



Electronic Thesis & Dissertation Collection

J. Oliver Buswell Jr. Library
12330 Conway Road
Saint Louis, MO 63141

library.covenantseminary.edu

This document is distributed by Covenant Seminary under agreement with the author, who retains the copyright. Permission to further reproduce or distribute this document is not provided, except as permitted under fair use or other statutory exception.

The views presented in this document are solely the author's.

COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SHORTER AND LONGER TEXT

A STUDY OF SIXTY PLUSES FROM THE GREEK TEXT OF JOSHUA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

BY

JULIAN CHIKE

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

2017

APPROVAL SHEET

SHORTER AND LONGER TEXT

A STUDY OF SIXTY PLUSES FROM THE GREEK TEXT OF JOSHUA

BY

JULIAN CHIKE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF COVENANT
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

Graduation Date MAY 19 2017

Faculty Advisor W. Brian Tucker

Second Faculty Advisor David W. Chapman

Director of the Program David W. Chapman

Director of the Library James C. Pakala

ABSTRACT

It has long been observed that the text of Joshua, as reflected in the Greek (OG), is quite different from the Masoretic Text (MT). These differences not only include pluses, minuses, and expansions but also variation in literary sequence. Most scholarly attention has focused on the difference in length between OG and MT; the former being noticeably shorter than the latter. Should the textual variation be attributed to the free creative initiative of the OG translator, or should it be attributed to a later Hebrew revisor who sought to *improve upon* the earlier text form (*Vorlage*)? The answer to this question provides more clarity to the larger question—which text reflects the earlier text form?

Since much scholarship regarding OG-Joshua *vis-à-vis* MT-Joshua has focused the attention predominately on the minuses of OG (or pluses in MT), the aim of the present thesis offers a contribution to the discussion by putting center stage the instances when the OG presents longer readings than the MT. The main question I seek to answer is: What sort of witness is the OG to the Hebrew text in its pre-MT form? That is, how much text-critical weight should be granted to variant readings contained in the OG but lacking in the MT (or lacking in the OG but contained in the MT)? The working

thesis of this study is that the OG more often than not reflects the earlier Hebrew text form.

The first chapter serves as an introduction familiarizing the reader to the problem which gave rise to the investigation as well as the three schools of thought which have hitherto emerged to explain the textual variation between OG and MT-Joshua. Additionally, I provide the reader with an overview of the Greek text and a survey of the ancient witnesses utilized in the course of the textual analysis in order to establish clear definitions and descriptions.

Chapters 2–5 comprise the analysis of the 60 pluses in the OG *vis-à-vis* the MT of Joshua. Each chapter constitutes the particular cause which gave rise to the textual variation—viz., textual error, harmonizations, amplifications, and sundry causes. Within the chapters, a case is made for why a particular plus should be placed in its respective category.

The final chapter functions as a conclusion, which summarizes the findings of the investigation and the corollary implications regarding the text-critical validity of the OG in relation to the MT of Joshua. According to the results of the analysis, when the OG presents a longer reading, about half of the time (on average) the OG will reflect the earlier reading.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my supportive and loving wife, Janelle. Her constant help and encouragement was integral throughout the past three years as I pursued my master's. Additionally, I express much gratitude to my grandparents who generously resolved to invest in my education by covering my tuition and educational expenses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations	x
Greek Manuscripts.....	xii

PART I: INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem: A Shorter Text	2
1.1. History of Research: Three Schools	3
1.1.1. The OG-Shortens School	3
1.1.2. The MT-Expands School	4
1.1.3. The Eclectic School	6
1.1.4. The Need for Further Research.....	7
1.2. Methodology	8
1.2.1. Overview of the Old Greek.....	9
1.2.2. The Greek Text of Joshua	13
1.2.3. Survey of Ancient Witnesses	15
1.2.4. Procedure & Presentation	18
1.3. Qualifications.....	19

PART II: ANALYSIS

2. Textual Error	22
3. Harmonizations	41
4. Amplifications.....	53
5. Sundry Causes.....	63

PART III: CONCLUSION

6. Findings & Implications	82
Appendix A	85
Appendix B	87
Bibliography	90
Index of Texts Discussed	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful for Dr. Brian Aucker who graciously agreed to be my primary faculty advisor for this project regardless of his already full academic plate. I would also like to recognize Dr. David Chapman and his willingness to function as my second reader; often the role of the second reader commences near the busiest time of the semester. Lastly, I extend many thanks to Dr. Jim Pakala for providing quick yet highly detailed feedback regarding format and citation.

Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers.

Unless otherwise indicated, quotations from the Septuagint are taken from *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, © 2007 by the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Inc.

ABBREVIATIONS

General Abbreviations

α'	Aquila's Translation
a.k.a.	also known as
Arm.	The Armenian Version of the Septuagint
cf.	<i>confer</i> , "compare"
ESV	<i>English Standard Version</i>
Eth.	The Ethiopic Version of the Septuagint
frg(s)	Fragment(s)
Gk.	Greek
Heb.	Hebrew
LXX	The Septuagint (also abbr. OG)
LXX- Brenton	<i>The Septuagint Versions of the Old Testament</i> by Lancelot Brenton
Margolis	Max L. Margolis, <i>The Book of Joshua in Greek</i> , Pts. I-V.
Mm	<i>Masorah magna</i>
Mp	<i>Masorah parva</i>
MS(S)	Manuscript(s)
MT	The Masoretic Text
MT ^K	<i>K^etîb</i> reading of the Masoretic Text
MT ^Q	<i>Q^erê</i> reading of the Masoretic Text
N.B.	<i>nota bene</i> , "note carefully"
NETS	<i>New English Translation of the Septuagint</i>
OG	The Old Greek
OG ^A	Codex Alexandrinus of the Old Greek
OG ^B	Codex Vaticanus of the Old Greek
OG ^L	The Lucianic Tradition of the Old Greek

OG ^o	The Origenian Recension of the Old Greek
OL	Old Latin
Passim	Scattered throughout
S	The Syriac Peshitta
Sah.	The Sahidic Version of the Septuagint
s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i> , “under the word”
σ’	Symmachus’ Translation
Syh.	The Syro-Hexapla
T	The Aramaic Targum Jonathan: <i>The Former Prophets</i>
Θ	Theodotian’s Translation
v., vv.	verse, verses
V	Vulgate
viz.	videlicet, namely

Bibliographic and Journal Abbreviations

AB	The Anchor Bible
HAT	Handbuch Zum Alten Testament
HSM	Havard Semitic Monographs
JSCS	Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies
OTL	Old Testament Library
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
SAIS	Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SJOT	Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

Uncial MSS

B — Codex Vaticanus.

B¹ corrections by the original scribe.

B^a B^b B^c corrections by three successive later scribes.

A — Codex Alexandrinus.

A¹ corrections by the original scribe.

A^a A^b A^c A^d corrections by four successive later scribes.

D — Codex Cottonianus.

D¹ corrections by the original scribe or a contemporary.

D^a D^b corrections by later scribes.

E — Codex Bodleianus.

E¹ corrections by original scribe.

E^a E^b later corrections.

F — Codex Ambrosianus.

F¹ corrections by the original scribe

F^a corrections in uncial hands.

F^b corrections in cursive hands.

G — Codex Colberto-Sarravianus.

L — Codex Purpureus Vindobonensis

M — Codex Coislinianus.

N — Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus.

S — Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲛ).

Minuscules MSS

a	(15)	<i>b</i>	(108)
b	(19)	q	(120)
c	(38)	r	(129)
d	(44)	s	(131)
e	(52)	t	(134)
f	(53)	u	
g	(54)	v	
h	(55)	w	
i	(56)	x	
j	(57)	y	(121)
k	(58)	z	(85)
l	(59)	a ₂	
m	(72)	b ₂	(29)
n	(75)	c ₂	(135)
o	(82)	d ₂	(61)
p	(106)		

PART I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM: A SHORTER GREEK TEXT

Turn to any page in the Hebrew text of Joshua using the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). In the critical apparatus, what will be found at least once per page is the siglum > followed by the Gothic letter Ɔ. This designation informs the reader that the particular word(s) as reflected in the Masoretic Text (MT) is (are) absent from the Greek text (OG).¹ In chapter 2 alone, > Ɔ appears fifteen times! Given the high frequency of absent readings in the OG textual tradition, it is little wonder why the Greek text of Joshua attracted much scholarly attention.

Although the generally held consensus is that OG Joshua is approximately 4–5% shorter than the MT,² much more polarized are the explanations proposed which account for the shorter version in the Greek textual tradition (or the longer version in the Hebrew textual tradition). Which textual tradition reflects the earlier text form? Does the shorter OG version of Joshua imply the editorial work of the translator who sought to condense and curtail his translation? Or does the longer MT version of Joshua imply the work of a

¹ For example, in 10:24 after ^aוַיְהִי כְּהוֹצִיאָם we read ^bהָאֱלֹהִים. The superscript letters refer the reader to the critical apparatus which reads: 24 ^a 2 Mss ^bוַיְהִי || ^{b-b} > Ɔ.

² Emanuel Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua in light of the Evidence of the Septuagint,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. The Board of the Quarterly, VTSup 72 (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 387; Kristin De Troyer, “The Battle Against Ai and the Textual History of the Book of Joshua,” *JSCS* 48 (2015): 42.

later revisor who sought expand his copy of the Hebrew? Moreover, what value does OG Joshua have for textual and literary criticism of the Hebrew text?

1.1. History of Research: Three Schools

Since the late 1800s, three schools have emerged which have hitherto sought to answer these perennial questions. I will refer to them as follows: The OG-Shortens School, The MT-Expands School, and The Eclectic School.³

1.1.1. The OG-Shortens School

In his 1886 commentary, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, August Dillmann was the first to disparage the text-critical value of the OG *vis-à-vis* MT, becoming the harbinger of the OG-Shortens School. He argued that all deviations (without qualification) ought to be attributed to the work of the OG translator whose *Tendenz*⁴ was to both shorten and introduce deliberate alterations. Based on this premise, the Hebrew *Vorlage* available to the OG translator was essentially the same as MT in its present form; thus, there would be no need to posit an underlying Hebrew *Vorlage* which differed from the MT. As a corollary, in cases where the OG lacks a reading attested in the MT, precedence should be given to the MT. Following in Dillmann's methodological

³ The ensuing delineation was aided in part by Michaël N. Van Der Meer's chapter surveying the history of research regarding OG Joshua *vis-à-vis* MT Joshua (*Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of Oldest Textual Witnesses*, VTSup 102 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 32–91). However, the breakdown into three schools portrays my own way of conveying the data.

⁴ This is a German term used of discernible tendency or bias in a work of a writer, translator, or redactor.

footsteps were William H. Bennet,⁵ J. E. Carpenter,⁶ Martin Noth,⁷ Max L. Margolis,⁸ and—more recently—Klaus Bierberstein,⁹ Martin Rösel,¹⁰ and Michaël N. Van Der Meer.¹¹ Harry M. Orlinsky notes that Dillmann’s approach “has generally prevailed” in the text-critical analysis of the MT.¹²

1.1.2. The MT-Expands School

In 1914, Samuel Holmes became the vanguard of the MT-Expands School by offering a formidable riposte to Dillmann’s cavalier dismissal of the textual integrity of OG Joshua. Through his meticulous investigation of the variations between the OG and MT, Holmes drew attention to the consistency among the deviations. That is, whenever the MT contained certain words or expressions which were absent from the OG, those same words and expressions were also absent from the OG elsewhere throughout the book. Such consistency, he argued, assumes some sort of systematic reworking or redaction. Although such redaction could, indeed, be attributed to the OG translator, Holmes suggested the variations between the OG and MT should rather be attributed to a

⁵ William H. Bennet, “Joshua,” in Paul Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament; A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text*, vol. 6 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1895).

⁶ Joseph E. Carpenter, *The Hexateuch according to the revised versions*, 2 vols (London: Longmans, 1900).

⁷ Martin Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, HAT, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953).

⁸ Max L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*, I-V (Publications of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation; Librairie orientale Paul Geuthner, Paris 1931-1938).

⁹ Klaus Bieberstein, *Josua-Jordan-Jericho, Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6*, OBO 143 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

¹⁰ Martin Rösel, “The Septuagint Version of The Book of Joshua,” *SJOT* 16, no. 1 (2002): 5-23.

¹¹ Van Der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 523.

¹² Harry M. Orlinsky, “The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua,” *VTSup* 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 188.

later Hebrew editor who sought to improve the earlier Hebrew *Vorlage*—a scribe is more likely to amplify than to shorten.¹³

Accordingly, the OG bears witness to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which reflects the ‘pre-revised’ Hebrew text. Thus, in cases where a the OG lacks a reading contained in the MT, precedence should be given to the OG. In the wake of Holmes’ seminal work, many scholars have followed suit: George A. Cooke,¹⁴ Charles D. Benjamin,¹⁵ Harry M. Orlinsky,¹⁶ Edward A. Chesman,¹⁷ A. Graeme Auld,¹⁸ and—more recently—Emanuel Tov¹⁹ and Kristin de Troyer.²⁰ Below is a table which presents passages often adduced to support their argument. The italicized word(s) in the English translation reflect(s) supplementations to the text.

Table 1.1. Passages where the MT supplements the text

1:2a	עָבַר אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן הַזֶּה	“go over <i>this</i> Jordan.”
1:2b	הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אֶנִּי נֹתֵן לָהֶם לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	“...the land that I am giving to them, <i>to the people of Israel.</i> ”
1:7	לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּכָל־הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה עַבְדִּי	“...to do according to <i>all the law</i> that <i>which</i> Moses my servant commanded you.”

¹³ Samuel Holmes, *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Text* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 3.

¹⁴ George A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua in the Revised Version* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1918).

¹⁵ Charles D. Benjamin, *The Variations between the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Joshua: Chapters 1–12* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1921). This is his University of Pennsylvania dissertation.

¹⁶ Orlinsky, “The Hebrew *Vorlage*.”

¹⁷ Edward E. Chesman, *Studies in the Septuagint Text of the Book of Joshua* (Master’s-and-Ordination Thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1967).

¹⁸ A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua Retold* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998). See his first chapter, “Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts.”

¹⁹ Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua.”

²⁰ De Troyer, “The Battle Against Ai.” 39-53.

1:11	הָכִינוּ לָכֶם צִידָה	“Prepare <i>for yourself</i> provisions,”
4:5	עָבְרוּ לִפְנֵי אֲרוֹן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	“Pass on before <i>the ark of the LORD</i> <i>your God.</i> ”
5:2	מִלֵּא אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁנִית	“circumcise the sons of Israel <i>a second time.</i> ”
6:10	לֹא תִרְיֶעוּ וְלֹא־תִשְׁמִיעוּ אֶת־קוֹלְכֶם וְלֹא־יֵצֵא מִפִּיכֶם דָּבָר	“You shall not shout or make your voice heard, <i>neither shall any word go out of your mouth,</i> ”
13:21	סִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֲמֹרִי אֲשֶׁר מֶלֶךְ בְּחֶשְׁבֹן	“Sihon king of the Amorites, <i>who reigned</i> <i>in Heshbon,</i> ”

1.1.3. The Eclectic School

As intimated by the title, this school neither condones a wholesale dismissal of the textual integrity of OG Joshua (*per* Dillmann) nor asserts that each variation may be attributed to a subsequent Hebrew revisor (*per* Holmes). The methodological wall which divided the previous two schools becomes semi-permeable, as it were, allowing for dynamic reasoning; though some variations may be ascribed to the OG translator, some may indeed be ascribed to a different underlying Hebrew *Vorlage*.²¹ Johannes Hollenberg was the pioneer of this school. Through his systematic investigation of the textual profile of OG Joshua, he concluded that both the MT and OG contain secondary elements.²² Accordingly, Hollenberg was much slower to assume a different Hebrew *Vorlage* behind OG Joshua. In his view, a variation between the OG and MT only reflects a different underlying Hebrew *Vorlage* if the variant cannot be explained by translation technique, inner-Greek corruptions, or a lapse in the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew. Other

²¹ Often recourse to an alternate Hebrew *Vorlage* was the last resort.

²² Johannes Hollenberg, *Die Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth* (Moers: Eckner, 1876).

scholars who have more or less followed Hollenberg's position are Samuel Oettli,²³ H. Holzinger,²⁴ Alexander Rofé,²⁵ and—more recently—Lea Mazor.²⁶

1.1.4. The Need For Further Research

In light of the methodological polarity delineated above, Siegfried Kreuzer rightly notes: "...the question of the source text, namely, whether the transposition of passages mentioned along with the supplements to the text are the result of the activity of the translator's or are derived from the Hebrew source text...must remain open for now."²⁷ It is my hope, therefore, to contribute to this ongoing discussion concerning OG Joshua and its relation to MT Joshua. Whereas much of the scholarly work in this area has focused on the instances where the OG is shorter than the MT and whether the OG likely reflects the earlier text form, my contribution will focus on the instances where the OG is longer than the MT. To be sure, scholars have certainly taken note of and commented on such instances;²⁸ but such analyses pale in comparison to the amount of space that has hitherto been given to analyzing the *shortness* of the OG.

²³ Samuel Oettli, *Das Deuteronomium und die Bücher Josua und Richter mit einer Karte Palästinas: Kurzgefaßter Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments sowie zu den Apokryphen A.2* (München: Beck, 1893), 127.

²⁴ H. Holzinger, *Das Buch Josua* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901).

²⁵ However, he agrees with "MT-Expands School" in more cases than "OG-Shortens School."

²⁶ Lea Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua—Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and its Literary and Ideological Development* (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1994).

²⁷ Siegfried Kreuzer, "Translation—Revision—Tradition: Problems and Tasks in the Historical Books," in *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, SCS 63 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 81.

²⁸ Cf. Holmes, Rösel, and Hollenberg *passim*.

The investigation boils down to this question: What type of witness is OG Joshua to the earlier Hebrew text form (pre-MT)? That is, how much text-critical weight should be granted to variant readings contained in the OG but lacking in the MT (or lacking in the OG but contained in the MT)? In addition to this central question, I hope to answer the following attendant questions: 1) When the OG presents a longer reading than the MT, does it more often than not reflect the original or the translator's initiative to expand? 2) In cases where the OG seems to reflect expansion, what do such additions reveal about the *Tendenz* of the translator? 3) Are there instances when the OG reading may constitute a literary edition discrete from the MT? The working thesis of this study is that the OG more often than not reflects the earlier Hebrew text form.

1.2. Methodology

Before discussing the procedure and presentation for the current study, it is integral for the reader to have a clear understanding of the Greek text as a whole, as well as the Greek of Joshua in particular. One's perception of the Greek textual tradition will greatly influence his/her assessment of Greek variants *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew text. Thus, the following will serve as a brief overview, which will hopefully enable the reader and the author to be on the same page regarding terminology. Additionally, a similar overview will be provided for the various ancient witnesses utilized in the course of this text-critical investigation.

1.2.1. Overview of the Old Greek

The Greek text is most often referred to with the Roman numeral LXX, which stands for ‘seventy.’ This label comes from the Latin title *Septuaginta*, which was derived from the Greek title οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα (“the seventy”) used by second century CE Christian writers.²⁹ The allusion to “the seventy”³⁰ was influenced by the pseudepigraphic Letter of Aristeas (a.k.a. Pseudo-Aristeas).³¹ Although one may still refer to the Greek translation of the Pentateuch as the Septuagint, it is important to clarify that there is no such thing as the Septuagint insofar as it assumes a *homogenous* translational text of the *entire* Old Testament.³² Whether or not the Pentateuch was translated all at once—as espoused by the Letter of Aristeas—the remainder of the Hebrew text was translated intermittently throughout a period of at least two hundred years by several translators,

²⁹ Prior to the second century CE, no definitive evidence has been found which illustrates any Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures referring to itself with this title (Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015], 17).

³⁰ The number was originally seventy-two but was subsequently rounded to seventy in order to bolster the legitimacy of the Greek translation as it would “portray [the translators] as assistants to Moses working centuries later to administer the law (cf. Exod. 24:1–2, 9–11; Num. 11:10–25)” (Jobes and Silva, 23). In light of the translation technique of the Pentateuch, the precise number of translators (70/72) who came from Jerusalem to Alexandria, as purported by the Letter of Aristeas, is likely the work of literary fiction (Fernández Marcos, 42).

³¹ This letter describes how, in the middle of the third century BCE, Demetrius, king Ptolemy’s librarian, asked the high priest to send translators to Alexandria that they might provide a translation of the Hebrew Torah (i.e., the Pentateuch) in Greek. Accordingly, six men from each of the twelve tribes of Israel (seventy-two) were sent to Alexandria. Over the course of seventy-two days, the first Greek translation of the Pentateuch was completed (Jobes and Silva, 18). To be sure, the date of composition, historicity, and purpose of the letter is still considerably debated. For a brief overview of the debate, see Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 39–47. Cf. Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 17–24.

³² Accordingly, for the sake of clarity, I have chosen to refer to the Greek text as the Old Greek (OG).

who translated at different times and places.³³ Moreover, the translation techniques of the putative translators throughout this time period often varied.³⁴

The OG was not the only attempt, however, to convey the Hebrew text in Greek. Three subsequent translators (Aquila, Theodotian, and Symmachus)³⁵ produced their own translations between the second and third century CE. Aquila, translating around 140 CE, employed a very literalistic approach to translation and sought to correct perceived deficiencies in the existing Greek versions. Theodotian, translating during the late second century CE, set out to revise the Greek version to a particular Hebrew text type at the time of his translation. Symmachus, translating around 200 CE, intended to provide a Greek translation which reflected the sense of the Hebrew original, while, at the same time, writing in clear Greek.³⁶ These translators would later be utilized by Origen in his hexaplaric recension. At bare minimum, the differences in each translator's approach reveal that there were divergent views among the Jews—around the 2nd-3rd century CE—about what a translation from Greek to Hebrew should actually look like.

Subsequent to the completion of the OG, deliberate and systematic changes were made by the scribes called 'recensions.' Three main recensions will noted here: the *kaige*

³³ Jobes and Silva, 14.

³⁴ Fernández Marcos, 50.

³⁵ These translators receive the sigla α' , θ' , and σ' respectively.

³⁶ Jobes and Silva, 24–30.

recension,³⁷ Origen's Hexaplaric recension, and the Lucianic (Antiochene) recension. The *kaige* recension was executed in light of two primary factors: 1) the recognition that the Greek text did not accord with the standard Masoretic text (proto-MT) of the late first century CE and 2) the development of new hermeneutical principles which led to new requirements for a translation.³⁸ Besides the signature characteristic of systematically translating the Hebrew כּאִי with καίγῃ, the main objective of this recension was to revise the Greek text in such a way that the reader would not only perceive the *meaning* of the Hebrew Scriptures but would also perceive the *appearance* of its Hebrew reference text (i.e., the surface of the text).³⁹ Despite this, along with other translational characteristics of the *kaige* recension,⁴⁰ it is often difficult to discern which portions of the earliest of OG text have been affected by the *kaige* recension, it is perhaps the most complex of the three recensions discussed above. Thus, Siegfried Kreuzer notes: “[it] is one of the several reasons why it is difficult to get access to the original Septuagint, that is, the so-called Old Greek.”⁴¹

³⁷ The name *kaige* was given to this recension because of its characteristic rendering of the Hebrew word כּאִי with καίγῃ. Regarding the precise date of this recension, the Dodekapropheton scroll of the Nahal Hever would suggest a date preceding the Christian era (Siegfried Kreuzer, “Toward the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint [Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige Recension],” in *The Bible in Greek*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, SCS 63 [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015], 113). Barthélemy dates the *kaige* recension in the first century CE “because of the assumed phenomenon with Rabbi Ishmael’s exegetical rules” (Ibid. citing Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila*, VTSup 10. [Leiden: Brill, 1963]).

³⁸ Kreuzer, “Toward the Old Greek,” 114–5.

³⁹ This is also referred to as the “isomorphic principle.”

⁴⁰ For an exhaustive list of these translational characteristics of the *kaige* recension, see Leonard J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, HSM 28 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 269–274.

⁴¹ Kreuzer, “Toward the Old Greek,” 114. This, to be sure, is only true regarding those which bear the *Kaige* characteristics (e.g., Judges, Ruth, sections of Samuel—Kings, and Lamentations).

Origen's hexaplaric⁴² recension took place in the third century CE, which sought to address the textual differences between the current Greek and Hebrew text.⁴³ seeking to demonstrate the textual integrity of the Greek text with that of the Hebrew.⁴⁴ Utilizing the famous Aristarchean text-critical signs, he marked pluses in the Greek which were absent from the Hebrew text (proto-MT) with an obelus. Additionally, he used the Three (α' , θ' , and σ') to supplement perceived deficiencies. Unfortunately for biblical scholars, this work has not survived the test of time. What remains is the Syro-Hexapla⁴⁵ (i.e., the translation of the Origen's revised text of the Septuagint into Syriac ca. seventh century CE) and a fairly comprehensive collection of hexaplaric readings published by Frederick Field in the late nineteenth century.⁴⁶ This recension is important as it may enable Septuagint textual critics to reconstruct the pre-Hexaplaric text as it would have appeared in the second century CE.

Lastly, the Lucianic (Antiochene) recension, *purported* to have taken place in the fourth century CE,⁴⁷ was an effort to update an existing Greek text with the intentions to

⁴² The term *Hexaplaric* is used because Origen's work consisted of six (*hexa*) columns: 1) The Hebrew text; 2) A transliteration of the Hebrew text in Greek letters; 3) Aquila's translation; 4) Symmachus' translation; 5) The translation of the Seventy [possibly with changes]; and 6) Theodotian's translation (Jobes and Silva, 40).

⁴³ Commenting on Origen's Hexapla, Jobes and Silva note: "[H]is aim was apologetic and in service to the church, to assure that the Greek Old Testament read by Christians accurately represented the Hebrew text known to him" (Ibid.).

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Syh readings follow Paulo de Lagarde, *Bibliothecae Syriacae* (Göttingen: Luederi Horstman, 1892).

⁴⁶ Work is still in progress under "the Hexapla Project" to publish more hexaplaric readings.

⁴⁷ See Kreuzer ("Toward the Old Greek," 126), who argues: "The characteristics of the Antiochene text are not the features of some Lucianic redactor around 300 CE; rather they are characteristic of the original Septuagint from around 200 BCE."

present a ‘full text’ free of omissions.⁴⁸ According to Kreuzer, the minuscule MSS which are identified as Lucianic are 19, 82, 93, and 108.

In light of the foregoing discussion of the origin and date of the Greek text, as well as the various recensions which took place subsequent to its completion, one must exercise caution when referring to the Greek text because, without a careful analysis of the Greek text itself, he/she can make rash generalizations while assessing variants *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew text.

1.2.2. The Greek Text of Joshua

Regarding OG Joshua, three Greek editions exist which will be briefly mentioned here.⁴⁹ First, is the diplomatic edition of Brooke-McLean⁵⁰ whose base text is the oldest extant manuscript, Codex Vaticanus (OG^B).⁵¹ The last two editions are both eclectic: Rahlfs-Hanhart⁵² and Margolis.⁵³ Rahlfs’ edition, although by-passing a comprehensive

⁴⁸ Fernández Marcos, 230. Many of these changes were stylistic. Fernández Marcos notes four main changes: 1) The use of proper names instead of pronouns; 2) Making implicit subjects and objects explicit; 3) Substituting synonyms; 4) Replacing Hellenistic forms with Attic forms (Ibid.).

⁴⁹ The descriptions of these three editions were aided by Cornelis G. den Hertog, “Jesus/Josue/Das Buch Josua,” in *Handbuch Zur Septuaginta: Einleitung in die Septuaginta*, vol. 1, eds. Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Siegfried Kreuzer (Gütersloh: Verlagshaus, 2016), 179–180; and Michaël N. Van Der Meer, “Joshua,” in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. James K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 86.

⁵⁰ Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray. eds., *The Octateuch Part IV. Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, vol. 1 of *The Old Testament in Greek* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1917).

⁵¹ Not only is OG^B the oldest extant MS, it is presumably the closest approximation of what the OG was like as it left the hands of the original translator(s) (Leonard J. Greepsoon, “Iesous,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007], 174).

⁵² Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, ed. Robert Hanhart, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

⁵³ Max L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*, Parts I-IV (Publications of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation; Librairie orientale Paul Geuthner, Paris 1931 [-1938]); Ibid., Part V, Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1992.

critical apparatus, produced a sober eclectic edition which mostly follows OG^B. Margolis' edition in some ways reflects a pre-Göttingen edition of Joshua as he sought to reconstruct the Old Greek by utilizing the same principles for organizing and rating the contents. Although meticulously executed, due to his idiosyncratic system of sigla, his edition is difficult to use—especially for those less abreast with research in the Septuagint. Throughout the course of my analyses, I will interact with all three editions. Methodologically, I will use Rahfls' edition as the point of departure and compare that with Margolis' edition, while interacting with the more accessible critical apparatus of Brooke-McLean.⁵⁴

Most agree that the book of Joshua was translated shortly after the translation of the Pentateuch.⁵⁵ Accordingly, a date between the late third century and early second century BCE has been proposed for the time of translation. In terms of the purpose of OG Joshua, Van Der Meer notes:

“The main purpose of the Greek translation of Joshua should perhaps not be sought in the liturgical needs of a synagogue community, but rather in the political interests both of an ethnic community trying to establish their cultural identity in a multicultural Empire and of rulers of that Empire who sought to maintain a much-disputed part of their territory.”⁵⁶

The last component of OG Joshua pertinent to the discussion is the translation technique of the translator(s). First, we should steer clear of construing translation technique as a deliberate and systematic approach utilized by various translators, since

⁵⁴ This methodological starting point was chosen in light of Michael N. Van Der Meer's suggestion.

⁵⁵ Hertog, “Jesus/Josue/Das Buch Josua,” 178; Kreuzer, “Translation—Revision—Tradition,” 78–9; Van Der Meer, “Joshua,” 88.

⁵⁶ Van Der Meer, “Joshua,” 89.

their translations were more often than not driven by intuition, spontaneity, and the needs of their target audience.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, based on such criteria as lexical equivalence, word order, Hebraisms, etc., one may discern a noticeable translation profile for each book which ranges from very free to very literal.⁵⁸ This range is similar to how we consider certain English translation as “dynamic equivalence” or “formal equivalence”. For our purposes, it is sufficient to simply note that OG Joshua is more literal than free, as it presents a relatively faithful rendering of the Hebrew.⁵⁹

1.2.3. Survey of Ancient Witnesses

Surveying the ancient witnesses is an integral component for textual criticism, as each witness is germane to the textual issues of a given text in varying degrees.⁶⁰ Consequently, the variants contained within a particular witness will fluctuate in their degree of influence based upon the character of the witness itself (e.g., date of composition, recensional activity, translation technique [*Tendenz*], textual affiliations, etc.). Therefore, each witness must be vetted in order to establish proper expectations

⁵⁷ Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993), 66.

⁵⁸ For an in-depth discussion of this criteria of the translational character of a text, see Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 22–31.

⁵⁹ Van Der Meer, “Joshua,” 87; Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua,” 288.

⁶⁰ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 127.

regarding the nature of their testimony as well as the weight ascribed to them in their efficacy to adjudicate in text-critical matters.⁶¹

The Old Latin (OL) translation is a daughter version of the OG, which attempted to produce a faithful rendering of the Greek text into Latin.⁶² It serves as an early witness to a Greek text that reflects a Lucian-like *Vorlage* before later Greek recensions (e.g., *Kaige*) were conformed to a MT-like text form.

The Targumim (T) are comprised of translations from the Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic to accommodate those dwelling in and around Galilee who lacked competence in Hebrew.⁶³ The Targum germane to this paper is that of Jonathan.⁶⁴ In comparison to other Targumim, the translational character of Targum Jonathan is literal and economical.⁶⁵ And based on its overall agreement with MT, the Targum likely shares a

⁶¹ Regarding the texts of each respective ancient witness, the Old Latin derives from Pierre Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, 3 vols. (Remis: Apud Reginaldum Florentain, 1743. repr. Paris: apud Franciscum Didot, 1751). The Targumic readings follow Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Vol. II: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959). The Syriac reflects George A. Kiraz and Joseph Bali, *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation*, trans. Gillian Greenberg and Donald M. Walter, ed. George A. Kiraz and Andreas Juckel (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2015). The Vulgate follows Bonifatius Fischer, I. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, and W. Theile, *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1994). English translations of these texts will reflect my own rendering.

⁶² Although the beginning of this translation cannot be so easily determined, its completion was likely at the close of the second century CE (Eva Schulz Flügel, “The Latin Old Testament Tradition,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø, vol. 1, pt. 1 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996], 645).

⁶³ Paul V. M. Flesher and Bruce Chilton, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*, SAIS 12 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 7.

⁶⁴ Although the Targum to the Prophets is attributed to one author (i.e., Jonathan), each book must be assessed on its own terms (Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 150). Although Flesher (200) espouses a *terminus a quo* of late second century CE, the precise date of this Targum is quite elusive. Despite whatever *terminus a quo* can be determined, it has been argued that the final redaction (i.e., *terminus ad quem*) of Targum Jonathan should be dated no later than 640–41 CE (Samson H. Levey, “The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets,” *Vetus Testamentum* 21, no. 2 [1971]: 192).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 206.

textual affiliation to the MT which became the standard Hebrew text in the late first century CE.⁶⁶

The Syriac Peshitta (S) is a translation from a Hebrew text into the native language of its target audience (i.e., Syriac) around the second to early third century CE.⁶⁷ For the present study, two points are worth mentioning. First, like the OG, the Peshitta was likely translated intermittently by various translators over an indeterminate amount of time. Thus, each book needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Second, like the Targumim, the Hebrew text utilized by the Syriac translators presumably reflects the consonantal text which became the standard (authoritative) Hebrew text in the late first century CE.⁶⁸

Unlike the OL which represents a translation from the Greek Old Testament into Latin, the Vulgate (V) represents a translation from the Hebrew Old Testament into Latin. This translation was undertaken by the Church Father Jerome between 390 and 405 CE, who presumably translated from the Hebrew text that had already become standardized.⁶⁹ Thus, like the Targumim and Peshitta, the Vulgate will customarily agree with the MT. Nonetheless, Jerome may have used other sources (e.g., OG, α' , and σ') to guide his translation.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 149.

⁶⁷ Sebastian Brock, *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*, 2nd rev. ed. (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 17.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 23. To be sure, based upon textual similarities to the Targumim and the OG which differ from the MT, the translators may have also consulted other sources outside of the MT for their translation.

⁶⁹ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 153.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

1.2.4. Procedure & Presentation

As mentioned above, the present study is acutely focused on analyzing the instances where the OG is longer than the MT (i.e., OG pluses). In order to narrow the scope, however, quantitative variations such as the addition of *καί* (e.g., 1:7; 2:1; 7:11) or explication of subjects (e.g., 6:14; 8:16; 10:12) will be excluded from the current discussion. In addition, minimal or no attention will be given to qualitative variations such as lexical variation (e.g., 3:17; 4:11; 7:16), graphical confusion/metathesis of Hebrew words (e.g., 6:19; 7:3; 9:14; 11:2; 17:1), place name discrepancies (e.g., 2:1; 15:49), or pronoun/pronominal suffix variation (4:23; 8:20; 9:5; 24:27c).⁷¹ Lastly, such variations as the transpositioning of passages and paraphrasing will not be addressed here.

Having thus localized the focus, I selected 60 pluses (out of the 100+ observed pluses), which would provide the reader with a diverse sampling of textual variation. That is, I chose some pluses which reflected the addition of one word, some of two words, and some of an entire paragraph. Additionally, I wanted to analyze repeated pluses such as the addition of *πᾶς* (6:5a, 20, 25; 9:3, 27a) and *ὁ υἱός* (3:7, 17; 5:9a; 8:24, 27; 10:10; 21:34).⁷² After an in-depth analysis of each plus, I placed them into one of four main categories:⁷³

- 1) Textual Error; 2) Harmonizations; 3) Amplifications; and 4) Sundry Causes. Each category will constitute an individual chapter of the study. In each chapter, the passages

⁷¹ For a side by side comparison of these qualitative differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts, see *Appendix A*.

⁷² See *Appendix B* for a list of pluses observed but not analyzed.

⁷³ The precise definition of these categories follow the BHQ; see Abraham Tal, “Genesis,” in *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015).

will be presented in sequential order (i.e., 1:2; 3:4; 5:6; etc.). The passages will appear as such:

(1) 2:12 וְעַתָּה הַשְׁבֵּעוּ־נָא לִי בַיהוָה καὶ νῦν ὁμόσατέ μοι κύριον τὸν θεόν

Moving from left to the right, the bolded (1) serves as a numerical tag which indicates that this is the first passage studied within the respective chapter. Next, the reference 2:12 refers to chapter 2 verse 12 of the book Joshua.⁷⁴ In terms of the comparative analysis, the Hebrew text presented reflects the MT⁷⁵ juxtaposed to the Greek which follows Rahlfs.⁷⁶ Lastly, the word(s) shaded in gray indicate(s) to the reader which portion of the Greek text lacks a Hebrew counter-part.

1.3. Qualifications

Before we begin, it is important for the reader to be aware that the evaluation of these OG pluses and their text-critical significance is inherently subjective. Just consider the following: the Hebrew *Vorlage(n)* used by the translator(s) is lost to us; the original autographs of the OG no longer exists; the textual data preserved in 4QJosh^{ab} are minimal; pre-MT (or whatever it was) is nonexistent. Accordingly, one scholar's conclusion may differ markedly from another's; one scholar might consider a certain variant more substantial than the other. Although certain objective criteria and processes exist to allay the inherent subjectivity of text-critical investigations, absolute objectivity remains unattainable. Thus, although I will interact with a variety of scholarly opinions,

⁷⁴ The abbreviated titled Josh. is not added to the reference since it is assumed in the study.

⁷⁵ *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

⁷⁶ Whenever an English translation is provided for the MT, I will follow the ESV unless otherwise stated; similarly, I will use the NETS for OG translations.

the evaluations of the 60 pluses analyzed reflect my own interpretation of the results.

Many might disagree with the conclusions reached in this paper. But, given that new evidence becomes available for the investigation (e.g., more textual data from a hitherto undiscovered Qumran scroll of Joshua), I am willing to allow my conclusions to undergo revision.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Indeed, pluses I at first thought were due to textual error, I realized upon further investigation may have been due to OG harmonization instead.

PART II

ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 2

TEXTUAL ERROR

Textual errors are (unintentional) corruptions of a manuscript that occur at the hands of the scribes (or translators) during transmission or translation. Within this broad category are several different types of textual errors which can either make a reading shorter than the original (e.g., haplography, *homoioteleuton*, *homoioarcton*) or make it longer (e.g., dittography, doublet).⁷⁸ Although other textual errors do occur in the OG (i.e., graphical confusion, metathesis, vocalization error), the focus in this chapter will be concerted towards textual errors which may have given rise to a longer Greek text.

(1) 1:15 | עד אֲשֶׁר־יָנִיחַ יְהוָה ἕως ἂν καταπαύσῃ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν
לְאַחֵיכֶם τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν

This OG plus, which is well attested among the Gk. MSS,⁷⁹ reads “until the LORD *your*⁸⁰ *God* gives rest to your brothers,” while the MT reads, “until the LORD gives rest to your brothers.” Accordingly, the *Vorlage* of the OG translator would have

⁷⁸ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 221–26.

⁷⁹ Gk. MS k omits ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

⁸⁰ OG^B reads κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. However, OG^L as well as MSS FMNΘafhijlsuv(mg) read κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν. Margolis and Rahlfs also support the ὑμῶν reading. The copyist of OG^B likely confused Y with H. If, on the other hand, OG^B reflects the correct reading, the ‘MT Textual Error’ explanation would be weakened considerably.

appeared thus: עד אשר יניח יהוה אלהיכם לאחיכם. Due to the consonantal similarity between אלהיכם and the following word לאחיכם, the MT scribe inadvertently passed over אלהיכם yielding the present MT form: עד אשר יניח יהוה לאחיכם.⁸¹ Thus, what appears to be a plus in the OG is actually a minus in the MT. Not all, however, agree with this explanation; Richard D. Nelson ascribes the OG plus to dittography⁸² on the part of the OG translator.⁸³

(2) 2:13 וְאֶת־אָחִי וְאֶת־אֶחָיוֹתַי καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκόν μου καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς, וְאֶת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר לָהֶם

According to the OG, Rahab implores the messengers to spare her brothers *and all her household*, and all who are with them. The italicized portion is unrepresented in the MT; situated in its place, however, is ‘my sisters’ (MT^Q, אֶחָיוֹתַי).⁸⁴ Although it is difficult to definitively discern which reflects the earlier reading, four suggestions may prove helpful.

- 1) The OG reflects the earlier; the Hebrew phrase וְאֶת כָּל בֵּיתִי was subsequently lost during transmission by *homoioteleuton*⁸⁵—skipping from the וְאֶת כָּל, which would have come before בֵּיתִי, to the וְאֶת כָּל before אֲשֶׁר.

⁸¹ So also Robert G. Boling, *Joshua*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1982), 116; Holmes, 18.

⁸² Dittography is the erroneous doubling of a letter, letters, word, or words. The components that are written twice are not always identical (Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 224).

⁸³ Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 28.

⁸⁴ MT^K, אֶחָיוֹתַי ‘my sister’.

⁸⁵ Homoioteleuton refers to the erroneous omission of a section influenced by the repetition of one or more words in the same context, appearing in an identical or similar way. In these cases, the eye of the copyist jumped from the first appearance of a word (or words) to its (their) second appearance, resulting in the intervening section being omitted from the new text, together with one of the identical elements (Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 222).

- 2) The MT reflects the earlier reading; the Greek translator harmonized v. 13 in light of the immediate context of v. 18—**וְאֵת אֲבִיךָ וְאֶת־אִמְךָ וְאֵת אֶחֶיד וְאֵת כָּל־בֵּית אָבִיךָ**.
- 3) Both the MT and the OG reflect the earlier reading but each lost a different part of the whole phrase which would have read thus—**וְאֵת אָחִי וְאֵת אֶחָיוֹתַי וְאֵת כָּל בֵּיתִי**.
- 4) Neither the OG reading nor that of the MT; both are secondary expansions.

In light of the frequency and proximity of the multiple **ואת** sequence, as well as the dual occurrence of **ואת כל**, I would argue in favor of suggestion #3. That is, the Greek plus arose by MT copyist *homoioleuton* while the MT plus arose by OG translator *homoioleuton*.⁸⁶ Thus, the translator of the OG did not augment his translation to align contextually with v. 18.⁸⁷ Nor can one say, from the perspective of the OG, that the MT copyist added **ואת אחיותי**.

(3) 2:16 עַד שׁוּב הָרִדְפִים ἕως ἀν' ἀποστρέψουσιν οἱ καταδιώκοντες
 וְאַחַר ὀπίσω ὑμῶν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα...

Having let the messengers down from her house, Rahab charges them to hide in the hills “until those who pursue *after you* have returned.” The Hebrew reflects the same exhortation except lacks the counter-part to *ὁπίσω ὑμῶν* (אחריכם).⁸⁸ Two comparable constructions occur within the immediate context: 2:5 (καταδιώξατε ὁπίσω αὐτῶν//דפו ורדפו) and 2:7 (οἱ διώκοντες ὁπίσω αὐτῶν//הרדפים אחריהם). In light of these comparable

⁸⁶ Such a conflate reading is actually attested by OG^{AL} and MSS MNΘad-hjklps-vx-b₂, (to save space, a-d stands for MSS abcd, s-v stands for MSS stuv, etc.) Arm., reading καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς μου καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκόν μου.

⁸⁷ This is the position taken by Boling, 142. Nelson (39) argues in favor of the fourth conjecture; Holmes (21) favors the OG as the original but does not disclose his rationale; Soggin holds the second conjecture (J. Alberto Soggin, *Joshua*, OTL [London: SCM Press, 1972], 37).

⁸⁸ MS k is the only Gk. MS which omits *ὁπίσω ὑμῶν*.

וְהָאֲנָשִׁים [ו] via *homoioteleuton*.⁹⁴ Of course, it is possible that the OG translator, desiring to harmonize this reading with a similar reading found in Deuteronomy 31:12, supplied τοῖς ἀνδράσιν.⁹⁵ In that passage, “men, women, little ones, and sojourners,” function epexegetically providing further clarity to ‘the people.’

(5) 9:27b	וַיְהִי בַיּוֹם הַהוּא חֹטְבֵי עֵצִים וְשֹׂאבֵי מַיִם לַעֲדָה וּלְמִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה עַד־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם...	καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ξυλοκόπους καὶ ὑδροφόρους πάσῃ τῇ συναγωγῇ καὶ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τοῦ θεοῦ· διὰ τοῦτο ἐγένοντο οἱ κατοικοῦντες Γαβων ξυλοκόποι καὶ ὑδροφόροι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς τὸν τόπον...
-----------	---	--

Within the description of Gibeon’s subjugation to the people of Israel, the OG exhibits a noticeable plus, which effectively reiterates the beginning of the verse. This would lead to the preliminary conclusion that a doublet has appeared at the hands of the OG translator. However, the retroversion of the Greek to Hebrew affords a more plausible explanation of the textual variation: ...לעדה ומזבח יהוה [על כן ויהיו ישיבי גבען הטבי עצים ...].⁹⁶ Because the phrase מזבח יהוה appears twice, the most likely explanation for the OG plus is that the MT scribe skipped from the first occurrence of מזבח יהוה to the second occurrence, thus omitting the material retained in OG.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Cf. Boling, 246.

⁹⁵ Concerning this possibility, Butler (90) notes: “Originally, the ‘assembly of Israel’ was probably understood as being composed of men.” Accordingly, for MT to include האנשים would be redundant.

⁹⁶ The retroversion of יהוה from τοῦ θεοῦ may indeed seem peculiar, as the more lexically equivalent of τοῦ θεοῦ retroversion would be (ה)אלהים. However, the OG translator elsewhere used ὁ θεός when יהוה (presumably) appeared in the Hebrew text (cf. 5:6; 10:12; 17:4). Note also that in the first half of 9:27, the OG translator rendered יהוה with ὁ θεός. Accordingly, my retroversion of יהוה from τοῦ θεοῦ seeks to remain consistent with the translation technique of the OG translator.

⁹⁷ Cf. Holmes, 49; Auld, *LXX Joshua*, 158.

(6) 10:1 וְכִי הִשְׁלִימוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל καὶ ὅτι αὐτομόλησαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες
 גְּבֵעוֹן אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל Γαβαων πρὸς Ἰησοῦν καὶ πρὸς Ἰσραηλ

The OG reads, “and that the inhabitants of Gibeon had deserted⁹⁸ to Joshua and to Israel,” whereas the MT reads, “and how the inhabitants of Gibeon had made peace with Israel and were among them.” At first glance, the Greek plus πρὸς Ἰησοῦν καὶ appears to be a harmonization in light of 10:4, which gives a nearly identical description—αὐτομόλησαν γὰρ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ. However, if the OG translator sought to harmonize the text with the immediate context, one would expect to read πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ instead of πρὸς Ἰσραηλ.⁹⁹ Instead of viewing 10:4 as evidence in favor of OG harmonization, one can view 10:4 as evidence of MT textual error—skipping from the first occurrence of אֶת to the second, thus omitting יהושע אֶת.¹⁰⁰

(7) 10:12 בַּיּוֹם תָּתַת יְהוָה אֶת־הָאֱמֹרִי ἡ ἡμέρα παρέδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀμορραῖον
 לְפָנֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ὑποχείριον Ἰσραηλ, ἡνίκα συνέτριψεν
 וַיֹּאמֶר αὐτοὺς ἐν Γαβαων καὶ συνετρίβησαν ἀπὸ
 προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ, καὶ εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς.

On the day Joshua and the Israelites had defeated the Amorites at Gibeon, the OG plus recounts, “[the LORD] shattered them [the Amorites] at Gibeon, and they were

⁹⁸ It is unclear whether αὐτομόλησαν reflects a variant of the Heb. root שָׁלַח (Soggin, 119) or simply the translator’s attempt to crystallize the precise contextual meaning of הִשְׁלִימוּ.

⁹⁹ Gk. MSS F^bdgnptwa₂, Sah., and OL harmonize πρὸς Ἰσραηλ to πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ.

¹⁰⁰ This is the position taken by Boling, 275 and Holmes, 49. Nelson, although offering both positions as possible, leans towards OG harmonization (Nelson, 136). Butler, on the other hand, holds the peculiar view that the translator’s addition of πρὸς Ἰησοῦν reflects “another element in the tradition’s continued effort to glorify Joshua” (Butler, 109).

translator harmonized his text;¹⁰⁶ or 3) both the MT and OG reflect contrasting haplographic omissions.¹⁰⁷

In favor of 1) and 2), 10:28 and 10:40 both contain synonymous battle descriptions which attest to OG plus *καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσ[α]ν* and MT clause (ואת כל הנפש והנשמה). Since *καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσ[α]ν* was absent in the OG translator's *Vorlage* in 10:32, he supplied *καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσ[α]ν* to create consistency with the immediate context. By the same token, the MT copyist supplied *ואת כל הנפש* to align with the immediate context. Despite the feasibility of these possibilities, a comparison of the retroverted Hebrew juxtaposed to the Hebrew of MT favors the third possibility. If we emend the plural Greek verbs *ἐξωλέθρευσαν* and *ἐποίησαν* to their singular forms *ἐξωλέθρευσεν* and *ἐποίησεν* (cf. OG^A, OG^L, MSS GN^Θacvya_{2b2}, Arm. and Sah.), the translator's *Vorlage* may have appeared thus—לפי חרב ויחרם אותה כאשר עשה ללונה.¹⁰⁸ Observe, then, the juxtaposed OG Hebrew *Vorlage* and the MT below:

OG: לפי חרב ויחרם אות[ה] ואת כל הנפש אשר ב[ה] כאשר עשה ללונה

MT: לפי חרב ו[יחרם אותה ו]את כל הנפש אשר בה כאשר עשה ללונה

Instead of assuming that the Greek plus *καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσεν αὐτήν* and the MT clause *ואת כל הנפש* are harmonizing expansions, it seems more likely that both textual traditions lost differing parts of the whole. Thus, Gk. MSS dghnptw and Syh. may reflect the full

¹⁰⁶ Nelson (137) advocates a combination of the first and second possibility.

¹⁰⁷ Boling, 290.

¹⁰⁸ The singular form is more probable especially in light of the attestation of the ancient witnesses to the singular verb forms throughout the verse.

could have skipped from the first occurrence in v. 7 to the second occurrence in v. 8.¹⁰⁹

See below.

Table 2.1. Comparison of MT with Retroverted Hebrew *Vorlage*

MT	OG <i>Vorlage</i>
לתשעת השבטים וחצי השבט המנשה הראובני והגדי	לתשעת השבטים וחצי השבט המנשה מהירדן עד הים הגדול למזרח השמש תתן אתה הים הגדול וגבול : לשני השבטים וחצי שבט המנשה הראובני והגדי

Although this makes sense of the suffix, עמו is unattested among the major Gk. MSS.

Margolis, in his reconstructed Greek text, attempts to explain the existence of עמו by

reading ...τῷ ἡμίσει φυλῆς Μανασση τῷ μετα τοῦ Ρουβην καὶ τοῦ Γαδ (חצי השבט המנשה)

reading ...τῷ ἡμίσει φυλῆς Μανασση τῷ μετα τοῦ Ρουβην καὶ τοῦ Γαδ (חצי השבט המנשה) [אשר] עַם הראובני והגדי). If Margolis is correct, this might explain MT עמו; after the

haplography of מהירדן to המנשה, the MT scribe may have attempted to make sense of the

remaining עַם by adding the pronominal suffix ו, which alludes back to חצי השבט המנשה.

These speculations notwithstanding, what appears most certain is that the OG plus in v. 8

was lost by *homoioteleuton* of the MT scribe.

(10) 15:59	וּמַעֲרַת וּבֵית־עֲנוֹת וְאֶלְתָּקָן עָרִים שֵׁשׁ וְחֻצְרֵיהֶן: קִרְיַת־בְּעַל הַיָּא קִרְיַת	καὶ Μαγαρωθ καὶ Βαιθαναμ καὶ Θεκουμ, πόλεις ἕξ καὶ αἱ κῶμαι αὐτῶν· Θεκω καὶ Εφραθα [αὕτη ἐστὶν Βαιθλεεμ] καὶ Φαγωρ καὶ Αἰταν καὶ Κουλον καὶ Ταταμ καὶ Εωβης καὶ Καρεμ καὶ Γαλεμ καὶ Θεθηρ καὶ Μανοχω, πόλεις ἑνδεκα καὶ αἱ κῶμαι αὐτῶν· Καριαθβααλ (αὕτη ἡ πόλις Ιαριμ)
------------	---	--

Toward the end of Judah's boundary allotment list, the OG contains a noticeable

¹⁰⁹ This is the generally held view (see Holmes, 56; Soggin, 150; Nelson, 168; Boling, 334).

lot out of the tribes of Judah, [and out of the tribes of] Simeon, and [out of the tribes of] Benjamin these cities that are mentioned by name.” Here, *ממטה בני שמעון וממטה בני בנימין* reflects the Hebrew counter-part to the Greek plus in Joshua 21:9.¹²⁰

Three possibilities to explain this textual discrepancy emerge: 1) the chronicler utilized a *Vorlage* similar to OG for his recounting of the distribution of Levitical cities which contained the reading now absent in MT; 2) the OG translator harmonized his account in 21:9 to accord with MT 1 Chronicles 6:50;¹²¹ 3) neither the chronicler nor the OG translator made use of the other but, rather, the MT copyist inadvertently omitted *ממטה בני בנימין* due to the frequent occurrence of *ממטה*.¹²² The second possibility seems unlikely considering the grammatical discrepancy between *ἔδωκεν* (Josh. 21:9) and *ἔδωκαν* (1 Chron. 6:50), and the absence of the Greek *κληρωτὶ* (or *ἐν κλήρῳ*) for the Hebrew counter-part *בגורל* and *ἀπὸ τῆς φυλῆς υἱῶν Βενιαμιν* in 1 Chron. 6:50. Additionally, the insertion of the reference to Benjamin here would have created a redundancy (cf. 21:17), which the OG translator, who sought to smooth out the text, would likely have omitted. Thus, although it cannot be definitively proven, in light of 1 Chronicles 6:50, *ממטה בני בנימין* was likely present in the translator’s *Vorlage* but subsequently lost in MT transmission.

¹²⁰ Ironically, in the Gk. version of 1 Chron. 6:50 *ἀπὸ τῆς φυλῆς υἱῶν Βενιαμιν* is unattested.

¹²¹ This is the view held by Nelson (235). Although Butler leans towards the originality of the Gk. plus, he nevertheless concedes the possibility of a later Gk. copyist inserting the reference to Benjamin (Butler, 221).

¹²² See Boling, 221.

(16) 23:5

וַיְהִי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הוּא	κύριος δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν, οὗτος ἐξολεθρεύσει
יְהִיכֶם מִפְּנֵיכֶם	αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν,
[וְהוֹרִישׁ אֹתָם מִלְּפָנֵיכֶם]	ἕως ἂν ἀπόλωνται, καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς τὰ
	θηρία τὰ ἄγρια, ἕως ἂν ἐξολεθρεύσῃ αὐτοὺς
	καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ προσώπου
וַיִּרְשָׁתָם	ὑμῶν,
אֶת־אֲרָצָם כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה	καὶ κατακληρονομήσατε τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν,
אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לָכֶם:	καθὰ ἐλάλησεν κύριος
	ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὑμῖν.

With respect to the remaining lands allotted Israel but yet unconquered, they are assured that the LORD will surely destroy them. The OG, however, goes on to explain that he will destroy them “until they perish, and he shall send wild beasts against them until he utterly destroys them and their kings from before you.” Despite the textual discrepancy of *וְהוֹרִישׁ אֹתָם מִלְּפָנֵיכֶם* between OG and MT,¹³² the final prepositional phrase at the end of the OG plus *מִלְּפָנֵיכֶם*—as it would appear in the *Vorlage*—creates the possibility for textual error by the MT copyist. If the OG represents the earlier text form, the MT copyist could have skipped from the first occurrence of *מִפְּנֵיכֶם* in the beginning of v. 5 to the second occurrence at the end of this plus. That the OG reflects the original reading may be further evidenced by the antithesis of the LORD’s promise to Israel if they do not walk faithfully before him: whereas the LORD would destroy their *enemies* until they perish (OG plus), the LORD would allow their enemies to destroy *them* until they perish (MT Josh. 23:13).¹³³

¹³² The OG translator may have omitted *וְהוֹרִישׁ אֹתָם מִלְּפָנֵיכֶם* by *homoioteleuton* of *מִלְּפָנֵיכֶם*.

¹³³ See also Lev. 26:22 where wild beasts are turned against Israel as covenant curse.

narrative.¹³⁵ Even though such an explanation is not altogether impossible,¹³⁶ a much simpler explanation exists. That is, the MT copyist wrote down **מצרים** at the end of v. 4 and began to write the words following the **המצרים** at the end of the Greek plus due their graphical similarity.¹³⁷ Thus, the Greek text likely reflects the earlier reading.

(18) 24:17 כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, αὐτὸς θεὸς ἐστίν· αὐτὸς
הַמַּעֲלֶה אֶתְנוּ ἀνέγαγεν ἡμᾶς

Having been faced with choice to serve the LORD or the gods of their fathers the people declare—according to the OG—“The Lord our God,¹³⁸ *he is God.*” The MT, however, lacks the Hebrew counter-part to *αὐτὸς θεός ἐστιν*.¹³⁹ Does this reflect an expansion on the part of the OG translator?¹⁴⁰ Retroverting the Greek into Hebrew may provide the answer and explain the origin of this Greek plus—i.e., יהוה אלהינו הוא אלהים. The graphical similarities between אלהים הוא and אלהינו הוא, along with

¹³⁵ See Cooke, 215. However, some noticable discrepancies exist between OG Deuteronomy 26:5–6 and Joshua 24:4–5 which weakens the possibility of interpolation. First, note the differences between μέγα και πλήθος πολὺ και μέγα (Deut. 26:5) and μέγα και πολὺ και κραταῖον (Josh. 24:4b). Second, Joshua lacks the adverbial clause ἐν ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖ (במתי מעט). Third is the grammatical discrepancy between ‘us’ (Deut.) and ‘them’ (Josh.).

¹³⁶ “It is not impossible that the translator or his *Vorlage* was led to continue the quotation from Deut. 26 beyond ‘and Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt’ under the influence of the tradition of the Haggadah where the exposition of Deut. 26:5–8 takes a central place” (Emanuel Tov, “Midrash-Type Exegesis in the Septuagint of Joshua,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. The Board of the Quarterly, VTSup 72 [Atlanta: SBL, 2006], 161).

¹³⁷ So also Boling, 530; Holmes, 78; Nelson, 264.

¹³⁸ N.B. the OG lacks the counter-part γάρ (ὅτι) to ו. This may reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* which differed from MT (Margolis, 464) or the translator's desire to emphasize monotheistic beliefs by converting the causal clause of MT into a main clause (Sipilä, 165).

¹³⁹ Few Gk. MSS omit *αὐτὸς θεός ἐστιν* (i.e., OG^L and MSS gnw). OG^O and Eth. support OG.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Auld, *LXX Joshua*, 224.

their proximity to each other, could surely have triggered a textual error on the part of the MT copyist by *homoioteleuton*, skipping from the first occurrence of הוא to the second.

To be sure, it is also possible the textual error happened the other way around. Through dittography, the OG translator could have translated אלהינו הוא twice but *apparently* changed אלהינו to אלהים.¹⁴¹ Some suggest that the plus arose out of the translator's ignorance of the syntactical function of הוא.¹⁴² If such were the case, however, the translator would have also struggled with a similar syntactical structure in Joshua 2:11—יהוה אלהיכם הוא אלהים—where it appears the translator knew quite well the function of הוא.¹⁴³ Of the three explanations above, *homoioteleuton* by the MT copyist appears the most viable.

¹⁴¹ This may explain why Gk. MS c reads αὐτὸς θεὸς ἡμῶν (= אלהינו הוא) instead of αὐτὸς θεός ἐστιν.

¹⁴² E.g., Holmes, 79 and Butler, 264.

¹⁴³ See also 13:14 (יהוה אלהי ישראל הוא נחלתו) // κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ, αὐτός [OG^A] αὐτῶν (αληγονομία); and 23:5 (יהוה אלהיכם הוא יהדפם מפניכם) // κύριος δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν, αὐτός [OG^A] ἐξολεθρεύσει αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν).

CHAPTER 3

HARMONIZATIONS

The term harmonization suggests that a particular force in the generation of the reading of a witness appears to have been an impulse to make the text read in a way that is consistent with some external frame of reference. The reading then would have been generated as a way to achieve *consistency*, not necessarily *similarity*. Sometimes a witness may harmonize his text to coincide with the wording of a similar phrase found in another biblical book; other times he may harmonize his text with the immediate context of the book itself. Below are the analyzed OG pluses which appear to reflecting harmonization.

(1) 2:12 וְעַתָּה הִשָּׁבְעוּ־נָא לִי בַיהוָה καὶ νῦν ὁμόσατέ μοι κύριον τὸν θεόν

As Rahab pleads with the messengers, OG reads, “And now swear to me by the LORD *God*,” while the MT reads, “Now then, please swear to me by the LORD.” Based on the rhetorical features of the Hebrew text, the OG plus is already suspect since יהוה אלהים never occurs by itself in MT Joshua.¹⁴⁴ Because of this, some Gk. MSS emended κύριον τὸν θεόν to κύριον τὸν θεόν ὕμῳ.¹⁴⁵ As there is no apparent textual trigger which

¹⁴⁴ That is, whenever יהוה אלהים occurs, it is always in conjunction with a pronominal suffix (3rd Person [2x]; 2nd person [19x]; 1st person [17x]) or followed by “of Israel” (13x).

¹⁴⁵ See OG^L, MSS d–gijnprstvwz, and Sah.

There is also the possibility, although difficult to prove, that the OG translator supplied τῇν χεῖρά σου to the LORD's injunction in order to create a connection between Moses and Joshua.¹⁵⁴ The phrase יָדָאֵת נָטָה occurs only four times throughout the MT, all of which depict the LORD commanding Moses to stretch out his hand before performing a miracle (cf. Exod. 8:1; 9:22; 14:16, 26).¹⁵⁵ Surely the vanquishing of 12,000 people at Ai by the Israelites was a miracle that the LORD performed through Joshua's outstretched hand just as the LORD performed the plagues through Moses' outstretched hand.

(4) 8:18b כִּי בִידְךָ אֶתְנָנָה εἰς γὰρ τὰς χεῖράς σου παραδέδωκα αὐτήν
καὶ τὰ ἔνεδρα ἐξαναστήσονται ἐν τάχει ἐκ
וַיֵּשֶׁע τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Ἰησοῦς
בְּכִידוֹן אֲשֶׁר-בִּידוֹ אֶל-הָעִיר τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, τὸν γαῖσον, ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν

predictive line *καὶ τὰ ἔνεδρα ἐξαναστήσονται ἐν τάχει ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν* was supplied in order to harmonize with v. 19—i.e., stretch out your hand...and the ambush will arise// and he stretched out his hand...and the ambush arose.

(5) 9:1b הַחֲתִי וְהָאֲמֹרִי הַכְּנַעֲנִי καὶ οἱ Χετταῖοι καὶ οἱ Χαναναῖοι καὶ οἱ
 הַפְּרָזִי הַחֲוִי Φερεζαῖοι καὶ οἱ Εὐαῖοι καὶ οἱ Ἀμορραῖοι καὶ
 וְהַיְבוֹסִי οἱ Γεργεσαῖοι καὶ οἱ Ἰεβουσαῖοι,

In the list of all the kings who heard the report of Ai's demise at the hands of Israel, OG includes the Gergashites which is absent from the MT. Οἱ Γεργεσαῖοι are recorded two other times in Joshua (3:10 and 24:11). In both of these verses, the OG and MT agree, albeit with varying order of names in the list. We may very well assume, then, that the OG translator harmonized his translation to be consistent with the number of names listed elsewhere in the book.¹⁵⁷

However, one cannot readily dismiss the possibility that *והגרגשי* was the original reading that was subsequently lost by haplography. Even if this was the case, did the omission occur earlier or later in transmission? That is, did the OG translator notice the omission and fill in what he felt was originally intended to be in his *Vorlage*? Or did the MT scribe omit *והגרגשי* after OG translation? Nonetheless, in the absence of any clear textual trigger, which could have caused the omission of *והגרגשי*, the more viable explanation for this plus is OG harmonization.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Deut. 20:17 where the OG translator makes the same addition.

(6) 9:2e [MT 8:34] כְּכֹל־הַכְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה κατὰ πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ
 Μωυσῆ·

As the kings rallied together to make war against the Israelites (MT: immediately after the king of Ai was hanged), Joshua built an altar at Mount Ebal where he read all the words of the law to the people. According to the OG, Joshua read “all things written in the law *of Moses*,” whereas, according to the MT, he read “all that is written in the Book of the Law.” Depending upon which textual tradition reflects the original, either the OG reflects a minus (the Book) and a plus (of Moses), or the MT exhibits a plus (the Book) and a minus (of Moses). Although most Gk. MSS support OG, some coincide with MT (cf. MSS vz and Syh.). In terms of the translation technique, the OG translator follows the Hebrew expression everywhere else in the book—*ספר התורה*// *ἡ βίβλος τοῦ νόμου* (1:8); *ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου Μωυσῆ*// *בספר תורת משה* (23:6); *βιβλίον, νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ*// *ספר תורת אלהים* (24:26). It is only within the covenant at Mount Ebal narrative (9:2a–e [MT 8:30–35]) where the OG deviates from the MT.

Because both the MT and OG exhibit variation in their phraseology throughout the book of Joshua,¹⁵⁸ as well as the continued growth in the literary development of the book, and since there appears to be no textual trigger to cause an error, both readings may reflect expansive additions. That is, the OG supplied *Μωυσῆ* to harmonize the

¹⁵⁸ MT: *ספר התורה* (1:8; 8:34); *ספר תורת משה* (8:31; 23:6); *ספר תורת אלהים* (24:26); *תורת משה* (8:32). OG: *ἡ βίβλος τοῦ νόμου* (1:8); *ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου Μωυσῆ* (23:6); *βιβλίον, νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ* (24:26); *τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ* (9:2b, c, e).

may not reflect the earlier reading.¹⁶⁷ Rather, it may reflect the translator's desire to harmonize it with the preceding clause.¹⁶⁸

(10) 21:1 וַיָּגִשׁוּ רָאשֵׁי אֲבוֹת הַלְוִיִּם Καὶ προσήλθοσαν οἱ ἀρχιπατριῶται τῶν υἱῶν Λευι

Here, the OG reads, “the sons of Levi,” while the MT reads, “the Levites.” The tribal designation הלויים appears fourteen times in MT Joshua of which the OG uses Οἱ Λευῖται as the lexical equivalent except 18:7 and 21:40. The description בני לוי, however, only occurs one time in MT Joshua (21:10) which agrees with OG (τῶν υἱῶν Λευι).

Although the OG plus of 21:1 is supported by V (*accesseruntque principes familiarum Levi*) and Syh. (הַקִּנְיָן לֵוִי), it is more probable that the OG translator sought to harmonize הלויים in his *Vorlage* with the 21:10 בני לוי. No other evidence in the Hebrew MSS can be adduced to support a text critical error in the MT.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁷ To be sure, it is certainly possible that not all Gk. MSS were aware of the MT; some Gk. MSS could have made the change towards the MT while others (perhaps earlier readings) may have kept ὧν συνέταξεν αὐτῷ Μωυσῆς. In order to determine this, one would need to ascertain the antiquity of the OG variation itself, which may warrant a separate thesis entirely.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. also Josh. 1:7b and 9:2f [MT 8:35] which may have provided further contextual incentive. However, see Butler (123), who envisages a more ideologically charged motive: “[the plus] more probably reflects the later tradition's refusal to leave the last command to Moses.” By a similar token, Nelson (150) perceives the MT reading ‘The LORD commanded Moses,’ as a “theologizing improvement.”

¹⁶⁹ Thus, Butler's suggestion that ‘sons’ may have originally belonged in both formulas is unlikely (Butler, 221).

(11) 22:33-34	<p>וַיְבָרְכוּ אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא אָמְרוּ לְעֵלוֹת עֲלֵיהֶם לְצַבָּא לְשַׁחֵת אֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר בְּנֵי־רְאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי־גָד יֹשְׁבֵימָּה בָּהּ:</p>	<p>καὶ εὐλόγησαν τὸν θεὸν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπαν μηκέτι ἀναβῆναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς πόλεμον ἐξολεθρεῦσαι τὴν γῆν τῶν υἱῶν Ρουβὴν καὶ τῶν υἱῶν Γαδ καὶ τοῦ ἡμίσεος φυλῆς Μανασσῆ. καὶ κατώκησαν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς.</p>
	<p>וַיִּקְרָאוּ בְנֵי־רְאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי־גָד לְמִזְבֵּחַ כִּי עַד הוּא בִּינְהִינוּ כִּי יִהְיֶה הָאֱלֹהִים</p>	<p>καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν Ἰησοῦς τὸν βωμὸν τῶν Ρουβὴν καὶ τῶν Γαδ καὶ τοῦ ἡμίσεος φυλῆς Μανασσῆ καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι Μαρτύριόν ἐστὶν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἐστίν.</p>

As mentioned in the discussion of Textual Error plus (14), the sons of Reuben, the sons of Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh directly address the officers of Israel (22:21-29). However, in MT vv. 33–34, only the sons of Reuben and the sons of Gad are mentioned; no mention is made of the half-tribe of Manasseh.¹⁷⁰ Whereas the absence of וחצי מטה מנשה can be explained by *homoioarcton*, the absence of וחצי מטה מנשה in vv. 33 and 34 cannot be explained as such. If, on the one hand, an earlier MT copyist inadvertently omitted the first occurrence of וחצי מטה מנשה in v. 32, a subsequent copyist could have harmonized vv. 33–34 with the absence of the reference to Manasseh in v. 32. On the other hand, the OG translator could have harmonized vv. 33–34 to maintain consistency with the reference to all three groups in 22:21. Since insufficient evidence is available to support MT error/harmonization, the more viable explanation is OG harmonization.

¹⁷⁰ Recall, the present study is primarily concerned with *quantitative* variations not *qualitative* variations. Thus, for the sake of the analysis, I am ignoring the stark translational variation between the OG and MT 22:34 (i.e., the plural ויקראו [the sons of Reuben and Gad] and the singular ἐπωνόμασεν [Joshua]; καὶ εἶπεν which is an explication).

(12) 24:14 וְהִסִּירוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר
עֲבָדוּ אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם καὶ περιέλεσθε τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς ἄλλοτρίους,
οἷς ἐλάτρευσαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν

According to the OG, Joshua charges the people of Israel to put away the ‘foreign’ gods which their father’s had served; a behest which sounds quite similar to 1 Samuel 7:3 —וְהִסִּירוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי הַנֹּכַר. The word הַנֹּכַר, which is absent in MT 24:14, appears later in MT 24:23, where, after the people professed their intention to serve the LORD alone, Joshua commands them a second time to put away the *foreign* gods. In light of the injunctive *inclusio*, the OG translator likely supplied τοὺς ἄλλοτρίους in v. 14 to coincide with v. 23. Additionally, the translator may have been further inclined to do so, since הַנֹּכַר is always included in the phrase הִסִּירוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי (cf. Gen. 35:2; Judg. 10:16; 1 Sam. 7:3; 2 Chr. 33:15).

(13) 24:27c פְּנֵי־תִכְחֹשׁוּן בְּאֱלֹהֵיכֶם ἡνίκα ἐὰν ψεύσησθε κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου

This stone of witness mentioned above, would be a witness against the people whenever they dealt falsely with “*the LORD*, my¹⁷¹ God.” OG Κυρίῳ does not have a counter-part in the MT. However, the plus does find support in OL (*cum mentiri fueritis Domino Deo vestro*), V (*et mentiri Domino Deo vestro*), and S (כִּי־אֵלֹהֵיכֶם).¹⁷² As it would be quite aberrant for an MT copyist to purposefully omit יהוה, and since there is no clear textual trigger to cause its omission, κυρίῳ arose at the hands of the OG translator to create further emphasis as has been the case in this verse.

¹⁷¹ As mentioned in the §1.2.4. of this paper, I will not be discussing variations in pronouns/ pronominal suffixes such as depicted here between the Heb. pronominal suffix ו- and the Gk. pronoun μου.

¹⁷² The plus is also attested by Gk. MSS gnptw.

Be that as it may, the syntagmatic features of MT Joshua may provide another explanation. Whenever אלהים occurs with a pronominal suffix in MT Joshua (43x), it is almost always preceded by יהוה—with the exception of 9:23 and 24:27c. In light of this consistency of formulaic expression, the OG translator may have supplied κυρίῳ in order to harmonize it with this unequivocal pattern.

CHAPTER 4

AMPLIFICATIONS

Amplifications are readings which arise from the *initiative* on the part of the copyist or translator to *fill out* a text. Such amplifications can consist of the addition of pronouns, adverbs, temporal markers, clarifying details, explication of implicit subjects, etc. Below are 15 OG pluses which appear to reflect this type of addition.

(1) 2:3b הוציאי האנשים הבאים [אלך] Ἐξάγαγε τοὺς ἀνδρας τοὺς
 אשר באו לבייתך εἰσπεπορευμένους εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν σου **τὴν**
 νύκτα¹⁷³

The OG reads, “Bring out the men who entered your house *tonight*,” whereas the MT reads, “Bring out the men who have come to you, who entered your house.”

Disregarding the absent **אליך אשר באו** in the Greek, the reading **τὴν νύκτα** (= [ה]ליל) finds support from S (כא). On the one hand, this plus may reflect the translator’s desire to amplify his text by providing further specification to the narrative. On the other hand, however, this variant may bear witness to the possibility of differing textual traditions.¹⁷³ Either way, the OG translator supplies **τὴν νύκτα** for specification.

¹⁷³ This may be evidenced by the absence of **τὴν νύκτα** in OG 2:2 which is present in the MT, the longer reading of MT v. 3 **אליך אשר באו** which may reflect a conflate reading (Holmes, 19), and the textual support from S which otherwise tends to agree with MT.

(2) 2:10 בְּצִאתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם ὅτε ἐξεπορεύεσθε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου

According to the Hebrew, OG should read ὅτε ἐξεπορεύεσθε ἐξ Αἰγύπτου;¹⁷⁴ but here, as well as other passages (e.g., 5:6, 24:7), OG supplies the genitive noun γῆς between ἐκ and Αἰγύπτου.¹⁷⁵ This reading is unlikely the original as the Hebrew equivalent of ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (מִמִּצְרַיִם) occurs only one time in MT Joshua (24:17);¹⁷⁶ it simply reflects the translator’s tendency toward “full phrase.”¹⁷⁷ There is also the possibility, albeit unlikely, that ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου arose from an inner-Greek corruption of ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου (cf. OG Amos 3:9).¹⁷⁸

(3) 5:9 הַיּוֹם גָּלוּתִי אֶת־חֲרַפְתָּ Ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἀφεῖλον τὸν
מִצְרַיִם מֵעֲלִיכֶם ὀνειδισμὸν Αἰγύπτου ἀφ’ ὑμῶν.

After the Israelites had been circumcised, the LORD said, according to the OG, “*On this very day* I have taken away the reproach of Egypt from you.” The MT simply reads הַיּוֹם which idiomatically means ‘Today.’ The Greek construct σήμερον ἡμέρα occurs nine other times in OG Joshua whose Hebrew counter-part is almost always הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה (Josh. 4:9; 5:9; 6:25; 9:27; 10:27; 13:13; 22:3; 22:29; 24:31). If in fact, הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה was originally

¹⁷⁴ Hence OG^{AL}, MSS MΘadghik–qtuxy, Arm., and Syh.

¹⁷⁵ In 24:17, S diverges from the MT in a similar way reading מִמִּצְרַיִם instead of מִצְרַיִם (so also OG^A and MSS MNΘ).

¹⁷⁶ To be sure, it is not impossible for an MT copyist to have committed *homoioarcton*, skipping from the first מ prefixed to אֶרֶץ to the second מ of מִצְרַיִם especially since the consonant cluster אֶר and צֶר look relatively similar. If, however, this were the only instance when the OG reads ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου while the MT reads מִמִּצְרַיִם, textual error of the MT copyist would be a more viable possibility.

¹⁷⁷ Butler, 26.

¹⁷⁸ Graphical confusion between Γ and Τ was quite common in the Uncial MSS.

present in the translator's *Vorlage*, there is no apparent textual trigger which could have caused its omission by later MT copyists. Thus, it is most probable that the translator, seeking to apply greater emphasis to the LORD's declaration, expanded the simple *σήμερον* to *ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρα*.¹⁷⁹

(4) 6:7a וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־הָעָם καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Παραγγείλατε τῷ
 עֲבָדָיו וְסִבּוּ אֶת־הָעִיר λαῶ περιελθεῖν καὶ κυκλῶσαι τὴν πόλιν

As mentioned in the discussion of Textual Error plus (4), the OG plus *Παραγγείλατε τῷ λαῶ* likely arose by the MT copyist omitting the Hebrew equivalent due to *homoioteleuton*. However, the preceding *λέγων* introducing the direct discourse, was supplied for grammatical reasons.¹⁸⁰ For similar instances of this grammatical addition see 2:4; 4:7; 10:24; and 15:18.

(5) 8:24 וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל καὶ ὡς ἐπαύσαντο οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ

The OG reads, “*sons of Israel*,” whereas the MT simply reads, “Israel.” This plus is one of several other instances when OG reads *οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ* in the absence of the Hebrew counter-part *בְּנֵי*.¹⁸¹ Although some of these pluses can be attributed to textual error by a subsequent MT copyist (e.g., 10:10, 11),¹⁸² there are no textual triggers in this

¹⁷⁹ It is interesting, though, that no Gk. MSS omit or emend this reading. Furthermore, OG receives partial support the Syh. (ܡܨܬܪܬܐ ܡܨܬܪܬܐ).

¹⁸⁰ Perhaps later MT copyists made the same grammatical move in 3:6, 8.

¹⁸¹ Cf. 3:7, 12, 17; 8:27; 10:10. See also 17:7, 17; 21:1, 12, 34 for similar additions of *οἱ υἱοὶ*.

¹⁸² Due to the graphical similarity of *פני* from *לפני* and *בני*.

(9) 17:16 וַיֹּאמְרוּ בְנֵי יוֹסֵף לֹא־יִמָּצָא לָנוּ הָהָרַי וַיֹּאמְרוּ Οὐκ ἀρκέσει ἡμῖν τὸ ὄρος τὸ Εφραιμ

The OG reads, “And they said, “*Mount Ephraim* (הר אפרים) is not enough for us,” whereas the MT reads, “The people of Joseph¹⁸⁹ said, “The hill country is not enough for us.” Out of the seven occurrences of [τὸ] ὄρος [τὸ] Εφραιμ in OG Joshua, only 17:16 lacks the Hebrew counter-part הר אפרים. The preceding verse (17:15) may explain the origin of the OG plus. In response to the dispute between Joshua and the sons of Joseph, Joshua encouraged them to clear ground for themselves since “Mount Ephraim is too narrow.” Because of this designation, the translator accordingly specifies τὸ ὄρος with τὸ Εφραιμ.¹⁹⁰

(10) 22:13 אֶת־פִּינְחָס בֶּן־אֶלְעָזָר τὸν τε Φινεες υἱὸν Ελεαζαρ υἱοῦ Ααρων τοῦ ἁρχιερέως הַכֹּהֵן

Similar to Amplification plus (7) above, the OG includes “son of Aaron” in the MT description of Phinehas son of Eleazar. This full description בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן appears eight times in the MT (six times in Numbers [3:32; 4:16; 17:2; 25:7, 11; 26:1]¹⁹¹ and once in Ezra [7:5]). Within MT Joshua, it occurs once (24:33) but without הכהן.¹⁹² In the absence of בן אהרן, the partial description אלעזר הכהן appears seven other times

¹⁸⁹ N.B. MT supplies בני יוסף to make the subjects of ויאמרו explicit. For other such instances of explication in the MT, see also 1:2 and 1:14.

¹⁹⁰ See Boling, 417, and Nelson, 200. OG^A and MSS NΘ omit this plus.

¹⁹¹ Yet, even within MT Numbers, the partial description אלעזר הכהן appears (17:4; 19:3, 4; 26:3, 63; 27:2, 19, 21, 22; 31:6, 12, 13, 21, 26, 29, 31).

¹⁹² In 24:33 S appears to reflect a conflate reading of MT and OG—וַיָּמָת אֶלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן בֶּן־אֶלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן (And Eleazar the priest, son of Aaron the priest, died).

הַיָּמִים would later bear significant eschatological overtones in the prophetic books, its employment here is more likely to contextualize, as was the case for the addition of *σήμερον* in the preceding clause.²⁰⁰ That is, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν builds upon *σήμερον* intimating, “whatever the LORD has spoken to us *today* shall be a witness not just for today but *until the end of the days*.” As Butler notes: “by adding the prophetic phrase ‘in the last days,’ the translator makes the passage more relevant to its own time rather than simply a report of the past history.”²⁰¹

(15) 24:33a וְאַלְעָזָר בֶּן אֶהֱרֹן מָת Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ Ελεαζαρ υἱὸς Ααρων (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς) ἐτελεύτησεν

In the final verse of Joshua, the OG introduces the narrative section with the temporal marker, “and it happened after these things,”²⁰² before describing how Eleazar the son of Aaron died. In all likelihood, this temporal marker was added by the OG translator in order to create a smoother transition from the story of Joseph to that of Eleazar. There is, however, the possibility of a later MT copyist omitting וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי when Joshua was being collected with Judges which begins with וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי.²⁰³ As this possibility

²⁰⁰ Cf. Auld, *LXX Joshua*, 226 who views ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν as an “eschatological plus.”

²⁰¹ Butler, 265.

²⁰² All Gk. MSS attest to καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα.

²⁰³ Of course, this suggestion depends upon the retroversion from Gk. to Heb.; Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα could also reflect וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה (Holmes, 80). However, whenever καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ appears in conjunction with ταῦτα, the Hebrew adverb אַחֲרֵי is used (usually followed by כֵּן). The only time καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα translates וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה is in 1 Kgs. 17:17. Additionally, whenever the idiomatic phrase הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה occurs, the OG often translates it with μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα (cf. Gen. 39:7; 40:1; Deut. 6:6). It is more probable, therefore, that καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα simply reflects וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי.

is too speculative, and because there is no clear textual trigger to cause its omission,²⁰⁴ the MT reflects the earlier and superior reading.

²⁰⁴ Holmes (80), however, maintains that a later MT revisor omitted **ואחר הדברים האלה** and substituted **ליוסף לנחלה** in its place.

CHAPTER 5

SUNDRY CAUSES

This final chapter of part II contains OG pluses which may have originated for a variety of reasons. The various explanations do not occur frequently enough to warrant their own chapter like “Textual Error” or “Harmonizations.” Thus, I have chosen to present the final 13 OG pluses as an amalgam. Hence, the word “sundry.”

(1) 3:4a אֶל-תִּקְרְבוּ אֵלָיו στήσεσθε, μὴ προσεγγίσητε αὐτῇ

On the brink of crossing the Jordan, the officers charge the people to keep a distance of 2,000 cubits between them and the ark of the covenant as they cross. After this, according to the OG, the officers charge the people saying, “*You shall stand still*. Do not approach it so that you may know the way whereby you will go.” This plus appears to stand in place of the MT במדה from the end of the preceding clause.

Before analyzing this plus, a syntactical discrepancy at the Greek level must be addressed. According to Rahlfs, στήσεσθε begins a new clause (i.e., *You shall stand still*); but according to OG^B and Margolis, στήσεσθε concludes the clause about the distance which should be maintained between the ark and the people (...about 2,000 cubits [from it] you shall stand. You shall not draw near it).²⁰⁵ If, in Holmes’ assessment, στήσεσθε

²⁰⁵ Cf. LXX-Brenton. OG^B agrees with the disjunctive accent (‘*atnach*’) under the ד of במדה in the MT.

reflects the imperative עמדו, Rahlfs' syntax is to be preferred.²⁰⁶ However, στήσεσθε more likely reflects the injunctive imperfect תעמדו.²⁰⁷ Thus, the syntactical arrangement as reflected in OG^B and Margolis is more preferable.²⁰⁸

That στήσεσθε completes the Greek clause is not inconsequential. Perhaps the translator's *Vorlage* appeared thus—באלפים אמה במדה תעמדו אל תקרבו אליו. If such were the case, the graphical similarity between במדה and תעמדו could have triggered a textual error, one which could have caused the OG translator to omit במדה and the MT copyist to omit תעמדו. Indeed, OG^O bears witness to such a reading (ὅσον δισχιλίους πήχεις ἐν μέτρῳ στήσεσθε).²⁰⁹ Nevertheless, it remains indeterminate whether במדה or תעמדו existed in the earlier text form since there is considerable variation among ancient witnesses.²¹⁰ If a greater degree of certainty can be had regarding their originality, the OG plus likely arose by MT copyist error.²¹¹

²⁰⁶ Holmes, 22.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Josh. 3:8 where στήσεσθε translates תעמדו. Moreover, whenever the imperative עמדו does occur in MT (Num. 9:8; Jer. 6:16; 2 Chron. 20:17; 35:5; Jer. 6:16; Nah. 2:9), the OG also uses the imperative form (usually στήτε).

²⁰⁸ Josh. 3:8 may provide support for this conclusion, since, in that verse, στήσεσθε concludes the verse.

²⁰⁹ See also Gk. MSS Ncq and Eth.

²¹⁰ S: אֶל־הָאֵלֶּיךָ לֹא תִקְרַב וְלֹא תִשָּׁחַק אֶת־הָאֵלֶּיךָ לֹא תִשָּׁחַק אֶת־הָאֵלֶּיךָ לֹא תִשָּׁחַק אֶת־הָאֵלֶּיךָ (“...about two thousand cubits from it. You must keep that distance, you must not approach it”); V: *spatium cubitorum duum milium ut procul videre possitis et nosse per quam viam ingrediamini quia prius non ambulastis per eam et cavete ne adpropinquetis ad arcam* (“...about two thousand cubits, and that you may be able to know which way to go, but do not go near it for you have not passed this way before”); OL: *quantum duo millia cubitorum stabitis: ne propinquetis ei* (“...about two thousand cubits you shall stand, you shall not draw near to it”).

²¹¹ Boling (156) argues that במדה is “unidiomatically redundant” and thus was the MT copyist’s attempt to make sense of a “mutilated text;” Auld (*LXX Joshua*, 104) believes it is safer to assume the OG reflects a *Vorlage* different than the MT in light of the infrequency of במדה; Nelson (54) prefers the MT reading but does not disclose his rationale; Margolis (36) views στήσεσθε as a replacement of במדה.

(2) 3:16 הָרַחֵק מְאֹד בְּאֶדָם הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר מֵצָד μακρὰν σφόδρα σφοδρῶς ἕως μέρους
 צָרְתָן וְהִירְדִים עַל יָם הָעֶרְבָה Καριαθιαριμ, τὸ δὲ καταβαῖνον κατέβη εἰς
 τὴν θάλασσαν Αραβα,

As the priests bearing the ark of the covenant of the LORD dipped in the brink of the Jordan, OG depicts the subsequent phenomena as such: “the waters flowing down from above stood still, a single solid heap stood apart very, *very* far off, *as far as part of Kariathiarim*, and that which came down came down²¹² to the sea of Araba.” The Hebrew text portrays the same phenomena, expect the waters stood in a heap very far away “at Adam, the city that is beside Zarethan.”

According to the OG, the translator’s *Vorlage* would have appeared as such: הָרַחֵק מְאֹד מְאֹד עַד (אֲשֶׁר) קֶצֶה כְּעִרִית יִרְעִים. This variant reading likely arose through a series of textual errors at the hands of the OG translator. First, if MT^Q is correct, the translator (mistakenly) read מְאֹד as simply מָאֹד. Second, the Hebrew word עִיר became עַד (ἕως). Last is the peculiar place name Καριαθιαριμ. Holmes suggests that the ד at the end of MT מֵצָד assimilated to the beginning of the following word (צָרְתָן) but was read as כָּרְתָן, while the צ of that word was read at ע resulting in the Greek word Καριαθιμ(ν). Attempting to makes sense of the text, the translator supplied יִרְעִים.²¹³ That this place name is textually problematic can be seen by the inner-Greek variations.²¹⁴

²¹² N.B. the switch to the singular καταβαῖνον from the plural Heb. participle הִירְדִים, as well as the additional Gk. verb κατέβη (ירד).

²¹³ Holmes, 23.

²¹⁴ OG^B (Καριαθαιιν); OG^A (Καθιαιρειν); Margolis (Καριαθαιιν); α', σ', and Θ (Σαρθαμ). Regarding OG^B, Leonard Greenspoon views Καριαθαιιν as a corruption of Καριαθειν (Leonard J. Greepsoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, HSM 28 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983], 126).

(3) 4:14 בְּעֵינֵי כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל ἐναντίον παντός τοῦ γένους Ισραηλ

Here, the OG refers to Israel as “the whole *race* of Israel.” The word γένους, which is a possible lexical equivalent of the Hebrew עַם(ה), only appears one other time in OG Joshua but most likely reflects a Greek corruption of ὄρους.²¹⁵ According to Muraoka, the term γένος denotes “a society of individuals with common beliefs and ancestry.”²¹⁶ Thus, the OG translator employed this terminology to provide further specification to כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל. This addition would make sense since one of the purposes of OG Joshua spoke to the “political interests both of an ethnic community trying to establish their cultural identity in a multicultural Empire and of rulers of that Empire who sought to maintain a much-disputed part of their territory.”²¹⁷

(4) 5:2 עָשָׂה לָךְ חֶרְבוֹת צָרִים Ποίησον σεαυτῷ μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου

Here, the LORD commands Joshua to make for himself swords with which he would circumcise the sons of Israel. According to the OG, these swords were to be cut from ‘sharp rock.’ Not all Gk. MSS agree, however, with μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου as illustrated in the table below.

Table 5.1. Textual variation among Greek witnesses

²¹⁵ Auld, *LXX Joshua*, 117.

²¹⁶ T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), s.v. γένος 2.

²¹⁷ Van Der Meer, “Joshua,” 89.

OG ^A , OG ^L , MSS xyb ₂ and OL	μαχαίρας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου
Theodotian and OG ^O	μαχαίρας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμους
Symmachus	μαχαίραν ἐξ ἀκροτόμου
Aquila and MSS dm	μαχαίρας πετρίνας

Since none of the major Gk. witnesses except OG^B contain both *πετρίνας* and *ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου*, we may assume that צרים underwent a double rendering—one literal; one midrashic.²¹⁸ Due to the redundancy of *πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου*, most Gk. MSS retain only one of the two renderings.²¹⁹ Since most of the major Gk. witnesses attest to *μαχαίρας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου*, the original reading in OG was likely *ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου* before the more literal *πετρίνας*—as attested by Aquila—was incorporated.

The Hebrew counter-part to *ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου* (מצור החלמיש) only appears one other time in the MT—viz., Deuteronomy 8:15.²²⁰ In this passage, Moses recounts the divine provision of the LORD bringing water ‘out of the flinty rock’ for the thirsty people of Israel. Accordingly, Auld views the addition of *ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου* as an exegetical maneuver; just as water from the flinty rock was a divine provision from the LORD, so also circumcision is a divine provision.²²¹ Thus, what appears to be a plus may be simply a free (midrashic) rendering of צרים.

²¹⁸ See Tov, “Midrash-Type Exegesis,” 155-156.

²¹⁹ Hence, Margolis (*μαχαίρας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου*).

²²⁰ A transposed variation of this modifier appears in Deut. 32:13—מהלמיש צור.

²²¹ Auld, *LXX Joshua*, 122. On the contrary, Soggin (69) asserts *ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου* is a “detail which conveys nothing.”

(5) 6:7b וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-הָעָם καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Παραγγείλατε τῷ
 עֲבְרוּ וְסָבּוּ אֶת-הָעִיר λαῶν περιελθεῖν καὶ κυκλῶσαι τὴν πόλιν.

The MT reads, “and he said to the people, ‘Go forward. March around the city,’” whereas the OG reads, “and [he] spoke to them,²²² saying, ‘Charge the people to go around and surround the city.’”²²³ This textual variation is challenging for several reasons. First, most of the preceding verse, as attested in the MT, is absent from the OG. Second, whereas the MT returns to narrative prose in 6:8, the OG continues the direct discourse of Joshua to the priests. Third, even at the Hebrew level, there appears to be a discrepancy as evidenced by MT^Q וַיֹּאמֶר and MT^K וַיֹּאמְרוּ.²²⁴ Fourth is the origin of Παραγγείλατε. BHS proposes that the OG translator read MT^K as the imperative form אִמְרוּ. However, if this was the case, one would expect the more lexically equivalent εἴπατε instead of παραγγείλατε.²²⁵

If the retroverted Hebrew text appeared thus as וַיֹּאמֶר אֵל(י)הֶם לְאִמֵּר הַשְׁמִיעוּ (צוּ)²²⁶ אֵת הָעָם, one possible, yet hypothetical, explanation which can account

²²² Although the Heb. אֵל הָעָם could be an explication of αὐτοῖς, in light of the immediate context, αὐτοῖς could also refer to τοὺς ἱερεῖς (אֵל הַכֹּהֲנִים) of the preceding verse. Indeed, MT 6:10 favors the latter as supported by the break in the *wayyiqṭōl* chain with וְאֵת הָעָם which appears to introduce a new addressee.

²²³ Only Gk. MSS gkn omit εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λέγων.

²²⁴ According to MT^Q, Joshua commands the people; according to MT^K, the priests command the people. The OG reading—with some variation—reflects MT^K.

²²⁵ According to Muraoka, this would be the sole exception where the root אִמַּר is rendered by παραγγέλω (T. Muraoka, *A Greek ~ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* [Leuven: Peeters, 2010], 90). Interestingly, the only other place where the imperative form of παραγγέλω appears is in OG Jeremiah (i.e., 26:14 [MT, 46:14]; 27:29 [MT, 50:29]; 28:27 [MT, 51:27]) where the LORD—through the prophet Jeremiah—is the issuer of the imperatives.

²²⁶ צוּ is proposed by Boling, 202. This retroversion seems unlikely as root צוּ is never rendered with the Gk. παραγγέλω. Additionally, when צוּ does occur in Joshua, the Gk. uses ἐντέλλομαι (1:9, 13; 3:3; 4:10) or συντάσσω (4:3, 8; 8:27). The Gk. MSS make no attempt to emend παραγγείλατε to either of these verb forms.

for the absence of אל(י)הם in the MT is haplography—אל(י)הם became אל העם by *homoioteleuton* of the final ם of אל(י)הם to the final ם of אל העם.²²⁷ However, given the other forms of textual variation surrounding both the preceding and subsequent context, the OG and MT may reflect two discrete literary editions at different points in the literary development of the book.

(6) 6:12 וַיִּשָּׁכַם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἀνέσθη Ἰησοῦς τὸ
בבקר πρωί

The MT informs us that Joshua arose early in the morning, while the OG provides the temporal specification “on the second day.” Interestingly, however, the MT provides the same specification (ביום השני) in 6:14 which is absent in OG. Although the placement of ביום השני differs between OG and MT, this does not necessitate a chronological inconsistency. The second day when the people marched around the city (per MT) was the same day Joshua arose early in the morning (per OG). The (re)positioning of ביום השני from v. 14 to v. 12 was likely made to achieve greater degree of clarity. Thus, as Trent Butler aptly pointed out: the OG supplies “on the second day” in v. 12 to make clear that v. 11 depicts day one.²²⁸

(7) 8:8 כְּדָבַר יְהוָה תַּעֲשׂוּ רְאוּ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ποιήσετε· ἰδοὺ
צוֹיָתִי אֲתָכֶם ἐντέταλμαι ὑμῖν.

With the attack against Ai on the horizon, OG Joshua commands the people, “you shall act according to *this* word; see, I have commanded you do,” whereas MT Joshua

²²⁷ Boling (202) also notes: The MT reading ויאמר אל את העם can be derived from the OG (ויאמר [אל]יהם צו את העם), but the OG could not be derived from the MT.

²²⁸ Butler, 66. See Nelson (87) who views both MT and OG inclusion of “on the second day” as expansionistic.

translator supplied κύριος to leave no doubt who is the agent of the verbs. The latter seems more likely, especially since the MT copyist would not intentionally omit the tetragrammaton.

(10) 13:14 כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר-לֹ: ס καθὰ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς κύριος. καὶ οὗτος ὁ καταμερισμός, ὃν κατεμέρισεν Μωυσῆς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Αραβωθ Μωαβ ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κατὰ Ἰεριχω. [15] Καὶ ἔδωκεν Μωυσῆς τῇ φυλῇ Ρουβην

Here, the OG contains a superscription²³⁴ introducing the division of land which Moses divided for the sons of Israel.²³⁵ Whereas the MT lacks this introductory header, a corresponding subscription does appear in MT Joshua 13:32, which essentially reiterates the superscription as attested by the OG. Below is a table which compares the superscription of OG 13:14 and subscription of OG 13:32 in the OG along with the retroverted Hebrew *Vorlage* and MT.

Table 5.2. Comparison of actual subscription and assumed superscription

OG Superscription (13:14)	OG Subscription (13:32)
καὶ οὗτος ὁ καταμερισμός, ὃν κατεμέρισεν Μωυσῆς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Αραβωθ Μωαβ ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κατὰ Ἰεριχω.	Οὗτοι οὖς κατεκληρονόμησεν Μωυσῆς πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐν Αραβωθ Μωαβ ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κατὰ Ἰεριχω ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν
OG <i>Vorlage</i>	MT
וזאת הנחלה אשר נחל משה לבני ישראל בערבות מאוב מעבר לירדן יריחו	אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר־נָחַל מֹשֶׁה בְּעֶרְבוֹת מוֹאָב מֵעֵבֶר לַיַּרְדֵּן יְרִיחוֹ מִזְרְחָהּ

Note the differences between the two texts in Greek: 1) the singular οὗτος of the

²³⁴ Although this plus appears at the end of v. 14 according to OG^B and Rahlfs' edition, since the material given in the plus reflects the superscription to the corresponding subscription of v. 32, I agree with Margolis' decision to assimilate the plus into v. 15 starting a new paragraph.

²³⁵ Only Eth. lacks this plus.

superscription and the plural Οὔτοι of the subscription; 2) the *hepax legoumena* ὁ καταμερισμός which is reflected by the relative pronoun οὗς in the subscription; 3) the lexical variation between verbs καταμερίζω and κατακληρονομέω; 4) the inclusion of τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ in the superscription; 5) the dual appearance of τῷ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου in the subscription; and 6) the absence of ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν in the superscription. These difference should preclude the possibility that the OG translator harmonized v. 14 with v. 32 by adding a superscription.

Yet the origin of this plus remains uncertain. Because no apparent textual trigger could explain the loss of the Hebrew ירדן—וַאֲתָ, justifying the originality of the plus on text-critical grounds is not a viable option.²³⁶ Nevertheless, the genuineness of the OG plus can be substantiated by the following: 1) the transliteration of what would have appeared as מַעְרִבֹת מִזָּבֵחַ with Αραβωθ Μωαβ; 2) the use of the obscure Greek noun καταμερισμός, since the OG translator would have used a more common noun like κληρονομία; 3) the completion of the superscription-subscription construction which appears elsewhere in Joshua (e.g., 12:1//12:7; 14:1//19:51; OG 20:3//MT 20:9). Either a later Hebrew editor omitted the OG plus in light of its repetition in v. 32, or the *Vorlage* behind the OG reflects a different literary edition, in which case both the MT and OG readings are legitimate. The extra material found in v. 14 of the OG did not originate at the hands of the OG translator, nor did an MT copyist lose the reading by *homoioeleuton*.

²³⁶ See Boling (334) who, nonetheless, suggests a long haplography on the part of the MT scribe; the eye skipped from the final ן in לוֹ to the final ן in ירדו.

(11) 19:16 זאת נחלת בני־זבולן αὕτη ἡ κληρονομία φυλῆς υἱῶν Ζαβουλων

In the description of the sons of Zebulun, the OG contains the additional noun ‘tribe’ before ‘sons.’ This plus is well supported not only by Gk. MSS²³⁷ but also V (*haec est hereditas tribus filiorum Zabulon*), T²³⁸ (דא אחסנת שיבט בני זבולן), and Mp (cf. Mm 1350). Elsewhere in MT Joshua, Zebulun is referred to as מטה זבולן (e.g., 21:7, 34). The absence of מטה is not due to textual error, however. Since in 19:10 the MT began the allotment to Zebulun with בני זבולן in the superscription, the MT copyist may have harmonized מטה בני זבולן in the subscription of 19:16 with the superscription of 19:10.²³⁹ The OG, thus, reflects the earlier reading.²⁴⁰

(12) 19:47-48

<p>וַיַּעַל בְּנֵי־דָן וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ עִם־לָשָׁם וַיִּלְכְּדוּ אֹתָהּ וַיַּכּוּ אֹתָהּ לִפְנֵי חֶרֶב וַיִּרְשׁוּ אֹתָהּ וַיֵּשְׁבוּ בָּהּ וַיִּקְרְאוּ לָלָשָׁם דָּן כְּשֵׁם דָּן אֲבִיהֶם</p>	<p>καὶ οὐκ ἐξέθλιψαν οἱ υἱοὶ Δαν τὸν Ἀμορραῖον τὸν θλίβοντα αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ οὐκ εἴων αὐτοὺς οἱ Ἀμορραῖοι καταβῆναι εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα καὶ ἔθλιψαν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τὸ ὄριον τῆς μερίδος αὐτῶν. (48) καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰουδα καὶ ἐπολέμησαν τὴν Λαχισ καὶ κατελάβοντο αὐτήν καὶ ἐπάταξαν αὐτήν ἐν στόματι μαχαίρας καὶ κατῴκησαν αὐτήν καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Λασενδακ. καὶ ὁ Ἀμορραῖος ὑπέμεινεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν Ελωμ καὶ ἐν Σαλαμιν· καὶ ἐβαρύνθη ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ Εφραιμ ἐπ’ αὐτούς, καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτοῖς εἰς φόρον.</p>
---	--

Aside from the transposition of vv. 47 and 48 in the OG *vis-à-vis* the MT, and a

²³⁷ OG^{AL} and Ndefijlmps–vy–b₂ with grammatical variation τῆς φυλῆς perhaps in light of 21:34.

²³⁸ MSS a (Tiberian Add. 26879) and f (*Codex Reuchlinianus*).

²³⁹ A similar scenario appears to have occurred with the superscription of 19:1 and the subscription of 19:9.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Butler, 199; Boling, 443; Holmes, 68.

few textual discrepancies,²⁴¹ the OG contains a substantial plus at the end of both verses. At the close of the Danite allotment list, the OG continues: “And the sons of Dan did not force out the Amorite who was oppressing them in the mountain, and the Amorites did not permit them to go down into the valley, and they reduced from them the boundary of their portion.” And after the description of the battle between the sons of Judah (OG, Dan) at Leshem (OG, Lachish), the OG records: “And the Amorite continued to dwell in Elom and in Salamin, and the hand of Ephraim was heavy upon them, and they became as tribute to them.” Those familiar with the introduction of Judges will notice a parallel between the two. Below is a table which compares the OG plus material with Judges 1:34–35.

²⁴¹ E.g., *οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰουδα*; *לשם*//*τῆς Λαχίς*; *דן*//*Λασηνδακ* (= *דן לשם*?). N.B. also the quantitative difference of MT verbal clause *וירשו אותם* and the explanatory clause *דן אביהם כשם* which are both absent in OG.

Table 5.3. Comparison of parallel passages in Joshua and Judges

OG Joshua 19:47b & 48b	OG Judges 1:34–35
καὶ οὐκ ἐξέθλιψαν οἱ υἱοὶ Δαν τὸν Αμορραῖον τὸν θλίβοντα αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ οὐκ εἶων αὐτοὺς οἱ Αμορραῖοι καταβῆναι εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα καὶ ἔθλιψαν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τὸ ὄριον τῆς μερίδος αὐτῶν.	Καὶ ἐξέθλιψεν ὁ Αμορραῖος τοὺς υἱοὺς Δαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος, ὅτι οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν καταβῆναι εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα.
καὶ ὁ Αμορραῖος ὑπέμεινεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν Ελωμ καὶ ἐν Σαλαμιν· καὶ ἐβαρύνθη ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ Εφραιμ ἐπ’ αὐτούς, καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτοῖς εἰς φόρον.	καὶ ἤρξατο ὁ Αμορραῖος κατοικεῖν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦ Μυρσινῶνος, οὗ αἱ ἄρκοι καὶ αἱ ἀλώπεκες· καὶ ἐβαρύνθη ἡ χεὶρ οἴκου Ἰωσηφ ἐπὶ τὸν Αμορραῖον, καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς φόρον
OG Vorlage	MT Judges 1:34–35
ולא לחצו בני דן את האמרי לחציהם בהר ולא חרפום האמרי לרדת לעמק וילחצו מהם את גבול חלקם	וַיִּלְחָצוּ הָאֲמֹרִי אֶת־בְּנֵי־דָן הַהָרָה כִּי־לֹא נָתַנוּ לָרֶדֶת לְעַמָּק:
והאמרי ישב לשבת באלם (באליון) ובשלמים ותכבד יד אפרים עליהם ויהיו להם למס	וַיֹּאֲלֶה הָאֲמֹרִי לְשִׁבְתָּ בְּהַר־חָרָס בְּאַיִלֹן וּבְשִׁעְלָבִים וַתִּכְבֹּד יַד בֵּית־יוֹסֵף וַיְהִיו לָמָס

If we emend Ελωμ and Σαλαμιν in OG Joshua to Αιλων and Σαλαβειν (cf.

Margolis), the parts of the plus which correspond to Judges are nearly identical yet different enough to preclude the possibility of interpolation. However, it is peculiar how the Judges material is separated by a summary statement in v. 47 (MT v. 48). That is, the Greek text appears to read thus: MT Judges 1:34—OG Joshua 19:47—MT Judges 1:35. Regarding the MT textual tradition, v. 47 is unusually placed since v. 48 should naturally follow v. 46. So then, we can see the text in vv. 47–48 is quite complex; a complexity which may lend itself to the view that the textual tradition of Joshua 19:47–48 as well as Judges 1:34–36 was still in the process of development and formation.²⁴²

²⁴² Butler, 200.

Be that as it may, three possibilities may account for the OG plus: 1) the narrative was omitted by a later Hebrew copyist either because of redundancy or the mention of failure;²⁴³ 2) the OG translator sought to create intertextual connections to Judges;²⁴⁴ 3) the extra material had already been added to the *Vorlage* of the OG prior to translation, in which case the reading is *technically* secondary, but not because the OG translator added it.²⁴⁵ Although it is often difficult to discern whether a plus such as this reflects an earlier Hebrew text form or a (midrashic) expansion, the OG reading does seem original to its context as it follows v. 46 (which records the allotment of Dan) and makes accords well with the MT clause ויצא גבול בני דן מהם (which is peculiarly absent from the OG).

(13) 20:3 והיו לכם למקלט מגאל הדם καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν αἱ πόλεις φυγαδευτήριον,
καὶ οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται ὁ φονευτὴς ὑπὸ τοῦ
ἀγχιστεύοντος τὸ αἷμα, ἕως ἂν καταστῇ
ἐναντίον τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰς κρίσιν.

In the description of the cities of refuge, we are told the man-slayer may flee to these appointed cities to escape from the avenger of blood. However, the OG continues reading, “and the slayer shall not die by the next of kin in blood (i.e., avenger of blood) until he stands before the congregation for judgment.”²⁴⁶ In terms of the immediate context, this additional description in the OG is supported by MT 20:9 as it appears to

²⁴³ Cooke, 186; Holmes, 70. This, however, seems unlikely as Judges itself is not afraid to mention the failure (Judg. 1:27–35).

²⁴⁴ Nelson, 225–226.

²⁴⁵ Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua,” 395.

²⁴⁶ This plus is well attested among Gk. MSS, with minor variation. MSS dpt read φονευσας with MT before καὶ οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται; OG^A, OG^L, as well as MSS N⁰deh–mpstuw–b₂ read ἀπο instead of ὑπο. OG^L and MSS cx read ἀπο τοῦ ἀγχιστεύοντος τὸ αἷμα after κρίσιν.

completes the *inclusio* of v. 3 (ולא ימות ביד גאל הדם עד עמדו לפני העדה)²⁴⁷ and v. 9 (ולא ימות) (ביד גאל הדם עד עמדו לפני העדה). Additionally, it coincides quite well with the description of the cities of refuge as described in Numbers 35:11–12.

After this plus, however, the OG exhibits a significant gap between MT 20:4–6 which may either reflect an omission in the OG or an expansion in the MT. The latter is more likely since no textual trigger could have caused its omission in the OG and because there is no apparent reason for the OG translator to intentionally omit the text. Thus, I agree with Emanuel Tov who suggests:

“[the OG and MT] reflect different literary editions, with the long edition developing from the short one...The shorter text of G reflects an early literary layer of this chapter. This assumption is based on the internal tension between this layer and that of the additions in the long text of MT.”²⁴⁸

That is, whereas the OG plus coincides with the description of the cities of refuge in Numbers 35:11–12, the additional material of MT 20:4–6 reflects not only Numbers 35 but also the content and style of Deuteronomy 19:4–10. Consequently, it has been suggested that a later edition of Joshua supplied additional information from the description of the cities of refuge as depicted in Deuteronomy.²⁴⁹ The longer text could certainly have arisen from the shorter, but the shorter is unlikely to have arisen from the longer.

²⁴⁷ The presumed retroversion from the Gk.

²⁴⁸ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 296. Of course, the challenge is knowing which differences one should ascribe to text-critical changes and which to ascribe to social and historical development (N.B. the differences between Num. 35:6–34; Deut. 4:41–43; Deut. 19:1–3; Josh. 20).

²⁴⁹ Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua,” 387. See Boling, 472; Nelson, 227; and Holmes, 71 who also defend the OG as the earliest reading.

(14) 21:42a-d

לְכָל־הָעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה

[41] πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ταύταις.

[42a] Καὶ συνετέλεσεν Ἰησοῦς διαμερίσας τὴν γῆν ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῶν. [42b] καὶ ἔδωκαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ μερίδα τῷ Ἰησοῖ κατὰ πρόσταγμα κυρίου· ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν, ἣν ᾔτήσατο· τὴν Θαμνασαραχ ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Εφραιμ. [42c] καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν Ἰησοῦς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ὥκησεν ἐν αὐτῇ. [42d] καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰησοῦς τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας, ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ τοὺς γενομένους ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὰς ἐν Θαμνασαραχ.

This extensive plus in the OG textual tradition provides similar concluding remarks to the allotments section as recorded in 19:49 (i.e., “And they proceeded to come into possession of the land according to their boundary—And Joshua ceased dividing the land in their boundaries”). Because 21:42a–d essentially repeats that which is recorded in 19:49–50, some conclude that it was not in the earlier Hebrew text form, but the OG translator added it to his translation for narrative effect.²⁵⁰ However, a comparison between the two accounts in the Greek, as depicted in the table below, militate against such a conclusion.

²⁵⁰ Cooke, 199; Nelson, 236.

Table 5.4. Comparison of alleged repeated passages

OG Joshua 21:42a–d	OG Joshua 19:49–50
<p>[42a] <u>Καὶ συνετέλεσεν Ἰησοῦς διαμερίσας τὴν γῆν ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῶν.</u> [42b] <u>καὶ ἔδωκαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ μερίδα τῷ Ἰησοῖ κατὰ πρόσταγμα κυρίου·</u> <u>ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν, ἣν ᾠτήσατο·</u> <u>τὴν Θαμνασαραχ ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Εφραιμ.</u> [42c] <u>καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν Ἰησοῦς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ὥκησεν ἐν αὐτῇ.</u> [42d] καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰησοῦς τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας, ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ τοὺς γενομένους ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὰς ἐν Θαμνασαραχ.</p>	<p>[49] Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἐμβατεῦσαι τὴν γῆν κατὰ τὸ ὄριον αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔδωκαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ κληῖρον Ἰησοῖ τῷ υἱῷ Ναυη ἐν αὐτοῖς [50] διὰ προστάγματος τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν, ἣν ᾠτήσατο, Θαμνασαραχ, ἣ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Εφραιμ· καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν τὴν πόλιν καὶ κατῴκει ἐν αὐτῇ</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>

The underlined words in 21:42a–c indicate those words which coincide with those attested in 19:49–50. Only 62% of the Greek text of 21:42a–c agrees with 19:49–50 which makes it quite unlikely that the OG translator simply repeated the information.

To be sure, the reading in 21:42a–c is likely secondary but not secondary at the hands of the OG translator. Alexander Rofé argues that at an earlier stage in the literary development of Joshua, chapter 20 (cities of refuge) and chapter 21 (Levitical cities) were incorporated into the text.²⁵¹ Following this line of reasoning, the additional material as reflected in the OG may not evince the translator’s desire to expand the text nor the MT copyist’s omission (intentional or unintentional); it may simply reflect two different textual traditions at different stages of literary development. In other words, the *Vorlage* of the OG may have always contained 21:42a–d while the textual tradition which would later become the MT may have never contained 21:42a–d.

²⁵¹ Alexander Rofé, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 74.

PART III

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS & IMPLICATIONS

The primary focus of this study has been to offer a contribution to the discussion regarding the text-critical validity of OG Joshua by putting center stage the instances when the OG presents longer readings than the MT. This was carried out by providing an in-depth analysis of 60 OG pluses which were placed into four constituent categories: 1) Textual Error; 2) Harmonizations; 3) Amplifications; 4) Sundry Causes. In each passage analyzed, a case was made for why it belonged in its respective category. The working thesis throughout the study has been that the OG more often than not reflects the earlier Hebrew text form.

Based on my preliminary research, especially those of the OG-Shorten's school, I expected to find support for the position. The results told a different story. Although they did not completely undermine this working thesis, they did appear to be slightly at odds with each other. Out of the 60 pluses analyzed, 18 arose from MT textual error, 13 from OG harmonizations, 15 from OG amplifications, and 14 from sundry causes. In the textual error chapter, the 18 pluses analyzed showed that the pluses are attributed to omissions and error by the MT scribe not to additions by the OG translator—what appears to be a plus in the OG is actually a minus in the MT. In the sundry causes chapter, only 4 pluses out of the 14 analyzed can be directly attributed to the OG translator. If we add the amount of pluses directly attributed to the OG translator

(i.e., 13 harmonizations + 15 amplifications + 4 sundry causes), we can see the total is 32. That is, out of the 60 pluses analyzed, 32 pluses can be attributed directly to the OG translator and 28 pluses are attributed to factors other than the translator's initiative.

Recall the methodological spectrum discussed in chapter one. The OG-Shortens school (Dillmann) proposed that where the OG deviated from the MT, precedence should be given to the MT; the OG translator had a proclivity towards shortening and introducing deliberate changes. The MT-Expands school (Holmes), on the contrary, maintained that precedence should be given to the OG when the OG deviates from MT; a later Hebrew editor reworked and revised the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG. Serving as a quasi-middle ground, the Eclectic school (Hollenberg) allowed room for the possibility that both the OG and MT contain secondary elements.

In the same way Harry M. Orlinsky once suggested a return to Holmes' school of thought,²⁵² perhaps the results of this study warrant a return to Hollenberg's school of thought, albeit with a less conservative reluctance to assume a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. One cannot proceed from the methodological presupposition that precedence should be given to the OG in the cases of textual deviation (*per* Holmes); nor can one proceed from the inverse presupposition that the MT should be given similar precedence in the event of textual variation (*per* Dillmann). Whereas the findings of the study cannot speak to the instances when the OG presents a shorter reading, when the OG presents a longer reading, the text-critic must be aware that about half of the time (on average) the OG will reflect the earlier reading. However, since the MT is longer on more occasions than the

²⁵² Orlinsky, 196.

OG is longer, the scale should tilt ever-so slightly in the favor of the OG. Therefore, one may very well confide in the integrity of the OG textual tradition, but, in light of the findings, he/she must be cautious not to overextend his/her confidence in the OG.

Contrary to Dillmann's presupposition, then, we should not look askance at the OG when it diverges from the MT as though the translator was playing fast-and-loose with the text before him. In at least 28 out of the 60 pluses analyzed, the OG has proved effective in recovering earlier readings of the Hebrew text. In the event that further textual evidence—e.g., discovering another Qumran scroll of Joshua with more textual data, publication of the Göttingen edition Joshua or BHQ—becomes available, the working thesis of this study may be further undergirded or (of course) challenged. Nevertheless, OG Joshua still remains an integral witness to the earlier form of the Hebrew text around the third or second century BCE.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF QUALITATIVE VARIATION²⁵³

Lexical Variation

3:17	עַד אֲשֶׁר־תָּמּוּ כָּל־הַגּוֹי לְעֵבֶר אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן	ἕως συνετέλεσεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς (העם) διαβαίνων τὸν Ιορδάνην.
4:11	וַיַּעֲבֹר אֶרֶוֹן־יְהוָה וְהַפְּתָנִים לִפְנֵי הָעָם	καὶ οἱ λίθοι (האבנים) ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν.
5:6	בְּקוֹל יְהוָה	τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (מצות [ה]אלהים)
7:11	חָטָא יִשְׂרָאֵל	ἡμάρτηκεν ὁ λαὸς (העם)
8:20	וַיִּפְּנוּ אַנְשֵׁי הָעִי	καὶ περιβλέψαντες οἱ κάτοικοι (הי[ו]שבי) Γαι

Graphical Confusion & Metathesis

6:19	יְהוָה יְבוֹא	κυρίου εἰσενεχθήσεται (יובא)
7:3	וַיָּכּוּ אֶת־הָעִי	καὶ ἐκπολιορκησάτωσαν τὴν πόλιν (העיר)
9:14	וַיִּקְחוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים	καὶ ἔλαβον οἱ ἄρχοντες (הנשיאים)
11:2	וּבְעֶרְבָה נִגְבַּב כְּנָרוֹת	καὶ εἰς τὴν Ραβα ἀπέναντι (נגד) Κενερωθ
15:7	וְהַגְדֵּרָה וּגְדֵרְתִּים	καὶ Γαδηρα καὶ αἱ ἐπαύλεις αὐτῆς (גדרתיה)
17:1	וַיְהִי הַגּוֹרֵל לְמִטָּה מִנְּשָׂה	Καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ ὄρια (הגבול) φυλῆς υἱῶν Μανασση
19:27	בְּזַבְלוֹן וּבְגִי	τῷ Ζαβουλων καὶ ἐκ Γαι (ומגי)

²⁵³ These examples provide a meager sampling of qualitative variations I observed during my survey of textual variation between the OG and MT. Indeed, more variations such as the above exist; but, since the focus of my study was concerted towards finding variations in the OG which have no counter-part in the MT, I only recorded a few of these.

Revocalization

2:1	מִן־הַשָּׂטִים	ἐκ Σαττιν (הַשָּׂטִים)
5:2	וְשׁוּב מִלֹּאֲת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ καθίσας (וְשׁוּב) περίτεμε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραηλ
19:27	בְּזִלְזוֹן וּבְגִי	τῷ Ζαβουλων καὶ ἐκ Γαι (גִּי)

Place Name Discrepancy

15:15	לְפָנִים קְרִית־סֶפֶר	πρότερον Πόλις γραμμάτων.
17:7	אֶל־הַיַּמִּין אֶל־יִשְׁבִּי	ἐπὶ Ιαμιν καὶ Ιασσιβ
18:15	מִקְצֵה קְרִית יַעֲרִים	ἀπὸ μέρους Καριαθβααλ
19:27	וַיֵּצֵא אֶל־כְּבוֹל מִשְׁמָאֵל	καὶ διελεύσεται εἰς Χωβα μασομελ

Pronoun/Pronominal Suffix Variation

1:6	אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאַבְרָם	ἣν ὥμοσα τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν (לְאַבְרָם)
4:23	אֶת־מִי הִירְדֵּן מִפְּנֵיהֶם	τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Ιορδάνου ἐκ τοῦ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν (מִפְּנֵיהֶם)
24:27c	בְּאֵלֵהֶם	τῷ θεῷ μου (אֵלֵהֶם)

APPENDIX B

PLUSES NOT ANALYZED²⁵⁴

1:11	יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם נָתַן לָכֶם (לְרִשְׁתָּהּ):	κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν.
2:1	וַיָּלְכוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ בֵּית-אִשָּׁה זוֹנָה וְשָׂמָּה רָחֵב וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ-שָׁמָּה:	καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσῆλθοσαν οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι εἰς Ἰεριχω καὶ εἰσῆλθοσαν εἰς οἰκίαν γυναικὸς πόρνῃς, ἥ ὄνομα Ρααβ, καὶ κατέλυσαν ἐκεῖ.
2:3a	וַיִּשְׁלַח מֶלֶךְ יִרְיָחוֹ אֶל-רָחֵב לֵאמֹר	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰεριχω καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Ρααβ λέγων
2:4	וַתֹּאמֶר	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λέγουσα
2:13a	וְהַחֲיִתֶם אֶת-אָבִי	καὶ ζωγρήσετε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου
2:19	וַאֲנַחֲנוּ נָקִים	ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀθῶοι τῷ ὅρκῳ σου τούτῳ·
3:7	בְּעֵינַי כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל	κατενώπιον πάντων υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ
3:15	בְּקֶצֶה הַמַּיִם	εἰς μέρος τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
3:17	וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ
4:5	עָבְרוּ לִפְנֵי (אֲרֹן) יְהוָה (אֱלֹהֵיכֶם)	Προσαγάγετε ἔμπροσθέν μου πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου
4:6	לְמַעַן תִּהְיֶה זֹאת אוֹת בְּקִרְבְּכֶם	ἵνα ὑπάρχωσιν ὑμῖν οὗτοι εἰς σημεῖον κείμενον διὰ παντός,
5:3	אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל- גְּבַעַת הָעֵרְלוֹת:	τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ ἐπὶ τοῦ καλουμένου τόπου Βουνὸς τῶν ἀκροβυστιῶν.
5:6a	כִּי אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה הָלָכּוּ בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל	τεσσαράκοντα γὰρ καὶ δύο ἔτη ἀνέστραπται Ἰσραηλ
5:6b	בְּמִדְבָּר	ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῇ Μαδβαρίτιδι,
5:6c	אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה הַיִּצְאִים מִמִּצְרַיִם	τῶν μαχίμων τῶν ἐξεληλυθότων ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
5:9	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ	καὶ εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Ἰησοῖ υἱῷ Ναυη

²⁵⁴ These pluses were not analyzed simply due to the constraints of space and time.

6:5a	וַעֲלוּ הָעָם	καὶ εἰσελεύσεται πᾶς ὁ λαὸς
6:5b	אִישׁ נֶגְדוֹ	ὁρμήσας ἕκαστος κατὰ πρόσωπον εἰς τὴν πόλιν.
6:20	וַיִּרְעוּ הָעָם תְּרוּעָה גְדוֹלָה	ἠγάλαξεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἅμα ἀλαλαγμῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἰσχυρῷ.
6:25	וְאֶת־רֶחֶב הַזֹּנָה וְאֶת־בֵּית אֲבִיהָ	καὶ Ρααβ τὴν πόρνην καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκον τὸν πατρικὸν αὐτῆς
7:19	שִׁים־נָא כְּבוֹד לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Δὸς δόξαν σήμερον τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ Ἰσραὴλ
7:25	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ מָה עֹכְרִיתֶנּוּ	καὶ εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς τῷ Ἀχαρ Τί ὠλέθρευσας ἡμᾶς;
8:27	לָהֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל	πάντα ἃ ἐπρονόμεισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ
9:1a	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ (כְּלִמְלָכִים אֲשֶׁר בְּעֶבֶר הִירְדֵּן	Ὡς δ' ἤκουσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν Ἀμορραίων οἱ ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,
9:2f (8:35)	אֲשֶׁר לֹא־קָרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ נֶגְדַּל כְּלִקְהֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל	ὁ οὐκ ἀνέγνω Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ ὧτα πάσης ἐκκλησίας υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ,
9:3	שָׁמְעוּ אֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה	ἤκουσαν πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν
9:5	וְכָל לֶחֶם צִידִם יָבֵשׁ הָיָה נֶקֶדִים:	καὶ ὁ ἄρτος αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐπισιτισμοῦ ξηρὸς καὶ εὐρωτιῶν καὶ βεβρωμένος.
9:10a		ὃς κατῴκει ἐν Ἀσταρωθ καὶ ἐν Ἐδραῖν
10:2a	וַיִּירָאוּ מֵאֵד	καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς σφόδρα·
10:2b	כִּי עִיר גְּדוֹלָה גְּבֻעִין	ἦδει γὰρ ὅτι μεγάλη πόλις Γαβαν
10:6	אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־הַמַּחֲנֶה הַגָּלְגָּל	πρὸς Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν Ἰσραὴλ εἰς Γαλγαλα
10:10	לִפְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ
11:7	וַיַּפְּלוּ בָהֶם	καὶ ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ὀρεινῇ.
13:2	גְּלִילֹת הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים (וְכָל)־הַגְּשׁוּרִי:	ὄρια Φυλιστιμ, ὁ Γεσιρι καὶ ὁ Χαναναῖος·
15:17	וַיִּתֵּן־לוֹ אֶת־עַכְסָה בַת־לָאֲשָׁה	καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν Ἀχσαν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ αὐτῇ γυναῖκα.
16:1	בְּהָר בֵּית־אֵל:	εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν τὴν ἔρημον εἰς Βαιθὴλ Λουζα
17:7a	וַיְהִי גְבוּל־מְנַשֶּׁה	Καὶ ἐγενήθη ὄρια υἱῶν Μανασσὴ Δηλαναθ
18:9	וַיַּעֲבְרוּ בְּאֶרֶץ וַיִּכְתְּבוּהָ	καὶ ἐχωροβάτησαν τὴν γῆν καὶ εἶδον αὐτὴν καὶ ἔγραψαν αὐτήν

18:19	וְהָיוּ תִצְאוֹתָיו הַגְּבוּל אֶל-לְשׁוֹן יַם-הַמֶּלַח	καὶ ἔσται ἡ διέξοδος τῶν ὁρίων ἐπὶ λοφίαν τῆς θαλάσσης τῶν ἁλῶν
19:9	מִחֶבֶל בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה נִחַלַת בְּנֵי שִׁמְעוֹן	ἀπὸ τοῦ κλήρου Ιουδα ἡ κληρονομία φυλῆς υἱῶν Συμεων
20:3	וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְמִקְלָט	καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν αἱ πόλεις φυγαδευτήριον
21:12	נָתַנוּ לְכָלֵב	ἔδωκεν Ἰησοῦς τοῖς υἱοῖς Χαλεβ
21:34	מֵאֵת מִטָּה זְבוּלֵן	ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς υἱῶν Ζαβουλων
23:2	וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְכָל- יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ συνεκάλεσεν Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραηλ
24:7	אֲשֶׁר-עָשִׂיתִי בְּמִצְרַיִם	ὅσα ἐποίησεν κύριος ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." In *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, 65–76. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *Joshua Retold*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- _____. *Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, Richard S. H. Hess, and John Jarick. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Boling, Robert G. *Joshua*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- Brenton, Lancelot C. L. *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: With an English Translation, and with Various Readings and Critical Notes*. 2 Vols. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1844–1851; repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978.
- Brock, Sebastian. *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*. 2nd ed. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006.
- Brooke, Alan England, Norman McLean, Henry St. John Thackeray, eds. *The Octateuch Part IV. Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament in Greek*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1917.
- Butler, Trent C. *Joshua*. WBC 7. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Cooke, G. A. *The Book of Joshua in the Revised Version*. Cambridge: University Press, 1918.
- De Lagarde, Paulo. *Bibliothecae Syriacae*. Göttingen: Luederi Horstman, 1892.
- De Troyer, Kristin. "The Battle Against Ai and the Textual History of the Book of Joshua." *JSCS* 48 (2015): 39–53.
- _____. *Rewriting the Sacred Text*. Vol. 4. Edited by James R. Adair, Jr. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Pt. 1. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1964.

- Fischer, Bonifatio, I. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, and W. Theile. *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Flesher, Paul V. M., and Bruce Chilton. *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*. SAIS 12. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Flügel, Eva Schulz. "The Latin Old Testament Tradition." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, vol. 1, pt. 1, 642–662. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996.
- Greenspoon, Leonard. "Iesous: To the Reader." in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 174–176. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- _____. *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. HSM 28. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Hertog, Cornelis G. den. "Jesus/Josue/Das Buch Josua." In *Handbuch Zur Septuaginta: Einleitung in die Septuaginta*, edited by Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Siegfried Kreuzer, vol. 1, 177–187. Gütersloh: Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Holmes, Samuel. *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Text*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Kiraz, George A., and Joseph Bali. *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation*. Translated by Gillian Greenberg and Donald M. Walter. Edited by George A. Kiraz and Andreas Juckel. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2015.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried. "Toward the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige Recension)." In *The Bible in Greek*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus, SCS 63, 113–128. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- _____. "Translation—Revision—Tradition: Problems and Tasks in the Historical Books." In *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus, SCS 63, 78–93. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Levey, Samson H. "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets." *Vetus Testamentum* 21, no. 2 (1971): 186–196.

- Marcos, Natalio Fernández. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Margolis, Max L. *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*. Parts I–IV. Publications of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation. Paris 1931 (–1938).
- _____. *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*. Part V. Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1992.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek ~ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- _____. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Joshua: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. “The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua.” VTSup 27. Leiden: Brill, 1969: 187–195.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta*. Edited by Robert Hanhart. 2 volumes. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Rofé, Alexander. “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a.” In *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15, 73–80. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Rösel, Martin. “The Septuagint Version of The Book of Joshua.” *SJOT* 16, no. 1 (2002): 5–23.
- Sabatier, Pierre. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*. 3 vols. Remis: Apud Reginaldum Florentain, 1743. Reprint, Paris: apud Franciscum Didot, 1751.
- Sipilä, Seppo. *Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges Regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by ו and וְ*. PFES 75. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Joshua*. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1972.

Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic Vol. II: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Tal, Abraham. "Genesis," in *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.

Tov, Emanuel. "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in light of the Evidence of the Septuagint." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by The Board of the Quarterly, VTSup 72, 385–396. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.

_____. "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the Septuagint of Joshua." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by The Board of the Quarterly, VTSup 72, 153–163. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.

_____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

_____. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

Ulrich, Eugene. ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. VTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Van Der Meer, Michaël N. *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of Oldest Textual Witnesses*. VTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

_____. "Joshua." In *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by James K. Aitken, 86–101. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

INDEX OF TEXTS DISCUSSED

Joshua

1:15	22	11:2	48
2:3b	53	11:15	49
2:10	54	13:7-8a	31
2:12	42	13:14	70
2:13	23	14:13	46
2:16	24	15:59	32
2:20	43	17:4	57
3:4a	63	17:16	58
3:16	65	19:16	72
4:14	66	19:47-48	73
5:2	66	20:3	75
5:9	54	21:1	50
6:7a	55	21:7	33
6:7b	25	21:9	34
6:12	68	21:36a	36
8:8	68	21:42a-d	77
8:18a	44	22:13	58
8:18b	45	22:32	37
8:24	55	22:33-34	50
9:1b	46	22:34b	37
9:2e	46	23:5	38
9:2f	26	24:4b-5a	39
9:6	69	24:14	51
9:10	48	24:15	59
9:27a	56	24:17	40
9:27b	27	24:25	59
10:1	28	24:27a	60
10:10	70	24:27b	60
10:12	28	24:27c	52
10:32	29	24:33a	61