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Introduction

One of the principal means of expressing ideas or beliefs in the Bible is through "recycling", i.e. the reuse and remolding of existing material, written or oral. This reworking allowed for the possibility of expressing views which might have been similar, different, or even diametrically opposed to the original meaning of the transmitted material. Biblical authors related to their sources as a kind of pliable plastic, which could be flexibly remodelled into new forms according with their new and continuously evolving conceptions. Additions, deletions, alterations in the order of the material or in context in which it appears, the replacement of one expression by another, or even the change of a single word could significantly alter the original meaning and thus convert the material into a new vehicle transporting a new message. This is true of all the biblical literary genres — law, prophecy, historiography, song, story, parable, or even genealogy. The process of change can normally be traced in the later literature when the earlier sources are documented in the Bible. However, when the original sources are non-extant, which is usually the case when the text under examination belongs to the earlier stages of the biblical literature, a complete tracing is impossible. Sometimes there are clear indications that a particular text is not an original form, but rather is already a later stage in a process of literary

¹This study was first presented in 1986 at the annual symposium dedicated to the memory of Dr. R. Weiss in the Department of Bible of the Hebrew University. I am very grateful to my teacher Prof. Emanuel Tov for his comments which greatly assisted in the development of this article. The responsibility, of course, is entirely my own.
development. Yet, how the text evolved from its original to its present form is nebulous and conjectural. This is especially the case when the only extant data are fragmentary, whether as corrupted traditions or as vague allusions, scattered in obscure sources. These traditions may be in the Bible or in extra-biblical sources, such as the Targumim, the Qumran scrolls, or the rabbinic literature. Tracing the processes of recycling is highly important, since an understanding of an opus is essentially an understanding of the processes which brought about its appearing in its specific and unique formulation. The present study deals with one particular example of the phenomenon of recycling, found in the historiographical literature, namely the curse upon the rebuilders of Jericho (Jos. 6:26).

The LXX of Jos. 6:26 and its Vorlage

The description of the pronouncement of the curse (Jos. 6:26) follows the narration of the conquest of Jericho:

ירשבע וטמש בהנה לאלים
אפרו הארץ לעני
אשר תקם וסנה את הערי הזואת ואת ירוח
בכפרו יספורנה וב었습니다 יציב ויהיה

The doubled direct object ירוחו את תאז is somewhat pleonastic. Accordingly, in Sifre on Deuteronomy, the Rabbis queried: "Do we not know that Jericho is her name?" In the same vein it was asked in the Talmud: "From the sense of the words 'this city', do I not know that the reference is to Jericho?"

The words יריחו are not represented in the major MSS of the LXX of Jos. 6:26, and several considerations point to the possibility that this absence is based on a Vorlage which differed from MT. Already at the beginning of this century...

\textsuperscript{2}§55. See further Yalkut Shim'onî I (Saloniki 1521-1527) § 888.

\textsuperscript{3}According to several MSS of the tractate and its quotation in Yalkut Shim'onî II, §§ 16, 207. In some of the editions of Sanhedrin 113a, the quotation of the baraita contains only the reply without the preceding question: לעתא: אל יריחו על שמי עלי אברחות אלו ערי תארית על. Likewise, in his commentary to Jos., M. Noth deletes the words יריחו את תאז basing himself on the LXX: Das Buch Josua, HAT (Tübingen 1953) 41.
Holmes showed that the LXX of Jos. preserves important traditions stemming from a variant Hebrew version. His views have since gained support in the literature, e.g. in Cooke's notes on the LXX in his commentary to Jos., the conclusions reached by Auld, and, more recently, the studies conducted by Rofé and Tov. These studies show that the LXX deviates from MT, particularly in its pluses and minuses. Thus Rofé analyzed the chapter on the cities of refuge, which is significantly shorter in the LXX, as well as the end of the book, which is considerably longer in Greek. He concluded that in both instances the LXX retains ancient and original Hebrew traditions. Tov examined the overall character of the translation and concluded that the MT and LXX reflect two different editions of the book, and that, therefore, the LXX contains much valuable material for the literary criticism of Jos. An examination of the nature of the LXX of Jos. 6:26 points in the same direction.

The Greek verse consists of two parts. The first part more or less parallels MT. The second, however, contains a rather long addition. The first part reads as follows according to B:

καὶ ὥρκισεν Ἰσσοῦς ἐν τῷ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐναντίον κυρίου λέγων ἐπικατάρατος
ὁ ἄνθρωπος δὲ οἰκοδομήσει τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, ἐν τῷ πρωτότοκῳ αὐτοῦ
θεμελίωσει αὐτὴν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔλαχιστῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστήσει τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς.

The most significant difference between the LXX and MT is the absence of ἡμέρα ἐν τῇ in the Greek. Secondly, instead of the phrase ἡμέρα τῇ, the LXX renders ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (reflecting: ἡμέρα τῇ ἐν). Furthermore, in the LXX, the words


5This retroversion is facilitated as the LXX translator of Jos. clearly distinguishes between the expressions ἡμέρα ἐν τῇ and ἡμέρα τῇ, in ἡμέρα τῇ, is translated by ἡμέρα in each of the eight instances when it is represented in the LXX (4:14, 8:25, 9:27, 10:28, 35, 14:9, 12, 24:25). ἡμέρα τῇ appears three times in MT of Jos. (5:2, 11:10, 21), and each time τῇ is trans-
The curse in MT begins with ... לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ. The difference between them is also reflected in two curse formulations attested elsewhere in the Bible. The long formulation includes לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ, lacking in the concise form. The long form is found in the curse לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ (1 Sam. 26:19), in the blessing לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ (Gen. 27:7) and is alluded to in לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ (2 Ki. 2:24) and לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ (1 Sam. 17:43). The shorter forms are found in Deut. 27:15, 20:15. Similar to this form is the curse formula in the burial inscription of לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ from the 8th century B.C.E., inscribed on a tomb from Siloam: לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ. See N. Avigad, "The Epitaph of a Royal Steward from Siloam Village", IEJ 3 (1953) 137-152.

Thus B, and with slight variations a few minuscules. The use of an auxiliary verb in a curse formula has no parallels in MT, and this situation explains its absence from the Hebrew version behind the LXX.

Three MSS of Sifre on Deut. § 95 (תֵּבֵן, לְאֵל, וּבֵית) read like the LXX, לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ. See L. Finkelstein, Sifre on Deuteronomy (New York 1969). The same reading is found in Kennicott MS 150. (cf. MS 336 וּבֵית). The formula of the curse without לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ is found in the quote of Jos. 6:26 in the Florence codex of Sanhedrin 113a. Cf. D. Rosenthal, ed., Babylonian Talmud Codex Florence (Jerusalem 1972) 286 and the quotation in MSS ו and ו in Tosephta Sanhedrin § 14 (ed. Zukermandel, 437). לא יירשבע משש בים ובראשׁ אֶל֖וֹ is also missing from the curse quoted in MS 701 (prima manu) of de Rossi.
The Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho

The most important witness in Hebrew, however, is found in 4QTTest, containing a collection of verses from the Pent., which concludes with a quotation from a source drawing upon Jos. 6:26. Both in its content and structure, the text of 4QTTest is divided into four sections. Each begins on a new line and is separated from the previous section by the sign >. The fourth and final section contains a quotation from the so-called 4QPssJos:10


Both in its character and intentions, this passage resembles the form of a pesher. First a verse is quoted (Jos.6:26), and then, after a space (between לחלקיה and תמא), its explication is offered. The spacing thus served as a technical means of indicating the end of a quote.\textsuperscript{12}

The reading of the Qumran scroll veers from MT and accords in most of its details with the LXX. The words יברעיה and לפלני are missing from the curse formula, and the simple future כאראשא appears rather than the compound auxiliary form אראשא. Most important, the words וייעד are also conspicuously absent. Only in one detail does the Qumran text substantiate MT vis-à-vis the LXX, as it uses the proximate demonstrative את תמא rather than את תמא.\textsuperscript{13}

The three texts can thus be presented in a tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>4QTest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לאמור תמא יברעיה בינת הוהיה ואראשא יברעיה לפלני</td>
<td>ירביע יברעיה בינת הוהיה ואראשא יברעיה לפלני</td>
<td>ירביע יברעיה בינת הוהיה ואראשא יברעיה לפלני</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the pesher felt free to use the Jos. text in order to sound the alarm about what was taking place in Jerusalem in his own day. He could do so, since his biblical text spoke anonymously of "this city" (תמא in the LXX) without explicit reference to Jericho. The identification with Jerusalem was made easy by the fact that of the 55 occurrences of the expression תמא in the Bible, 53 refer to Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. 1QpHab separating between the biblical text and the exegesis with an open space varying in width from one word to a half line, and 4Qplsl, 4QpHos\textsuperscript{b}, 4QpNah. Cf. B. Nitzan, Pesher Habakkuk (Jerusalem 1986) 7-8 (Hebr.).

\textsuperscript{13} The affinity between the readings of 4QTest and the LXX has been recognized for some time, especially because of the patent similarities between the quotation from Deut. 33:8-11 and the LXX of these verses. See P.W. Skehan, "The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumran", CBQ 19 (1957) 435-440 and also Strugnell (op. cit. n.11).
(excluding Jos. 6:26 and inner-biblical parallels). The readings attested in the Hebrew sources, especially in 4QTest, thus make it likely that the LXX version is based upon a Hebrew Vorlage very similar to the Qumran scroll, and that הָזִּיָּה was missing from this text.

After the first section of the verse, which runs approximately parallel to MT, follows this plus:

καὶ οὔτως ἐποίησεν Ὀξαν ὁ ἐκ Βαιθηλ.
ἐν τῷ Αβειρὼν τῷ πρωτότοκῷ ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν
καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ διασωθεῖτι ἐπέστησεν τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς

Thus did Ozan of Bethel (i.e. he built the city).

At the cost of Abiron his firstborn, he laid its foundations,
and at the cost of his younger child, who had survived, he set up her gates.

This addition has obvious affinities with 1 Ki. 16:34, as demonstrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The LXX addition in Jos. 6:26</th>
<th>1 Ki. 16:34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οὔτως ἐποίησεν</td>
<td>בֶּן בַּנָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὀξαν ὁ ἐκ Βαιθηλ</td>
<td>ἡραίᾳ βιτ ηδίαλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ Αβειρὼν τῷ πρωτότοκῷ</td>
<td>ἡ αἰκις την καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν</td>
<td>ἀπανίστο καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ διασωθεῖτι</td>
<td>ἔστησεν τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The crucial question is the nature of the text underlying the LXX. Comparison of the LXX of Jos.6:26 with 1 Ki. 16:34 shows that for his rendition of Jos. 6:26 the translator did not draw upon the Greek version of Ki. which reads as follows:

14 Only twice in the Bible (excepting Jos. 6:26) does יִירָה refer to a city other than Jerusalem (Gen. 19:20 and 1 Sam. 9:6). Elsewhere in the Bible, i.e., 53 times (not including the Is. parallels to 2 Ki.), the expression refers to Jerusalem: 2 Ki. 18:30 (=Is. 36:15), 19:32, 33, 34 (=Is. 37:33, 34, 35), 20:6, 6 (=Is. 38:6, 6), 23:27; Jer. 17:24, 25, 25, 19:8, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21:4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 22:8, 8, 26:6, 11, 12, 15, 20, 27:17, 19, 29:16, 32:3, 28, 29, 29, 31, 36, 33:4, 5, 34:2, 22, 37:8, 10, 38:2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 23, 39:16; Ezek. 11:2, 6; Neh. 13:18; 2 Chr. 6:34.
The locative descriptor (יוֹלֶדֶה בֵּית) is formed in Ki. by -אֵיתְס (וה בֵּיתאֵיתְס), while in Jos. it is indicated by the preposition הֵק (וה הֵק). Moreover, unlike in Jos., in Ki. the possessive suffixes of זָכַרְוָה and וַעֲרַיִית are translated explicitly:

Ki.: †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס
Jos.: †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס

The vocabulary of the two translations also differs. זָכַרְוָה is translated in Ki. by נֶכֶש in Jos., by נֶכֶש. †וֹלֶדֶה is rendered in Ki. as †וֹלֶדֶה; in Jos., as †וֹלֶדֶה. Finally, the name of the rebuilder of Jericho differs in the two translations, and the name of the younger son is transliterated in Ki. whereas it is translated in Jos. The two translations, therefore, are definitely not interrelated.

As the addition in Jos. is not culled from the LXX of Ki., it seems reasonable to assume that it rests on a Hebrew source. Such an assumption is corroborated by the Hebraisms in the Greek: the expression נִכְנָשָׁה and the prepositional prefix †ב (בכּוּרְוֶה...) translated by הֵק. Theoretically, one could posit that the LXX translator expanded Jos. 6:26 based on MT of Ki. But for two reasons such a possibility is rather remote: 1) the differences between the addition in the LXX of Jos.

15Thus B. In A and N וָיָבְרִים is reflected by †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס †וֹ וֹאֵיתְס.

16The equivalent of †וֹלֶדֶה in Ki. is †וֹלֶדֶה, as usually elsewhere in the LXX. Not so, however, in Jos., where in the curse and its fulfilment, †וֹלֶדֶה is used, usually translating נִכְנָשָׁה. The LXX of Jos., as a rule, distinguishes carefully between door (וֹלֶדֶה) and gate (נִכְנָשָׁה) as is clearly evident in the spy narrative in ch. 2. Jericho has a נִכְנָשָׁה, †וֹלֶדֶה, but Rahab’s house has a †וֹלֶדֶה, †וֹלֶדֶה (vv. 5, 7; cf. also 7:5 with 2:19). Nonetheless, one should not necessarily reach the conclusion that the LXX of Jos. 6:26 reflects a Hebrew version of the curse which spoke of erecting gates, rather than doors. The huge doors which close off the entrance to the city are called רַדְלוֹת, †וֹלֶדֶה, the same as for doors of a house. Yet, it is conceivable that the Greek translator chose to translate נִכְנָשָׁה by †וֹלֶדֶה in order to stress that the context of Jos. 6:26 is city-gates and not household-doors. שְׁמֵי רַדְלוֹת and שְׁמֵי נִכְנָשָׁה occur in parallelism in Is. 45:1, and in the construct in Jud. 16:3 (קָנָשָׁה נִכְנָשָׁה), in 1 Sam. 21:14 (נִכְנָשָׁה נִכְנָשָׁה), and in 1 Chr. 22:3 (ניִכְנָשָׁה שְׁמֵי נִכְנָשָׁה).

17Six times in Jos. וֹאֵיתְס + מֹנְעָא translates MT נִכְנָשָׁה + מֹנְעָא (4:8, 9:26, 10:1, 39, 11:15, 14:5). In 6:14, it translates נִכְנָשָׁה כֵּן in 7:20 וֹאֵיתְס כֵּן and in 10:25 וֹאֵיתְס כֵּן.
and the verse in MT of Ki. (see the comparison in the table below); and 2) such an assumption runs contrary to the character of the Greek translator of Jos. who was not prone to insert new material of his own initiative. A reasonable conclusion, therefore, is that the LXX addition to Jos. 6:26 derives from a Hebrew Vorlage.

To sum up to this point, the LXX of Jos. 6:26 reflects a Hebrew text which differed considerably from MT. In part it is similar to 4QTest, and in part it contains an addition taken from some other Hebrew source. This addition will now be considered.

The name of the rebuilders and of his youngest son according to the LXX

According to 1 Ki. 16:34, the curse of Joshua was fulfilled upon Hiel, the Bethelite. At the cost of Abiram, his firstborn, he laid the foudations of the city, and at the cost of Segub (Kethib: Segib), he set up its gates. The LXX, there, transliterates the names as Αχειηλ, Αβειρων, and Ζεγουβ. Αχειηλ is the fuller form of the name לֵיתָרָה; Αβειρων (ending with ι) is the usual transliteration for אֵיבִּרִים, and

18 Two people in the Bible have the name אֵיבִּרִים: 1) the firstborn of Hiel the Bethelite (only once in MT, 1 Ki. 16:34); 2) the son of Eliab (10 times in MT). The name is consistently transliterated in the LXX as Αβειρων. This holds for the LXX addition in Jos. 6:26, for 1 Ki. 16:34 and for the references to the Dathan and Abiram rebellion in Num. 16:1 (MSS B and F), 12, 24 (MS A), 25, 27 (MS A), 27, 26:9; Deut. 11:6; Ps. 106(105):17.

Interchange of the final letters mem and nun is a common phenomenon. For example, יַרְחָא (Num. 26:8) תַּרְחָא (Ruth 4:19, 19) אָרָא or אָרֵא (1 Chr. 2:27), מָרָא (1 Chr. 1:21) מֶֽהְדִּירָא (MS A), מֶֽהְדִּי (1 Chr. 1:29) מַבּאָא (MS A), מַבּאָה (1 Chr. 1:39) מַבּאָה (1 Chr. 1:40) מַבּאָה (Jos. 11:7) מַבּאָה. The interchange also occurs in the reverse direction when the nun at the end of the name is transliterated with a mem. מִדָּא (Gen. 36:28; 1 Chr. 1:42) מַבּאָה (in Chr. according to MS A), מַבּאָה (Jos. 10:41, 15:51) מַבּאָה (Jos. 12:12) מַבּאָה, מַבּאָה (1 Chr. 1:32) מַבּאָה, מַבּאָה (1 Chr. 1:42) מַבּאָה, מַבּאָה (1 Chr. 2:8, 6:29[44]) מַבּאָה (MS B. Cf. S. Soderlund, "The Greek Text of Jeremiah", JSOT 47 (1985) 131-133), מַבּאָה (1 Chr. 7:27) מַבּאָה. The name מַבּאָה is always מַבּאָה in the LXX, probably reflecting מַבּאָה, also found in 1Qls 8

See E.Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (Leiden 1974) 108. This linguistic phenomenon is also well-attested in rabbinic Hebrew and in the spoken Arabic of Syria and Palestine. See A. Bendavid, Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew I (Tel-Aviv 1967) 218-219 (Hebr.); J. Kutscher, "Studies in Galillean Aramaic", Tarbiz 23 (1951) 38-43 (Hebr.); id., "The Present State of Research into Mishnaic Hebrew (Especially Lexicography) and its Tasks", Archiv of the New Dictionary of Rabbinical Literature I (ed. E.Y. Kutscher) (Ramat-Gan 1972) 3-28 (Hebr.). It is also apparent in the parallel texts of the Bible, e.g., בֵּין נִר וּת (Jos. 13:27) // בֵּין נִר וּת (Num. 32:36); שְׁמַמְשָׁם (Num. 32:36);
Zeγουβ properly transliterates the Qere בַּשָּׁה. In contrast, the LXX of Jos. in all major MSS (and with only minor variations in the other codices) gives Οξαν as the father's name, Αβ(ε)ρων as the name of the firstborn, and instead of a name for the youngest child — διασωθέντι, "the one who had survived". Two questions arise: First, how does one account for the differing names of the father — ἔλαιον/Ἀχενήλ in Ki. and Οξαν in Jos.? Second, and even more difficult, why does the LXX of Jos. refrain from naming the youngest son, whose name is almost called for by the context itself and from the parallel in Ki., and instead opt for a rendering διασωθέντι?

Addressing only the latter question, Holmes reticently proposed that perhaps the translator did not grasp the name בַּשָּׁה as a proper name, but rather as a common part of speech derived from the root בָּשָׁה.19 The only scholar who not only observed the divergences in the names but also sought to present a full explanation for them is Margolis.20 Contrary to the editions of the LXX by Brooke-Mclean and Rahlfis, wherein the name of the father appears as one word, Οξαν, Margolis separates the omikron from the name and treats it like an article ο ξαν. This name, he claims, is based on ο ξαν, the reading in MS w1, and "azael" of the Vetus Latina. Thus, ο ξαν is the climax in a chain of corruptions, which Margolis describes as follows:

ο ξαν < ο χαν < ο χαά < ο θαά < ο χαάλ.

As for the name of the youngest son, Margolis states that διασωθέντι translates the name בַּשָּׁה. As proof he cites Prov. 29:25 where בַּשָּׁה is translated by σωθήσεται.

26:39) / / תּוּחַ (1 Chr. 8:5). The mem / nun suffix interchange can even occur within a single narrative, such as in 2 Sam. 19 where in vv. 38-39 an individual is called בּוּחַ but in v. 41, בּוּחַ. This is also the case for parallel texts of the same context. בּוּחַ (1 Chr. 6:1) / / בּוּחַ (1 Chr. 5:27). For the interchange in geographical names, see N. Na'aman, Borders and Districts in Biblical Historiography (Jerusalem 1986) 121.

Regarding the name בּוּחַ, discussed here, compare the quotation of 1 Ki. 36:34 in the Pal. Talm.: אֲבֵדִי נְכָר, יִתְנַה וּבְשָׁהוּ בֶּעַדְיוּי (Sanhedrin, 10.8) with its quotation in the Bab. Talm.: אֲבֵדִי נְכָר וּתְנַהוּ בֶּעַדְיוּי (Sanhedrin 113a, codex Florence).

19 Holmes, Joshua, 34.

One would seriously doubt whether Margolis' complicated series of textual corruptions from χαωηλ to οζαν is correct, especially since not even one of the stages from χαωηλ to οζαν is documented in any of the dozens of LXX manuscripts. The entire hypothetical stream of corruptions rests solely on the testimony of a single MS, w_1, which Margolis himself describes as corrupt. Margolis preferred w_1 over and above B and other important MSS because it is the only MS which spells the father's name with a ξ, o ξαν. The letter ξ can result from the combining of the letters σ and χ. Accordingly, Margolis could arrive at the χ, found in χαωηλ.

(For the λ at the end of the name, Margolis found support in the Vetus Latina.)

His identification of διασωθέντι with בנים is also difficult. True, his proposal of a semantic development connecting the root of the name בנים to the meaning of the Greek σφειν (to save, keep alive) is valid. The root בנים means "to be high up, exalted". A lofty location can then take on the meaning of a shelter or secure fortress, a meaning which the root בנים actually has in various biblical passages. However, in the analysis of ancient translations, one must consider not just the meaning of words in the language of the source text, but even more so the way these words were understood by the translators. בנים is translated in the LXX by a wide variety of words, the more prominent of which are άντίλαμβάνεθαι (12 times, primarily as a translation of בנים), κραταιον (3 times), and ύψον (3 times). These terms express notions of aid, strength, and altitude, but not of deliverance or survival. διασφειν, the verb appearing in the LXX of Jos. 6:26, is

---


22 The root בנים is found as a verb and adjective twenty times in MT. Five of them are unrepresented in the LXX (Is. 2:17; 9:10, 12:4; Ps. 91:14 and Prov. 18:11). The other fifteen are translated by a dozen different Greek words: ἀγιος Is. 33:5; ἄντιλαμβάνεθαι Ps. 69(68):30(29); βοηθειν Ps. 107(106):41; διασφειν Deut. 2:36; ἐξεγειρειν Job 5:11; εὐφραίνειν/σφειν Prov. 29:25; κραταιον Ps. 139(138):6, Job 36:22; λυτρον Ps. 59(58):2; ὕψος Is. 26:5, 30:13; ὑπερασπίζειν Ps. 20(19):2; and ύψος Is. 2:11, Ps. 148:13 and Prov. 18:10. The noun בנים is found seventeen times, ten of which are translated by ἄντιλαμπτερ: nine in Psalms 18(17):3(2), 46(45):8(7), 12(11), 59(58):10(9), 17(16), 18(17); 62(61):3(2), 7(6), 144(143):2, and one in 2 Sam. 22:3. The verb ἄντιλαμβάνεθαι translates בנים in Ps. 48(47):4(3). The six remaining occurrences of בנים are translated variously as βοηθος in Ps. 9:10; ὕψος in Is. 33:16 (A - ὕψος); καταφυη in Is. 25:12; Ps. 9:10 and 94(93):22 and κραταιομα in Jer. 48(31):1.
found over 40 times in the LXX and not once does it translate בָּנָשׁ. In the LXX of Jos., it is the usual translation of דְּרָדָה (10:20, 28, 30, 37, 39, 40, 11:18; and in 9:15 it translates מְכַל). The verb, referred to by Margolis, συζευγιν, without the prefix δια, is especially common in the LXX. Appearing approximately 250 times, only once, in Prov. 29:25, does it translate the verb בָּנָשׁ. Apparently Margolis also did not pay attention to the fact that in Prov. 29:25 the phrase בָּנָשׁ תַּחֲפֵר is represented by a double translation in the LXX: ὥ δὲ παποιθὲν ἐπὶ κυρίῳ εὐφρανθήσεται and ὥ δὲ παποιθὲν ἐπὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ σωθήσεται. The verb בָּנָשׁ appears once more in Prov. (18:10), and there it is translated by ὑψόν. The double translation in Prov. 29:25 and the translation of the root בָּנָשׁ by three different Greek verbs — εὐφραίνειν (to enjoy oneself), συζευγίν (to rescue), and ὑψόν (to be aloft) — seem to imply that the translator of Prov. was rather uncertain about the meaning of the root and came up with various renderings based on the context. It is also worth remembering that the LXX of Prov. is very free. These considerations weaken the only sliver of evidence mustered for the claim that συζευγίν translates בָּנָשׁ.

Margolis’ method is based upon the assumption that the names of the father and of his youngest son in the LXX of Jos. 6:26 coincide with their counterparts in 1 Ki. 16:34. However, disencumbering ourselves from this assumption and concentrating not only on the features which unite the LXX addition of Jos. 6:26 with 1 Ki. 16:34, but also on its unique aspects, we may find the way to a correct understanding of the text.

23 In his treatment of proper nouns in Jos., Margolis consistently veers from his essential preference for MS B and instead opts for those readings which are closer to the reading of MT. On this, see E. Tov, “The Fifth Fascicle of Margolis’ The Book of Joshua in Greek”, JQR 74 (1984) 407, n. 23. Consistently faithful to his view that the names in the LXX addition of in Jos. 6:26 are identical with the ones in 1 Ki. 16:34, Margolis presents the name of the firstborn son as Αβευρωμα, ending with a μυ, rather than a μα (thus only MS a). (In the Brooke-McLean edition, two minuscules, a and x, are listed as reading the name with a concluding μυ). Surely, however, such an hypothesis is unnecessary for maintaining the identification of דִּינָא / אַבֵּאֵרְוֹא, since, first, the transliteration with the concluding μυ is the usual transliteration of דִּינָא in the LXX, and, second, the interchange of the letters מ/ם at the name-endings is quite common. (see n. 18). For examples of the letters μ/ν interchanging at the end of names, as attested in the various MSS of the LXX, see H.L. Gilbert, “The Forms of the Names in 1 Chronicles 1-7 Compared with those in Parallel Passages of the Old Testament”, AJSL 13 (1896/7) 289-290 and J. Ziegler, Beiträge zur Jeremia-Septuaginta (Göttingen 1958) 66-68.
The solution to the enigmatic Greek text comes from an unexpected direction. The name Ὠζαν, precisely in this spelling, is found once more in the LXX, as a transliteration of the name שליה in the pair of names שליה שליה in 1 Chr. 7:24: בְּהוֹם שליה שליה שליה שליה. Interestingly enough, in this text, the only one in the Bible where שליה appears, it is adjacent to a word, שליה, which can be associated with the word which follows Ὠζαν in the LXX of Jos.6:26, viz. διασώθεντι. The verb, διασώθεντι, signifies "to escape death" or "to remain alive". Similarly, שליה in biblical Hebrew signifies one who escapes calamity or annihilation, especially following the death of a close kin.24 Is this not the intent of the LXX addition to Jos. 6:26? The text should then be taken as following: "At the cost of Abiron, his firstborn, he established it [viz., the city], and at the expense of his youngest son, who had remained alive [viz., after the death of the firstborn], he erected its gates." Instead of transliterating the name שליה, the LXX presents a midrash on the name, which suits perfectly the intention of the verse. Thus, it is proposed here that Ὠζαν and διασώθεντι of Jos. 6:26 represent the names שליה and שליה, now found only in 1 Chr. 7:24, and that the Hebrew source of the LXX of Jos. read as follows:

[Hebrew text]

Having reconstructed the Vorlage of the LXX of Jos. 6:26, we now turn to a comparison of that text with 1 Ki. 16:34. In both Jos. 6:26 and 1 Ki. 16:34, there is a curse formula and additional details identifying the place where the curse was

24 E.g. "Elimelech, Naomi’s husband, died; and she was left (שליה) with her two sons.... Then those two — Mahlon and Chilion — also died; so the woman was left (שליה) without her two sons and without her husband" (Ruth 1:3, 5); "And Jehu struck down all that were left (שליה) of the house of Ahab in Jezreel" (2 Ki. 10:11); "no son remained (שליה) save Jehoahaz, his youngest" (2 Ch. 21:17); and above all, Jacob’s reply to Reuben: "My son must not go down with you, for his brother is dead and he alone is left (שליה)" (Gen. 42:38). Cf. further Gen. 7:23, 14:10; 1 Sam. 11:11; Is. 4:3; Jer. 44:7; Ezek. 9:8, 17:21 and 2 Chr. 34:21.

25B: καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑλαχὶστῷ διασώθεντι
A: καὶ ἐν τῷ διασώθεντι ἑλαχὶστῷ
invoked and the people involved with it. From the curse itself no information may be obtained, since it is formulaic. This is not the case, however, with respect to the unique details about the individuals and the location. In the MT of Jos. and Ki., the city is specified as Jericho, but in the LXX of Jos., the name of the city is undesignated. In Ki., the rebuilders of the city is Hiel, and his sons are Abiram, the firstborn, and Segub, the youngest. According to the reconstructed Vorlage of the LXX of Jos., the rebuilders are Ozan, and his sons are Abiram and Sheerah. The differences, therefore, between Ki. and the LXX of Jos. touch upon three of the four names associated with the curse. This can hardly be accidental. It should therefore be investigated whether there is some connection between the fact that, on the one hand, Ki. (and MT of Jos.) associates the event with Jericho and names the dramatis personae as Hiel, Abiram, and Segub, and that, on the other hand, the LXX Vorlage of Jos. 6:26 leaves the city unnamed and presents the names of the father and his youngest son as Ozan and Sheerah. There is still another question: If there are differences with regard to three of the four names, why then is the fourth name unchanged? Why does the name of the firstborn remain unaltered?

Since nothing is known about Hiel and Segub outside of 1 Ki. 16:34, our inquest begins with Ozan and Sheerah.

1 Chr. 7:20-28

The names Ozan and Sheerah link Jos. 6:26 with 1 Chr. 7:24, which is part of a genealogical list of the descendants of Ephraim in 1 Chr. 7:20-28. This section is the main biblical text dealing with the history of the tribe of Ephraim during the period of the conquest and settlement. It is also the only text in the Bible, which, though coming after Jos., adds to our knowledge about Joshua's life. The list of the sons of Ephraim includes a genealogy, a story about Ephraim and his children, and a description of the territorial holding of the tribe. The story which stands in the center of the section is reminiscent in its content, style, and overall atmosphere of the narratives in Gen. The Ephraimites are slain by the inhabitants of Gath "because they had gone down to take their cattle. And Ephraim their father mourned many days" (vv. 21-22).26 The birth of Beriah (v. 26v. 22, "and Ephraim, their father, mourned many days, and his brothers came to comfort him", is reminiscent of Jacob's mourning of Joseph: "...and he mourned for his son many
23) signals a change for the better. Beriah comes in lieu of the deceased offspring and succeeds where they had failed. In 1 Chr. 8:13 it is said that Beriah joined forces with a strong family from Benjamin, and together they managed to oust the men of Gath from the area: "And Beriah and Shema - they were chiefs of clans of the inhabitants of Aijalon, who put to flight the inhabitants of Gath." The story, which commenced on a sour note, ends on an optimistic tone by noting the construction of cities. It is a simplified description of the attempts of the families of Ephraim to settle the region of Gath and Beth-horon during the earlier stages of the settlement of Canaan.27 Ephraim personifies the entire tribe, and his children are personifications of the families within the tribe.

In the reconstructed Vorlage of the LXX of Jos., Ozan and Sheerah are the names of the father and his son, respectively. But in Ch., Uzzen is an element in the composite geographical name Uzzen-Sheerah, and Sheerah is the name of a woman mentioned in v. 24. In order to address this problem, we now take a closer look at 1 Chr. 7:24.

Upon examination of this verse in its context, certain difficulties become evident. The first involves the location of Uzzen-Sheerah. The verse states that Sheerah built (יָבִים) three cities: Lower Beth-horon, Upper Beth-horon, and Uzzen-Sheerah. Yet, whereas Upper and Lower Beth-horon are well-known within the Bible and in extrabiblical sources, Uzzen-Sheerah is unknown.28 One days. All his sons and daughters sought to comfort him..." (Gen. 37:34-35). The narrative of the birth of Beriah is composed of the components typical of birth stories in Gen.: pregnancy, birth, naming, and midrashic explanation of names. See, e.g., Gen. 4:1, 17, 16:4, 21:2-3, 29:32-35, 30:4-23, 38:2-5.


28 The only geographical identification suggested so far is the Arab village Beth-Sira. See S.E. Loewenstamm, "Uzzen Sheerah", Encyclopaedia Biblica I (Jerusalem 1950) 187-188 (Hebr.). The identification is based upon the village's proximity to Beth-horon and also upon the phonetic similarity between Sira and Sheerah. However the identification is moot since there is no archaeological nor historical supporting evidence.
is also surprised to hear that a woman built the cities. Nowhere else in the Bible is a woman mentioned as building cities. Yet here Sheerah is said to have erected three of them. Another problem concerns בותנ שאריה תמר (his son). Following where Sheerah is the subject of the sentence, one finds in v. 25 רושם בן (her son), when one expects רושם בן (his son). These difficulties prompted some of the commentators to suspect that the verse is corrupt. However, an overall solution to these problems has yet to be suggested.

The rendering of v. 23-25 in the LXX reflects a syntactical conception considerably differing from that of MT - the first two words of v. 24 of MT continue of the previous sentence, and the last words of v. 24, begin a new sentence:

MT:

(23) ייבא אל אשמה תותת תחל ב ויקרא תיא שמ ברעה
(24) יכ ברעה תותת בbrit.
(25) בותנ שאריה.

LXX: (23) καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλαβεν ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱόν, καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Βαρσαγα ὦτι ἐν κακοῖς ἐγένετο ἐν σῷ καὶ ἐν ἑκείνοις τοῖς καταλοίποις.
καὶ φυκοῦσαν Βασιλικαν τὴν κάτω καὶ τὴν ἀνω.
καὶ υἱῶν Ωζὶαν Σηρᾶ (25) καὶ Ραφὴ υἱῶν αὐτοῦ Ρασεφ καὶ θαλε υἱῖα αὐτοῦ

Οὐσ αὐτοῦ...

29 So E.L. Curtis, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Chronicles, ICC (Edinburgh 1910) 154. Two explanations have been suggested to solve this problem: Either Sheerah is the son of Beriah, mentioned in v. 23 (the commentary attributed to Rashi; one of the disciples of Saadia Gaon; Elijah Gaon; Metzudath David) or the words בותנ שאריה continue of the genealogical list which was interrupted by the tale about the men of Gath (Kimchi; D.J. Hänel, Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik, KAT [Leipzig 1927] 144ff. and W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, HAT [Tübingen 1955] 71).

In the LXX שאריאת נבון is represented by καὶ ἐν ἑκείνοις τοῖς καταλοίποις: the daughter is not translated, and the proper name שאריאת appears in translation rather than transliteration — τοῖς καταλοίποις. Since καταλοίποις elsewhere in Ch., reflects "a remnant" the midrash on the name Beriah according to the LXX would be: "evil (הער) was in my house [note the first person and even among them who remained alive". The evil is the death of his children at the hands of the men of Cath (v.21). The tragedy is great since evil effected also the survivors from this battle.

It is worthwhile noting that the representation of שאריאת in the LXX as stemming from the root שאר is translated with the Targum (T) and the Peshitta (S). In T שאריאת is translated ובריהתה שאריאת and in S שאריאת is translated [ה]יאשתית נמו ט colours אשתית התוושתית נמו ט and in S שאריאת is translated ובריהתה שאריאת שאריאת.

31 Preserved only in B. MSS byez reflect the Hebrew version of MT, and MSS A and N conflate both versions:

B: καὶ ἐν ἑκείνοις τοῖς καταλοίποις
byez: καὶ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ Σααρά
AN: καὶ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ Σααρά καὶ ἐν ἑκείνοις τοῖς καταλοίποις

32 It represents מנהגה הנחיתו התוושית התוושית שאריאת שאריאת. E.g. ירוחם תגא רט שאריאת המל_sideh - και ἐπέταξαν τοῖς καταλοίποις τοὺς καταλειφθέντας τοῦ Ἀμαλήκ στὸ ἸουδάVen. 19:43 - και ἐπέταξαν τοῖς καταλοίποις τοὺς καταλειφθέντας τοῦ Ἀμαλήκ στὸ Ἰουδά in 2 (Ch. 36:20) - και ἀπέκτεισαν τοὺς καταλοίπους εἰς Βασσαλάνα.

33 The prefix ב in כְּי בַּרְעָה הָיָה has no syntactical function. The meaning of the words כְּי בַּרְעָה הָיָה is the same as כְּי בַּרְעָה הָיָה. Its raison d’être is only to effect an alliterative association between the name of son (גֶּרֶם בֶּן) and the midrash on the name. Y. Zakovitch, Double Name Derivations (M.A. diss.), Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1971) 186-187 cites additional cases where an author employs prepositions unconventionally for the sake of creating a midrash on a name. The midrash on שמריאת (Gen. 16:11) plays on the unusual expression לֹֽא מַשמֵּ֣ע מִלְּאֵ֣ב, instead of the usual מַשמֵּ֣ע מִלְּאֵב. The midrash on Moab (Gen. 19:36-37) uses the expression מכת אֲמָאֵב (Moab) - מַשָּׁמֵע מִלְּאֵב (from a father). This midrash receives a particular emphasis in the LXX. Following the words "and named him Moab", the LXX adds λέγουσα 'Εκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου viz., "from my father". The name Israel (ישראל) is interpreted in Hos. 12:5 - יִשְׂרָאֵל (he strove with an angel). לא שְׁמַע, לֹֽא מַשמֵּ֣ע מִלְּאֵ֣ב replaces the expression לא שְׁמַע in the preceding verse and לא שְׁמַע in Gen. 32:29.

34 In the opinion of Barthélemy, the reading of the LXX, יבּ, is to be preferred: Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament, OBO 50/1 (Göttingen 1982) 443.

(and her daughter who remained). T even specifies that the survival is from a massacre. The unison in the treatment of שָׁאֵרָה in the LXX, T and S is remarkable since usually they differ from one another (see for example their translations to the rest of v.24). One is obliged therefore to conclude that the LXX translation of שָׁאֵרָה was prompted by an exegetical tradition.

The retroversion of καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς καταλοίποις into Hebrew becomes בֵּית שָׁאֵרָה. The entire Hebrew Vorlage of the midrash on the name לַיְיוֹת would be thus: יִכְּכַּת הַיָּוֵת בֵּית שָׁאֵרָה. First, the general term is used ("in my house"), then the more specific one ("them who remained alive").

The (and his daughter) in MT developed through a mistaken analogy to the preceding word, בֵּית (in his house). MSS 80 and 117 of Kennicott attest the plene form בֵּיתוּ (בֵּיתוּ), written like בֵּיתוּ. By the dynamic of "creative misinterpretation" the gender of the verb בֵּיתוּ was altered in order to accord with the new subject. בֵּיתוּ was changed to בֵּיתוּ, and Sheerah, once a man, became a woman.

That indeed Sheerah was originally a male is seen clearly from the end of v. 24ff. in the LXX. In place of ... (25) וֹרֶם בֵּיתוּ לַיְיוֹת בֵּיתוּ the LXX reads καὶ νῦν Οζαν Σεϕα καὶ Ραϕα νῦν αὐτὸν Ραϕα καὶ Θαλε νῦν αὐτὸν (...). καὶ νῦν Οζαν serves as a title of a genealogical list, the list of the sons of Ozan. The list begins with Sheerah, Rephah and Resheph (vv. 24-25) and ends in v.27 with "Nun his son, Joshua his son". According to this list Ozan is the father and Sheerah is his son. The relationship between Ozan and Sheerah is thus the same as in the LXX of Jos. 6:26! It is interesting to see that when Sheerah appears as one of the sons of Ozan in the genealogical list his name is transliterated, but when he appears in the narrative (vv. 21-24) his name is translated according to the midrash on the name.

The question which must be asked now is how בֵּית שָׁאֵרָה (the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX) became corrupted into בֵּית שָׁאֵרָה (MT)? The process can be described as follows: It is well-known that genealogies were collected and

36 καὶ = 1, ἐν = 2, τοῖς καταλοίποις = שָׁאֵרָה. The use of the plural shows that שָׁאֵרָה was grasped as a collective noun. ἐκεῖνος was added for clarity. The reconstruction by L.C. Allen, The Greek Chronicles II (Leiden 1974) 115 שָׁאֵרָה (ק) is very questionable.

37 For this construction cf. Jos. 2:1; Num. 31:6; 2 Sam. 2:30; 2 Sam. 22:1 (cf. Ps. 18:1); and 1 Ki. 11:1 (הָעִדוֹל שָׁלֹם אָם) (شعب כְּהַיָּוֵת בֵּית שָׁאֵרָה).
copied successively onto scrolls. The list of the sons of Ozan may have been recorded after the list of the sons of Ephraim. The list of the sons of Ephraim ended with בְּנֵי אָתָה שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת, and the list of the sons of Ozan began with בְּנֵי אָתָה שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת. The juxtaposition of the two lists created the sequence שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת בְּנֵי אָתָה (the end of the narrative combined with the defective beginning of the genealogy of the sons of Ozan), solved the problem by turning שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת into a direct object of the previous sentence: שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת בְּנֵי אָתָה. Such a solution is not unlikely for a scribe who was long ago cut off from the historical and geographical background of the text and wished to solve textual problems. The process, hitherto described, continues in MSS 145 172, and 224 of Kennicott: שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת בְּנֵי אָתָה שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת, thus creating an additional location...

The LXX of v. 24 solves all the three problems of vv. 24-25 presented at the outset: 1) Uzzan-Sheerah (v. 24) was not geographically identified, and should not be geographically identified, since it is a corruption from the original בְּנֵי אָתָה שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת, 2) since Sheerah is a man's name no emendation is needed for the possessive suffix of שֵׁשַּׁת הָיֶלֶת in v. 25, and 3) no woman built Upper and Lower Bethhoron.

The LXX to v. 24 clarifies the original structure of 1 Chr. 7:20-28, which may now be presented. (The text is essentially MT except for v. 24 which is based on the LXX.)

The Genealogy of Ephraim

The Narrative

The Genealogy of Ozan

The Territory of Ephraim
It can be seen now that 1 Ch 7:20-28 contains two independent genealogical lists with similar structure: the first is a list of the prominent families of the tribe of Ephraim, resembling the list in Num. 26:35-37 and the addition in the LXX to Gen. 46:20, and the second one, is a list of the ancestry of a particular individual, Joshua son of Nun. The narrative was not inserted between וֹאֲשָׁתָל יִּבְנֵי (v.21) and וֹאֲשָׁתָל יִּבְנֵי (v. 25) by mere chance (MT) but rather placed thoughtfully between two lists owing to the elements which it shares with each of them. Ephraim in the narrative is linked to Ephraim who heads the first list, and Sheerah, mentioned further on in the narrative (וֹאֲשָׁתָל יִּבְנֵי שֵׁרֶש [vv. 23-24 according to the LXX]), is the son of Ozan who heads the second list.

Though the main figure of the narrative in vv. 22-24 and the eponym of the tribe in v. 20 bear the same name, "Ephraim", certain considerations cast doubts upon their being identical. Ephraim son of Joseph known from the Pent. was never in Canaan. He was born in Egypt, dwelt there with his children and his only brother Manasseh, and died there (Gen. 46:20, 48:5, 50:22-23; Ex. 1:6; and cf. Gen. 15:13). However, the narrative in 1 Chr. 7 describes Ephraim as living in Canaan with his children and brothers (pl.). Moreover, between Ephraim of the genealogy and Ephraim of the narrative separate many generations (וֹאֲשָׁתָל יִּבְנֵי indicates a new generation, as is evident from vv. 26-27). We must conclude then, that Ephraim of the narrative is not Ephraim son of Joseph, known from the Pent.39

According to the midrash on the name Beriah, שֵׁרֶש (v. 23 in the LXX), Sheerah is one of the sons of Ephraim, but according to the genealogy of the sons of Ozan Sheerah is the son of Ozan (end of v. 24 in the LXX). These data point to the possibility that originally the story in vv. 21-24 was about Ozan. The author chose to relate the episode to Ephraim rather than to Ozan since the latter personifies a family in the tribe while Ephraim personifies the entire tribe. The generalization turned the narrative about Ozan and his offspring into a representative tradition about the whole tribe of Ephraim during the period of the conquest and settlement.

38 נִוּל דֶּכֶּרְפָּא מַעַ 조금 נַעְתָּלָאָק וֹאֲשָׁתָל יִּבְנֵי.
The connection between 1 Chr. 7:20-28 and Jos. 6:26

Once 1 Chr. 7:24 is properly understood and the content and structure of the entire literary unit is clarified, then many internal ties between the tradition in Chr. and the tradition in the LXX of Jos. 6:26 become apparent, ties which go far beyond the mere common denominator of the unique names "Ozan" and "Sheerah".

1 Chr. 7 is connected with Joshua, his period and his territory. The narrative on the father and his sons is followed by the genealogy of the sons of Ozan which specifies that Joshua son of Nun is a descendent of Ozan. The period is that of the conquest and settlement, and the territory is that of Ephraim, namely, Joshua's tribe. The narrative mentions Lower and Upper Beth-horon which are located on the border between the territories of Ephraim and Benjamin (Jos. 16:1-5, 18:11-14), and according to the LXX of Jos. (and MT of 1 Ki. 16:34) the rebuilders of the city is a Bethelite. Bethel is recorded in the description of the territory of Ephraim which follows the genealogy of Joshua son of Nun (1 Chr. 7:28), and is also on the border between Ephraim and Benjamin (Jos. 16:1-2, 18:11-13, 21-22).

All these points, however, belong to the background of the traditions, but the decisive factors are the resemblance in the events themselves and in the persons involved. Both traditions refer to a father and his sons and to the death of sons. The extent of the disaster is expressed in 1 Chr. 7 by the lengthy mourning of Ephraim on the death of his children and in Jos. by "at the cost of Abiron, his firstborn, he laid its foundations, and at the cost of his youngest, Sheerah, he set up its gates". In both traditions the death of the sons is linked to the building of a city or cities, and above all, according to the LXX of 1 Chr. 7:24 and the LXX of Jos. 6:26 Ozan and Sheerah are a father and his son.

The identity of the names and of the relationships between the individuals involved, the resemblance of the events, and the association with Joshua, his period and his territory signify that the tradition in the LXX of Jos. 6:26 and the narrative in the list of the sons of Ephraim are two distinct literary shapings of the same event.

The tradition preserved in the LXX of Jos. 6:26 reflects thus local tribal events related to certain families of Ephraim during the period of the conquest and settlement. This conclusion explains why מִשְׁדָּא נָא is missing in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jos. 6:26. The territorial background of the settling efforts of Ozan
and Sheerah is the southwestern part of the territory of Ephraim, mainly the region of Beth-horon, and it has nothing to do with Jericho. In one of the formation stages of Jos., the tradition on the rebuilding of the city was added to the story of the conquest of Jericho. The formula בֵּית בֶּן הָאָמָם in the beginning of v. 26 (وسائل) indicates the secondary nature of this connection. בֵּית הָאָמָם is a prevalent formula in Deut. where it indicates an expansion in the text. In Jos., the formula appears three more times (5:2, 11:10, 21) and in each of them it introduces a new subject. The words הָאָמָם were added to MT of Jos. 6:26 by a

40 Catt, mentioned in 1 Chr. 7:21, is Catt-Githaim, identified by Mazar as Tel‘Abu-Hamid in eastern Ramleh of today; B. Mazar, "Catt and Gittaim", IEJ IV (1954) 227-235. The identification is accepted by Z. Kallai, Historical Geography, 24 and see further A.F. Rainey, "The Identification of Philistine Catt", Eretz Israel 12 (1975) 63-67. N. Na’amana, Borders and Districts, 107-108, 113-114 however prefers to identify as Abu-Hamid as Gibbethon. Aijalon (8:13), like Upper and Lower Beth-horon (7:24), is located on the southwestern perimeter of Ephraim. The association of Ephraim with this area may be seen also in the list of the conquered people in Jud. 1:29, 34-35. See Kallai, op. cit. in note 27. B. Mazar, Canaan and Israel (Jerusalem 1980) 112 (Hebr.) finds a connection between Beriah, mentioned in the list of the sons of Asher (1 Chr. 7:30), and Timnah-Sera, the city of Joshua (Jos. 19:50), the LXX expansion of 21:42; 24:30; Jud. 2:9). The connection of the city of Joshua (identified as Herbet Tzibnah located in the western hills of Ephraim) with Beriah fits well with our previous conclusion that Joshua is a descendant of Ozan and that probably Beriah too is of Ozan’s lineage. On the ties of the clan of Beriah with the tribe of Asher and the ancient tribal holdings of Asher in the hills of Ephraim see Z. Kallai, The Northern Boundaries of Judah (Jerusalem 1960) 42-43 (Hebr.); Y. Aharoni, The Land of the Bible (tr. by A.F. Rainey) (London 1979) 244; B. Luria, "Asher in the Hills of Ephraim and the Covenant at Shechem", Oz le-David, Bible Studies in Honor of David Ben-Gurion, (Jerusalem 1964) 183-202 (Hebr.); J. Liver, "The Israelite Tribes", in B. Mazar, ed. The World History of the Jewish People - Judges (Tel-Aviv 1971) 205-206; A. Malamat, "Origins and the Formative Period", in H.H. Ben Sasson, ed., A History of the Jewish People, (London 1976) 64.

41 The story of the conquest of Jericho was the only suitable place in Jos. for the tradition on the rebuilding of the city. The plain sense of the story demands that it follow a story involving a capture and destruction of a city. Two such stories exist in Jos.: one about Jericho and the other about Ai. The story of Ai was unsuitable since it concludes with the words: "then Joshua burned down Ai and turned it into a mound of ruins for all time, a desolation to this day" (Jos. 8:28) which run contradictory to the reconstruction. So, the only story left was the story of the conquest of Jericho.

42 See S.E. Loewenstein, "The Formula בֵּית הָאָמָם in Deuteronomy", Tarbiz 38 (1968) 99-104 (Hebr.).
reductor who wanted to strengthen the connection of the tradition on the rebuilder of the city to the story of the conquest of Jericho. This reductor considered the demonstrative pronoun in נאנה יעם insufficient, so that he explicitly mentioned Jericho.

The relationship between the LXX of Jos. 6:26 and 1 Ki. 16:34

1 Ki. 16:34 is explicitly linked to Jos. 6:26 and one would like to know whether the addition in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jos. 6:26 was derived from 1 Ki. 16:34 (Noth\(^43\)) or alternatively, 1 Ki. 16:34 was derived from the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jos. 6:26 (Holmes and Rofé\(^44\))? Any reply must take the differences between the two texts into consideration.

The evidence points in the direction of the latter possibility. The Hebrew Vorlage of the addition in the LXX of Jos. 6:26 is well integrated with Joshua's curse which precedes it, both in its subject matter and literary style, and it suits Jos. as a whole since it deals with events concerning Joshua. 1 Ki. 16:34, in contrast, is not connected with the surrounding verses. It disrupts the flow of the text from the sins of Ahab, mentioned in 1 Ki. 16:29-33, and his punishment, described in 1 Ki. 17:1ff. The verse is lacking in the Lucianic recension (MSS boc\(_2\)e\(_2\)) which may point to a stage when it had not yet been included in Ki. וסבו (in his days) which opens 1 Ki. 16:34 is an editorial expression used as a means of linking the new element into the context.\(^45\) Moreover, Kenyon reports that in her digs in Jericho she found no evidence for the rebuilding of the city during the period of Ahab (9th cent. B.C.E.) and that the only clear signs of rebuilding are from the 7th cent. B.C.E.\(^46\) 1 Ki. 16:34, therefore, was transferred from Jos. to the history of Ahab. The fact that v. 34 in 1 Ki. 16 already mentions Jericho proves that the verse was

\(^{43}\)His comment to Jos. 6:26 in BH\(^3\).

\(^{44}\)Holmes, Joshua, 37; A. Rofé, The Prophetic Stories\(^2\), (Jerusalem 1986) 156. (Hebr.)

\(^{45}\)On expressions of time as a means of associating literary units, see I.L. Seeligmann, "Hebräische Erzählung und biblische Geschichtsschreibung" Thz 18 (1962) 305-325.

\(^{46}\)K.M. Kenyon, Digging up Jericho, (London 1957) 263-264. See also "Jericho", Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land, (Jerusalem 1970) 252 (Hebr.). It thus becomes clear, that David instructed his insulted emissaries to remain in Jericho until their beards grow back (2 Sam. 10:5), because the city was not inhabited.
incorporated into Ki. subsequent to the time when ובֵי נַהֲרָא was added to the tradi-
tion of the curse upon the rebuilders of the city in Jos.

In 1 Ki. 16:34 the fulfilment of the curse becomes a fulfilment of a prophecy ("in
accordance with the words that the Lord had spoken through Joshua son of
Nun"). This change in the conception is a clue to the redactor's motivation. Ac-
cording to von Rad, the Deuteronomic redactor of Jos.-Ki. wanted to dem-
strate that history is a continuous line of fulfilments of ancient prophecies.47
Seeligmann argued that the appearance of the chain of prophecies and fulfil-
ments in the Deuteronomic historiography is a literary device enabling the
author-redactor to express his philosophy of history. The word of the Lord not
only predicts from the outset what will later occur, but also has the power to
shape the future.48 The tradition about the curse and its fulfilment found in Jos.
was especially suited to the redactors' purposes since it enabled him to expand
the range of the prophecies far beyond the boundaries of the period of the
monarchy, back to the period of the conquest. Yet, in order to adopt the tradition
to its new goal certain adjustments had to be made. First, the tradition was di-
vided into two segments and the part about the fulfilment was transferred to the
history of Ahab, the sinful king. (For that evil king who pursued the prophets of
God, the fulfilment of an ancient severe prophecy was only too fitting.) Then, the
curse was converted into a word of God and the names of Ozan and Sheerah were
changed to Hiel and Segub.49 The reason for the name-changing was to conceal

47 The prophecies listed by von Rad are 2 Sam. 7:13, materializing in 1 Ki. 8:20; 1 Ki.
11:29ff, in 1 Ki. 12:15b; 1 Ki. 13, in 2 Ki. 23:16-18; 1 Ki. 14:6ff, in 1 Ki. 15:29; 1 Ki. 16:1ff, in 1
Ki. 16:12; Jos. 6:26, in 1 Ki. 16:34; 1 Ki. 22:17, in 22:35ff; 1 Ki. 21:21ff, in 1 Ki. 21:27-29 (cf. 2
Ki. 9:7ff); 2 Ki. 1:6, in 2 Ki. 1:17; 2 Ki. 21:10ff, in 2 Ki. 24:2 (cf. 2 Ki. 23:26), and 2 Ki. 22:15ff,
in 2 Ki. 23:30. See G. von Rad, "The Deuteronomic Theology of History in the Books of

167-169 (Hebr.).

49 In the literature of the Bible, as elsewhere, it occurs that particular actions are at-
tributed to different persons. The motivation behind the transfer of actions from one figure
to another varies, of course, with each case. Cf. e.g. the changes in the name of the hero of
the Flood legend in the Babylonian tradition and in the biblical tradition and the different
traditions about the victor over Goliath (1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21:19). In the Aggadah lit-
erature, see a further example in J. Heinemann, Aggadah and its Development, (Jerusalem
1974) 62-63 (Hebr.).
those elements which might have given away that the tradition belonged to the period of Joshua. Ozan and Sheerah were well-known Ephraimite families during the period of the conquest and settlement and they had no place in the reign of Ahab four hundred and fifty years later. Regarding Abiram, however, the Bible contains no special tradition, neither story nor genealogy and, thus, owing to his anonymity, his name could remain unchanged.

The rabbinic tradition of "another city"

Our study on the curse upon the rebuilders of Jericho commenced with the surprise expressed by the sages regarding the doubled direct object in Joshua's words in Jos. 6:26 *תַּאֹרְעָא יִרְאוּ עַל רְעָא יִרְאוּ* Their reply, as found in the *Tosephta* to *Sanhedrin* 14, is now quoted: "Rabbi Jose and Rabbi Joshua ben Qorha said: it is stated 'cursed of the Lord be the man who shall undertake to build this city, Jericho' - Do we not know that Jericho is its name? The meaning is that he shall not build it and call it by a different name, and he shall not build another city and call it by the name of Jericho. It is further stated 'at the cost of his firstborn he shall lay its foundations, and at the cost of his youngest he shall set up its gates' and also 'in his days, Hiel the Bethelite built Jericho...' but Hiel is of Jehoshaphat and Jericho belongs to the tribe of Benjamin! Why then is the incident associated with Ahab? (רָמַלָּהּ תְּלֵה בָּאָאוֹב). To teach that culpability is associated with the culpable (מֶלְמָה שְׁוֵהְלוּ בוֹ בָּחוֹי). Similarly, 'and Jonathan son of Gershom son of Menasseh' (Jud. 18:30). Is he really the son of Menasseh? He is the son of Moses! Then why is he associated with Menasseh? To teach that culpability is associated with the culpable... Rabbi Simeon ben Elazar said: He did not build it but rather another city, and once he built it, permission was given to dwell therein."

The *Tosephta* states three important things: 1) Joshua's curse bears not only upon the rebuilders of Jericho, but also upon the rebuilders of "another city" if its name be Jericho.51 2) Rabbi Simeon ben Elazar says that Hiel did not build Jeri-

50 In the Pal. Tal. (10.8), Rabbi Simeon's words are quoted in the plural: "They did not build it..." (יִרְאוּ עַל רְעָא יִרְאוּ).

51 *Sanhedrin* 113a quotes a story about Hiel the Bethelite, "... This teaches that he buried [his children] in succession from Abiram to Segub. Now Ahab was his close friend. He and Elijah went to inquire after his welfare in the house of mourning. He sat and remarked, 'Perhaps when Joshua pronounced his curse, it was thus: Neither Jericho under a different
cho, but rather "another city" (it is not said that this "other city" bears the name "Jericho") and 3) in referring to the inclusion of the verse about Hiel within the history of Ahab, the Tosephta uses the term נַחַל.

It would appear, therefore, that our conclusions regarding Jos. 6:26 and 1 Ki. 16:34 basically concur with the rabbinic position, though it is difficult to determine whether the Rabbis were engaged in pure exegesis or whether they preserved memories and remnants of traditions about "another city". It is, after all, a well-known phenomenon that rejected traditions from biblical times can reappear in later periods, when the reasons for their rejection have since disappeared.52

In this article we described the long and complicated history of the curse upon the rebuilders of Jericho. The changes in the names of the individuals involved, in the time and location of the events and in the extent of the tradition, can serve as an example from the historiographical literature for the system of recycling biblical material mentioned at the beginning of this study.

name, nor a different city by the name of Jericho?" Elijah replied, 'That is so.'" On this story (with support from the Pal. Tal.) A. Steinzaltz, Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin (Jerusalem 1983) 491, notes that it appears that Hiel did not build Jericho itself, but rather built another city by the same name. Because Hiel was not from Benjamin, he could not have built a city in Benjamin. Moreover, Jericho was part of the Kingdom of Judah, and since Hiel was from the northern Kingdom it is doubtful whether he could have built a city in Judah.

52U. Cassuto showed that in late legends in the literature of the Talmud, midrash, and Kabbalah, reminiscences are preserved of an ancient tradition about the rebellion of the sea against the God of Creation: "The Israelite Epic", Biblical and Oriental Studies, Volume II (Jerusalem 1975) 80-83.