AT THE BOUNDARY OF TEXTUAL AND LITERARY CRITICISMS:  
THE CASE OF כִּי אָשֶׁר אָטָר
IN LEV 20:9

Simeon Chavel

The priestly laws in the Pentateuch display a rich variety of casuistic formulations.\(^1\) Among the many forms, that of Lev 20:9 deserves special attention on account of its distinctive protasis.\(^2\) The Holiness Code states, כִּי אָשֶׁר אָטָר, "Anyone who curses his father or his mother shall surely die; his father and his mother have he cursed! His bloodguilt shall be upon him." The repeated subject כִּי אָשֶׁר אָטָר, "anyone," constitutes a hallmark of priestly style,\(^3\) where its usage ranges from simply designating the subject of a casuistically formulated law to grandly introducing an entire series of laws,\(^4\) in

\(^1\) I am currently in the process of preparing a study of the various formulations and their uses.

\(^2\) Shalom Paul has demonstrated, against A. Alt, that the כִּי אָשֶׁר אָטָר form belongs to the ancient Near East in general, not to Israel in particular, and also that it belongs to the casuistic category. See S. M. Paul, "Models of Formulation of Law in Israel and Mesopotamia," \textit{Lešonenu} 34 (1970) 257–266, esp. 259, 261 (Hebrew); see also the earlier discussion in S. E. Loewenstamm, \textit{Encyclopaedia Biblica}, vol. V (Jerusalem, 1968) 625–628, esp. 626 (Hebrew).

\(^3\) Ehrlich chalks up most cases of the doubled subject—in particular, it would seem, those in casuistic protases—to dittography, but it occurs too frequently with this particular word, far beyond any other specific example of dittography, for such an explanation to be likely. See A.B. Ehrlich, \textit{Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel} (6 vols.; Leipzig, 1908–1913; repr. Hildesheim, 1968) II.52. Goldenberg elegantly attributes the double subject in Lev 20:9 to rhythmic symmetry in that it matches the doubled form of שארא בּשָׂר, but in no other case of כִּי אָשֶׁר does this explanation apply. See A. Goldenberg, \textit{Textbooks of Biblical Interpretation} (5 vols.; Tel Aviv, 1974–1979) III.34 (Hebrew).

\(^4\) The priestly narrative, too, makes use of the doubled subject, and it does so in only one, broadly defined, yet clearly delimited context. When the narrative refers to a specific group of people appointed to a particular role in the establishment and running of the Tabernacle

[\textit{Textus} 20 (2000) 61–70]
topics as diverse as impurity (Lev 15:2; 22:4; Num 9:10), sacrifice (Lev 17:3, 8; 22:18), ingestion of blood (17:10), suspected adultery (Num 5:12), cursing one’s parents (Lev 20:9), Molek worship (20:2), idolatry (Ezek 14:4, 7), and blasphemy (Lev 24:15). Moreover, when followed by either כי or אשר and then the imperfect verb, the doubled subject may also signal that the priestly author has reworked a previous formulation. In this case, the author has redrafted the law found in the Covenant Code, אָּרוֹן אֲדֹנָי אַחֲרֵי מוֹות תִּמְרָכֵל “and whoever curses his father or mother shall surely die” (Exod 21:17). In addition to satisfying the priestly author’s preference for symmetry and restatement, the law’s new cast—chiastic repetition

and the camp—the artisans (Exod 36:4), the tribal leaders (Num 1:4), members of the Qehat clan (Num 4:19), and the Levites (Num 4:49)—the doubled form occasionally occurs. It seems to signify on one hand that each member of the group has received the job most appropriate for him and yet emphasize on the other that the members acted in concert, making for a smooth camp and cult life—an ideal blend of individual and communal in the service of God.

5 On the apodictically formulated Lev 18:6, which addresses the issue of incest, see below.

6 The interchangeability of כי and אשר in this otherwise uniform protasis suggests that both serve as relative conjunctions to be translated “who.” (Although not recorded in the standard grammars and dictionaries, this function of כי should occasion no surprise since כי and אשר mirror each other as the introductions to both object clauses and subject clauses; see E. Kautzsch, ed., Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar [trans. A. E. Cowley; Oxford, 1910] 8157 a-b and n. 3; P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, A Grammar of the Biblical Hebrew [2 vols.; Rome, 1993] II. §145a). At the same time, though, א subur may serve as the conditional particle, “if” (which the grammars and dictionaries do point out; in addition to Lev 4:22, compare Josh 4:6 and 4:21 as noted by R. Weiss, “Synonymous Variants in Divergences between the Samaritan and Massoretic Texts of the Pentateuch,” in Studies in the Text and Language of the Bible [Jerusalem, 1981] 140 [Hebrew]; on the use of א subur, too, as the conditional particle, see his comments, 76–77). Translations, from the LXX through modern times, present an altogether complicated, inconsistent picture and are therefore of dubious help. At this stage, I suggest tentatively that because of the many syntactical areas in which כי and א subur so closely rub up against each other and even overlap, the priestly draftsmen came to equate them entirely, differentiating them only along stylistic lines. I count on my forthcoming study (see above, n. 1) to issue more concrete and precise conclusions. For the meantime, to the extent possible, I will avoid qualifying כי and א subur by their syntactical roles.

7 Compare, for example, Lev 24:15 with Exod 22:27. For more detailed discussion, see M. Paran, Forms of the Priestly Style in the Pentateuch: Patterns, Linguistic Usages, Syntactic Structures (Jerusalem, 1989) 29–40 (Hebrew).
in the apodosis, signature verbal shift from imperfect to perfect, and unexpected
punch line in the second stich—emphasizes the horror of cursing one’s parents.8

But what of the initial מ with which the law begins? A number of minor
manuscripts of the Septuagint translate מ in Lev 20:9 by εὐλ (Δέ), “if,”9 reflecting
the conditional element that defines casuistic protases.10 However, this knee-jerk
reaction to מ positioned at the beginning of a casuistic law produces a sentence
that violates stylistic and syntactical rules of Greek as well as the retroverted
Hebrew. Against classical casuistic style (conditional particle—imperfect verb—
subject), this reading assumes the otherwise unattested form of a doubled subject
preceding the verb (conditional participle—doubled subject—imperfect verb;
compare Lev 20:9 with Lev 25:25, 35, 39, 47 in both Hebrew and Greek). What’s
more, it renders the verse syntactically nonsensical because of the presence of

By and large, scholars have preferred to resolve the problem posed by this
particle with the explanation that it facilitates the flow of vv. 7–8 into vv. 9–21.

---

8 On the chiastic construction of the verse and the verbal shift from imperfect to perfect as
stylistic, even poetic, features distinctive of priestly drafting of laws, see Paran, Forms of the
Priestly Style, 39–40, 49–97 (esp. 64), 114–116, and the bibliography cited there. On the
general biblical use of second stichoi to add new dimensions to the thought expressed in
first stichoi, see J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History (New

9 Manuscripts Mabceginsuwvwxz, the Sahidic version, and Or-gr, cited in A. E. Brooke and

10 On protatic מ, see GKC § 159bb; F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs (eds.), A
Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1907 [1975]) 473, 82b; L. Koehler and
W. Baumgartner, Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament [4 vols.; Leiden,
1967-1990] II.449; Jotun-Muraoka, II.§167e; A. Aejmelaeus, “The Function and
Interpretation of מ in Biblical Hebrew,” in On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected
Essays (Kampen, The Netherlands, 1993) 171 n. 10.

11 Despite all this, Wevers untenably holds that שָׁמַי מ in Lev 20:9 represents a legitimate
variation of casuistic formulation and, furthermore, that the Septuagint’s text, διαφορώ τοῖς,
translates this phrase rather than פָּרָשׁ שָׁמַי, its otherwise consistent equivalent; see J. W.
Many read יכ here with the indirect causal sense, “for,” used to introduce motivational, explanatory, or evidential clauses that do not “state the cause for what is actually said in the main clause but rather the reason for saying it.” Hoffmann elaborates that יכ serves to denote the entire series of family-relations laws as exemplifying the serious nature of God’s injunction to Israel to strive for holiness and the severe punishment that awaits its violation.

Whatever the particular spin put on it, though, this kind of loose linkage with the preceding verses, in this instance, stretches beyond the limits of definition and explanation, ultimately reaching into the realm of hermeneutics. Furthermore, in only one other instance—a priestly one, no less—does the Bible preserve a passage formulated similarly, Ezek 14:7: יכ איש איש מנה מנה רוחה ואש רוח נורה נורה נורה פנים ילך פנים ילך. A mere glance at the context, vv. 6-8, leaves no doubt that יכ there signifies


13 For this broad definition of the indirect causal יכ, see Aemmelaeus, “יכ in Biblical Hebrew,” 179 (her italics). The overall thrust of her argument rejects the wide applicability of the emphatic interpretation of יכ favored by many scholars, even questioning its very existence in biblical Hebrew altogether, in favor of the indirect causal interpretation (see further W. T. Claassen, “Speaker-Orientated Functions of יכ in Biblical Hebrew,” JNSL 11 [1983] 29-46). Nevertheless, she admits (p. 184) that in several cases (e.g., Gen 18:20; 1 Sam 13:13; 14:30, 44; 26:16; 2 Sam 23:5; Isa 7:9; Ps 49:16; 128:2) the emphatic interpretation fits best.


15 Actually, וָאָסָר poses as complicated a problem as יכ (described above, n. 6). It appears to function as a relative conjunction in Lev 22:4 וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא וְהוֹדוּ הַצָּרָה אֶל דָּוִד, and less equivocally so in the non-priestly Gen 11:4 זָמַן לְרָאשׁוֹת בְּשִׁמְיָם; see also 2 Sam. 12:30 זָמַן לְרָאוּ אָשֶׁר לֹא וְהוֹדוּ הַצָּרָה תָּמִית אֶל לֹא וְהוֹדוּ הַצָּרָה תָּמִית אֶל לֹא וְהוֹדוּ הַצָּרָה. LeViticus 13 presents a particularly complicated problem, which requires a detailed discussion; suffice it at this point to state economically, if somewhat elliptically, that the text flows most smoothly if וָאָסָר functions at certain points as the conditional particle. Here, in Ezek 14:7, it
direct causality: “because anyone from among the house of Israel or from among the resident aliens living among Israel who falls away from me....” It would be odd indeed to find precisely the same unique formulation in Leviticus 20 (with אֶרֶץ in place of waw) demonstrating a different conjunctive sense for כי. At the same time, כי in Leviticus 20 does not convey the direct causal sense “because” and introduce the reason for the preceding exhortations to the Israelites to make themselves holy by observing God’s rules and regulations (vv. 7–8), as suggested by Mendelssohn. After all, these exhortations require no further justification or explanation than that offered in v. 7 itself: כי אני יהוה אלהיכם “because I am YHWH your God,” which in this context recalls the explicit charge, נִשְׁמָתָךְ נִשְׁמָתָךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ יִשְׁרָאֵל “You shall become holy because I, YHWH your God, am holy” (19:2). Besides, if the indirect causal “for” requires a bit of a stretch of the hermeneutic imagination, then direct causal “because” can provide no improvement. More importantly, vv. 7–8 serve to conclude the preceding verses on Molek worship and necromancy (1–6) rather than to introduce the series of laws on family and sexual relations, especially since in the legal material the formula כי אני occurs dozens of times as a concluding signature, but only a handful of times as an introduction (e.g., Lev 18:2; 19:2), which renders any type of syntactical linkage with the subsequent material very unlikely.

could function as conditional particle, but the verse reads best with waw as relative conjunction. The various grammars and dictionaries have not thoroughly and systematically addressed all of these possibilities. On the translation of waw in the Septuagint, see A. Aejmelaeus, Parataxis in the Septuagint – A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch (Helsinki, 1982); idem, “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint,” in The Septuagint Translators, 49–64.

Mendelssohn takes the linkage to mean: “Follow my laws (vv. 7–8) כי because not doing so can lead to capital punishment as exemplified in the following cases (vv. 9–21);” see M. Mendelssohn, Netirot Hashalom: The Pentateuch with Translation and Commentary (9 vols.; Vienna 1846; repr. Jerusalem, 1974) IV. ad loc. (Hebrew).

One may quibble over several instances, but the essential proportion stands firm. Moreover, the phrase appears throughout the Bible, most frequently in Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel, where, too, it occurs mostly as a concluding signature. J. Milgrom, Leviticus 17–27 (AB; New York, forthcoming), understands it as the priestly equivalent of the prophetic כי, meaning, “I YHWH have spoken.” Ezekiel’s expressions, בְּנִי יְהוָה (5:15, 17;
In light of the likelihood that the law against cursing one’s parents introduces a separate series of laws with no syntactically logical connection to what precedes it, Paran posits that, shorn of any syntactic or even semantic value, קֶרֶם in this case simply marks the beginning of a new paragraph. Poetic passages do seem to attest this usage of קֶרֶם, but in legal sections, only וָאָבֶא serves in this asyndetic capacity, Lev 20:9 would comprise the sole example of this phenomenon for קֶרֶם.

To return to קֶרֶם, then, as related somehow to the casuistic formulation of Lev 20:9, Kalisch flatly describes קֶרֶם as a pleonasm with אָבֶא. Kalisch’s statement, descriptive rather than explicative, should lead nowhere. However, combined

17:21, 24; 21:22, 37; 22:14; 24:14; 30:12; 34:24; 36:36), and especially אָבֶא אֲשֶׁר (26:14), prove him right.

18 This is not to deny a thematic connection within the chapter. Mr. Aryeh Wiener has noted (oral communication) that within the overall arrangement of the chapter in terms of familial relations, the situation envisioned in v. 9 inverts the direction of harm inherent in Molek worship, from parents sacrificing their children to children cursing their parents.

19 Paran, Forms of Priestly Style, 39 n. 33.

20 See the examples brought and discussed in J. Muijlenburg, “The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle קֶרֶם in the Old Testament,” HUCA 32 (1961) 135-160. Aejmelaeus, though, always in favor, on theoretical linguistic grounds, of narrowing the range of semantic value of a particle (“Kalisch in Biblical Hebrew,” 169), prefers to posit a connective function, a causal interpretation, for many of these cases, even where the logical connections are not at all apparent (“Kalisch in Biblical Hebrew,” 181).

21 The ancient biblical manuscripts 4QpaleoExod and 11QpaleoLev discovered at Qumran attest to an interesting scribal phenomenon that suggests that ancient Hebrew scribes appreciated this non-conjunctive, non-semantic function of וָאָבֶא. When the first word of a paragraph began with וָאָבֶא + imperfect, the scribes displaced the וָאָבֶא to the (empty) middle or end of the previous line, apparently to signify the beginning of a new paragraph. See P.W. Skehan et al. (eds.), Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts (DJD IX; Oxford, 1992); D.N. Freedman and K.A. Matthews, The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1985).

22 Ehrlich pointedly explains that קֶרֶם functions like the modern colon (Randglossen, II.69). He borrows the phenomenon explicitly from the Bible’s representation of direct speech, a literary context that is neither analogous nor applicable. On קֶרֶם recitativum and its Greek counterpart in the Septuagint, see A. Aejmelaeus, “OTI recitativum in Septuagintal Greek,” in The Septuagint Translators, 37-48.

23 Kalisch, Commentary, II.446, although his translation renders קֶרֶם by “indeed.”
with the evidence from the Septuagint, it does inspire an alternative direction of thought, which, oddly enough, not one scholar has proposed, namely, the current form of the verse has resulted from a faulty transmission of the text. 24

The Greek translator of Leviticus, who generally displays “a rather firm word-for-word method,” 25 demonstrably recognized sixty-three instances of the indirect causal ב, faithfully representing it by either γάρ or ὅτι. 26 Yet this translator offers no equivalent whatsoever for ב at the beginning of Lev 20:9, implying that it did not originally appear there. 27 Within the MT itself, further support for this inference derives from Lev 18:5-6, which mirror the flow of Lev 20:8-9, but, demonstrating no need for any sort of linkage between the rhetorical passage and the laws that follow, dispense with any conjunctive particle altogether. Given that the rhetorical passage in Lev 20:8-9 concludes its preceding topic whereas the rhetorical passage in Lev 18:5-6 introduces the following laws, the situation appears backwards: if either text begs for linkage, Leviticus 18 presents the better candidate. In addition, Lev 18:6 displays a syntactical, grammatical, and stylistic complexity suggesting that the compiler of Leviticus 18 or a subsequent editor deliberately reworked the original form of the verse in order that the flow from v. 5 to v. 6 resemble more closely its counterpart in Leviticus 20. 28 From this perspective, the absence of ב from Leviticus 18 raises

24 Noth considers the verse unusual in part because of the odd causal linking, yet for some unarticulated reason he maintains ב as an original element of the verse (Leviticus, 149).


27 Brooke-McLean, Exodus and Leviticus, ad loc.; Wevers, Septuaginta: Leviticus; similarly, A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart, 1935; repr. 1979). Those MS cited above, n. 9, which do represent ב all generally tend to reflect the later propensity for “correcting” the LXX towards the MT, and do not offer reliable witnesses to the original text of the Septuagint.

28 The verse contains disagreement in subject number (sgl. בטזר vs. pl. ברה) and address (3rd pers. בושם ניריס ידיש vs. 2nd pers. ברה); note how the Septuagint smooths out these problems with the 3rd pers. sgl. προσελεύσται = ברה*, although it violates the uniform predicate of the chapter’s laws, formulated in 2nd pers. sgl. The (indirect) object clause לבר תמר has two subjects, (1) “you,” embedded appropriately in the predicate ברה, and (2) “any man,” which appears redundantly at the head of the verse. This unexpected subject, especially in its doubled form שאר ידיש, properly belongs to casuistic
eyebrows even more forcefully. These observations lead to the conclusion, first of all, that Lev 20:9 at its earliest stage did not begin with ב, and secondly, that ב entered the text erroneously. Indeed, for what reason would some annotator feel compelled to add (supposed) rhetorical force in Leviticus 20 through an emphatic or motivational particle (where it really does not belong), but not in Leviticus 18?

A survey of priestly casuistic formulations, in particular, those with the doubled subject שָׁם שָׁם, provides the key for explaining the addition of ב to Lev 20:9.29 Essentially two styles of the doubled subject prevail in the priestly literature: the doubled subject followed immediately by ב (Lev 15:2; 24:15; Num 5:12; 9:10) and formulations rather than the apodictic cast of this verse (compare Lev 15:2; 17:3, 8, 10, 13; 18:6; 20:2, 9; 22:4, 18; 24:15; Num 5:12; 9:10; Ezek 14:4, 7). Moreover, in every casuistic instance the governing verb agrees with the doubled subject in address: 3rd pers.

E. S. Gerstenberger remarks, “During the process of transmission and copying, these two, closely related chapters [18 and 20] no doubt mutually influenced one another” (Leviticus—A Commentary [OTL; trans. D. W. Scott; Louisville, 1996] 248; see further ibid., 288–289, as well as Kalisch, Commentary, II.386–387, 439–441; Bertholet, Leviticus, 61–64; Baentsch, Exodus–Leviticus–Numbers, 401; and B. J. Schwartz, Selected Chapters of the Holiness Code—A Literary Study of Leviticus 17–19 [Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University; Jerusalem, 1987] 55–60 [Hebrew]). I would add that this mutual relationship manifested itself already at the literary level in the phenomenon of assimilation (to use Y. Zakovitch’s apt term). Briefly, v. 6 originally headed the group of laws now in vv. 17b–23, probably reading: אֲלֵיהוּ בְּשֶׁשֶּׁר פָּרֶץ; the compiler of the chapter wedged in the clan taboos, placing v. 6 at their head, and prefaced the whole with a rhetorical opening. With only a few deft touch-ups, the compiler revised v. 6 to serve as a transition from the rhetorical opening (vv. 2b–5) to the laws (vv. 7–23) and as a two-pronged introduction directed at each of the two blocs within the laws (7–17a, 17b–23; see K. Elliger, Leviticus [HAT; Tübingen, 1966] 231–235; Schwartz, Selected Chapters, 70–73). As part of these slight changes—returning the discussion to the relationship with 20:8–9—perhaps because the compiler or a subsequent reviser desired a formal style to introduce the laws after God’s paratelic remarks, on the model of the already similar chap. 20, he partially recast the verse in 3rd pers. form beginning with שָׁם שָׁם. (For an array of examples of assimilation, see R. Weiss, “Synonymous Variants,” esp. 132–158; Y. Zakovitch, “Assimilation in Biblical Narratives,” in Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism [ed. J. Tigay; Philadelphia, 1985] 175–196; E. Tov, “The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History,” ibid., 211–237; J. Licht, Commentary on the Book of Numbers [3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1985–1995] II.5 [Hebrew]; E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible [Minneapolis and Assen–Maastricht, 1992] passim.)

29 ב probably did not enter the text under the influence of v. 7 or v. 8, both of which have the word ב, since neither verse shares any other characteristics with v. 9 that would have palpably contributed to this vertical dittography.
the doubled subject followed first by some form of the partitive מָכָה יִשְׂרָאֵל and then by בָּשָׂר (Lev 17:3, 8, 10, 13; 20:2; 22:18; Ezek 14:4, 7; see also Lev 18:4).30

The formulation of the protasis in Lev 20:9 stands out as an isolated exception, violating this firm stylistic rule of the priestly draftermen; no partitive clause follows the doubled subject, yet בָּשָׂר appears, not בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר. Perhaps because every other law in Lev 20:9–21 (except for the apodictic v. 19) begins, the compiler of this paragraph adjusted v. 9 from the original בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר כִּי to the original אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׂר in order that it match the rest; or perhaps the compiler of Lev 20:9–21 himself constructed Lev 20:9 directly from Exod 21:17, and employed בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר in v. 9 to begin with because of the form of the laws he knew would follow. In either case, an astute, seasoned scribe attuned to the protatic styles prevalent in Leviticus and Numbers may have recognized that בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר ought to replace אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׂר and signaled as much by entering it into the margin or in between the lines of the text.31 An early copyist, rather than substituting בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר for בָּשָׂר, mistakenly inserted it at the beginning of the verse, creating the redundant and misleading protasis, בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר.32 According to this reconstruction of

---

30 For recent attempts to differentiate priestly strata according to the various styles of the casuistic protasis, including doubled or simple subject, use of חַיּוֹת or חַיָּיוֹ for the subject, and use of אֲשֶׁר and בָּשָׂר, and to align these styles topically within the strata, see I. Knohl, The Sanctuary of Silence: A Study of the Priestly Strata in the Pentateuch (Jerusalem, 1992) 83–84 and nn. 85–86 (Hebrew), and the reactions in Milgrom, Leviticus 17–27.

31 E. Tov has concluded (oral communication) that the Qumran materials demonstrate a marked preference on the part of scribes for interlinear corrections rather than marginal ones. On scribal corrections in general, see E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 64–67, 258–258.

32 For a truly parallel example of this series of textual events, see Y. Zakovitch’s comments to Gen 11:7, in which he argues that the text originally had בְּנֵי חָלֵל; scribal error caused it to mutate to בְּנֵי חָלֵל; a marginal correction reintroduced בְּנֵי חָלֵל the final hand, rather than substituting בְּנֵי חָלֵל, וּהֲרֵם, instead (Y. Zakovitch, review of J.P. Fokkelman, Narrative Art in Genesis, Shalom – An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies 4 [1980] 302–308, esp. 308 [Hebrew]).

Other examples of material entered into the text incorrectly include: 1 Kgs 22:28 refers to Mic 1:2 in order to identify the two prophets bearing the same name; it never should have entered the text at all. Gen 10:14 אֲשֶׁר מָאָשָׁם מָעִית כִּלָּה מְדִינֵי לָזֶה should follow אֱלֹהִים מָאָשָׁם מָעִית כִּלָּה מְדִינֵי לָזֶה rather than אֱלֹהִים מָאָשָׁם מָעִית כִּלָּה מְדִינֵי לָזֶה, which should follow Ninveh rather than Kalah (see Jonah 1:2), though in this case the scribe who incorporated the comment may have preferred not to interfere in the verse and intentionally placed the phrase at the end (on deictic elements and the various difficulties
events, Kalisch's seemingly offhand remark that יכ constitutes a pleonasm of נשא actually hits the mark.

The protasis in Lev 20:9, then, and the process of recovering its development provide an additional example of the occasionally blurry border between literary and textual criticism, the crossroads between the creation of a text and its transmission. One scribe, perhaps the author/compiler himself, sought to unify the protases in the paragraph, although the immediate conformity violated overarching stylistic rules. A second scribe, intending to improve the style of the text by (re)turning it to overall consistency, without altering the meaning at all, inserted a synonymous alternative to the troublesome particle into the margin or interlinear space. A third scribe, though, bungled the substitution, resulting in a text that continues to break with general drafting convention and, moreover, now boasts an entirely new and misleading feature—an indication of causality between Lev 20:7–8 and 9–23. Appropriately enough, the support for this three-stage reconstruction comes not only from the Septuagint, in a quintessential text-critical argument, but also from the literary development of a parallel passage within the MT itself.

causd by the clauses they introduce as signalling the secondary work of a scribe, see M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford, 1985, repr. 1989] 39–55). MT Josh. 8:30–35 appears between 9:2 and 9:3 in the Septuagint, and in yet a third place—before chap. 5—in 4QJoshv (published by E. Ulrich in *DJD XIV* [Oxford, 1995]), suggesting a secondary passage whose author did not indicate clearly enough where to add it (although its totally different position in 4QJoshv, explicable on hermeneutic grounds, looks like a deliberate relocation of the passage). MT Jer 10:9 appears in the middle of v. 5 in the Septuagint, again suggesting an addition not marked clearly. (Thanks to Michael Segal and Jonathan Ben-Dov for providing these examples.)