REVIEW OF BOOKS

Klaus Bieberstein, Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch. Mit einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Hirbet Qumran (Biblische Notizen, Beih. 7, herausgegeben von Manfred Görg), München, 1994, 107 pp., n. pr., n. ISBN.

This monograph presents an expanded version of an appendix to Bieberstein's dissertation: Josua-Jordan-Jericho. Archäologie und Geschichte der Landnahmeerzählungen Joshua 1-6, Tübingen 1991/2. Although of limited size (107 pp.), this is a rich book, full of important data and observations. The author is aware of most of the recent discussions of the LXX and the Qumran texts of Joshua, all of which are incorporated in the analysis. Among other things, B. presents a decipherment of the Qumran texts from cave 4 on the basis of The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche (Leiden 1993) as well as their detailed analysis. The analysis of 4QJoshb constantly refers to the preliminary publication of that text by the present reviewer (Kraków 1992), while that of 4QJoshua, a very important text, is presented in isolation of the work of others. Since the preface of B.'s work is dated June 1994, B. could not yet have known of the preliminary publications of that text by E. Ulrich which was published in the fall of 1994: "4QJoshua and Joshua's First Altar in the Promised Land", in G.J. Brooke, with F. García Martínez, eds., New Qumran texts and Studies—Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992 (STDJ 15; Leiden/New York/Köln 1994) 89-104; see also pp. 73-80 in the same volume: A. Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJoshua".

The fact that this book developed from a dissertation which was not devoted to questions of textual criticism explains its background, since under different circumstances B. would have been expected to explain his textual presuppositions at greater length. As it stands, this work contains an interesting combination of original observations on the Qumran documents and various aspects of LXX research on the one hand and on the other hand the somewhat uncritical following of the lead of others in the area of LXX research.

The title of the monograph (Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch) is probably somewhat misleading, since its scope is wider than these two versions. Did B. want to stress that in these two areas his contributions are more important than in other areas of LXX Studies?

The major part of this monograph deals with the evidence of the Greek versions of Joshua 1-6 analysed beyond the earlier editions and analyses. B. accepts the classification of the witnesses of the LXX into four (local)
recensions as suggested by Pretzl, Margolis, and Smith, and he accordingly lists the manuscripts (pp. 15-22) representing four recensions from Egypt (Gε), Syria (Gσ), Constantinople (Gγ), and Palestine (Gπ) as well as a fifth group of mixed evidence. The original text of each of these four recensions had been reconstructed by Margolis (1931-1938), and on pp. 22-27 B. presents some corrections of Margolis’ reconstructions. On pp. 28-50 B. depicts the patterns of developments of these four recensions from their reconstructed common ancestor (G*), thus advancing the discussion beyond Margolis. According to B., Gε and Gσ,π,γ branched off from G* both inserting independent stylistic changes and approximations to a Hebrew text like MT. Within the group Gσ,π,γ B. recognizes two subgroups, Gσ and Gπ,γ. These groups had been recognized previously by Margolis and Smith, but while for these scholars Gε depended on Gπ, for B. Gε and Gπ derived from a common source. Gσ reflects a Syrian text revised by Lucian, but the exact relation between the two is not explained by the author.

A large section (pp. 51-70) is devoted to the nature of the Lucianic recension, which was considered to be identical with Gσ. This textual tradition displays the largest number of inner-Greek changes vis-à-vis the presumed common text, denoted as Gσ,γ,π,π by B. According to the author, the Lucianic revision derived much material from other sources, in the first place Theodotion, and in the second place Symmachus (pp. 60-70).

This monograph has no concluding section, and paragraph 4.3 (“Die textgeschichtliche Einordnung des Ergebnisses”, pp. 70-74, with a chart describing the textual history of Joshua on p. 71) should probably be understood as such. It is in this section that some of the problematic assumptions of B. come to light. First of all, the reliance on Margolis’ system is problematic. That scholar’s detailed reconstruction of the original text of the four recensions, together with their textual apparatuses, and the reconstruction of an Urtext for Joshua, has not been followed in the research, neither for Joshua, nor as a model for other books. That is, the leading principle behind Margolis’ work, deriving from de Lagarde and others, that the Urtext of the LXX can be reconstructed, has been followed in the editions of the Göttingen Septuagint. However, Margolis’ method of reconstructing that Urtext from four recensions, whose original texts are also reconstructed, has not been adopted by others. It is therefore somewhat surprising that in 1994 B. returned to Margolis’ system as if there has not been any progress in the area of the Editionstechnik of the LXX. Also, the presentation of all the witnesses of Joshua in the form of a stemma is problematic. The late text of Gε (Constantinople) and the earlier one of Gπ (Palestine = Hexapla) derive from a common source, but how is this possible chronologically? 4QJoshα and 4QJoshβ, both described by B. as proto-Masoretic (p. 93)