

The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Literary Criticism: The Case of Numbers 27,15-23

The text of the Greek canon of Scripture is not uniform, each book requiring individual consideration as a separate unit of translation. Nonetheless, the majority of the Septuagintal books share a broad base of equivalents, whose origin lies in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. The acceptance of this translation led to the adoption of this base of equivalents by the translators of the rest of the biblical books⁽¹⁾.

An examination of the degree to which the Septuagintal translators exhibit consistency in their choice of vocabulary can assist us in establishing the level of confidence with which we can reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage* which lay before the translators. In those places where the translators chose their Greek equivalents freely, any reconstruction of the original Hebrew text must be tentative. In contrast, in those places where the translators were consistent in their choice of equivalents, such consistency enables us to reconstruct the original Hebrew text with a high degree of confidence⁽²⁾. Several scholars have demonstrated that in some cases, the translators employ variant sets of Greek equivalents to translate the same Hebrew word(s)⁽³⁾. This tendency has been taken as evidence of the work of various translators, some scholars appealing to such differences to support literary-critical arguments regarding the biblical texts.

One such instance is the description of the construction of the Tabernacle in Exodus 35–40. Numerous scholars have pointed to the divergences which exist between the manner in which the command to build the Tabernacle (Exodus 25–31) is translated and the description of the implementation of the command (Exodus 35–40). These disparities have led them to conclude that the two units were translated by different hands⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ E.g. E. TOV, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the LXX: The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique", *Tarbiz* 47 (1977-1978) 121 (Hebrew).

⁽²⁾ On the use of equivalents to reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage* which lay before the translators, see E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem 1997) 60-71. For a survey of the question of the heterogeneity of the Septuagint, see I.L. SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", *Textus* 15 (1990) 181-201 [Dutch original, 1940]. On the variety between translation styles with respect to technical terms, see, e.g., D.W. GOODING, *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (Cambridge 1959), 8-13. Rabin has argued that the translators only exercised strict consistency with regard to terms of theological significance: C. RABIN, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968) 24.

⁽³⁾ For a survey of the scholarship until 1940, see SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", 192-194. For a survey of the literature on the use of equivalents to determine the number of translators of the books of the Pentateuch into Greek, see H. KIM, "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch" (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem 2006) 3-9.

⁽⁴⁾ A survey of the scholarship on this issue can be found in KIM, "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch", 35-38.

Several scholars have further suggested that the translator of chapters 25–31 did not have chapters 35–40 before him. According to this thesis, the latter chapters were added to the text of Exodus at a later stage and the Hebrew *Vorlage* which lay before the first translator constituted an earlier stage of redaction, one made prior to the addition of these chapters. The change of translator is understood to reflect the various stages of the development of the biblical text: once these chapters had been incorporated into the Hebrew text, they were translated and added to the Septuagint⁽⁵⁾.

In this article, I shall employ a similar argument to the one just outlined in order to reconstruct the passage concerning Joshua's investiture in Numbers 27,12-23. After having informed the reader that God commanded Moses to ascend Mount Abarim to die (vv. 12–14), the passage describes Moses' request that God appoint his successor (vv. 15-17). God responds to Moses' appeal, commanding him to appoint a successor by means of a series of specific acts (vv. 18-20a). Joshua's role is defined in vv. 20b-21, and the text subsequently relates that Moses appointed Joshua, performing the required actions in accordance with God's command (vv. 22-23).

The actions which God commanded Moses to carry out in order to complete Joshua's investiture were as follows: 1) to take Joshua (v. 18a); 2) to lean his hands upon him (v. 18b); 3) to stand Joshua in front of Eleazar and the community (v. 19a); 4) to publicly appoint him (v. 19b); 5) to place part of his *ruah* upon him (v. 20a)⁽⁶⁾.

The fourth action — Joshua's appointment — is formulated by use of the verb *צִוָּה*, whose meaning here, as in several other instances in the Hebrew Bible, is "to appoint"⁽⁷⁾. The text's intention appears to be that Moses is to publicly appoint Joshua as his successor⁽⁸⁾.

I have argued elsewhere, on the basis of various factors and considerations, that v. 19, which includes Moses' standing Joshua before Eleazar and the community and his public commission, is not part of the

⁽⁵⁾ See, e.g., A. KUENEN, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London 1886) 79-80 (Dutch original, 1885).

⁽⁶⁾ On the meaning of *רוּחַ* and its significance in this text, see I. KISLEV, "The Investiture of Joshua (Numbers 27:12-23) and the Dispute on the Form of the Leadership in *Yehud*" (forthcoming in *VT*).

⁽⁷⁾ Both here and in v. 23, the verb *צִוָּה* carries the meaning of "to appoint to a task": cf. also Num 32,38; Deut 3,31; 31,14. 23; 1 Sam 13,14; 25,30; 2 Sam 6,21; 7,11; Neh 5,14; 1 Chr 22,12. See Nachmanides and Sforno to Num 27,19; A. DILLMANN, *Numeri, Deuteronomium, und Josua* (Leipzig 1886) 180; BDB, s.v. *צִוָּה*, 845; N. LOHFINK, *Theology of the Pentateuch* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Edinburgh 1994) 240 and n. 27; J. MILGROM, *Numbers* (JPS; Philadelphia, PA 1990) 326, n. 42; M. WEINFELD, *From Joshua to Josiah* (Jerusalem 1992) 198 and n. 18 (Hebrew); HALOT, s.v. *צִוָּה* (3:1011). According to the Samaritan addition to the end of Numbers 27, based on Deut 3,21-22, the verb *צִוָּה* is understood in its usual meaning as referring to specific verbal content, however.

⁽⁸⁾ Lohfink, *Theology of the Pentateuch*, 241-243; D.J. MCCARTHY, "An Installation Genre?", *JBL* 90 (1971) 31-41; J.R. PORTER, "The Succession of Joshua", *Proclamation and Presence. Old Testament Essays in Honour of G.H. Davies* (eds. J.I. DURHAM – J.R. PORTER; Macon, TX 1983) 104-106. It would appear that the significant differences which exist between the examples adduced by these scholars mean that the examples cannot constitute a sufficient basis for reconstructing the way in which such investitures were performed. They can, nevertheless, provide information concerning those descriptions of investitures which employ the verb *צִוָּה*. Porter also believes that the use of this verb is typical of descriptions of this sort: PORTER, "The Succession of Joshua", 107-109.

original text⁽⁹⁾. The verse interrupts the original flow of the text, which links God's command to Moses to lean his hands on Joshua in v. 18 with the command to place his *הַיָּד* on him in v. 20. The reference to the placing of *הַיָּד* here is clearly associated with Moses' leaning his hands upon Joshua — rather than constituting a separate and independent action. If this assessment is correct, the words “place some of your *הַיָּד* upon him” represent a purpose clause: “thereby placing some of your *הַיָּד* upon him.” According to such a reading, this clause ought to follow immediately after the words “lean your hands upon him.” The commands to stand Joshua before Eleazar and the community and to appoint him in v. 19 are consequently not to be understood as belonging to the original text. I have assumed that v. 19 was added in order to harmonize the priestly account of Joshua's investiture in Numbers 27 with the account in Deuteronomy (Deut 3,28; 31,7.14.23, and to emphasize Eleazer's role in the national leadership⁽¹⁰⁾.

On this basis, I concluded that the reference to these actions in the description of the implementation of the command (vv. 22-23) similarly constitutes a secondary addition. I further argued that not only these two actions but the entire detailed description of the implementation and the restatement of the general implementation formula (vv. 22b-23) constitute a latter addition⁽¹¹⁾.

In support of this claim we can adduce the fact that vv. 22-23 contain two formulations of the implementation of the instructions: “Moses did as the LORD had commanded him” (22a) and “As the LORD had spoken through Moses” (23b). Between these two verses a detailed description of the specific actions performed is inserted. While such a formulation is occasionally preceded or followed by a detailing of actions, the occurrence of a double formulation enveloping a detailed list is exceptional; such examples are almost unattested in the priestly literature⁽¹²⁾. The second expression describing the implementation therefore appears to constitute a form of resumptive repetition—indicative of the fact that the entire list of actions represents a latter addition⁽¹³⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ KISLEV, “The Investiture of Joshua”. A specification of the considerations appears there, with a full discussion.

⁽¹⁰⁾ KISLEV, “The Investiture of Joshua”.

⁽¹¹⁾ See KISLEV, “The Investiture of Joshua”, and S. MITTMAN, *Deuteronomium 1:1–6:3* (BZAW 139; Berlin 1975) 110.

⁽¹²⁾ MCEVENUE, following ELLIGER, argues that the fulfillment of the divine word in general, and that of the commandments in particular, is typical of the priestly literature. In a survey of the various occurrences of descriptions of such fulfillments of the divine will, he notes that Gen 1,7.24b-25; Num 20,27-28; 27,22-23 are exceptional in containing both a general implementation formula and a detailed description of the fulfillment of the command: K. ELLIGER, “Sinn und Ursprung der Priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung”, *Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament* (Munich 1966) 174-199 (= *ZTK* 49 [1952] 121-143); S. MCEVENUE, “Word and Fulfilment: A Stylistic Feature of the Priestly Writer,” *Semitics* 1 (1970) 104-106; cf. also J. BLENKINSOPP, “The Structure of P”, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 275-277. Num 27,22-23 is unique in this regard in containing a double formulation of the implementation process in addition to an enumeration of the details. A similar phenomenon can be found in the description of the preparation of the priestly garments in Exodus 39,1-31 and the description of the erection of the Tabernacle in Exodus 40,16-33 (and cf. Num 8,20-22).

⁽¹³⁾ KISLEV, “The Investiture of Joshua”.

An examination of the LXX translation of these verses may strengthen the claim that the depiction of the implementation in vv. 22b–23 constitutes a later addition and provide more evidence concerning the development of this text. In the Masoretic Text, the two formulations describing the implementation process differ. The first reads: ויעש משה כאשר צוה יהוה אהו “Moses did as the LORD had commanded him,” while the second reads: ויעש משה כאשר דבר יהוה ביד משה “As the LORD had spoken through Moses.” In the LXX, the first formulation is translated: καὶ ἐποίησεν Μωυσῆς καθὰ ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ κύριος; while the second is rendered: καθάπερ συνέταξεν κύριος τῷ Μωυσῆ. While the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the first phrase in the LXX almost certainly resembled the MT, it is reasonable to assume that, in contrast to the MT, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the second phrase read כאשר צוה יהוה אה משה, “as the LORD had commanded Moses”⁽¹⁴⁾. The verb συντάσσω renders the verb דבר only five times and the noun דבר only once. It is the standard equivalent of צוה⁽¹⁵⁾.

Several further textual witnesses may be adduced for the use of the verb צוה in the second phrase of the verse⁽¹⁶⁾. To these, midrashic evidence may also be added. *Sifrei* to Numbers 27,23 states: “‘and he commanded him as the LORD had commanded Moses’—Moses commanded Joshua with joy as the LORD had commanded him with joy” (§141; Horowitz ed., p. 187). While not all manuscripts contain this reading of the verse⁽¹⁷⁾, it is clear from the content that the verb צוה existed in the text which lay before the midrashic author. The midrashist compares the commands which Moses gave to Joshua with God’s command to Moses. Without the presence of the root צוה in v. 23, no basis for this interpretation would exist. We can therefore conclude that the textual reading of v. 23 which lay before the midrashist was כאשר צוה יהוה “as the LORD had commanded.” Those manuscripts of the midrash which possess the text as it appears in MT are to be regarded as having been altered by scribes seeking to harmonize the biblical text recorded in the midrash with the MT. The midrash and the other textual witnesses thus strengthen the claim that the reading כאשר צוה יהוה “as the LORD had commanded” also lay before the Greek translators.

It would also appear that the phrase “through Moses” (literally, “by the hand of Moses” (ביד משה) was lacking from the Hebrew source on which the Septuagint text is based. It was replaced by the phrase τῷ Μωυσῆ “to Moses,” which probably reflects the Hebrew expression אה משה⁽¹⁸⁾. The phrase ביד משה “through Moses” appears 31 times in the MT and is generally translated in the Septuagint by the phrase ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ⁽¹⁹⁾.

⁽¹⁴⁾ J.W. WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (Atlanta, GA 1998) 469.

⁽¹⁵⁾ With the exception of the present case, the verb συντάσσω translates the verb דבר in Exod 1,17; 9,12; 31,13; Joel 4,8; Job 42,9, and in one other case the noun דבר (Exod 12,35). According to E.C. DOS SANTOS, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem 1973), συντάσσω renders the verb צוה 79 times.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Several Hebrew mss, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Vulgate; see BHS.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See the critical apparatus in the HOROWITZ edition, p. 187.

⁽¹⁸⁾ WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 469.

⁽¹⁹⁾ The phrase ביד משה appears in Exod 9,35; 34,29; 35,29; Lev 8,36; 10,11; 26,46; Num 4,37.45.49; 9,23; 10,13; 15,23; 17,5; 27,23; 33,1; 36,13; Josh 14,2; 20,2; 21,2.8;

Here, too, textual witnesses to the reading אֵת מֹשֶׁה exist, a fact which makes it reasonable to assume that the Septuagint also reflects such a text⁽²⁰⁾.

According to this reconstructed *Vorlage*, the phrase $\text{כִּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה}$ appeared twice in these verses. The Greek text has no such duplication, however. The first time this phrase appears, the Septuagintal text employs the verb ἐντέλλομαι , while the second time it uses συντάσσω . Both these verbs are standard equivalents for צִוָּה and represent appropriate translations of the Hebrew root⁽²¹⁾. Why, however, did the translator alternate the Greek verb he used to translate the Hebrew verb צִוָּה ? Such alternation between the use of ἐντέλλομαι and συντάσσω to render צִוָּה is indeed not uncommon in the Septuagintal text of the book of Numbers. The verb ἐντέλλομαι translates צִוָּה 18 times, whereas συντάσσω does so 28 times⁽²²⁾. These two verbs also occur in close proximity to one another in Num 2,33-34; 8,20.22; 34,13, and 36,2.5-6.

This discrepancy must be considered in the light of two other differences regarding the description of the implementation process in vv. 22-23, however. While the word כִּאֲשֶׁר in v. 22 is rendered by the term καθά , in v. 23, καθάπερ appears. John Wevers has noted that while this is an exact translation, this is the sole place in Numbers where the word כִּאֲשֶׁר is rendered as καθάπερ in the phrase $\text{כִּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֵת מֹשֶׁה}$ or in similar formulations of the implementation of a divine command⁽²³⁾.

Furthermore, the verb צִוָּה occurs once more in our passage, in the description of Moses' implementation of one of the commands connected

22,9; Judg 3,4; 1 Kgs 8,53.56; Ps. 77,21; Neh 8,14; 9,14; 10,30; 2 Chr 33,8; 34,14; 35,6. With the exception of 12 instances (Exod 9,35; 34,29; 35,29; Lev 8,36; 10,11; Num 27,23; Josh 14,2; 20,2; 21,8; Neh 8,14; 2 Chr 34,14; 35,6), the expression is rendered by the phrase ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῆ . Of these exceptions, in three cases (Lev 10,11; 2 Chr 34,14; 35,6) it is translated using διὰ χειρὸς Μωϋσῆ . In Josh 14,2, the expression ἐν χειρὶ Ἰησοῦ occurs. In Exod 34,29, the phrase is translated as $\text{ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν Μωϋσῆ}$, and in Exod 35,29 and Josh 20,2 as διὰ Μωϋσῆ . In the five remaining cases (Exod 9,35; Lev 8,36; Num 27,23; Josh 21,8; Neh 8,14), we find the phrase τῷ Μωϋσῆ . It is clear that, with the sole exception of Num 27,23, wherever the phrase מֹשֶׁה בְּיַד appears in the book of Numbers it is translated using the Greek ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῆ . For the translation of בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה using the regular dative, see J. JOOSTEN, "L'Excédent Massorétique du Livre de Jérémie et l'Hébreu Post-Classique", *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period* (eds. J. JOOSTEN – J.S. REY) (STDJ 73; Leiden 2008) 104, n. 45.

⁽²⁰⁾ Several Hebrew mss, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (see BHS) and the midrash cited above reflect the reading אֵת מֹשֶׁה . Also in Neh 8,14 several Hebrew mss and versions reflect the reading אֵת מֹשֶׁה : see BHS there.

⁽²¹⁾ According to DOS SANTOS, *Expanded Hebrew Index*, ἐντέλλομαι is employed to translate צִוָּה 339 times.

⁽²²⁾ These data follow KIM, "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch", 126. Kim notes that, in contrast to the translator of Leviticus, the translator of Numbers prefers συντάσσω when the person giving the command is God, whereas he prefers to translate the verb צִוָּה by ἐντέλλομαι when a human being is the initiator (ibid, 147). On the use of Greek verbs signifying "command" in the LXX, see J.A.L. LEE, "A Lexical Study Thirty Years On, With Observations on 'Order' Words in the LXX Pentateuch", *Emanuel. Studies in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. S.M. PAUL – R.A. KRAFT – L.H. SCHIFFMAN) (VTSup 94; Boston 2003) 513-524.

⁽²³⁾ WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 469; J.W. WEVERS, *Text History of the Greek Numbers* (AAWG. MSU 16; Göttingen 1982) 127.

with Joshua's investiture (v. 23). In this case, the Septuagint text translates the Hebrew root by the Greek verb συνίστημι, whose meaning in this context is "to appoint"⁽²⁴⁾. The translator here correctly understood that the verb צוה is not used in its regular signification of "command" but in its much rarer meaning of "to appoint"⁽²⁵⁾. While in the command section, wherein God explains to Moses the process of Joshua's investiture (vv. 18-20), the verb צוה similarly signifies "to appoint," the Greek text renders this root by the verb ἐντέλλομαι, whose meaning is "to command". It is highly unlikely that the translator suddenly understood this unusual usage of the verb צוה precisely between his translation of v. 19 and v. 23. Even were this true, he could easily have gone back and emended his translation of v. 19⁽²⁶⁾.

The alternation between these terms is distinctive and of considerable significance for our argument. The appearance of the word καθάπερ in this context and the fact that, in contrast to v. 19, the root צוה is rendered by the Greek συνίστημι — which accurately reflects the meaning of the Hebrew verb in this context⁽²⁷⁾ — point to the irregular nature of vv. 22b-23 in the Septuagintal text. The anomaly can be ascribed to various causes. It may represent variations within Septuagintal vocabulary⁽²⁸⁾, the reworking of the section by a later hand, or a switch in translators at this point and onwards.

Nonetheless, it is implausible that a reworking which correctly translated צוה as συνέστησεν in v. 23 would have failed to employ the same verb in v. 19. The suggestion that these differences reflect variations within Septuagintal vocabulary is also unconvincing, especially where a significant discrepancy in meaning between the two verbs in question exists. Moreover, in order to demonstrate the replacement of one translator by another from this point on, further evidence that a new translator began his work exactly at this point is necessary. The appearance of καθάπερ in this context makes the possibility of a switch in translators even more improbable.

Were it not for the fact that other considerations exist, we would be compelled to adopt one or other of these solutions. We have previously referred to the factors that led us to conclude that vv. 22b-23 represent a secondary insertion into the Hebrew text. This is consistent with the finding

⁽²⁴⁾ On the various meanings of the verb συνίστημι in the LXX, see J.A.L. LEE, "συνίστημι: A Sample Lexical Entry", *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (ed. T. MURAOKA) (Atlanta, GA 1990) 1-16. For the development of the meaning "to appoint" for the verb συνίστημι, see, *ibid.*, 11-12.

⁽²⁵⁾ See n. 7 above.

⁽²⁶⁾ In fact, the translation of v. 19 contains a form of double translation of the phrase צוה צוה: καὶ ἐντελῆ αὐτό, καὶ ἐντελῆ περὶ αὐτοῦ. While this doubling is apparently a scribal error, it witnesses to variant attempts to translate the phrase צוה צוה.

⁽²⁷⁾ The verb συνίστημι renders the verb צוה one other time, in Num 32,28. LEE ("Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch", 11-12) considers that there, too, the meaning is "to appoint". WEVERS (*Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 154), on the other hand, argues for a variant meaning.

⁽²⁸⁾ See SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", 181-201; GOODING, *The Account of the Tabernacle*, 8-13; RABIN, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint", 24.

that the Septuagintal text of vv. 22b-23 diverges from the verses which precede it. In light of these facts, we can suggest that the translator of vv. 22b-23 was not the same as the translator of the rest of the section on Joshua's investiture. This is probably due to the fact that the Hebrew text that lay before the initial translator did not include vv. 22b-23, making it impossible for him to have translated these verses. Only at a later stage, when this additional section became an accepted part of the Hebrew text, did another translator find the need to translate it and add it to the Septuagintal text. He focused on his mission to translate the additional Hebrew verses ignoring the meaningful differences between his translation and the previous translation. The differences in translation vocabulary between vv. 19-22a and vv. 22b-23, combined with the arguments regarding the textual status of vv. 22b-23, thus witness to a two-stage process of translation as a result of two stages in the composition of the Hebrew text.

The attempt to harmonize the Septuagintal text with that of the MT is a well-attested phenomenon, known both from the Septuagintal revisions and from a comparison of the Greek biblical scrolls from Qumran with the later Septuagint version⁽²⁹⁾. It would appear that in our present case the addition of the translation of vv. 22b-23 came about through similar reasons. The recognition that the authoritative text included a passage not reflected in the Greek translation led to its addition in the Septuagint. The later translator did not adapt his new translation to the translation before him, however, but worked it anew. It is therefore possible to identify traces of his handiwork through his choice of vocabulary.

As stated above, on the basis of various factors I concluded that v. 19 was added to the pericope of Joshua's investiture in Numbers 27 at a later stage and that the description of the implementation in vv. 22b-23 was similarly absent from the original text of the passage. Our identification of two stages in the Greek translation enables us to gain a more precise insight into the development of the passage. According to the Septuagintal evidence, the description of the implementation was incorporated at a later stage than the addition of v. 19. The different translations of the verb צִוָּה demonstrate that the addition of the description of the implementation was made by a translator other than that of v. 19. In light of these findings and conclusions, we are led to assume that v. 19 lay before the initial translator, whereas vv. 22b-23 did not exist in his version. In other words, the development of the text included a stage which contained v. 19 but not vv. 22b-23. We can thus conclude that the additions were made in two phases:

⁽²⁹⁾ See SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", 185; E.C. ULRICH, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value", *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (eds. G.J. BROOKE – B. LINDARS) (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33; Atlanta, GA 1992) 49-80; E. TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, PA 2001) 143-148; E. TOV, "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean desert", *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (eds. S. MCKENDRICK – O.A. O'SULLIVAN) (London 2003) 97-122; S. KREUZER, "From 'Old Greek' to the Recensions: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint?", *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (eds. W. KRAUS – R.G. WOODEN) (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 53; Atlanta, GA 2006) 225-237.

v. 19 was added first, and at a later stage the description of the implementation in vv. 22b-23 was inserted.

This conclusion is further substantiated by a comparison of the order of the actions in the command section (vv. 18-20) and the implementation section (vv. 22-23). In the instructions given in v. 19, Moses is commanded to stand Joshua before Eleazar and the community and to appoint him, the instructions to carry out these two tasks being juxtaposed next to one another. In the description of the implementation in vv. 22-23, however, the two actions are separated by the description of Moses' leaning his hands on Joshua. If these two additions were carried out by one pen, how is the divergence in order to be explained?

It is reasonable to assume that the scribe who added the description of the implementation process in vv. 22b-23 reordered the actions according to a more rational sequence. He realized that the order of the actions in the section detailing the instructions is illogical. It is not clear why the instructions to stand Joshua before Eleazar and the entire community are only given in v. 19, following rather than preceding God's instructions to Moses to lean his hands upon Joshua. The scribe who added vv. 22b-23 placed the act of standing Joshua publicly before Eleazar and the entire community earlier, prior to God's instruction to Moses to lean his hands upon Joshua. It would appear that the difficulty raised by the order of the instructions regarding Joshua's investiture in vv. 18-20 lay, amongst other reasons, behind the addition of vv. 22b-23⁽³⁰⁾. Thus v. 19 was already part of the text in front of the second interpolator when he added vv. 22b-23.

In summary, a change in vocabulary occurs between the instructions in v. 19 and the formulation in v. 22a, on the one hand, and the description of the implementation of the command in vv. 22b-23 on the other. Moreover, the translation of the verb צוה in v. 23 demonstrates that the translator accurately understood the unusual signification of this root in its particular context. In contrast, the stereotypical translation of this verb in v. 19 indicates that the translator of this verse did not comprehend the specific meaning of the root צוה carries in this verse. These findings, combined with additional literary-critical considerations, suggest that different translators were involved in the translation of these two sections and that it is unlikely that the first translator had vv. 22b-23 before him. Only once this section

⁽³⁰⁾ I hypothesized that v. 19 in its entirety was meant to be inserted before v. 18b, prior to the instructions to Moses to lean his hands upon Joshua. It was initially written in the margins of the text and subsequently mistakenly incorporated after v. 18b. It is not feasible to argue that the instruction to stand Joshua before Eleazar the priest and the entire community alone was intended to be placed before v. 18b and that in the Hebrew text which lay before the second interpolator the order of instructions in vv. 18-19 (before the second interpolator began his work) was in fact: Joshua's standing before Eleazar and the community, Moses' leaning of his hands, and Joshua's appointing as recorded in the description of the implementation process in vv. 22b-23. The formulation of the instructions regarding the commands to Joshua in v. 19 witnesses against such an assumption. V. 19 states וצוה אתו לענייהם. The antecedents of the pronominal suffix of לענייהם are Eleazar and the entire community, who are referred to at the beginning of the verse. The instructions regarding the appointing thus originally followed immediately upon the instructions to stand Joshua before Eleazar the priest and the entire community, and cannot be separated from one another.

was added to the Hebrew text did it occur to a translator to insert a translation of it into the Septuagintal text. This explanation of the differences in the Greek translation concerning Joshua's investiture also deepens our understanding of the development of the Hebrew text. The study of the choice of vocabulary by the Greek translators thus adds to a literary-critical analysis of the biblical text itself.

Department of Bible
University of Haifa, Israel

Itamar KISLEV

SUMMARY

A careful attention to the change in the employment of Greek equivalents in the translation of Hebrew words in the Septuagint may help us to identify involvement of different translators. Such a change may sometimes point to some stages in the composition of the Hebrew text. In this article some interesting differences in the vocabulary of the Septuagint in the passage of the investiture of Joshua in Num 27, 15-23 are examined and with some other literal-critical considerations lead to exact exploring of the literal process of the graduated formation of the Hebrew passage.