genazoth II (1950), p. 22; M. Wallenstein, VT 4 (1954), p. 211; C. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (1954), p. 2.
75. Infra pp. 174–75, further cases of conflation of the infinitive with finite verbal forms are recorded.
76. מִשְׁמָה as a geographical term is used once more in Ezek. xlvi, 8. Cf. Joel ii, 20; Zach. xiv, 8.
77. Comp. ib. xliv, 12; xlv, 12; xlvi, 2, and xlvi, 1; xliii, 17; xlvii, 18; xlviii, 1, 2 etc.
78. The translation of G reflects in both cases the text of MT in Ps. cxv, 6: διὸς ἐγγύτητος καὶ ὅς διδάσκων τοὺς. In Ps. cxxxv, 16–17 G harmonizes the translation with Ps. cxv, 5–7 by supplying the elements which are missing in MT. O has marked these additions with an obelus.
DOUBLE READINGS IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

(2xv. 6); or alternatively, the same effect may be achieved by a positively worded rhetorical question presupposing a negative answer: שֵׁם אִישׁ רֹאשׁ בְּכָלָה. These two possibilities have been combined to form a double reading in Ps. cxxxv, 17:

there is a similar case in I Sam. xxi, 9, with the difference that there a real question is asked, the answer to which cannot be predicted. Hence, the question can there be formulated either negatively or positively. These two methods have been blended in the doublet:

2. I Sam. xxi, 9 MT:79 אֲרוֹמָר דִּבְּרֵי אֹזֵרְתָּל אָמַר שֶׁאֱלֹהַי יְהוָה תֹּחַ נִזְכָּר G: lōdē el ʾōṣēn āḇrāʾēḇa šāhā ʾēḇrāʾōḏ šōn bōrō
T: אֲרוֹמָר דִּבְּרֵי אָבְרָהָמִי מִתְזָכְרוּ נִזְכָּר

T and G bypassed the doublet by giving the force of “if”, on the analogy of שֶׁאֱלֹהַי in Aramaic, perhaps with the interchange of ו in the usual sense.

3. I Kings x, 21 MT: אֶת כֵּסָף אֵל מְדַבֵּר בִּימֵי שִׁלֹה יְהוָה לאָם [T] מָשָׁב בִּימֵי שִׁלֹה יְהוָה לאָם [G]

Alongside the reading preserved in both of the parallel passages, there was included in the text of I Kings a second reading, מָשָׁב, in which the verb was taken to be in the past tense. The Greek translators of I Kings tried to get over the difficulty by subdividing the sentence after מָשָׁב, adding the conjunction הָיָה and omitting לְמֵאֲזָרַת so that the double negative should not be interpreted as an affirmative: oβ εἶναι ἀγαθόν, δὲν οὐκ ἢ ἦν λογιζόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Σαλμών.

IV Bd. Doublets in which one of the alternative readings is appended at the end of the sentence outside the syntactical framework, but with the addition of connective words

Two alternative ways of negation were apparently conflated in the verse:

1. I Sam. xx, 26 MT: 80 כִּי אָמַר מִכְרָדָם וַחֲלִיתִיהוֹ מָתָרָה וְהָיָה כְּלַלָּה מַעֲרָר

79. Smith, Samuel, ad. loc., accepts Klostermann’s proposal to read: המ שין ו. Comp. Kimchi’s remarks on the nom. propr. בְּכָלָה ו. (I Sam. iv, 21) and Koehler’s comments on בְּכָלָה (Lexicon in V. T. Libros, sub מ III).

80. This is the only case in the O. T. where an adjective is negated by שֶׁא. Cf. F. Wernberg-Moeller, ZAW 71 (1959), p. 56.
The doublet is also mirrored in the Versions, though there, as usual, an attempt has been made to disguise it. In G this is achieved by a paraphrastic rendering, σφυττρομα πέριπτον μὴ καθαρὸς ἐλιφεί οὐ χειμαθηροματικον, which accords the words μήκες and ἀλαμφίον a ritual-technical sense. This interpretation is based on a tradition which is also reflected in T, ἀρει ἀπειρόλαβε τριώς ἢ τριώ τριώ ἢ τριώ. T has also reserved a second rendering which gives these words the meaning of a mere incident: "A single (nail) was driven in, and the nail was left in its place." The translator conjoined these two explanations by inserting the conjunction "καὶ," just as MT combined the alternative readings by adding the conjunction "καὶ." 

ICa. Readings juxtaposed in the middle of the sentence without syntactical co-ordination.

II Sam. vi. 20 MT: אַשָּׁר גְּדֹל הָיוּ ... חָזַקְוּ הָוֵלֶת אָצְלֵי הָרִיקָה ... Here דַּמְלִית (דַּמְלִית) are variant forms of the Niphal infinitive which have been conflated, as was observed by Kimchi: “Both of them are infinitives of the Niphal. One has the full form of strong verbs, as in נָשִּׁיא בֶּן אָדָם 84, while in the other there is the usual omission of the nun of the Niphal (as in weak verbs). 85 The infinitive is repeated to emphasize the indecorousness of his behaviour...”. A similar attempt at harmonization is also found in the ancient versions. G turned one of the two infinitives into a finite verb: καθαρὸς ἀποκολλοῦσκεται ἀποκολλούσκεται. T went still further and translated both of them as finite verbs derived from two different Aramaic roots: כָּפָן דָּוֵל יָמָנוּל יָמָנוּל תְּזַמָּנָה מְסַמְּקָה מְסַמְּקָה דָּוֵל מְסַמְּקָה מְסַמְּקָה.

ICb. Juxtaposition of an infinitive and an alternative finite form of the verb in the middle of the sentence without syntactical co-ordination.

1. Ex. xl, 15 MT: מִמֶּה יִהְיֶה לְחֹזֶה לָהֶם מְשַׁמְּשָם לָהֶם פְּרִימָן We propose the following reconstruction: מִמֶּה יִהְיֶה לָהֶם מְשַׁמְּשָם הָיְתָה לָהֶם פְּרִימָן.

81. Cf. Deut. xxiii, 11. A similar interpretation was accepted by traditional exegetes (Rashi, Kimchi etc.) as well as by Smith, Samuel, pp. 192-3.
82. In Deut. xxiii, 11 the Targums employ the Hebrew term הָרַךְ in their translations.
83. Cf. Ruth ii, 3; Eccles. ix, 3. With regard to רֶסֶן, cf. Ex. xxv, 11, 17, 24, 29; xxx, 3; Zach, iii, 5 etc.
85. Cf. Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar 2nd Engl. ed. (1910), §51k, p. 138. Ibid. §75y (p. 213) the suggestion is made that הָרַךְ “is a subsequent correction of an erroneous repetition of הָרַךְ.”
The doublet can also be discerned in the Versions.

2. Gen. xxvii, 44–45 MT: [Sam. T]
   תמה האורך: דע שוב את גאותרך מקך
   והם את אשתו לוהי

Here G has disguised the doublet by omitting some words and connecting the others by means of καί: εἰς τὸν αἰσθητὸν τὸν θεοῦ καὶ τὴν θεήν τοῦ δειλίου σου ἀπὸ σου. It appears probable that for the same reason the verse divider was placed in MT between the alternative readings86: דע שוב את אשתו לאו תרשה את אשתו אותרך. A similar explanation applies to the following verses:

3. I Sam. ii, 31 MT: קֹד בַּכְתּ: הָבוֹתֵם אֶרֶץ נְכוּ בּוֹרֵשׁ
   מַהֲרָה אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם בּוֹרֵשׁ אֶרֶץ
   וּבְּכֵתּ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם אֶרֶץ בּוֹרֵשׁ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם [T]
   וּבְּכֵתּ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם אֶרֶץ בּוֹרֵשׁ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם
   אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם אֶרֶץ בּוֹרֵשׁ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם

G has not translated the words קֹד בַּכְתּ וּבְּכֵתּ. This line as a whole is a veritable crux interpretum, but the first part of it may be explained as being simply a parallel reading to the end of verse 32, as against the infinitive מַהֲרָה אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ. Besides the different ways of negation and the use of a finite verb—אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ—as against the infinitive מַהֲרָה אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ, it may also be conjectured that the sections of the sentence were arranged in a different order in the two alternative readings:

4. I Sam. iv, 21 MT: מַהֲרָה אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ (כֶּל הַיָּמִים) הָבוֹתֵם אֶרֶץ בּוֹרֵשׁ אֶרֶץ
   נָבָא בּוֹרֵשׁ אֶרֶץ מַהֲרָה אֵלֵיה בְּכֵתּ קֹד בַּכְתּ: מֵהָבוֹתֵם בּוֹרֵשׁ אֶרֶץ

The main difference here between G and MT lies in the absence of any Greek equivalent for the words נָבָא בּוֹרֵשׁ אֶרֶץ in v. 21, which are

86. Cf. Ob. 9–10, supra p. 164.
87. The readings of MT and G were conflated in T. Cf. supra p. 154.
88. An interpretative alteration.
to be taken as an alternative reading to v. 22. The synonymous readings in MT are distinguished by the alternation of these infinitives הָלִיךְ ... וֹאָמַרְתָּ ... מָלֵךְ ... מְלִיכָה ... One of these readings is an almost word-for-word repetition of part of verse 19 of the same chapter, the other is perhaps derived from the wording in verse 11.

The single reading of G contains elements of the two alternatives preserved in MT. The finite form הָלִיךְ is found here next to וֹאָמַרְתָּ, which reflects the infinitive מָלֵךְ. The hexaplaric translation presents already, with slight alterations, the double readings of MT:

καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ παιδίων οὐαὶ χαμοῦ καὶ ἔλπαν (ἐν) ἀπόκεισται δόξα ἀπὸ κυρία τοῦ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ λῃστήν αὐτής καὶ τὸν ἀνέφη αὐτήν καὶ ἔλπαν "Ἀπόκεισται δόξα ἀπὸ κυρία τοῦ κυρίου τῆς ἐλήφθη, ἡ κυρία τοῦ βασιλείου."

The additional phrase in this rendering, καὶ διὰ τὸ τεθνηκόντα, taken from verse 19 of the same chapter (see 2 Samuel 89 shows that this version is secondary. A similar addition is also found in T: דַּרְמֵי מְרָדָד בִּלְעָדָה אָדָם וְדַרְמֵי מְרָדָד בִּלְעָדָה 50.

5. Deut. ii, 31 MT: רָאָה הַגְּלִיֹת הַנַּעֲפִיתָה אֲנָה שָׁם וָאֶצְרָצֵי הָיָה [Sam.] [Sam.] [Sam.]
   ג: ἐνάγξαι κληρονομήσαι τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν
   ib. ii, 24 MT: ἐπέρασεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου [Sam.]
   ג: ἐνάγξαι κληρονομεῖν

From the translation of G to Deut. ii, 31 and from the Hebrew version of ii, 24, it seems probable that MT of ii, 31 is a conflation of the alternative readings לֵשֵׁם הָיוּ בַּאֲרִिי [Sam.]
6. Synonymous expressions and different tenses of the verb.

Josh. ii, 3 MT: תְּהִי הַבַּיִת אֲלֵי [Sam.] [Sam.]
G translates only one reading, but in such a way that it contains clear indications

89. The pointing הָלִיךְ is to be preferred to הָלִיךְ of MT. Some MSS and editions read actually הָלִיךְ כֶּסֶף (see Aptowitzer, op. cit., II, p. 10). The verse is thus quoted by Rashi in his commentary on Gen. xxxvii, 35 (ed. Berliner). C. D. Ginsburg collated some MSS which read (probably erroneously) הָלִיךְ.
90. Similarly Kimchi: מִתָּהוּ הָלִיךְ כֶּסֶף. Kimchi apparently recognized the doublet as such but explained it as a combination of two sayings uttered at different occasions.
of the two alternatives. The repetition of the words which are to be explained as a synonymy of the corresponding passage in I Chron. xviii, 13, nor in the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions.  

8. II Kings xv, 16 MT: ... יִהוּדָה ... בִּלְךָ אֲחַז יִתְנַהָ אֲשֶׁר וְאָבָטָה וְאָבָטָה שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה אֲשֶׁר...  

G: δεσώσα ευνοίων αἰώνα καὶ ένδέχεται αἰώνα  

T (MS 1): אַר יִתְנַה תּוֹעֲשָה לְאָשֶׁר לְאָשֶׁר וְאָבָטָה  

In MT a synonymous reading has been added according to which the verse began with a verb in the imperfect with way consecutive, instead of the plain imperfect in the alternative:  

The awkwardness of the doublet was felt by the translators who tried to smooth the syntactical structure of the verse by exegetical additions.  

ICC. Is.xxvi, 5 MT: שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה אֲשֶׁר אָרַץ יִתְנַהָ וְאָבָטָה DSIa: שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה וְאָרַץ יִתְנַהָ וְאָבָטָה  

In G the words שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה are not represented at all and the preceding hemistich:  

This evidence, which is corroborated by S and the reading of DSIa, makes it probable that the word שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה is pleonastic in MT. Accordingly, the verse originally ran שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה וְאָרַץ יִתְנַהָ וְאָבָטָה. The form שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה  

accords with that of the neighbouring verbs והֵמָּה וְאָבָטָה (verse 6), whereas the form שִׁמְשִׁלָתָה (cf. Job xli, 11) has no parallel in the immediate context. Kimchi noticed the doublet and explained it after his usual manner, as “a repetition for the purpose of emphasis”. T got round the difficulty by rendering the synonymous words by two different verbs and connecting them by way conjunctions:  

G added: הָיָה וְדִכְיָה, trying, apparently, to harmonize v. 3 with v. 2.  

G reflects the same text, though rendering לָכֵי בֵּית לְקָדָשָׁה בֵּית מֵאָשֶׁר.  

IVCd. Parallel prepositions, one of which is appended outside the syntactical framework with the addition of a connective word.

I Chron. xiii, 14 MT: יָשַׁב אֲרֹן הַאֲבוֹתִים עַל בִּתְּכֵן אֲרֹן בּוֹכִית

II Sam. vi, 11 MT: יָשַׁב אֲרֹן הַבּוֹכִית אֵלֹהִים

G: ἐν οἴνῳ (ἐλς οἴνῳ) Ἀβεβδομᾶ ὁ Θεὸς

The parallel reading יָשַׁב, found in II Sam., has been placed at the end of the verse in I Chron., the necessary syntactical adjustment being made by the addition of a preposition 95 and a possessive suffix referring back to the object of the sentence. This second reading was not translated in G, but was added in the Lucanian recension with a further development in the process of adaptation, this time by inserting a conjunctive phrase: τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ὅλου τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ.

VCe. Combination of determination by means of the definite article with determination by means of pronominal suffix.

1. II Kings xv, 16 MT: ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν ἀνεγερθέντων

G: καὶ τὸς εἰς γαστέρας ἐγερθέν

T: ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

In MT the reading ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα, which is reflected in the version of G, has been blended with the alternative ὁ δὲ τὸν, which is preserved in T. 96

2. Josh. viii, 33 MT: ἀνὰ τὸν ἁλίκην ἄνθρωπον

G(B): καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος

G(A): οἱ ἄνθρωποι

T: ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

3. Josh. vii, 21 MT: ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

G: ἐν ὧν σάρκιν ὁ πατὴρ

T: ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

IID a. 1. Josh. iv, 7 MT: ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

The words ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα are not translated in G and seem to be an alternative reading. The verse, then, originally ran as follows:

ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

The words are not translated in G and seem to be an alternative reading. The verse, then, originally ran as follows:

ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ

ἀνὰ τὸν σάρκα τῶν εἰσιν αὐτοῦ


One of the two readings conflated here is based on indirect speech (אמרוהו עלמה: נברת), the other on direct speech (אמרהו נברת). The alternatives are also distinguished from each other by the use of two different forms of the construct case of לְהִימָן.

IDA. Two synonymous forms of the relative clause conflated.

2. I Kings xii,8 MT: יִרְאוּ אֵת הָיְלִידֵת אֶת הָרֶה נָרָה אֵת אָשֶׁר הָעַמֵּר לְהִימָן
II Chron.x,8 MT: יִרְאוּ אֵת הָיְלִידֵת אֶת הָרֶה נָרָה אֶת הָעַמֵּר לְהִימָן

MT of I Kings has combined the two synonymous readings אָשֶׁר הָעַמֵּר only one of which has been preserved in II Chron. T employs here the paraphrastic translation ויהי המששֶם, derived from the Hebrew text of verse 6.

IIDa 3. Ezek. iii,15 MT: והנה אלה המתלה את בקז והשבית נאם נר כּכר
אָשֶׁר צָּה לַכּךָ וְתֵסֵבְךָ שָׁם
t: נחתה בְעִירָה אָשֶׁר צָה לַכּךָ וְתֵסֵבְךָ שָׁם

We conjecture that MT is a conflation of two readings joined together by way 98:

הָעַמֵּר G, which also had difficulty with the beginning of the verse, omitted the word והשבית and the conjunctive way before אָשֶׁר, thus obtaining a smoother syntactical construction:

kal περιπλήθον τοῦ κατοικοῦντας θεοί τοῦ ποταμοῦ τού Χοβαρ τοῦ ἰσκείας θεοί.

T, like the Qere, gave את the meaning of את and inserted the connective word יְהַתִּית. This same interpretation may have caused the duplication of the word שֶׁ in MT.

VD a. Eccl.vi,10 Kethib: יָעַל יָכִל לַדִּים וְשֵׁתָיו מַמְצִית
Qere: מַמְצִית שֵׁתָיו 99

It appears that here the alternative readings 100 שֵׁתָיו מַמְצִית were conflated.

98. This way does therefore not introduce an explanatory gloss, as suggested by Gesenius, §154a, note 1b (p. 484). Similarly Cooke, Ezekiel, ad. loc., who proposes to delete one of the alternative readings which he considers a gloss.
99. So many MSS and K Or.
IE. Alternative readings distinguished by some additional word(s) found in only one of them without affecting the meaning of the passage.¹⁰¹

1. Nu.xiii,33 MT: שם רוח לא הפשיל אלא בלאคม
  G: ויהי רוח קידוע שם גָּהְנָתָּא

Proposed reconstruction:¹⁰² שם רוח לא הפשיל אלא בלאך שם גָּהְנָתָּא

It should be noted here that in one reading scriptio plena is used (הפשילא) and in the alternative scriptio defectiva—(הפשילא). The redactor preserved even this detail when he combined the two readings (cf. Ezek. iii,15).

2. Jer. xxvi,22 MT: יָרָשׁוּ חָמְלִי יָדִירִים כָּל אֲדֹמֵהּ בְּכָּל אֲדֹמֵהּ וְהֵמָּה דְּלִי כָּל מַדְרִים
  G: בָּעָמָה, כָּל אָזְמָה בְּכָּל אָזְמָה וְהֵמָּה דְּלִי כָּל מַדְרִים

Here the second line, which is an enlarged alternative reading, is missing in G. Presumably, then, the two readings came from different sources. One of them, perhaps because it originated in official circles, preserved detailed information, while the second contained only a general statement. This technique of preserving a detailed version alongside a more general one is also found occasionally in parallel passages in MT. It will suffice, e.g., to draw attention to

Ex. xx, 10: [Sam.] עֲבֹדָהּ אָמְרָה נָעַט מעְשָׁנָה [Sam.]
Deut. v, 14: [Sam.] עֲבֹדָה אָמְרָה נָעַט מעְשָׁנָה [Sam.]
G in both passages renders the fuller reading.

3. I Sam. ii,23 MT: יַעֲרֹר לָהּ לֹא מַעְשָׂה לְהַרְבּוּת הָאָדָם אָשֶׁר
  G: וַיִּהְיֶה לָהּ לֹא מַעְשָׂה לְהַרְבּוּת הָאָדָם אָשֶׁר

Proposed reconstruction: יַעֲרֹר לָהּ לֹא מַעְשָׂה לְהַרְבּוּת הָאָדָם אָשֶׁר

It is possible that the parallel דַּרְבּוּרָם רַעָמָה appears again in a modified form, in the addition found in G at the end of chap.iii:

καὶ ὁ Πρεσβύτερος σφόδρα καὶ οἱ νἱοὶ αὐτοῦ πορεύοντες ἐποδύστε καὶ πονηρὰ ἡ δοξάς αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου.

101. The same criterion differentiates between parallel readings, e. g. Jer. vi, 22 —1,41.
104. ὁ* add ἐγγυτὰ πονηρὶ in accord with MT.
4. Ju. מַע, 9 MT: "הָאָמַר הָיוָהִים לְעֹרֶב לְרוּתָא הָדָות הָוָה לְפָה"

Nowack 105 rightly observed that two readings have been combined in this verse. He characteristically regarded them as further evidence of the two sources, traces of which he found everywhere in Ju. Actually we apparently have here alternative readings that were not preserved in their entirety in MT but can be reconstructed from G, which records each of them separately in different witnesses.

A: "Iδον δὴ εἰς ἐσπεραν κεκλινεν ἢ ἡμέρα
B: 'Iδον δὴ ἡφθηνησαν ἡ ἡμέρα εἰς τήν ἐσπεραν"

B represents the verb ἐσπεράν of one of the readings. The translation of A seems to reflect ἡφθηνεν of the other reading, which the translator perhaps read as ἡφθηνεν, as a result of metathesis. 106 We conjecture, therefore, that the wording of the two original readings was as follows:

a. הננה את רמה הווה למרבור_LOOP (תפ"ה)
b. הננה (תפ"ה) הווה לרמרבר (תפ"ה) LOOP

5. Ex. xviii, 10 MT:

"בּוֹר וְאֵין אָלָכָה יָדָּה מָצוּרָתָה מֵאָלָכָה"

G (B) renders only the upper reading, slightly modified: ὅτι ἐξείλατο αὐτοῖς, where the change from second person plural to third person brings out the identity of this reading with the alternative text. 107 In most of the Greek tradition we find a single translation which shows traces of the two distinctive readings in the Hebrew text: ὅτι ἐξείλατο τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῖς 108 (b) ἐκ χειρὸς Ἀλγντιὼν 109 καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς Φασαὼ.

TO and TJ tried to gloss over the doublet by translating the repeated Ми́р in two different ways: once they rendered it literally by δι' ἄι, while in the second instance it was interpreted metaphorically as מתוות רוח המחרא הקדש.

106 Or else he found that reading already in his Vorlage. The rendering of A was possibly influenced by v. 8: νῦν ὁ ναὸς ὑμῶν. Cf. I Sam. iv, 2 MT: ἡμεῖς ἡμῶν, G: καὶ ἐκλήσιν (ἡμῶν) ὑπὸ πόλεμος.
107 The alteration of a noun and a pronoun constitutes often the difference between synonymous readings. But it is possible that in the case under review one of the Greek scribes erroneously wrote αὐτοῖς for αὐτοίς.
108 Determination by a possessive pronoun instead of the article.
109 Twice in Ex. xviii, 8–10, MT has the composite expression מִצְרִים אִישֶּׁהָ - מִצְרִים אִישֶּׁהָ (vv. 8, 10a) and twice מִצְרִים alone (vv. 9, 10b). G renders always the composite expression.
In this case the alternative readings are distinguished from each other by:
a. The use of direct speech (ראשם) in contrast to indirect speech (말ות);
b. stylistic expansions found alternately in one or the other of them, but not in
both: רְשָׁם מַלְוֹדִי פָּרֵצָה — מַלְוֹדִי מַלְוֹדִי; מַלְוֹדִי — מַלְוֹדִי.

F. Complex Doublets.

Alternative readings conflated in a doublet are sometimes distinguished by
several of the criteria enumerated so far, rather than by one simple feature.
This multiplicity of differentia is found especially when alternative readings are
not just marked by a custos, but are recorded in the doublet in full, or at least in
part. This feature has already been observed in several of the examples given
above. We shall therefore now content ourselves with citing only one further
instance.

II Kings xxii,5 MT:

יָדָהוּ לְעַל יִשָּׁע מִלְוֹדִי אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית ה
לָוֹךְ בֵּרֵךְ הָאָבִי: לְחַרְשָׁם אֵלִיבִים לְזֵדָרִים לְקֹנָה נְגֵי גוֹבִּי אֲשֶׁר
לָוֹךְ הָאָבִי

To appreciate the character of the doublet in this verse, it is desirable first to
review the sequence of the preparations for the renovation of the Temple, as
they are recorded in the parallel narrative from the reign of Jehoash,II Kings
xii,12-13.

When the “chest” which served as a repository for the offerings intended
for the repair of the Temple was full, the high priest and the King’s secretary
counted the money: “And they gave the money that was weighed out into
the hands of them that did the work, that had the oversight of the house of
the Lord: and they paid it out to the carpenters and the builders, that wrought
upon the house of the Lord. And to the masters and the hewers of stone, and for
buying timber and hewn stone to repair the breaches of the house of the Lord,
and for all that was laid out for the house to repair it”\footnote{112}.

This means that those “who had the oversight of the house of the Lord”
acted as the intermediaries between the “finance committee” and the labourers
who executed the work. As directors and supervisors of the building operations,
they hired the craftsmen and purchased the building materials. A brief summary
of these arrangements is given in the parallel verse in II Chron.xxiv,12. The same
procedure was also followed in the reign of Josiah. Then the king sent Shaphan

\footnote{Q: יָדָהֻ וְלָוֹךְ הָאָבִי.
\footnote{Many MSS (=G): יָדָהֻ וְלָוֹךְ הָאָבִי.
\footnote{G translates the same text with only slight variations.
the Scribe to the House of the Lord, where, together with Hilkhiah the High Priest, he was to count the money that had been brought to the Temple and disburse it for the necessary renovations (II Kings xxii, 3-4). In the next verse, which is the one discussed here, it is stated that they were to give the money to the overseers to enable the latter to employ craftsmen and purchase building materials. At this point, however, the copyist has combined two readings, of which one is very similar to the version of Joash's action as reported in II Kings (xxii, 12-13), while the other keeps close to the version given in II Chron. (xxiv, 12). The verse in II Kings xxii, 5 may therefore be restored as follows:

a. רוחנת יִדֶּסֶת נַפְּלוֹת בֶּן בֶּת הַמֶּהלַכָּא בְּרֶשֶׁת לְאֶשֶּׁר בִּרְכָּתָה הָיוּ לְעַל עַל לְעַל בַּרְדֵּךְ לְאֶשֶּׁר בַּרְדֵּךְ.

b. לְּרַחְשִׁים לְבַבֶּן רוֹדְבֵי לִקְנָה עֲשֵׂים וַאֲבָן מַסָּבָּב לְחָזֵק בָּדַק פָּרֵק.

The alternative readings are differentiated from each other by the following criteria:

1a. The subject of the verb is apparently Hilkhiah the Priest or the king, and the verb is therefore to be pointed (יוּת הָרוּת). So in II Chron. xxiv, 12: יִתְחַתת הָרוּת הָדוֹרָה אֵאֵל. Similarly in II Kings xxii, 12: יִתְחַתת הָרוּת אֵאֵל בְּכָפָר.

b. The subject is the secretary and the priest, and the verb is to be pointed יִתְחַתת.

It is noteworthy that G in this verse makes a distinction between the two verbs by rendering יִתְחַתת with אֵאֵל, and יִתְחַתת with אֵאֵל אֵאֵל אֵאֵל.

2a. The objective suffix is attached to the verb, יִתְחַתת, as also in Chron. xxiv, 12: יִתְחַתת בְּכָפָר.

b. The object is expressed by the separate pronoun, יִתְחַתת אֵאֵל. The construction in II Kings xxii, 12 is similar: יִתְחַתת אֵאֵל בְּכָפָר.

3a. יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים (נַפְּלוֹת כָּרָה) as in II Kings xxii, 12.

b. יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים (נַפְּלוֹת כָּרָה), to which may be compared (דּוֹרֵים (נַפְּלוֹת כָּרָה) in II Chron. xxii, 12.

4a. A technical designation of "the workmen" who act as "overseers", יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים. So the Qere in II Kings xxii, 12 and similarly the Kethib, (?) יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים.

b. A vague, general description of their connection with the Temple, יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים, paralleled by II Chron. xxiv, 12: יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים בְּכָפָר.

5a. יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים as in II Chron. xxiv, 12: יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים.

b. יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים as in II Kings xxii, 12: יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים.

It is quite possible that, because of the unrecognized doublet, the word יִתְחַתת דּוֹרֵים, or a similar word, which, in the story about Joash, indicated the transference of

the money from “the overseers” to the craftsmen — the carpenters, builders, etc.—was omitted at the end of this sentence or at the beginning of the next. The omission would have resulted from the identification of the workmen “that had the oversight of the house of the Lord,” referred to in the second reading, with the carpenters and builders. This identification was made all the easier by the outward similarity of the construction with lamedh dativi. 

The redactor of Chron., who already had the double reading before him, observed the unusual construction of the verse. He therefore tried to give it a proper syntactical form by introducing additions and slight changes. The most important of these is the omission of the lamedh before the second mention of המלאכה. This makes them the subject of the sentence and also the subject of the verb יחנה, which now becomes virtually synonymous with ידיאתי (II Kings xii,12) or יחנה כרימ (II Chron. xxiv,12) in the story about Joash.

II Chron. xxxiv,10 MT: ירחנה על ידי שם המלאכה המקדש בובית ה, יחנה כרימ
אלה שם המלאכה האור פספס ת"כ, יחנה כרימ
ולוחך בובית, יחנה ירחנה לוחך לוף
ומכח עניבי למחברתו תיקנה את התיבות האונס
שתים מלכי יהודה. [G]

We are now in a position to distinguish four stages in the textual transmission of the verse under discussion:

1. The original reading was that preserved in II Kings xii,12-13 117, in the narrative about the renovation of the Temple in the reign of Joash.
2. A parallel reading was incorporated into the corresponding passage in Chron. xxiv,12.
3. In the secondary narrative referring to events in the reign of Josiah the two foregoing readings were combined in a single verse in II Kings xxii,5-6.
4. In the corresponding passage in II Chron xxxiv,10, an attempt was made to disguise the doublet and regularize the syntactical structure of the verse.

To be continued

114. *Legs* ראש, in correspondence with (ן) ראש in the parallel.
115. An (explanatory?) gloss derived from II Kings xii, 12.
116. Instead of *שכורה* in the parallel reading.
117. Possibly we have already here a doublet: ירחנה "" — המלאכה מקדש ה. ירחנה כרימ.