De Rossi and Kennicott invested infinite labour in their compilation of all the textual variants appearing in a manifold of manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible. Hempel's more recent research continued their efforts and at present we have the work done here by D. S. Loewinger. Currently, Gottstein has observed that the manuscripts in question should be evaluated with great caution. Actually, already Rosenmüller, in his critical review of Kennicott's volumes, voiced his doubts as to the value of a full comparison of all the mentioned manuscripts. The obtaining variants are minor and incidental, and in fact they prove nothing more than that the form of all Massoretic manuscripts is one and the same. Given this situation Rosenmüller — and after him Lagarde, Kuenen and others — maintained that all Hebrew manuscripts derive from one archetypal codex. The hypothesis formulated in this way is indeed somewhat exaggerated — since the manuscripts present some textual variants that may in fact attest to pre-Massoretic forms of the

Translated by Judith H. Seeligmann. The Hebrew original appeared in Turbit 25 (1955/6) 118-139. The title of the English abstract in that publication was "Researches into the Criticism of the Massoretic Text." Some details of this article have become dated by the recent publication of more texts from Qumran. However, the general methodological approach deserves, now more than ever, the attention of text-critics and scholars at large.

1 The introductory paragraph of the present article is meant to introduce additional studies concerning other phenomena in the history of the biblical text.


4 E. F. K. Rosenmüller, Handbuch der Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese, I (Leipzig, 1797) 247. His interesting remarks are quoted by E. Preuschen, ZAW 9 (1889) 303.
text of the Bible—yet the extraordinary uniformity of all the manuscripts vouchsafes our stating that a common text form underlies them all.\(^5\)

These circumstances are clearly of consequence regarding the method and limits of biblical text criticism. The aim of such criticism is, of course, to establish, with as much certainty as possible, the text created by the authors of the biblical books. The accepted procedure to answer a question like this—most specifically in the realm of classical philology—would be to compare the various manuscripts and compile an *apparatus criticus* based on differences between them. In the case of the Hebrew Bible this course does not lead towards the required aim. The textual witnesses are for the greater part indirect witnesses—though in recent years this situation has somewhat changed due to the finds at Qumran—a factor that leaves its stamp on the nature of the *apparatus criticus*, and in fact is responsible for its absence. A taste of what has been lost can be acquired from the Hebrew manuscripts of Ben Sira found in the Geniza. Their margins contain annotations and text variants,\(^6\) and we may perhaps presume that at a certain stage there existed manuscripts of the books of the Bible in this very form, containing glosses similar in nature to those obtaining in the manuscripts of Ben Sira. These,

\(^5\) From the above quote by Preuschen we learn that Rosenmüller was the first to formulate this thesis (he repeated it in 1834), which is usually attributed to Lagarde (P. A. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zu den griechischen Proverben* [Leipzig, 1865] 2), and that Lagarde himself claimed to be its author, specifically in *Mitteilungen* 1 (Göttingen, 1884) 22-25. Among others this thesis was accepted by Nödeke (Th. Nödeke, *Alttestamentliche Literatur* [Leipzig, 1868] 241 and elsewhere), Kuenen (A. Kuenen, *Der Stammbaum des MT des AT* [Amsterdam, 1873]). See especially: J. Reider, *Prolegomena . . . to Aquila* (Philadelphia, 1916) 81. In spite of Lagarde’s evidence it seems that Olshausen’s formulation is closer to the situation in speaking about one recension at the root of all the manuscripts (see: J. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen* [Leipzig, 1853] 17-18), as it turns out that residues of a vulgar pre-Massoretic text found their way into several manuscripts. Cf. Hempel in the above quoted articles of 1930 and 1934 (supra, n. 2), specifically regarding the readings in common with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and presently those in common with 1QpIsr. Gottstein as well, in the above quoted (supra, n. 3) deems implicitly, if not explicitly, this possibility a likely one.

\(^6\) Segal pointed out the value of the variants annotated in the margins of the Ben Sira manuscripts: M. H. Segal, *The Complete Book of Ben Sira* (Jerusalem, 1957) 51-52 (Hebrew).

therefore, can serve us as valuable ancillary tools in our investigation into the MT. In compiling a sort of substitute for an *apparatus criticus*, several other tools are at our disposal: first of all a number of manuscripts discovered at Qumran and those still in the process of being found there (with, at the same time, a constant increase in studies and disputes regarding their value). Besides these we have the parallel passages within the Bible, which not infrequently convey the same text in different forms. To such parallel renderings we should compare, up to a certain point, the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch. The majority of the one thousand three hundred instances of *Qere* and *Ketib*⁷—at times reflecting vestiges from diverging recensions—should be regarded as text variants. In sorting and evaluating these instances, the information scattered in the Talmudic literature regarding the formation and phenomena of the Biblical text should be utilized.⁸ In addition to these we have the textual variants extant in Rabbinic literature in a twofold capacity: those citations that specifically quote a text deviating from the Massoretic one, as well as those, even more significant ones, in which a midrashic exposition is assumed to derive from a text differing from the MT (though the quote has been harmonized with MT).⁹ A certain value can also be attached to citations in the New Testament and in the writings of the Church Fathers. Last but not least in import stand the ancient translations, with the Septuagint in the lead (while constantly collating it with remnants of other Greek translations).

---

⁷ Regarding the nature of the *Ketib* and *Qere*, see, for the time being, R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making* (Philadelphia, 1937). Among reviews see esp.: L. Rost, AoF 13 (1938) 164.

⁸ The Talmudic pre-Massoretic material was collected by C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London, 1897). It was dealt with again in: A. Sperber, *Problems of the Masora* (New York, 1943). However, the material requires a fresh comprehensive critical investigation.

⁹ Of decisive value in the field of text variants in Talmudic literature are, of course, Aptowitzer’s studies: V. Aptowitzer, *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur*, vol. 1 (Wien, 1906). Israel Abrahams’ remark is worth quoting: “Of all the unexplored aids to the recovery of the pre-Massoretic text of the Old Testament, the Rabbinic literature is by far the most important.” See I. Abrahams, “Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis,” in *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day* (Cambridge, 1909) 171. Abrahams points at the tendency of late reworkers to harmonize the quotes obtaining in Rabbinic literature with the MT. This phenomenon was also highlighted by Kahle regarding quotes from other biblical texts.
Each of these tools has complicated predicaments of its own,¹⁰ and does not yield but a small degree of approximation to the truth. A relative degree of conclusiveness can be attained by a compound use of several of the mentioned tools. When a number of text witnesses, independent of each other, point in the same direction, it may at times be feasible to conjecture the primary form of the passage under discussion. However, more important than the reconstruction of single verses is the attempt at identifying the practices and idiosyncrasies of the early scribes that determined the history of the text transmission as well as the nature of the mistakes that were likely or inevitable to crop up. A systematic examination of the phenomena that are liable to occur in the biblical text, based on a combination and collation of all indirect witnesses, will result in two distinct advantages. First, it will, somewhat, undermine the unjustifiable starting point of the commentator who tends to construe the original wording based on his so-called aptitude—accepting as authentic what he understands, and casting doubt on what he does not, as if his understanding were the only criterion for establishing the text! Secondly, an examination of this kind should curb the danger of arbitrariness constantly lying in wait for biblical criticism—a discipline that for lack of direct witnesses will always vastly depend on the critics’ imagination, brilliant conjectures, and shrewd guesses.

Revising One Word by Another As a Practice of Copyists

In what follows we shall demonstrate one such scribal practice: a routine or deliberate replacing of one word by a synonymous one. We shall see that dealing with this phenomenon is instructive on more than one ground. This phenomenon, in particular, has left its mark on nearly every one of the mentioned text witnesses, and as such can offer us quite a few examples of the compound application of the variegated data. This specific procedure will show us the potentialities and limits in establishing the biblical text, when we compare the process with that available, for example, in the discipline of classical literature. And above all, this phenomenon reflects, in many instances, important stages of the earliest exegesis.

¹⁰ I intentionally refrained here from enumerating the problems. Even a selection from the huge, sprawling literature dealing with each of the mentioned tools would necessarily be very limited and rather arbitrary.
of the biblical text, and is thus unique in allowing us an insight into the degree of awareness and tendentiousness at work in the formation of text variants; there may be no other phenomenon like it to offer us such insight. These degrees of awareness on the part of the copyists will guide us when sorting out the documentary evidence of our phenomenon.\textsuperscript{11}

I

The majority of text variants spring from routine and mechanical mistakes made by the copyist; there is more than a grain of truth in the charge laid against historians and theologians who, allegedly, are inclined to guess at the "deliberate" tendencies at the root of textual variants. Still, in our case we do not lack word replacements that, nevertheless, can be stated with certainty to be intentional and deliberate. A few examples will suffice.

In 2 Sam 5:21 we read: יִשְׂרָאֵל חָזַק בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה וַיְהִי נְחָל הַמַלְכָּה. "they (the Philistines) abandoned their idols there, and David and his men carried them off". In the parallel passage in 1 Chr 14:12 the reading is: יִשְׂרָאֵל חָזַק בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה וַיְהִי נְחָל הַמַלְכָּה, "they abandoned their gods there, and David ordered these to be burned". We are justified in stating two facts: a) in the first part of the verse the text in

\textsuperscript{11} I have hinted at the phenomenon dealt with here in my book: I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden, 1948), where I adduced several examples. The examples given in the present study are a threefold, or more, of those adduced there; the ones repeated here have been expanded, some rephrased. However, the main difference is in the method of research and its conclusions, that is to say, in classifying the examples and grading them according to the degree of consciousness and tendentiousness they reflect. Admittedly, I have become aware of this method in the course of my conversations with Mr. Shemaryahu Talmon concerning his study on "Basic Phenomena in the Transmission of the Biblical Text", in the process of being written.
Chronicles preserved the earlier form; the text of 2 Samuel underwent correcting by a hand that did not want to designate the Philistine idols. To strengthen the second conclusion it must be pointed out that the tendency to remove obstacles in the designation of gods is, in general, typical of the form in which the text of the books of Samuel has been transmitted, correcting many names whose original form has been preserved in other books such as Judges and Chronicles.

Let us mention: אַרְבַּךְ בַּנְיָהוּ in 2 Sam 11:21 (but ισραήλ in the LXX), as opposed to אַרְבַּךְ בַּנְיָהוּ in Judg 6:32. So מִשְׁפָּט, in 2 Sam 4:4; 9:6, but in later מִשְׁפָּט of the Septuagint מִשְׁפָּט, whereas in 1 Chr 9:40 מִשְׁפָּט, and as in 1 Chr 8:34 מִשְׁפָּט, כִּי בִּלְעָד. In 1 Chr 8:33; 9:39 we find מָכַש, in its Canaanite form (compare מָכַש). This name was corrected in two different ways, but the tendency of the corrections and its results are the same: 2 Sam 2-4 אֵשׁ בַּשׁי, and אֵשׁ בַּשׁי (1 Sam 14:49). This second change is similar to the mitigating of מָכַש in 1 Chr 14:7 into מָכַש (2 Sam 5:16, however, so too in 1 Chr 3:8). The latter corrections reflect a kind of disposition to appropriate to the Lord of Israel the features associated with the Canaanite Baal, which may already have been expressed in the name בַּשָּׁל, in 1 Chr 12:6. Yet, it is known that the (later) practice of disparagement, which led to changing Baal into Bosheth, is more common.

12 Chronicles here has preserved the original reading—as in many instances—a fact that merits special attention, since the end of our verse in Chronicles has undergone an evident tendentious reworking. In 2 Sam 5:21 יִשָּׁמֵר וְדַרְשׁוּת is a terminus technicus for carrying off war spoils: 1 Sam 17:34; Hos 5:14; Isa 8:4; 39:6; Mic 2:2 (cf. מִשְׁפָּט a woman; Judg 21:23); and esp. 1 Chr 18:11. Whereas in Chronicles, יִשָּׁמֵר וְדַרְשׁוּת, the editor of the text adapted David’s and his men’s deeds to the Deuteronomistic command (Deut 7:5, 25–26).

13 Such rewordings qualify Wolfson’s fine remarks that the Bible does not avoid designating religious-idolatrous values by the same terms—לַא, מָכַש, מְכַש (Isa 16:12, etc.)—that it uses for monotheistic values; see: H. A. Wolfson, Philo, vol. 1, (Cambridge, Mass., 1947) 9. This word replacement is based on the Bible considering the foreign gods and their idols as one and the same. This has been observed by W. W. Baudissin, Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1876) 81–96 and especially by Y. Kaufmann, in וחלות, especially in monotheistic idols, and in monographs on the subject. In my opinion, this identification requires additional study regarding the ability of biblical language to differentiate between concrete objects and abstract values.

14 Regarding the problematic nature of name-composites with בַּשָּׁל, and specifically the name בַּשָּׁל, cf. M. Noth, Israelitische Personenamen (Stuttgart, 1928) 120–121.
It is of interest to trace how such a replacing can result in the corruption of a text. The list of David’s warriors, in MT 2 Sam 23:8, opens: יַעֲשֶׂה בָּשָׁה יָכִּים (in the LXX ἡσθοῦ ὦ ἤκαναίος), but in 1 Chr 11:11 the text has the name: יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה יָכִּים (in the LXX ἡσθαῖα εἷς Ἀχαμαῖν). True, this is the form of the name also in 1 Chr 27:2: יַעֲשֶׂה בָּשָׁה (in the LXX ἡσθαῖα) (probably influenced by names such as ἅρτος and the like). However, it is clear that the original form was יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה, and the primary form in 2 Sam 23:8 probably read יַעֲשֶׂה בָּשָׁה. It is well known that the replacing of “Baal” by “Bosheth” did not occur in personal names only (Jer 3:24; Hos 9:10). This is most obvious in such cases where the tendentious replacement yielded doublets, as in Jer 11:13: יָכִים וְיָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים לְבֵית יָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים לְבֵית יָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים לְבֵית יָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים לְבֵית יָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים לְבֵית יָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים לְבֵית יָכִים יָכִים יַעֲשָׂה בָּשָׁה בֱּוָת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה מֶבַחַת לוּקְרִים L. For your gods have become as many as your towns, O Judah, and you have set up as many altars to Bosheth as there are streets in Jerusalem—altars to sacrifice to Baal.”

From the examples seen so far we may already conclude that there is no consistency in this conscious replacing of words, a phenomenon that goes hand in

---

15 Most of the topics mentioned have been dealt with more than once by Baudissin (supra, n. 13), 108–109. See also: idem, Kyrios, vol. 3 (Giessen, 1929) 89, 399. (The phenomenon of name replacing is a classical example of how the Lord of Israel appropriated concepts that had previously been attributed to gods who preceded him in Canaan). From the fact that the text of Samuel has been reworked in places where the text of the Chronicles was not, Gerleman drew conclusions regarding the transmission history of the biblical text. Cf. G. Gerleman, Synopsis Studies in the Old Testament (Lund, 1943) 23. Gerleman stretches the point in considering the text of Chronicles to be an uncorrected Vulgarrezeption. There is some truth in Talmon’s remark that the text of Chronicles has been reworked—but also a degree of unqualifying generalization. See S. Talmon, “The Samaritan Pentateuch,” JJS 2 (1951) 146 (cf. n. 26).

16 The question should be asked whether in the books of the prophets there are instances in which the use of בָּשָׁה does not result from later reworking, but belongs to the prophet’s ipissima verba. The verse יַעֲשֶׂה בָּשָׁה יָכִּים יִשְׂרָאֵל (Jer 3:25), suggests that v. 24 יַעֲשֶׂה בָּשָׁה יָכִּים יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּלַה (אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה אֲכָלָה A. Dillmann maintained that this was a replacing of בָּשָׁה יָכִּים (or should we take בָּשָׁה יָכִּים as a collective noun?).
hand with the usually inconsistent reworking process that the MT, as well as the Septuagint, underwent. A most striking example of this lack of consistency within the framework of the phenomenon under discussion is probably to be found in the text of 1 Sam 14:18. In v. 3 of that chapter we read that Ahijah the priest from the house of Eli was in Saul’s army as bearer of the ephod; in v. 18, however, we read:

The Septuagint (which in the books of Samuel constitutes a witness that should in no way be disregarded) transliterates and translates here as follows: προσάγαγε τὸ εφόσου ἢπειρον τὸ εφώσιν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνη ἐν Ισραήλ. This is to be retroverted in Hebrew as follows: הנשח האפור כה דוא נוש אפור בדם היה נבא(לִבְּר) the son of Levi, that is to say “Bring forth the ephod’, since he carried the ephod on that day in front of ( = לִבְּר which should read לַבל = to the sons of) Israel”. This formula conveys the situation described in 1 Sam 23:9, 30:7: “present the ephod” and with the mention of the Urim and Tummim in the sequel of our story (verse 41 in the Septuagint version). The formula left its imprint in Rabbinical literature, and possibly even into the exegesis of the Middle Ages. The MT here seems to be the handiwork of our editor who did not accept the ephod as a legitimate means of divination and thus replaced it with the Ark of the Lord, whose presence in the warring camp was acceptable. Yet, the

17 Bar. Melekh HaMishkan, ch. 6 and elsewhere. This material was collected by Aptowitz, Das Schriftwort, 48-51, and in his opinion, the citation was adjusted according to the MT, y. Seqal. 6:1; y. Sota 8:3. Arnold’s contention that the ייִשָׁר was the primary reading and the רַדָּם substituted the ייִשָׁר and not vice versa (W. R. Arnold, Ephod and Ark [HTS 3; Cambridge, Mass., 1917]) “could not have been accepted, for the weight of evidence is overwhelming against it”– J. Morgenstern, “The Ark, the Ephod and the ‘Tent of Meeting’,” HUCA 18 (1944) 1-52, at p. 1. [The wording of this footnote has been corrected following a suggestion of Mr. Roni Goldstein, Jerusalem.]

18 Regarding the ephod, see my article “On the History and Nature of Prophecy in Israel,” Eriter 3 (1954) 125-132 (Hebrew), at 126, n. 12. (However, I have not sought to exhaust the references to recent research.) There is no clear-cut evaluation of the ephod in the Bible; the same goes for other religio-cultic concepts, probably of Canaanite origin, such as the Teraphim, Nehushtan and the like.

19 The decisive evidence that the Ark was taken to wars obtains in 2 Sam 11:11. The Rashbam’s comment on Deut 23:15 is noteworthy: “The Lord your God moves about in your camp to protect you” – since also the Ark containing the Torah went out to war with
phenomenon in question makes one wonder: if in v. 18 the words "who bore the ephod on that day" are original, then v. 3 should be considered an editorial addition. Even so, the lack of consistency is quite disturbing, seeing that in v. 18 the ephod was replaced by the Ark of the Lord, when in v. 4 the ephod remained untouched.20

The next example of tendentious replacement shows up in an unexpected place. In 2 Kgs 23:24 we read: "וַאֲנָהָ הָאָדָם הַחִדְעָנָס הָאָדָם הַמָּפָס הָאָדָם הַמֶּלֶל הָאָדָם נִפְרָדָה נוֹךְ נוֹךְ... בּוֹרָא שָׁמֶר". This sentence has no parallel in Chronicles; however, the LXX has an addition after 2 Chr 35:19, which is a duplicate translation of 2 Kgs 23:24–27.21 The translation reads as follows: καὶ τὰς ἑγγαστριμύθες καὶ τὰς γυνάκια καὶ τὰ ἀνδραφυν καὶ τὰ εἶδωλα καὶ τὰ καρσαίμ... ἐνθιάσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ιωσίας. The transliteration of the last object seems to reflect an old text form in which the

them". [Cf. however, S. D. Luzzatto’s response to Rashbam, in his commentary ad loc.—the editor.]

20 Continued inquiry into the matter has taught me that there have indeed been reworking processes in the MT, yet they never evince any degree of consistency (the same applies to the many text reworkings in the LXX). Presently, I must limit the number of examples. The text of Chronicles offers us an obvious example. In 1 Chr 9:8 one of David’s sons is called אֶלֶף, whereas in 1 Chr 14:7, in the same list, his name remained בַּלְעֶז. LXX Prov 31:26 opens with the letter מ"מ coming before v. 25, which starts with the letter מ"מ. this order is not due to a corruption on the translator’s part, but reflects the original one in his Vorlage according to the ancient alphabet. It is the MT that underwent corruption. There can be no doubt that the same transposition occurred in the MT of Ps 34. It is accepted that the original order here was: בְּצֵק יֵד (v. 16) מִי הָאָדָם הַמֶּלֶל נִפְרָדָה (v. 17). In these instances, editors of the text arranged the verses according to the order of the alphabet they knew, whereas in Lamentations 2:3; 4 they left the מ"מ before the מ"מ (yet in chapter 1 the מ"מ comes before the מ"מ). The compound מ"מ אֶלֶף, is translated in the LXX κιβοτός διαθήκης κυρίου (Jos 4:10; 11; 1 Sam 5:4; 2 Sam 6:10), but not consistently: in the verse before 2 Sam 6:10 (v.9) we find κιβωτός κυρίου. But in 1 Sam 4:3 the MT has אֶלֶף, and the LXX κιβωτόν τού θεού ἡμῶν. Apparently, both the MT and the LXX present reworking processes that aim at modifying the bold compound מ"מ אֶלֶף but the processes were not completed, leaving inconsistencies. These inconsistencies are of consequence regarding a common apologetical challenge: is one justified in assuming that a certain text underwent reworking when we do not find it in a similar text where it could be expected? And indeed, we must take into account that lack of consistency is a feature characterizing all literary activity in the Orient.

21 In 1 Esdr 1:21–22, Greek text, there is a different addition that evidently follows 2 Kgs 23:25–28.
original כָּנָסִים, which later scribes found objectionable, had not yet been replaced by כָּעָסִים, "and all the abominations". It is not quite clear why the translator used a transliteration for a word as common as כָּעָסִים instead of translating it, and a wrong transliteration at that! Is it possible that he was familiar with both formulae כָּעָסִים כָּמָס "holy objects" and כָּעָסִים כָּעָס "abominations"? Or did the original refer to כָּעָסִים כָּעָס "male prostitutes" and not to כָּעָסִים כָּעָס "holy objects"? This conjecture can be corroborated by the parallel בֹּלְלָי קָרָס/ קָרָס "male prostitutes" in 1 Kgs 15:12, and by the text of 1 Kgs 22:47: וַיָּקְרָס אֶל נַשָּׁה בְּיָאוֹר אָבִי בְּעֵרוֹן אָבָי בְּעֵרוֹן אָבָי בְּעֵרוֹן, "He also stamped out the remaining male prostitutes who had survived in the land from the time of his father Asa" (Cf. 1 Kgs 15:12; 2 Kgs 23:7). Nevertheless, the conjecture does not stand to reason; it is not likely that an editor would replace כָּעָסִים כָּעָס with כָּעָסִים כָּעָס and—what is more—in the MT of 2 Kgs 23:24 we find the word כָּעָס, duly represented in the LXX before the כָּעָס, implying that this last component of the list should function as a recapitulation, a role the specific כָּעָס could not fill. All said, one must admit that the conjecture of כָּעָס in the MT being but a tendentious replacement for כָּעָס could lend us a parallel and a plausible substantiation to Nestle’s well known hypothesis that in Dan 9:27 (cf. Dan 11:31; 12:11) the words כָּעָס כָּעָס replaced an original כָּעָס כָּעָס.

It seems to me that the next example should also be evaluated as a tendentious substitution. The MT of Isa 37:24 reads: וַיָּדֶר כִּבְרָהָה חַפָּת אָצֵּר. The LXX reads: ὀριαὶ δὲ ἀρχισάρων κύριῳ. At no other instance does ὀριαῖος translate “servant”19; and indeed the parallel text in 2 Kgs 19:23 has: κύριος πρὸς θησαυρὸς Μελακέ. Apparently, somewhere between 140 BCE—the date of the Septuagint translation of Isaiah20—and the end of the first century BCE, the word πρὸς was replaced by κύριος, as extant in the MT of Isaiah, seeing that 1QIsv too, has πρὸς, and so do all three late

22 Indeed the word כָּעָס כָּעָס proves that here we do not have an original parallel כָּעָס כָּעָס as in Deut 29:16; Ezek 20:7–8; 37:23.


24 Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, esp. pp. 86–91. [Editor’s Note: I harbor no doubt that Prof. Seeligmann would have corrected this assertion had he lived to see this translation. The relationship between the various text-witnesses should not be conceived as a linear one. Rather a ramification, common in textual stemmata, should be taken into account: the prototype of 1QIsv and the MT could have undergone the modification of כָּעָס כָּעָס long before the year 140 BCE].
Greek translators. The intent behind this change was to prevent the very thought that divine messengers could be sent by Sennacherib. Such a notion could indeed seem possible at first reading of the text in its original form, as is seen for example in a midrash in Num. Rab. 9:30: “And so Sennacherib did not boast before the Lord but by an angel, as we read: ‘through your servants you have blasphemed my Lord ... and I have reached its highest peak’. Thus the Lord did require him by an angel, as is written: ‘An angel of the Lord went out and struck down in the Assyrian camp, etc.’”. It is most fascinating that this midrash, in all its various forms, quotes the text as we have it in Isaiah, דיבר הadvisor, though the version underlying its content is unmistakably the earlier text: דיבר המלך.

Needless to say, the examples adduced in this section by no means seek to cover the entire field. From the nature of the examples and the way of argumentation it is clear that the subject cannot be exhausted here. We have seen that in a number of cases the path to the original text was open only by means of “neglected” textual witnesses (parallel readings or ancient translations) that escaped the corrector’s eye. The nature of the reworking processes here postulated entails that in many


26 S. Talmon remarks that the word כלאך in the Bible is synonymous to the words כלאך (Isa 7:13), כלאך (Isa 30:4) and כלאך (Isa 44:28). He maintains that the word replacements in Isa 37:24 should be regarded as routine, not intentional. He in particular drew my attention to the replacement in 2 Sam 10:2, ירפה, דוב ... וכלאך, ריזו, and in the parallel instance 1 Chr 19:2, ירפה, דוב ... וכלאך. However, the latter argument is based on the wrong assumption, that every text in Chronicles deviating from its parallel has to be a reworking or, for that matter, a later rewording. In my opinion, there is no doubt that here too it is Chronicles that preserves the primary reading which was emended by the scribe who edited the text of Samuel as his went. Examples of exactly the same nature occur in 1 Chr 14:12 versus 2 Sam 5:21; 1 Chr 11:11 versus 2 Sam 23:8; 1 Chr 17:12 versus 2 Sam 7:12. By the same token there is no doubt that in 1 Chr 2:17 is to be preferred over 2 Sam 17:25; and so many more.

27 In my opinion Peters is off the mark in considering the famous word נחלמה in Isa 7:14 as a late (and tendentious) substitute of נחלמה that had been replaced by הבכילה (taking הבכילה “virgin” to stand for זילוי, עין). He maintains that this version appeared in the manuscript from which the LXX translator worked: ἠδεὺσεν ἑαυτῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑωροθείᾳ ἐξελέξατο. See J. P. Peters, “Critical Notes,” JBL 11 (1892) 46–49. Cf. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 119–120.
instances all traces of corrections have disappeared. Thus we have no way of proving now the secondary character of the MT. 28

II

There is a second kind of word replacement, not as tendentious as the previous one, yet it too shows a certain degree of cognizance and deliberation. I refer to the replacing of rare and unknown words by familiar and more frequently used ones. 29

1. We understand the nature of these exchanges when we compare, first of all, parallel texts within the Bible. In 1 Kgs 10:18 we read for example: יִצְפָּהוּ יְהֹוָֽהּ וּלֹא מִפְּשֵׁית whereas the parallel text in 2 Chr 9:17 has יִצְפָּה יְהֹוָֽהּ וּלֹא מִפְּשֵׁית. We see that the latter reading is easier vis-à-vis the former. So 2 Sam 6:16: יחֹוָֽהּ יְהֹוָֽהּ וּלָֽשָֽׂהּ יִתְּנְּשֵֽׁהּ is explained by 1 Chr 15:29: יחֹוָֽהּ יְהֹוָֽהּ וּלָֽשָֽׂהּ יִתְּנְּשֵֽׁהּ. In this type of word replacement the easier reading obtains in most of the cases in Chronicles, the later version. However, again, we cannot state as a rule that in every case the text of Chronicles is secondary vis-à-vis that of Samuel and Kings. So, for instance we may assume that the text in 2 Chr 22:10 וְעָלָ֣ה תִּזְרִ֑יבָּהּ אֵלָ֣ו צְלַ֑מָּהּ precedes in its wording the simpler reading of 2 Kgs 11:1: וְעָלָ֣ה תִּזְרִ֑יבָּהּ אֵלָ֣ו צְלַ֑מָּהּ. Slightly more complicated is the argumentation in the next case. In 2 Sam 7:10 we read: וְלָ֔א יִשָּׁ֖פֵר בַּנָּ֑י שָׁלֵ֖לֶת whereas in the parallel text in 1 Chr 17:9: וְלָ֔א יִשָּׁ֖פֵר בַּנָּ֑י שָׁלֵ֖לֶת. The Septuagint in both cases has τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἀποστόλον. A comparison of

28 The first to develop the theory of tendentious corrections was, as is well known, A. Geiger, in his Uberschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau, 1857). Let me note that none of the examples adduced in this paragraph of my study is brought in Geiger’s book.

29 Regarding the transmission of classical texts Hall writes that there is a strong tendency to substitute more familiar words for uncommon ones, which are “similar in form”, and he brings examples of this phenomenon. See F. W. Hall, A Companion to Classical Texts (Oxford, 1913) 185. However, the decisive factor in biblical manuscripts is precisely the fact that here the similarity in form does not constitute any cause for replacements, and it can be assumed that from the outset that the degree of cognition here was greater than that at work in the transmission of classical texts.

30 However, one should take into account that we deal here with nothing more than a graphical mistake יִוֹרֵ֥ר – which may have been influenced by a subconscious wish to simplify the expression.
the translations of Samuel and Chronicles does not favour the assumption that in
this case one translation influenced the other, so we are entitled to posit that
is the original version in both texts. True, it is not all that obvious how the version
derive from לilitating. At face value the contrary would seem likely. However,
a number of important manuscripts, and several old editions, have
לilitating. Moreover, as attested to in b. Ber. 7b this was the version extant in the school of
Sura in the third century BCE: ה רצ ה חינ לֵנוֹת כות ה לֵנוֹת. הָחִיא לֵנוֹת
לֵנוֹתק לֵנוֹת “Rav Huna queried: it says to oppress and it says to annihilate, at the
beginning to oppress in the end to annihilate.” The very same textual change is
known to us from Job 21:13: יָלָחֵלָל בָּשָׂר כִּי מִית. It may very well be that the
reading לֵנוֹת—even though it is the easier one—preceded לֵנוֹת. In this case
לֵנוֹת לֵנוֹת, but we are unable to state whether this was a
tendentious or routine change.

In my opinion, there is another interesting example of word replacement meant
to facilitate the reader’s understanding. It comes to light, again, through a
comparison with a parallel text. At face value the case is somewhat odd, since the
replacement originates from a misunderstanding. Yet, to my mind, there is no
doubt that we are dealing with a case of word replacement. I refer to Ps 136:17–18:
לֵנוֹת לֵנוֹת נֶלְכָּה לֵנוֹת כִּי לֵנוֹת נֶלְכָּה. וְיָרָה לֵנוֹת אֱלֹהִים כִּי לֵנוֹת נֶלְכָּה.
The disturbing repetition of “kings” grates on the ear, even in a psalm rather poor in artistry
(similar examples are Sir 36:17 and Prov 8:16 which will be dealt with shortly).

Psalm 136, as is well known, paraphrases and enlarges on Ps 135, most specifically
on vv. 8–12. Ps 136:19–22 is verbatim identical with 135:11–12. Now, before these
verses, in 135:10, we read פֶּרֶס וַתֵּשָּׁמֶה יִּשְׂרָאֵל לְכִלָּם אֱלֹהִים
(nations/kings) could strengthen our doubts regarding the authenticity of the
repeated “kings” in Ps 136. Here we have to remember that the biblical vocabulary
had a noun לֵנוֹת with the rare meaning of “kings”. This sense of the word לֵנוֹת is
corroborated by a threefold tradition: several of the Septuagint translators render
אָלָמִים (Gen 27:29; Isa 51:4) or ἁρχοντες (Isa 34:1; 41:1; 43:4; 9); the
Aramaic translations of the books Genesis and Isaiah (though not in other books)
interpret לֵנוֹת; this tradition also underlies the known midrash on Gen 25:23 (b.

On R. Huna’s way to explain inconsistencies between various sources see W. Bacher,
Agada der Babylonischen Amoräer (Strasbourg, 1878) 54ff., esp. p. 56, n. 15.
'Abod. Zar. 2b): This threefold tradition has its roots in the living use of the biblical language, seeing that in Ps 148:11, for example, we read: מלבות אלים ממלכת אלים with meaning "reign". It seems that this being so, we may assume that in Ps 136:17 the original reading was ממלכת אלים, completely parallel to 135:10: שמה נוח רמב (andelot): One of the scribes, however, understood the word ממלכת in its rare meaning of "kings", and thus replaced it by the simpler word מלכים, but this intervention in the text was based on a mistake. 33

2. In a number of instances the ancient translations, and especially the LXX, are based on rare expressions, which in the MT have been replaced by more familiar words. These instances are of special interest in those cases in which, most of the times, reconstruction would not be possible unless we surmise a certain misunderstanding on the translator's part. Here are a few examples. MT 1 Sam 1:15 reads: וַאֲמִרֵךְ קָשָׁה וַרְזֵךְ וְאֵיךְ נַפְלָה (דַּלּוּשׁ), and in the LXX γυνῇ ἡ σκόληρον ἡμῖρα ἠγάλεν ἐγείμι. It is obvious that the translator worked from a text that still had the compound קָשָׁה וַרְזֵךְ in which the meaning of the word מָשָׁה is not the regular one ("day") but the rare meaning of "breath". 34 This assumption throws light on the compound מָשָׁה in

32 Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 51. There I did indeed show the parallel לְמִלְכָּה לְמִלְכָּה (e.g. Gen 17:6). However, the conclusions that derive from the fact that in the Bible one word (לְמִילְכָּה) is used to denote both מָשָׁה and מָשָׁה, and their significance as to the way the king and his attitude toward the people were conceived of, still have to be investigated.

33 Gunkel in his commentary on Ps 136 (p. 578) relies on a suggestion made by Gressmann (in a letter), correcting the reading to לְמִילְכָּה, which Gunkel accepted without offering any argumentation.

34 It is interesting that Philo of Alexandria sees ἡμῖρα as the feminine form of ἡμῖρος, thus Hannah is the "gentle and tender". He adds a long Hellenistic homily regarding the quality of tenderness, a homily in which he even quotes Hesiod; see Ebr. 36, 149-150.

35 Both Assyriologists and biblical scholars have tried to detect elsewhere this rare meaning of umu = וּינוֹ. In the Bible it seems to obtain in Cant 2:17, 4:6, and perhaps also in Isa 27:8; cf. P. Ruben, Recensio et Restitutio (London, 1936) 269, 481.
Job 30:25 where the picture is one of a man whose breath is stuck. Thus, in the MT of 1 Sam 1:15 the word רוח has the meaning of “breath” and not “state of mind”! Jer 2:24 has has הָעָרָה יִנָּאוֹת, the LXX has: εἰς τὸν θαπτωμέαν σώματι εὐφράσουσαν σώμαν. We know that in the LXX ταπτωμέαν is the common translation of the root רוח. There is no doubt that our translator had a hard time translating a pre-MT נועה that seemed to go with נועה, “her conjugal rights” in Exod 21:10 and strengthens the traditional explanation of the term there. The Hebrew formula in Sir 13:19, אַפְאָל אֱוֵרָה מָרָה מִבְּרֵב, is represented in the Greek translation by κατάγει κολονάν οὐσίαν εἰς ἐρήμῳ. The words κατάγεις— εἰς stand in the LXX for: רוח and רוח רוח, “hunter” (Gen 10:9, 25:27). Clearly, the translator of Ben Sira worked from an older text: רוֹחַ אַרוֹר אֵרָה מָרָה. Whoever replaced the word רוח, in the Hebrew text, by the simpler מַפְלָכָל—in the Hebrew text of Ben Sira such changes are particularly frequent—had a better understanding of the text than the Greek translator who confused here the words רוח and רוח, two words whose root relation is very doubtful.  

---

36 In his commentary to Job 30:25, Tur-Sinai adduces as a parallel the text of 1 Sam 1:15, but he construes it differently. See N. H. Tur-Sinai, The Book of Job (Tel-Aviv, 1953-4) (Hebrew).

37 We know the Sages’ sayings regarding מעון of the Torah: b. Ketub. 47b; (cf. also with R. Akiba’s dictum: מעון זה המיחש נוחית מעון, b. Sanh. 65b). It is interesting that alongside this tradition there is a different interpretation, according to which מעון has a “dwelling place” from מעון (Menahem in his Malhevet; the Rashbam claims this is the מכות (‘plain meaning’); cf. the Qaraite interpretation: A. ben Elijah Nicomodeo, Sefer Keter Torah (Gӧsloew [Yevpatoria], 1866-1867): מעון יד והנה. This is how the LXX translates מעון in Isa 13:22. It seems that this is the right explanation for מעון (Mal 2:12). See G. R. Driver, “Confused Hebrew Roots,” in Occident and Orient: Gaster Anniversary Volume (London, 1936) 73–83, at pp. 80–82.

38 The readings annotated in the margins also point in this direction: שָׁלָל instead of שלל (32:13); instead of מְלָכָה (33:10); instead of מִלְכָּת (38:3); and many more such. [Editor’s note: After the publication of this article in 1956, the Hebrew reading וביה turned up in MS C.]

39 E. Ben-Yehuda in his dictionary has two separate lemmata for מַפְלָכָל, in my opinion rightly so. The LXX translated מַפְלָכָל ἐπιστῆται and in Job 38:41 βοῶν “provisions”, “food”. Only in Ps 131(132):15 is there a mistake, as in Ben Sira, where they translated מַפְלָכָל (בַּיִת אֵבֶר) שָׁלָל.
The word replacing and translation in the next instances is of greater consequence. The MT of 2 Sam 7:12 reads: הקומת וא ובר עונר, and the LXX renders δος ἐστοι εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν σου. In such a literal translation the choice of the word ἐστοι to translate העי is surprising. Therefore the diverging version in 1 Chr 17:11: "one of your sons" is of special significance. We are actually justified in saying that the word היה here is attested by two witnesses: the MT in Chronicles and the LXX in 2 Samuel. The parallel use of היה and העי is also known from another instance; we cannot deny the affinity between מלכים ומר זכר (Gen 17:16) and שמות ומות (Gen 17:6). We may assume the existence of a verb היה with the meaning of "issue forth". This particular meaning was apparently no longer in use, and the need was felt for a substitution of that expression. This need was met in two distinct ways: in 2 Sam the root היה was replaced by עי, in 1 Chr היה remained untouched, but was replaced by העי. In another context I discussed an echo of a rather interesting word replacement. The MT of Isa 66:9 reads: יהי איש ארצי ולפיי אתרי. The LXX renders εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας μου εἰς πόλεις πάσας. It seems that the translation (which is rather literal in our chapter) derived from איש, "hope for". However, it is exactly a hypothesis of this kind that forces us to look for a Hebrew Vorlage of the words κοινωφείας μου literally translated. Now, in v.7 we read: שֵׁם אָדָם לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם אֱלֹהִים. The expression שֵׁם אָדָם לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם suggests that the translator who wrote in v.9 שֵׁם אָדָם worked from a text that had a form derived from this שֵׁם. I tend to presume that biblical Hebrew had a term שֵׁם כַּכְּרוֹב meaning "giving birth to a living baby", very much in the same way as

40 On היה as a basis for an interesting, though somewhat bold, theory regarding the Tetragrammaton, see P. Ruben, Recensio, 98.

41 A philological comparison of the instances in 2 Sam 7:12 and 1 Chr 17:11 by no means bears out von Rad's conclusions who wants to find an intentional theological twist here in Chronicles: "Die Gültigkeit der Verheissung ist sichtlich für eine viel fernere Zukunft ausgeweitet." See G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes (Stuttgart, 1930) 124.

42 Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 62.
the later form הפלבור conceived. So we may surmise that the original text was לארוניך, “shall I bring on labour” and you shall not give birth to a living baby”. The words of the MT are no more than a clarification of the rare expression.

3. Many examples of word replacement are extant in IQIs; it seems that at least some of these replacements are intended to explain difficult words to unlearned readers. As such we should, perhaps, evaluate the following: in 13:10 we read: כי השפתי אל אלהי אזור, instead of הבאר את עשתו אל אזור; and 47:2 השפתי יבשל ואמר, instead of הבאר את עשתו אל אזור, in the MT. More fascinating and of even greater importance is the example in Isa 9:16. In the scroll we read: לכל דבר אל יהוה ארתי יתPrivateKey[1] in the MT, instead of הבאר את עשתו אל אזור, in the MT. In this case there is no doubt that the MT preserved the correct text, whereas the reading of the scroll smoothed over the MT. Already about sixty years ago F. Perles maintained that in the expression אל יהוה ארתי, the word יתPrivateKey[1] derives from the Arabic اسم—meaning “to spare.” He also drew attention to a similar case in Sir 36:17-18 (Segal ed., pp. 11-12). The Hebrew there has: והם אל פנים, instead of הבאר את עשתו אל אזור, in which the

43 The similarity between the conjectured הפלבור and the Mishnaic הפלפיל would be even more conspicuous if we could follow Ehrlich in a number of passages (Gen 17:14; Jer 20:15; Mal 1:14) and interpret רכ as not as “male” but as a “viable infant.”

44 The explanation suggested here presumes a rather extreme alteration due to the reworking of the MT. In a future study I hope to be able to demonstrate that reworking and modifications of this kind did indeed take place in the MT.

45 In a conversation we had already in 1950, the late Professor Cassuto expressed his belief that many of the features characterizing IQIs should be explained as a tendency to simplify the text for the understanding of the masses. This opinion also is at the root of E. Y. Kutscher’s studies of this scroll.

46 F. Perles, “Notes critiques sur le texte de l’Ecclesiastique,” REJ 35 (1897) 63-64. The primary meaning is, probably, “lifting up”, and in metonymy, “to have pity”, which was taken from the gesture of a mother lifting up her child to her bosom or in her arms. And perhaps Prov 13:9, 18, 23, should be explained according to this meaning: “will go up”. In any case this meaning is preserved in Ps 89:43: יתPrivateKey[2], i.e. “you have caused the enemy to have the upper hand”.
double opening rather disturbs the ear. The Greek renders the passage using two different verbs: ἐλέησεν and σικτήρησεν, whereas the Syriac translates the first as ḫêt. In front of the Greek translator there still was the variegating version: השנה על עס הרוח על קרית קרוש. He did not understand the שנה, which was later removed from the Hebrew version.

It is not unlikely that in another instance in Ben Sira the Greek translator misunderstood the reading of the קדש in this sense. In Sir 13:12(15) we read in the difficult Hebrew version: מִן מֵאֲרֵי שָׁמָיִם, על נפש רבי קרוש קרש. The Greek has οἱ παντελῆμεν ὁ μὴ συνεργάζων λόγους καὶ οὐ μὴ φεισάται περί κακώσεως καὶ δεσμών. It is quite clear that in this translation καὶ οὐ μὴ φεισάται stands for αλά יתני. One should therefore ask whether οἱ παντελῆμεν (λόγους) is a more original duplicate for this expression and comes to translate mutually 알仞行政部门 and a wrong reading of שמה אל שמה. We should assume that in the Hebrew original קדש and קדש are doublets. We should assume that in the Hebrew original קדש and מִן are being an explanation of מִן. If so, the original version should be מִן מֵאֲרֵי שָׁמָיִם, from which derived the Hebrew exchange מִי יתני מֵאֲרֵי שָׁמָיִם and the Greek οἱ παντελῆμεν (= שמה). It seems that the Septuagint translator of Isaiah still knew the root המה = שמה.

In Isa 59:2 MT we read: מִן מֵאֲרֵי שָׁמָיִם, from which derived the Septuagint has: καὶ διὰ τὰς ὁμορραγίας ὑμῶν συμπετρεῖτε το πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐρήμων τῷ μὴ ἔλθεισκα.

---

47 It may well be that the translation οἱ παντελῆμεν λόγους was influenced by the wish to describe the observer of the Torah as pious, and he who does not as wicked. There is no doubt that such a tendency influenced the interesting variant τῶν λόγους σου in ms 253, which is also reflected in the ancient Latin translation: verba tua.

48 The postulate that in the manuscript of Ben Sira מִן מֵאֲרֵי is an explanation of מִן מֵאֲרֵי (in both m. Sota 9:2 and Sipre 207) is strengthened by the tradition ad Deut 21:4, which can be applied to a cruel person.

49 The end of this verse in the Septuagint reads: περὶ κακώσεως καὶ δεσμών. It seems that there is a confusion here between וַיִּשָּׁר and וַיִּשָּׁר עֹשֶׂה, in a way similar to the explanation the Talmudic tradition (b. Sanh. 103b and others) is inclined to offer for the suspended וַיִּשָּׁר עֹשֶׂה in Job 38:13, 15. I believe we should read וַיִּשָּׁר עֹשֶׂה. If this is the case the verse contributes to the deep psychological contrast between the well off and the poor as expressed in the book of Ben Sira, a contrast so well depicted by Victor Tcherikover: 'לְעָם פֶּסְקָרָאָבֶר לֶא יְדֵוֶת הָדוֹרִים הַיֵּשׂוּ בַּחֲמָס הַהֲוֵה הָלוֹסֶסָה, (לְאילַמְּבְּדִ וָרָּד) 192–187. [Engl. Transl. by S. Applebaum: Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews (Philadelphia, 1959) 145–151.]
It is well possible that the last words יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ translate (the conjectured misreading being sustained by the rarity of the verb in this meaning and the influence ofnishmat at the end of v.1).

From a graphical point of view the conjectured exchange is completely identical with the mistake in 2 Kgs 20:13: יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ, the correct version of which we read in Isa 39:2.50 Most interesting is the fact that the midrash still knew exactly, without a trace of doubt, the meaning of יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ, seeing that in Gen. Rab. ad Gen 25:19 we find: יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ אַחֲרֵי מֵדָא אָרָא אָמַר שִׁיסַּנְיָא מְשִׁים: יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ אָרָא אָמַר שִׁםָא מְשִׁים.

The very same idea that the son who studies the Torah is expressed in a midrashic extant in Yal. Mechiri to Prov 23:24,51 but unlike the midrash in Gen. Rab., which is based on Prov 23:15, in the Yal. Mechiri we are referred to Prov 27:11: יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ. However, precisely this midrashic use of the same root יָכֹּלְךָ כַּלָּמֵּךְ in two different instances testifies to the strength of this exegetical tradition, which explained the root as “filling with pity”.

4. We shall end this series of examples of word exchanges with two additional instances. True, in the first case we have to admit to a degree of uncertainty, whereas the second is totally unacceptable. Perles, in his day, wanted to enter the word תֵּירָא (Aramaic תֵּירָא = justice) as a lemma into the biblical dictionary, based on the assumption that copyists who had not understood it had replaced it by the frequently used תֵּירָא, land.52 One of the few instances in which printed Bibles, even modern ones, offer textual variants that affect the meaning is Prov 8:13–16: יִכְּלַלְתָּם בְּרֵאשִׁי הָיָה חַיָּיו, בְּרֵאשִׁי שָׁרַע רוֹאֵית הָיָה חַיָּיו. This is the reading in many manuscripts and proofread editions, whereas others have תֵּירָא instead of the second תֵּירָא (thus avoiding the harsh repetition). And this, apparently, was the text underlying the Greek translation: τὸ πόνον τὸ ἐκ τῆς παραδοσίας γίνεται; in the Targum,

50 To the interchange of the gutturals in general, and תֵּירָא and תֵּירָא in particular, I hope to address one of my future studies in the history of the biblical text.


52 F. Perles, Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments (Leipzig, 1922) 34. It seems that the primary meaning of עֵנָי in Akkadian and Hebrew is “to stretch” (so according to Perles still in Ps 68:32). Thus we have here a transfer from the concrete to the ethical denotation, a transfer exactly parallel to that of עֵנָי in Hebrew; cf. also הַנָּשָׁה (Amos 3:10)).
v.15 ends מלחטך ידני ותרצווה, טשרו אנא מְשִיחַךְ וַעֲקַדְתָּחָם. In other words, this translator may well have had in front of him two synonymous words for "righteousness", something we would certainly expect given the structure of the two verses! Therefore I wondered whether in the second verse the original text was זָכַרְךָ וְשֵׁם תְוִי (Targum חַזְרָא תָּרוּא מֶשֶךְ), from this version both textual variants could derive: זָכַר a mere erratum, and זָכַר זָכַר as replacing a very rare, incomprehensible word. This solution, however, might be too much of a guess. (Perles’s other examples for the existence of the word זָכַר in biblical Hebrew are far from convincing!). Plausibly we have here no more than the influence of the word זָכַר, appearing at the end of v.15, on v.16, which originally had זָכַר וַעֲקַדְתָּחָם (and the Targum only tried to diversify the rendering of the double זָכַר, זָכַר, which it already read in both verses).

The second example as well ties in with a conjecture suggested by Perles, yet of a different nature. In MT Job 7:12 we read: דִּים אַנִי אָמְתָּךְ יִנְעָךְ עַל מִשְׁרָמָה. Perles postulates that a mythical figure was mentioned here as parallel to נְעַם and that the opening of the verse actually had: יחֵדְהוֹנָה יָא, but scribes who failed to understand the mythical meaning of יחֵדְהוֹנָה replaced it by דִּים אַנִי. I deem this hypothesis totally unacceptable, seeing that in Job 26:12 הוא יס stands parallel to וַדִּים as a mythical figure par excellence. Moreover, nowadays the Canaanite-Phoenician material has proven beyond doubt that the word הוא is used in the Bible more than once as the proper name of the god of the sea and abyss.

The series of examples adduced in this section, being based on different text witnesses, proves, so I believe, that the replacing of one word by another in order to facilitate the understanding is a fact that can hardly be doubted. On the other hand, the last examples have shown that in certain instances our assumptions are no more than guesses, most specifically so in those cases in which no parallel text, or ancient translation or manuscript confirm that a word has indeed been replaced. Besides, even in this section it was not easy to determine the degree of calculated intention underlying word replacements. S. Talmon drew my attention to the possible existence of an additional category of replacements in which there is still

53 Perles, Analekten, 102.
less tendentiousness, i.e., when an unconscious adjustment is made to the vocabulary typical of the idiom of a certain public or group or of a particular sect. Such an adjustment may have left its stamp on the Samaritan Pentateuch. However, this possibility is the topic of a distinct study which he is dealing with, therefore this is not the place to go into it.

III

( Ibn Ezra in his long commentary to the book of Exodus, introduction to ch. 20)

A large part (I would say the majority) of the examples for the phenomenon under discussion originates from a mechanical replacing of a word or expression by a synonymous noun, and in this realm too cases of misunderstanding are not infrequent. Since these routine replacements are such a recurring phenomenon, their presence is not limited to the transmission of the biblical text alone. Their frequency and relevance are proven by the following two instances taken from extra-biblical material. A case in point are the questions asked in Muslim tradition regarding the reading of those passages in the Koran which, though identical in meaning, are formulated in different ways. The essential answer is attributed to Ibn Mas'ud: “I have heard the readers of the Koran, and have found them very similar to each other (even in those cases where their versions diverge from each other), therefore read as you know! And to what should we compare it? As if you were saying halumma or ta'ali (and the meaning of both is one and the same: “come hither”). Yet this routine replacing may often be of consequence regarding the implication of the issues under discussion, as a further example, taken from a completely different context will prove. According to t. Hag. 2:5 (and so in baraitot in b. Hag. 15a; y. Hag. 2:5) R. Joshua, on hearing of the cosmic speculations of ben Zoma, tells his pupils: “ben Zoma is already out (מכחט); shortly after that ben Zoma passed away.” In Gen. Rab. 2:4 we read the same tradition in a slightly different formulation: “R. Joshua turns and tells the pupils: ben Zoma has gone;

55 So according to I. Goldziher, Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung (Leiden, 1920) 34.
and no more than few days went by and ben Zoma was in the better world (בּוּלֶז)." The replacement of the expression, done inadvertently, does away with the vein of mysticism present in the main text: "ben Zoma is already out (מְבִיתו)."

It is obvious that with regard to the biblical text an important cause for this kind of word replacement is the characteristic tendency towards repetitions and duplications through synonyms. We can go as far as saying that the very nature of the biblical style brought about the routine form of this phenomenon. This fact, of course, complicates matters when looking for the beginnings of the process of word replacement, which may have its roots in a period close to the days of the very emergence of the biblical texts. The examples are many, particularly so in parallel passages. However, we must here confine ourselves to a number of cases that are especially significant for the history of the text, or those from which conclusions can be drawn regarding the meaning of scriptures.

From among the examples that we can cull from parallel texts, let me mention only one, with which I dealt once and which has recently been studied by S. Talmon. I defined the verse in Isa 37:18, אֲנָנָהּ הַמְדִירֵי מִלְכוּ אָשְׁרֵי אֵל כָּל אֲדָמָה הָאֲרָבָּמִים, as an inadvertent corruption of the text of 2 Kgs 19:17: אֲנָנָהּ הַמְדִירֵי מִלְכוּ אָשְׁרֵי אֵל כָּל אֲדָמָה הָאֲרָבָּמִים. In the meantime Talmon has shown, by means of a clever comparison of LXX 2 Kgs 19:17, ἐπείγομαι βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίας ταῦ ἐνώ, with IQIs אֲנָנָהּ הַמְדִירֵי מִלְכוּ אָשְׁרֵי אֵל כָּל אֲדָמָה הָאֲרָבָּמִים. Isa 37:18: "True, O Lord, the kings of Assyria have destroyed all the nations", that the MT in both instances was preceded by a stage in which the end of the verse was not yet part of the text. I accept his postulate that sees the words 아ֵל אֵכָל אֲדָמָה as an addition resulting from a misunderstanding (perhaps his theory may even be borne out by the fact that the continuation of the verse comes to stress the futility of the idols and not the destruction of the land). Yet, I have my misgivings as to his assumption that the words המְדִירֵי מִלְכוּ אָשְׁרֵי should be given the same value, as two "independent original wordings". There can be no doubt that the primary text put only one of the two expressions into Hezekiah's mouth! Indeed it is hard to

56 W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tanaiten (2nd ed.; Strasburg, 1903) 424.
57 Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 59-60.
decide which of the two is the original. He thinks that the formula (cf. Isa 60:12) ties in better with what follows; specifically since it is a more difficult version and therefore could have been changed into (Judg 16:24, Isa 34:10; 49:17) rather than the other way round. Maybe the process was that at first the words (as most modern commentators claim according to v. 11 מֵרָאָהּ הָגוֹיָ֥הּ נַחֲלָתֶ֥הָ לַֽהַרְוָיִ֙ים֙, cf. especially 2 Chr 32:14 where Sennacherib says: השרה ההרויים אבניא), The corruption contributed to the replacing of “nations” by “الأئراث, “lands”.

There is an additional instance of routine replacing (made possible, though, by wrong vocalization) whose nature can be understood through a comparison of parallel texts. In Isa 63:5 we read: וּקְרָאֵנוּ לְאֹּתָרֶךָ וּנְפֹךְ וְתֵעָשֶׁת לְרִי דֶּתֶר, whereas in Isa 59:16 יַרְעֵבָה יָדֶךָ וְתַעֲשֶׁה מִיָּחֲרֵדָה יִרְדָּקֵר אִית סֶפֶכֶתָהוּ, it is obvious that the last part of the verses is identical, except for the change of the words which altogether needs clarifying! It was David Yellin who already doubted the correctness of the reading in 63:5; he suggested "and my arm", a rather rare word that parallels ירֶדֶנ קָרָא in the same verse. The very rareness of the word caused it to be misconstrued in another location as well. In Ps 91:4 the last word should be vocalized אָרָבָה, "his arm", but the Massoretes vocalized – we could perhaps say almost inadvertently – אָפָה, “His truth”. This process hands us the key to the two instances under discussion in Isaiah. In Isa 63:5 the rare word אָפָה was corrupted (as Yellin rightly observed) into אָפָה, whereas in Isa 59:16 the same word was pronounced אָרָבָה, which at a

59 D. Yellin, *Hagria Moqra* 2 (1939) 84.

60 Immanuel Loew explained Ps 91:4 to me in a conversation in the summer of 1934.

61 Seeilgmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 67. It should be added that the word אָפָה was still alive in the Hebrew language in later periods as well. The fact is corroborated by the interesting midrash on Exod 2:5 (b. Sota 12b; Exod. Rab. ad loc.): וְעַל תְּשׁוֹלָה אָפָה אָפָה, "The law of the 12th of Tishrei, the 12th of Tishrei."

יזֶהוּ חַיִּים וְנִתְנָה הָאָפָה וְאָפָה וְאָפָה וְאָפָה.
later stage was replaced by דְּרַכֵּה, a corresponding term, which was considered suitable in the context dealing with the heroic war deeds of the Lord.  

In the next three examples, the LXX will come to our aid in reconstructing the texts. The problem regarding 1 Sam 10:13 is quite simple: יִירַל מֵתְנֶהְבָּה רוב אֶת הָבָּה; in the LXX we find: καὶ συνέτελεν προφητεύων καὶ ἐς τὸν βοσκόντων. 63 There is no doubt that the translator worked from a text that still had אתננה, but he did not recognize it as a place name and translated it as a common noun (so in v. 10; 13:3; 23:19; 26:1). The development of the incorrect version in the MT may have been influenced by 9:12, 13, 14, 25. Wellhausen rejects the Septuagint version, considering it a superfluous repetition of information obtaining in v. 10. 64 However, the ancient Near Eastern style does not avoid repetitions of this kind. 65 Besides it is possible that we have here traces of the combination of two different traditions. (At any rate, I am not sure whether the aetiological passages concerning the signs connected with the saying הנֵּמ שָאֵל נְבֵי מֵעָיִם belong to the basic story of Saul’s anointment.)

On the face of it the LXX translation ἐγνώρισθη τὸ στήριγμα τῶν ἀνθρωποτρόπων εἰς ἀναμλήσειν for ὡς ἑαυτῷ κατειρήματι in Isa 33:2 seems difficult. Even taking into account that the translator understood the first words as “their seed was”, to which he freely added, as he was wont, the comment τῶν ἀνθρωποτρόπων, the words εἰς

62 Examples for the affinity between הנֵּמ and דְּרַכֵּה: Isa 48:1; Zech 8:8; Ps 19:10; Prov 11:18. The attribute of דְּרַכֵּה as a quality of the God who fits for His people in the same context: ἔπεθεν דְּרַכֵּה (Isa 59:17); cf. Judg 5:11; 1 Sam 12:7.

63 Note that part of the Lucanian tradition (mss 19, 108) reads εἰς τὸν βοσκόν; apparently this reading does not belong to the older elements in the Lucanian recension. Transliterations (as a substitute for translations) are not limited to the earlier strata in the LXX!

64 J. Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis (Göttingen, 1872) 75. Driver followed suit.

65 This is one of the arguments the late Professor Cassuto never tired of stressing, basing himself specifically on the epic tradition, which is fond of this kind of repetition (also in Greece, for example). Regarding Ugarit, see F. Rosenthal, “Die Parallelstellen in den Texten von Ugarit,” Or 8 (1939) 312ff. Yet, one can by no means deny that in many cases the repetitions result from the fusion of various traditions, the existence of which should be accepted even in those instances where they cannot be told apart clearly enough to reconstruct each of them. We know that in Near Eastern literature it is the standard procedure to combine various traditions, whereas Western or later literatures would select the one and discard the other.
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still seem unintelligible. Here we should remember two points: ἀπολέσσαν and its synonyms stand in the LXX for the root עירן; see, e.g., Job 20:5; Ezek 26:16 (cf. Ezek 32:10; Isa 28:12). On the other hand, ת公共文化 לרבות יבשות וavior, “You inspect him every morning, examine him every minute” (Job 7:18) proves that לברות and לברות are synonymous, interchangeable expressions. That being so, we must assume that the LXX here translates לברות, which is no more than a variant version of the MT לברות; the latter was at the root of all three later Greek translations where we read εἰς τῶς πρωῖς. This fact renders it likely that לברות is the earlier version, though certainty cannot be attained.66

More complicated is the example which has recently attracted much attention. The starting point is Deut 32:43: הרניא נמע וכ ירבעי יקמ; in the Septuagint: εὐφράνθησεν οὐρανοὶ καὶ προσκυνήσατο σὺν πάντες υἱῷ θεοῦ; εὐφράνθησεν Εῶν μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ θυσίατωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ζιγγαλοὶ θεων. ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἕκδικαται. The doublets in the LXX evince to a succession of hesitant interpretations.67 The version of the LXX is now substantiated by fragments found in Qumran, which contain, in other instances as well, readings similar in this respect, to those of the Septuagint, and they seem early and accurate.68 In the case in question the readings diverging from the MT undoubtedly reflect a very early concept. After one of the gods has won a glorious victory, he becomes the object of the veneration of the other gods. This function of

---

66 Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 52 and 68. (It is noteworthy that in Isa 27:3 the translator rendered differently).

67 In Heb 1:6 the quoted text is as follows: καὶ προσκυνήσατο σὺν πάντες ἀγγέλοι θεοῦ; whereas in Rom 15:10 it is εὐφράνθησεν Εῶν μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Editor’s note: This quote has been corrected by the author in an offprint of the Hebrew article.] In the LXX the two traditions were fused together, and each of the two letters in the NT quotes one. Aquila: συνοπλαζότα (TH. συγαλλισθ), Εῶν, λαὸς αὐτοῦ. Many have dealt with the quotes and the tense of the traditions in the Septuagint; regarding the instances in Deut 32:43 and Zech 14:17 see esp. an offprint in Modern Greek: B. M. Vellas, Θεολογία 13 (1955) 137–145; P. W. Skehan, “The Structure of the Song of Moses in Dt. 32,” CBQ 13 (1951) 153–163.

68 The fragments have been published in a preliminary stage by P. W. Skehan, “A Fragment of the Song of Moses Deut. 32 from Qumran,” BASOR 136 (1954) 12-15. An interesting variant, concuring with the LXX was already known from Qumran: יררחו כה דמע יรา ואררביה שאלת (Deut 31:1). Recently, further significant variants have been added: in 32:8, ירבג נמל חמי למסומ בנות לא 32:8, and at the end of 32:43: שלמה זמר (י) LXX).
the pantheon is more than once transferred to the angels, ἅγγελοι θεοῦ or to the heavens (and the earth and their hosts).\textsuperscript{69} It looks as if we are justified in assuming that the MT here remolded the previous description into a new one, removing the idolatrous concept by which gods were venerated. Such a process would, so one could allegedly think, classify this verse with the first paragraph of our study, among the replacements originating with a theological tendency! However, the question arises whether in the present case graphic factors were not more decisive than dogmatic grounds. In any case, the possibility should be taken into account that the fragment of the MT is no more than a mechanical substitute for שמים, ושמים, with being but a graphic corruption of שמים. On the one hand, the interchange between שם and שמים is not at all uncommon in the biblical text;\textsuperscript{70} on the other hand there

\textsuperscript{69} Winter considers Deut 32 a fusion of two poems from different periods (he finds support in stylistic dissimilarities and several readings in the LXX, in v. 16 as well as other instances). The older poem, according to Winter, had לא be before the drastic reworking, whereas in the later poem they are יסראל פנים. The replacing of the primary יד בני יד (v. 43) by יד בני יד of the MT, Winter also explains as an outcome of the tendency to remove misunderstanding in the term פנים. See P. Winter, "Der Begriff 'Söhne Gottes' in Moseled, Dtn 32: 1–43," ZAW 67 (1955) 40–48. The material from the Akkadian, Hittite and Ugaritic literature (II AB VI:44 etc., and III AB) has been collected and worked on by Gaster (who is not mentioned by Winter) on several occasions; see esp. T. H. Gaster, "Psalm 29," JQR 37 (1946–1947) 55–65. Let me note in this connection that the question of which Hebrew phrase is concealed behind שים פנים שמים פנים θεοῦ is of utmost importance. The fragment from Qumran reads here ולל ושם נושאת and perhaps at one time the text was: ושם ולל ולל ושם נושאת שמים, so too conjectured by Skehan. ושם signifies the praise and glory given to the Lord; see Ps 29:1 (in a Canaanite text, probably according to the primitive conception that the very singing of a god’s praise adds to his power). I deem the expression שמים פנים in 2 Chr 30:21, to be early; the LXX reflects it also in 2 Sam 6:5 (ם פנים) and cf. 1 Chr 13:8 (ם פנים) and in 2 Sam 6:14\textsuperscript{\textasteriskcentered}. We should add Ps 68:35; 96:6 (1 Chr 16:27). According to the ancient conception, the gods, the angels or the heavens paid homage to the Lord. However, with the changing of outlook, the praise was transferred from the Lord of Israel to the people of Israel. In the Sipre to our text (paragraph 333) we find the two concepts side by side: "In the future, when the Lord redeems Israel, the nations show Him their wrath … Another homily: in the future the nations will praise Israel." What follows is interesting: "and so will heaven and earth as is written: ונה כולם את השם: ונה כולם את השם: and in Mic 4:1–2: ונה כולם את השם. It is the nature of differences and nuances to fade with time; see: L.
are other instances with an affinity to Deuteronomy 32, in which we may assume the graphic corruption  תמשיט וסוס. We note that a central issue in Isaiah 34 is Edom’s standing for all the other nations of the earth (vv. 2, 5–6). In a seminar on prophecies against the nations, which I conducted at the Hebrew University in 1951/52, I postulated that in this prophecy an original Assyria or Babylon may have been replaced by Edom, when the latter became the symbol of an ungodly empire. At any rate, I hardly doubt that the original version in Isa 34:5 was ירהו התמצית, והנה לקום רדה. Both context and logic demand this assumption. However, a text even closer to Deut 32:43 obtains in Jer 10:10: והאלים אתו והוה. The harsh expression and the deficient parallel at the end of the verse bring to mind that the original version was: כמסור ואלך מהרר אלו יכלו עמר. It seems to me that the parallel instance (Joel 2:10) greatly confirms—almost to the point of certainty—our conjecture regarding Jer 10:10. Now, if we are right, we must posit here too, the triplefold course: אל כיידי שמם, which was mechanically replaced by גיימ, as we have assumed for Deut 32:43.


As to the problems regarding Isa 34–35 see W. Caspari, “Jesaja 34 und 35,” ZAW 49 (1934) 67–86; J. Muilenburg, “The Literary Character of Isaiah 34,” JBL 59 (1940) 339–365. The juxtaposition of all the nations to Assyria characterizes the prophecies of Isaiah, and in spite of K. Fullerton, “Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah’s Hopes for the Future,” JBL 41 (1922) 1–101, there is no doubting their authenticity: Isa 8:9–10; 14:25–26; 17:12–14; 29:7–8; 30:28, 31 (cf. regarding Babylon Isa 13:4). The origin of this identification lies in the construction of the Assyrian army, being composed of auxiliaries from different nations (see especially Ehrlich’s fitting and tasteful comment on Isa 8:7, with a comparison to Josh 3:13). An interesting contribution to the understanding of the process in which Edom inherited the function and the characteristics of the anti-godly Empire in prophecy has recently been made by Rudolph who pointed out that in the Peshitta of Chronicles, Edom always appropriates the place of Aram, even in instances that explicitly mention Damascus; see W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher (HAT 1, 21; Tübingen, 1955) VII (2). This development requires further study.

This question poses itself: perhaps this replacement of ידים (which is rooted in a mistake) by ידים has bearing to more comprehensive problems. It is well known that in the study of the Psalms one of the focal questions concerns the identity of the “I” (is it an individual or a congregation?) and the nature of the enemies of this “I”. On occasion, in a psalm in which the “I” seemingly refers to an individual and the enemies are described as
I am inclined to find an explanation for other biblical texts as well by means of this combination between an *erratum* and a routine word replacement. In Hos 5:1 the MT reads: שמעו אתならばים והקרוב בוו ישראלים ויהוה המלך האתונ ויכך הממשות. “Hear this O priests, attend, O House of Israel, and give ear, O royal house; for right conduct is your responsibility!” Many have stumbled here upon ישראלים, and rightly so. Its place between רבי המלך האתונ and שמעו ... וה바נים ...นาม and raises doubts, nor does it fit in with what follows: הממשות (whether we explainlemen as a predicate: you must vouch for the execution of law in the country, or as an object: you especially will be hit by the Lord’s judgment). However, when speaking about the population of the Northern Kingdom, Hosea intermingles the compounds ישראלים (Job 5:9) and ישראלה בות familiar with ישראלוות (11:12: 1:6:). This being so, would it be too bold to posit that ישראלה in the MT is but a routine substitute for ישראלי being a mechanical corruption of ישראלי? Such an expression would be very much in place between ישראליות and רבי המלך; (and what follows—יכך הממשות—should then be the predicate: the three functionaries mentioned here are those who maintain justice in the country). Such a hypothesis entails a rather interesting conclusion regarding the possibility that the Northern Kingdom on the eve of its fall knew ישראלה as officially titled being hostile to this individual (not necessarily the king’s enemies, as de Wette and Birkeland take it!), the קיים are suddenly mentioned. So we read in Ps 56:6-8: על כל המחטב ... עקרת máy' ... עקרת ים ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרת ימין ... עקרק...
office-bearers; it is obvious, however, that such a conclusion holds a great degree of uncertainty.73

My next suggestion regarding Jer 17:16 may seem even bolder: און לא אצתי מרטה (אתי רגש, אתי רגש אתי גע שלא הדתיה). In the Septuagint: και οὐκ ἔπιστρέφεται καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκδίδοται. My question is whether it is in the spirit of the biblical idiom to designate a day as און לא אצתי, and does not the Greek translation, which seems rather unintelligible at first reading, point to the right direction to emend and construe the verse: גע שלא הדתיה, as an interpretation to און לא אצתי, which in its turn is a mechanical replacement for און לא אצתי. Jeremiah, however, said here as he did in other instances (18:17; cf. 46:21; Deut 32:35; Obad 13): גע שלא הדתיה, "their day of disaster"!

My intention when adducing the examples in the present paper was not merely to dwell on individual verses in the Bible. I meant to bring to light as far as possible, in the light of methodically classified examples, a factor that was active in the transmission of the biblical text. I would like to conclude by making two fundamental remarks. For the three sections of this article I have chosen examples to which I could append annotations. I may well have been tempted to do so by the natural inclination of a Bible interpreter, who loves to indicate that textual details, which may seem minor to the student, are of consequence to the understanding of the Bible, at times even to the history of religion and thought. However, I have to stress, that in substance the study of the history of the text and its exegesis are two disciplines that may border on each other but are distinct from each other. If we succeed in proving the existence of a phenomenon at work in the genesis of the text, this proof is an achievement in its own right, in no way connected with the results it may have in the field of interpretation. Moreover, in the greater part of the instances I have dealt with I tried to point out the text that I consider to be original. This circumstance too may be somewhat misleading, since at least in a number of cases in the third category—the routine word-replacement—the fact that a replacing has occurred is obvious, but one cannot always state with certainty which was the original version and which the secondary. Accordingly, I have expressed my doubts and hesitations in choosing between לֹא כִּיּוֹם לַיְהוָה (2 Kgs 19:17; Isa 37:18) or between לֹא כִּיּוֹם לַיְיָ (Isa 73 See Mic 4:14 and Noth’s arguments: M. Noth, “Das Amt des Richters Israels,” in Festschrift A. Bertholet (Tübingen, 1950) 415.
Yet, I have emphasized that in my opinion the historian who follows the history of the biblical text is not free to refrain from introducing in each and every case the query: which is the primary reading? There will be instances, perhaps quite a few, where he will be unable to answer the question, or not allowed to prefer one reading over the other. But this inability to choose will always involve an element of surrender due to a lack of knowledge. The fact remains that the Near Eastern tendency towards repetitions, variations, and the preservation of every variant that ever came into being, resulted, already at a very early stage of the history of the biblical text, in the existence of synonymous readings\(^{74}\)—as was the case in other Near Eastern texts—that have continued to circulate side by side. This circumstance renders the possibilities of biblical text criticism—per force, not per choice!—more limited than those prevalent, for example, in the criticism of classical texts, which underwent a stricter selection during the process of their transmission.

\(^{74}\) The term נדנדה איזה (synonymous readings) has been coined—successfully in my opinion—by S. Talmon.