



BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

No. 15 Fall, 1982

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, San Francisco	1
Financial Report	3
News and Notes	4
Record of Work Published or in Progress	7
Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings <i>Julio Treballe</i>	12
A Short Commentary on Some Verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23 <i>Arie van der Kooij</i>	36
Guidelines for Editions of Armenian Biblical Texts <i>Michael E. Stone and Claude E. Cox</i>	51

BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by
The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

Albert Pietersma
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
Canada

Honorary President

Harry M. Orlinsky
Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
One W. Fourth Street
New York, NY 10012

Vice President

Robert Hanhart
Septuaginta-Unternehmen
Friedländerweg 11
3400 Göttingen
West Germany

Immediate Past President

John Wm Wevers
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
Canada

Secretary

Leonard Greenspoon
Dept. of History
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina
29631

Members-at-Large

George Howard
Dept. of Philosophy and
Religion
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Treasurer

Melvin K. H. Peters
Dept. of Religious Studies
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Robert A. Kraft
Dept. of Religious Studies
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
19174

Associate Editor

Claude Cox
Dept. of Religious Studies
Brandon University
Brandon, Manitoba, R7A 6A9
Canada

Emanuel Tov
Dept. of Bible
Hebrew University
Jerusalem
Israel

Editor

Eugene Ulrich
Dept. of Theology
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

21 December 1981, 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 m.
Hilton Hotel (Shasta Room), San Francisco

Programme

Albert Pietersma presiding

- Paul E. Dion, University of Toronto
"The Greek Version of Deut. 21:1-9 and Its Variants:
A Record of Early Exegesis"
- Melvin K. H. Peters, Cleveland State University
"Some Observations on the Coptic Text of Genesis"
- Leonard Greenspoon, Clemson University
"The Text-critical Importance of the Joshua Portion of the
Samaritan Chronicle II"
- Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto
"Did or Didn't the Septuagint Use *Kyrios*?"

Business Meeting

11:30 a.m.: *Called to order by the President, Albert Pietersma*

1. President's Report

IOSCS will meet with IOSOT in Salamanca, Spain, 1983.
Topics for the meeting were suggested.
Reported that *Bulletin* 14 had been published.

2. Recommendation of Executive Committee

H. Orlinsky moved that \$250 be given to Scholars Press in
regard to the Challenge Grant they had received from
NEH. Motion passed.

3. Treasurer's Report (below)

Motion to accept was passed.

4. Editorial Committee

H. Orlinsky reported that four manuscripts were either
accepted or in the process of acceptance:
a) John Miles (accepted)

- b) John Lee (accepted)
- c) T. Muraoka (accepted in principle)
- d) Unnamed (in progress)

Already published: David Burke, *The Poetry of Baruch*.

5. New Business

H. Orlinsky drew attention to E. Tov's article in the current *Bulletin* [14] on the recently-found manuscript of Margolis. Reported that it will be published.

12:00 m.: *Adjournment*

George Howard
for the Secretary

FINANCIAL REPORT

December 18, 1981

BALANCE ON HAND, Nov. 8, 1980 (<i>Bulletin</i> 14, p. 9)		\$922.41
INCOME		
Subscriptions 11/8/80 - 12/18/81	\$847.04	
Interest on Savings	67.00	
	<u>914.04</u>	
EXPENSES		
<i>Bulletins</i> 13 & 14		
Duplication & Printing	598.16	
Postage & Supplies	249.62	
	<u>847.78</u>	
Income	914.04	
Expenses	<u>847.78</u>	
NET GAIN	66.26	
Balance on Hand, Nov. 8, 1980	922.41	
Net Gain to Dec. 18, 1981	66.26	
BALANCE ON HAND, Dec. 18, 1981	<u>\$988.67</u>	\$988.67

Melvin K. H. Peters
Treasurer, IOSCS

Auditors: Derwood C. Smith, Ph.D. Department of
 Religious Studies,
 Cleveland State
 University

NEWS AND NOTES

Professor I. Seeligmann

It is with a deep sense of sorrow that we report the recent death of Professor I. L. Seeligmann of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He was appointed a member of the Executive Committee of the IOSCS in 1972 and served as a member of its Board of Advisors from 1973 to 1976. The next issue of this *Bulletin* will provide a more detailed tribute to this esteemed septuagintal scholar.

Computer-Assisted Tools

The project for creating computer-generated tools for the study of the septuagintal materials, described in *BIOSCS* 14 (1981) 22-40 and centered at the University of Pennsylvania, has received a major grant from the Research Tools and Reference Works program of the Division of Research Programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The grant is for a two-year period, from June 1982 through May 1984, and consists of \$150,000 outright plus up to \$50,000 in "matching funds" that will become available as the project is able to raise an equivalent amount from other sources, for a maximum sponsored budget of \$250,000. In addition, the University of Pennsylvania (R. Kraft, project co-director) and Hebrew University (E. Tov, project co-director) have committed large amounts of "cost sharing" funds to the project, and continued generous support from David Packard and his IBYCUS System office in installing and maintaining the computer configuration deserves particular mention.

The primary goals for this grant period are (1) morphological analysis of the entire corpus, beginning with the machine-readable

text of the Rahlfs edition purchased from the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Project, but ultimately extending to the relevant textual variants as well, (2) encoding of the textual variants from the Göttingen and Cambridge editions, and (3) alignment of the parallel Greek and Hebrew texts of at least the Pentateuch, for comparative analysis.

The initial stages of morphological analysis have been completed, and the resulting materials are being verified and corrected. The text-critical data have been entered for Ruth and for part of Samuel-Kings; the Pentateuch is the next priority. Ultimately, the project hopes to produce as complete a data base as practical, which will be available at cost to all qualified researchers, and a variety of by-products (concordances, lexical tools, analyses) as appropriate. We are anxious to receive advice and suggestions, and will continue to develop a network of interested volunteers associated with the project and its needs as well as to explore ways of raising the necessary additional funding to complete the projected data bank.

New Manuscript of the Greek Deuteronomy

Six small fragments from Qumrân cave 4 which had been labeled "non-biblical Greek" have recently been identified by Eugene Ulrich as the remains of a manuscript of Deuteronomy. The manuscript (4QLXXDeut) has been assigned the Rahlfs number 819 by Professor R. Hanhart of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen.

New Books by IOSCS Members

Since the last issue of *BIOSCS* went to press, three books relating to the Septuagint by IOSCS members have been received.

In a work of major importance, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), Emanuel Tov offers a rich blend of

theory and detailed examples concerning "The Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX: Possibilities and Impossibilities" (Part I) and concerning the nature of "The Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX" (Part II). The book (343 pp.; \$17) may be ordered from Simor Ltd., P. O. Box 39039, Tel Aviv, Israel 61390, or from Eisenbrauns (\$18 [\$16.25], see below).

Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University, 1981) presents a clear and instructive exposition of many aspects of Greek palaeography, from the origins of the Greek alphabet and the making of ancient books, to uncial and minuscule handwriting and such special features of biblical manuscripts as *nomina sacra*, colometry, and onomastica. Included are excellent facsimiles, almost all in actual size, of 13 MSS of the LXX and 32 of the NT. (x + 150 pp., incl. 45 pl.; \$17.95 / £10.-).

James H. Charlesworth, in *The New Discoveries in St. Catherine's Monastery: A Preliminary Report on the Manuscripts* (ASOR Monograph Series 3; Winona Lake, IN: ASOR, 1981) introduces those MSS with a preliminary report on the discoveries, an account of the rumors and counter-rumors, a brief discussion of the MSS, facsimiles from seven MSS, and newspaper articles on the discoveries. The monograph (xv + 45 pp., incl. 8 pl.; \$6.00 [member price \$4.80]) may be ordered from Eisenbrauns, P. O. Box 275, Winona Lake, IN 46590, USA.

Honors for a Past President

Harry M. Orlinsky was elected a member of the Society of Scholars of the Johns Hopkins University (its only humanist). He gave the Invitation Lecture and the Banquet Address at the Fiftieth Anniversary meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies in Ottawa, June 2-5, and has also been appointed to the Honorary Committee of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology (Jerusalem, April 2-9, 1984), sponsored by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

- Aberbach, M., and Grossfeld, B. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: Aramaic Text and New Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Aly, Zaki. *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy*. A photographic ed., with preface, introd., and notes by L. Koenen. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 27. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1980.
- Beentjes, P. C. "Jesus Sirach en Tenach. Een onderzoek naar een classificatie van parallellen, met bijzondere aandacht voor hun functie in Sirach 45:6-26." Ph.D. dissertation, Amsterdam, 1981.
- Blau, Joshua. *On Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew*. Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities VI,2 (Jerusalem 1982) (detailed discussion of transliterations in the LXX).
- Bodine, W.R. (1) *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments*. HSM 23. Chico: Scholars, 1980. (2) An analysis of the textual affiliations of the Peshitta of Judges [in progress].
- Burchard, Christoph. "Ein vorläufiger griechischer Text von Joseph und Aseneth," *Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament* 14 (Okt. 1979) 2-53.
- Burke, David G. *The Poetry of Baruch*. SCS 10. Chico: Scholars, 1981.
- Busto-Saiz, J. R. "El texto teodocionico de Daniel y la traducción de Símaco," *Sefarad* 40 (1980) 41-55.
- Casetti, P.; Keel, O.; et Schenker, A., eds. *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Etudes bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 38. Fribourg/Göttingen, 1981 (many articles on the Septuagint).
- Charlesworth, James H. *The New Discoveries in St. Catherine's Monastery: A Preliminary Report on the Manuscripts*. ASOR Monograph Series 3. Winona Lake, IN: ASOR, 1981.
- Chaze, M. "Remarques et notes sur les versions grecque et ladino

- du Pentateuque de Constantinople, 1547," pp. 323-32 in *Homage à Georges Vajda*. Louvain, 1980.
- Collins, John, and Nickelsburg, George. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SCS 12. Chico: Scholars, 1982.
- Deboys, D.G. "The Greek Text of 2 Kings." M.Litt. thesis, Oxford, 1981 (director: S. Brock).
- Dion, Paul E. "Did Cultic Prostitution Fall into Oblivion during the Postexilic Era? Some Evidence from Chronicles and the Septuagint," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 41-8.
- Drazin, I. *Targum Onkelos on Deuteronomy*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Estin, C. "Saint Jérôme, de la traduction inspirée à la traduction relativiste," *RB* 88 (1981) 199-215.
- Fernández-Marcos, N. (1) "Nueva acepción de ΤΕΡΑΣ en las 'Vidas de los Profetas,'" *Sefarad* 40 (1980) 27-40. (2) "La edición de las 'Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena' de Teodoro," *Sefarad* 40 (1980) 235-53. (3) "La religión judía vista por los autores griegos y latinos," *Sefarad* 41 (1981) 3-25. (4) "La Septuaginta y los hallazgos del Desierto de Judá," in *Simpósio Bíblico Nacional* (Salamanca, 26-29 Septiembre 1982) [in press]. (5) "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms. From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism" [in press]. (6) Review of: J. Trebelle, *Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2 - 12; 14* (Salamanca/Jerusalem: Universidad Pontificia, 1980) in *Sefarad* 41 (1981) [in press].
- Gentry, Peter. "The Asterisked (Theodotonic?) Materials in Judges." Ph.D. dissertation, Toronto (dir.: J. W. Wevers) [in progress].
- Gaylord, H. E. "The Slavonic Version of the Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch*." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dirs.: M. E. Stone, D. Flusser, and M. Altbauer) [in progress].
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis," *JJS* 33 (1982) [in press].
- Grossfeld, B. *A Critical Commentary on Targum Neofiti I to Genesis*, with the text critically edited by L. H. Schiffman. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Hann, Robert. *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon*. SCS 13. Chico: Scholars, 1982.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Research on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha During the 1970s," *CBQ* 42 (1980) 147-59.
- Heater, Homer. *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. CBQMS 11. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982.
- Hilhorst, A. (1) *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Herma*. Graecitas christianorum primaeva 5. Nijmegen, 1976. (2) "Darius' Pillow (1 Esdras iii.8)," *JTS* 33 (1982) 161-3.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 508-24.
- Lee, J. A. L. "Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX," *RB* 87 (1980) 104-17.
- Lipscomb, W. L. "The Armenian Adam Books." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia (dirs.: M. E. Stone, J. A. Sanders, and R. A. Kraft) [in progress].
- Lust, Johan. "Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517-33.
- McCullough, J. C. "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews," *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 363-79.
- McKay, K. L. "On the Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek," *NT* 23 (1981) 289-329.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University, 1981.
- Müller, Augustinus Rudolf. "Ex 17,15f in der Septuaginta," *Biblische Notizen* 12 (1980) 20-3.
- Nicholls, P. "The Composition of the *Testament of Job*." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dir.: M. E. Stone) [in progress].
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Pace, S. A. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame (dir.: E. Ulrich) [in progress].
- Passoni dell'Acqua, A. "Ricerche sulla versione dei LXX e i papiri," *Aegyptus* 61 (1981) 171-211.

- Peters, Melvin K. H. "The Textual Affiliations of Genesis 1:1-4:2 According to Papyrus Bodmer 3" [in press].
- Richard, Earl. "The Old Testament in Acts: Wilcox's Semitisms in Retrospect," *CBQ* 42 (1980) 330-41.
- Safrai, C. H. "The Pseudo-Philonic 'De Sampson.'" Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dir.: M. E. Stone) [in progress].
- Satran, D. "The Figure of Daniel in Jewish and Christian Exegesis." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dir.: M. E. Stone) [in progress].
- Schenker, Adrian. *Psalmen in der Hexapla: Erste kritische und vollständige Ausgabe der Hexaplarischen Fragmente auf dem Rande der Handschrift Ottobonianus Graecus 398 zu den Ps 24-32*. Studi e Testi 295. Citta del Vaticana, 1982.
- Shutt, R. J. H. "The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus," *JJS* 31 (1980) 171-89.
- Siegert, Folker. *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten: Ps.-Philon, "Über Jona," "Über Simson" und "Über die Gottesbezeichnung 'wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer.'" I. Übersetzung aus dem Armenischen und sprachliche Erläuterungen*. WUNT 20. Tübingen, 1980.
- Silva, M. "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek," *Bib* 61 (1980) 198-219.
- Spottorno y Díaz Caro, Ma. V. (1) "La omisión de Ez 36,23b-38 y la transposición de capítulos en el Papiro 967," *Emerita* (1981) [in press]. (2) "El Papiro 967 de Ezequiel como testimonio prehexaplar," *Simposio Bíblico Nacional* (Salamanca, 26-29 Septiembre 1982) [in press].
- Stone, M. E. (1) *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets*. Jerusalem: Academy of Sciences, 1982. (2) "Epigraphica Armeniaca Hierosolymitana," and "Epig. Arm. Hieros. II," *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 1 (1980) 51-68, and 2 (1981) 71-83. (3) *The Penitence of Adam*. 2 vols. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 429-30. Louvain: Peeters, 1981. (4) "A Rare Armenian Coin from Jerusalem," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 4 (1980) 77-8. (5) "Report on Seth Traditions in the Armenian Adam Books," pp. 459-71 in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (Yale Conference 1978), ed. B. Layton. Leiden: Brill, 1981. (6) *Scriptures, Sects, and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980. (7) "Sinai Armenian Inscriptions," *BA* 45 (1982) 27-31.

- Talshir, Sipporah. "'Ezra' haḥissony - diyoqan shel targum miluly," *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Bible*. Jerusalem, 1982, pp. 47-52 (Hebrew).
- Tischendorf, C., ed. *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*. 4 vols.; repr. of the 1862 ed. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Tov, Emanuel. (1) *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3. Jerusalem: Simor, 1981. (2) "The Lucianic Text of the Canonical and the Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book," *Textus* 10 (1982) 1-25. (3) "Greek Translations," pp. 774-830 in *Encyclopedia Miqra'it* 8. Jerusalem, 1982. (4) *Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the Septuagint and its Revisions*, rev. and enlarged ed. Jerusalem: Academic, 1982. (5) "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* [in press]. (6) "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings - The Limitations of Textual Rules," *HTR* [in press]. (7) Editorial work on and introduction to the fifth fascicle of M. L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek* (see *Bulletin* 14 [1980] 17-21).
- Trebolle, Julio. (1) "El estudio de 4Q Sam^a: Implicaciones exegeticas e históricas," *Est Bib* 39 (1981) 5-18. (2) "La caída de Samaria, Crítica textual, literaria e histórica de 2 Re 17,3-6," *Salmanticensis* 28 (1981) 137-52. (3) "Textos 'Kaige' en la *Vetus Latina* de Reyes (2 Re 10,25-28)," *RB* [in press].
- Ulrich, Eugene. (1) "The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumrân, Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut)" [in press]. (2) Preliminary edition of 4QDana^{a,b,c} [in progress].
- Waard, J. de. "'Homophony' in the Septuagint," *Bib* 62 (1981) 551-61.
- Wevers, John Wm. (1) Ed. *Numeri*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 3/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982. (2) *Text History of the Greek Numbers* [in press]. (3) *Leviticus* and *THGL* [in press]. (4) "The Textual Affinities of the Corrector(s) of B in Numbers," pp. 139-53 in *Studies in Philology in Honour of Ronald James Williams: A Festschrift*, ed. G. E. Kadish and G. E. Freeman. Toronto, 1982.
- Zippor, Moshe. Review of: *Targum Hashiv^cim Lattorah* [a modern Hebrew translation of the LXX by Z. Karl, Jerusalem 1979] in *Kiryat Sepher* 55 (1980) 168-74 (Hebrew).

REDACTION, RECENSION, AND MIDRASH
IN THE BOOKS OF KINGS*

Julio Treballe

Instituto Español Bíblico y Arqueológico, Jerusalem

Research on the books of Kings has been dominated in these last decades by the work of M. Noth on the Deuteronomistic redaction.¹ His masterpiece opened up new paths and proposed new models of research. After every masterpiece, however, research sooner or later becomes "scholasticized" and confines itself tamely to the lines traced by the master. Furthermore, the impact of a masterpiece tends either to marginalize earlier paths of research or to close them off entirely. Thus in the work of Noth and his disciples very little importance has been given to the contributions to be drawn from the versions (esp. the LXX and the VL) for recension history and text history of the books of the Bible. In the books of Kings these versions offer many important variant readings with respect to the MT. Noth's work in 1943 coincided with a generalized "return to the MT" movement.² At that time the Greek version came to be considered mostly as a targum or as a *midrashic* paraphrase of the Hebrew. J. W. Wevers at mid-century and more recently D. W. Gooding and R. P. Gordon developed this line of research by studying the "principles of exegesis" underlying the Greek version of Kings and the midrashic elements it contains.³

If the early decades of this century were characterized by both the use and abuse of conjecturally restoring the "primitive text" (*Urtext*) by choosing among the many variants found in the versions,

these last decades have seen the analogous abuse of conjecturing, on literary grounds, what was the "primitive form" (*Urform*), and this on the basis of the Massoretic text alone. Consequently, if on the one hand the history of the tradition and redaction of Kings (10th-5th century BC) now appears excessively complicated, on the other hand we are content with a very simple history of the transmission of the text. In the long span stretching from the 5th century BC up to the medieval Massorettes, it is currently assumed that there existed but a simple and direct line of textual transmission in Hebrew (Noth);⁴ the variants of the versions are considered to be merely tendentious deviations from a uniform Hebrew text.

The study of the biblical MSS of Qumran, in particular of 4QSam^{a,b,c}, has facilitated a new understanding of the parallel history and parallel evolution of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Samuel-Kings. This new knowledge creates the need for an interdisciplinary dialogue between the practitioners of redaction history (Noth and his school) and those of the study of the transmission and recension of the text (e.g., W. F. Albright, F. M. Cross, D. Barthélemy, etc.).⁵

In such a dialogue it will be accepted that many of the variants in the versions do not represent isolated phenomena or occasional acts of negligence on the part of the translators and/or copyists. Rather, they represent complete patterns all their own which correspond to different types of text that once existed in the Hebrew tradition. It will also be accepted that the plurality of textual types can even reflect different stages in the earlier process of the redaction and editing of the text.

Our study begins with the textual and literary analysis of selected passages. From these analyses a working method will be extracted which will prove to be better adapted to the textual and literary characteristics of the books of Kings. As a result, we

will see the need for a return to textual criticism and frequently to the *Urtext* as found in the text of the versions. Instead of being an arsenal for random corrections to the current Hebrew text, these versions will serve as evidence for the existence of a non-Massoretic Hebrew type of text or a pre-Massoretic recension-form of the text. For its part, textual criticism will be seen to need the literary-critical method to help it isolate merely textual phenomena such as glosses, omissions, and transpositions.

I. Jeroboam at the Assembly at Shechem:

MT 1 Kgs 12:2 // LXX 11:43

1 Kings 12:2 is one of the most important and most discussed passages in the books of Kings. The history of the Assembly at Shechem depends on the correct interpretation of this text. The majority of authors tend to correct the MT *wayyēšeb...b^e* to *wayyāšob...min*, in conformity with Alexandrinus (LXX^A) and with the parallel in Chronicles: "Jeroboam returned from Egypt."⁶

The expression *wayyēšeb b^e* appears frequently in contexts speaking of a flight into exile, forming part of a fixed narrative structure: "(...when X heard these things,) he sought to kill Y; Y was afraid, and he fled from the presence of X and settled in Z" (...*wyšm^c... 't dbrw wybqš... l'nyt 't...wyr[']...wybrh mny...wayyēšeb b^e...*). The flights of Moses, Jephthah, David, Absalom, and Jeremiah are all expressed in this narrative pattern (cf. esp. Exod 2:14-15; Jer 26:21; cf. also Judg 9:21, 11:3; 1 Sam 19:2, 23:14-15, 27:1-4; 2 Sam 4:1-3, 13:37-38). This conventional expression is found in narratives from such diverse epochs as, for example, the story of the flight of Idrimi (14th century BC) and the NT flight of Joseph into Egypt.⁷ In these notices the fleeing protagonist ends up "residing in" or "settling in" a place of exile.

The text in 12:2 reproduces essential elements ("he fled... and settled in..." = *wybrh...wyšb b...*) of that narrative sequence

(above). This proves the value of the reading *wayyēšeb...b^e* against the generally proposed correction. Furthermore, it renders impossible the proposed separation of the two verbs by consigning one to the parenthetical sentence and one to the main sentence: "When Jeroboam, son of Nebat, learned of this (for he was still in Egypt, whither he had fled from King Solomon), then Jeroboam returned from Egypt." The expression *wayyēšeb b^e* also forms part of the inserted parenthesis. The corresponding passage in the Old Greek, located in 11:43, confirms this conclusion: here the parenthesis includes and closes after the expression "and Jeroboam settled in Egypt" (*hōs ephygen ek prosōpou Salōmōn kai ekathēto en Aigyptō*). Then follows the apodosis of the main sentence: "he set out and came to his city in the land of Sareira, in the mountains of Ephraim" (*kateuthynei kai erchetai eis tēn polin autou eis tēn gēn Sareira tēn en orei Ephraim*).

The subject of the apodosis must be the same as the subject of the protasis, "Jeroboam." Furthermore, the same verb, *wyb[']*, is attested in all the forms of the manuscript tradition: in the Q *wyb[']* of 1 Kgs 12:3 and in 17 MSS (K *wyb[']w*); in LXX 11:43 and in LXX 12:24f; in the Hexaplaric text of LXX^A 12:3 (including the Armenian and Syrohexaplar versions); and in 2 Chr 10:3. The nucleus of the original apodosis, then, is contained in the expression: "When Jeroboam learned of this..., he came to..." (*wyb['] yrb[']m*).

This main sentence is found outside its proper context in both the MT and the Old Greek. In the MT it interrupts the sequence between verses 1 and 3b (cf. LXX): "[v 1] Rehoboam went to Shechem, where all Israel had come to proclaim him king. [v 3b] They said to Rehoboam..." In the Old Greek it is interpolated by means of the process of *Wiederaufnahme*, between the concluding formulas of Solomon's reign: "Solomon rested with his ancestors; he was buried in the City of David his father (LXX: When Jeroboam, son of Nebat, learned of this...). King Solomon rested

<u>LXX^B</u>	<u>LXX^B</u>	<u>MT</u>
12:24b καὶ ἦν ἐπαιρόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν	καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶγμα ὡς ἐπήρατο χεῖρας ἐπὶ βασιλέα...(w 27-39)	וַיְהִי כִּי הָרַח אֱשֶׁר הָרַח יְד 11:27a בַּמֶּלֶךְ... (w 27-39)
24c καὶ ἐζήτει Σαλωμών θανατῶσαι αὐτόν καὶ ἐφοβήθη καὶ ἀπέδρα αὐτός πρὸς Σουσακεῖμ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἕως ἀπέθανεν Σαλωμών	11:40 καὶ ἐζήτησεν Σαλωμών θανατῶσαι τὸν Ἱεροβοάμ καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀπέδρα εἰς Αἴγυπτον πρὸς Σουσακεῖμ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕως οὗ ἀπέθανεν Σαλωμών	וַיִּבְקֶשׁ שְׁלֹמֹה לְהַמִּית אֶת יְרָבֵעַם וַיִּקְרַע יְרָבֵעַם וַיִּבְרַח מִצְרַיִם אֶל שִׁישַׁק מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַיְהִי בְּמִצְרַיִם עַד מוֹת שְׁלֹמֹה וַיְהִי 11:40
24d καὶ ἤκουσεν Ἱεροβοάμ	11:43 ...καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς ἤκουσεν Ἱεροβοάμ υἱὸς Ναβάτ, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἔτι ὄντος ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ	כַּשְׁמַע יְרָבֵעַם בֶּן נִבַּט וְהוּא עֹדֵנּוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם 12:2

24f ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ὅτι τέθνηκεν Σαλωμών... καὶ ἐξεῆλθεν Ἱεροβοάμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς γῆν Σαρειρὰ τὴν ἐν ὄρει Ἐφράιμ...	ὡς ἔφυγεν ἐκ προσώπου Σαλωμών καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, (ὅτι τέθνηκε Σολομών <i>hoc_{2e2}</i>) κατευθύνει(v) καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν Σαρειρὰ τὴν ἐν ὄρει Ἐφράιμ...	אֲשֶׁר בָּרַח מִפָּנָיו מֶלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּמִצְרַיִם וַיִּשְׁלַח וַיִּקְרָא לָרֹדֶף וַיִּבְאוּ יְרָבֵעַם וְכָל קְהַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְדַבְּרוּ 12:3
24p Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ λαός πρὸς Ῥοβοάμ...	12:3 Καὶ ἐλάλησεν ὁ λαός πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ῥοβοάμ...	וַיִּדְבְּרוּ 12:3 אֵל רֹדֶף... 12:3

with his ancestors, and his son Rehoboam succeeded him as king."⁸

According to the arrangement of the text in the MT, Jeroboam returns from Egypt when he learns that all Israel and Rehoboam have assembled in Shechem (cf. v 1); thus, the *šm*^c of 12:2 now in the MT refers to the assembly. The Old Greek, on the contrary, alone preserves an original element: Jeroboam returns from Egypt when he learns that Solomon has died; thus, the *šm*^c of 12:2 (= the *ēkousen* of LXX 11:43) originally referred to the death of Solomon and connected with 11:40, of which it is the direct continuation. Accordingly, "[Jeroboam] remained in Egypt until the death of Solomon...; when Jeroboam learned of [the death of Solomon]..., he came..." A similar passage in 1 Kgs 11:21 has a formally similar element: Hadad also returned from Egypt upon hearing of the death of David (*šm*^c...*ky [mt]*...).⁹

A further confirmation is found in the text of a notice preserved in the so-called "supplement" or "midrash" of the Old Greek in 12:24c(d,f). This form of the notice represents or closely approximates the original. It even contains a formal element of the literary genre "flight notice" which is absent in MT/LXX 11:40, that is, the "fear" of the persecuted (*wyr*² = *kai ephobēthē*): "[v 24c] Solomon sought to kill Jeroboam; Jeroboam was afraid and fled to Egypt where he found refuge with Shishak, and he settled there until the death of Solomon. [24d] When Jeroboam learned in Egypt that Solomon had died..., [24f] he came to"¹⁰ All the essential elements of the "flight notice" are found here assembled in the proper order: (1) the persecution (*wybyqš* ...*l'myt* ²t...); (2) the flight of the persecuted (*wybrh*); (3) the temporary residence in exile of the persecuted person (*wyšb/wyhy b*...); (4) the news of the persecutor's death (*wyhy kšm*^c *ky mt*); and (5) the return (*wyb*²...).

Such an argument of literary criticism, based on the literary genre of the "flight notice" and based on form rather than on content, allows us to resolve here a question of textual criticism:

which of the two is the preferred reading, "settled in" or "returned from"? It equally allows us to discover the limits of the present literary unit.

The "flight notice" of the MT/LXX 11:40 (= also LXX 12:24c) continues and ends with the sentence: "When Jeroboam heard..., he came to..." (MT 12:2; LXX 11:43 and 12:24d,f). The LXX texts 11:43 and 12:24f both identify this place as Sareira. This "flight notice" is a part of the whole narrative beginning with the abortive revolt of Jeroboam (MT 11:26-28; LXX 12:24b) and following with the account of the Assembly at Shechem (MT 12:3b-21; LXX 12:24nβ,p-x). There can be no doubt, then, that Jeroboam was at the Assembly at Shechem from its very outset.¹¹ He is not, however, expressly mentioned as being present. In fact, the only people who intervene in the deliberations are those who are authorized, such as the elders of the people and, in opposition to them, the young friends and counselors of Rehoboam's court.

II. The Accession Formula: Text and Composition

It is not possible to discuss here the text of the so-called "supplement" or "duplicate" in LXX 12:24a-z. Since the time of Meyer (1906)¹² it was quite simply set aside as being late "midrash." Gooding qualified it as pedantic in its chronology and as biased against, and insulting to, Jeroboam. The first verse of this "supplement" (LXX 12:24a) appears to be a "duplicate" of the accession formula of Solomon and Rehoboam.

The stereotyped phraseology of the accession formula recurs frequently throughout the books of Kings. This therefore allows us another approach to the study of the process of the recension and composition of the books. Despite the rigidity of its formulation, the accession formula nevertheless undergoes numerous variations. As an explanation for this phenomenon Bin-Nun supposes a plurality of formulations in the original source. E. Cortese thinks rather of a redactor's literary variations upon the primitive

formula. These authors do not take into account the textual variants of the Old Greek and, in the case of Rehoboam, do not pay the least attention to the text of LXX 12:24a.¹³

The accession formula is as follows: "In the year...of X, king of Israel/Judah, there became king Y, son of Z, king of Judah/Israel..." (*bānt...l...[bn...] mlk ysr 'l/yhwdh mlk...bn... 'l yhwdh/ysr 'l*).

In five cases in the MT, the formulation of the phrase presents a common anomaly, repeated by LXX^B in the *kaige* section. This anomaly consists in inverting the order of the sentence in such a way that the synchronism shifts to the second position: "Y, son of Z, became king over Judah/Israel in the year...of X, king of Israel/Judah" (1 Kgs 16:29 Ahab; 22:41 Jehoshaphat; 22:52 Ahaziah of Israel; 2 Kgs 3:1 Jehoram of Israel; 12:1 Joash of Judah).

In these cases, the text of the Old Greek, reflected in the *kaige* section only by the Antiochene text, always preserves intact the original formulation with the synchronism in the initial position: *en tō eniautō*.... The change in the MT is always occasioned by the transposition of the whole formula to a different context from its primitive location. A displacement of the formula in the ensemble of the composition provokes a readjustment in the formulation of the phrase.

The anomaly in the formulation of MT 1 Kgs 16:29 (Ahab), 22:41 (Jehoshaphat), and 22:52 (Ahaziah of Israel) is in each case due to the transposition of the occurrence of the formula in reference to Jehoshaphat. The original position of Jehoshaphat's accession formula was in 1 Kgs 16:28a. This is attested by the Old Greek (LXX^{BL} in a non-*kaige* section), which has here the formula in its regular form. The original position fits the pattern of synchronisms which structures the composition of 1-2 Kings.¹⁴

In the same way the anomaly of the MT in the formulation of 2 Kgs 3:1 (Jehoram of Israel) is motivated by the transposition of the formula. Its original position was in 2 Kgs 1:18a. This fact is attested by the Old Greek (LXX^L in the *kaige* section and Josephus),¹⁵ which here has the normal formula; it corresponds, furthermore, to a second principle of the composition of the books: that compositional units (notices or historical narratives, prophetic oracles and narratives, etc.) must be integrated within the framework of that reign with which they are synchronized. In the text-form reflected by the Old Greek, the prophetic narratives of chap. 2 are set within the framework of the reign of Joram. On the contrary, in the MT they remain outside the framework of any reign.¹⁶

The MT of 2 Kgs 12:1 first gives the age of Joash of Judah at the moment of his accession to the throne, followed by the synchronism for his accession. The Old Greek, represented here by LXX^L, preserves once more the habitual formulation.

In an earlier passage the MT presents the synchronism in the accession formula for Ahaziah of Judah in 8:25 ("In the 12th year of Joram son of Ahab"), but in 9:29 it adds a different synchronism corresponding to the chronological system of the Old Greek: "in the 11th year of Joram son of Ahab, Ahaziah began to reign over Judah." This phrase and its synchronism belong to the original text of the regnal formula of Ahaziah as preserved in the so-called "addition" of LXX^L VL after 10:36. The formula comes immediately before the "conspiracy notice" (*qšr 'l*) of Jehu, redacted according to the narrative pattern of the "conspiracy" or "coup d'état" (*hkh, Putschbericht*):

...καὶ Ὀχοζίας υἱὸς ἦν εἴκοσι καὶ δύο ἐτῶν ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ἓνα ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ. καὶ ὄνομα τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Ροθολία θυγάτηρ Ἀχααβ βασιλέως Ἰσραηλ. καὶ ἐπο-

ρεύθη ἐν ὁδοῦ οἴκου Αχααβ.... Καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ὀχοζίας ἐπὶ Ἀζαηλ βασιλέα Συρίας εἰς πόλεμον. Τότε συνῆψεν Ἰου υἱὸς Ναμεσσει ἐπὶ Ἰωραμ υἱὸν Αχααβ βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἐν Ἰεζραηλ, καὶ ἀπέθανεν. καὶ ἐτόξευσεν Ἰου καὶ τὸν Ὀχοζίαν βασιλέα Ἰούδα ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα, καὶ ἀπέθανεν. καὶ ἀνεβίβασαν αὐτὸν οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ θάπτουσιν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ἐν πόλει Δαυειδ (2 Kgs 10:36+).

The Old Greek (cf. VL) here preserves the text of Jehu's coup d'état notice integrally and in its proper place, that is, after the initial formula of Ahaziah and before the beginning of chap. 11. Also in the MT the initial sentence of the notice (8:28a) follows the initial formula of Ahaziah (8:25-27). Nevertheless, the remainder of this notice, taken from the Annals of Judah, now appears in the MT in pieces scattered throughout a prophetic narrative which comes from the Northern Kingdom and recounts the revolt of Jehu (8:28a; 9:14a.28).¹⁷

The composition of the books of Kings appears then as a process in three stages: (1) At first there was a synchronic scheme of the reigns of Israel and Judah. (2) Within this scheme were integrated notices from the Annals of both kingdoms (e.g., "conspiracy notices"). Also in the second stage, narratives gathered from prophetic and historical sources were incorporated into the framework of the respective reigns with which they were synchronized. (3) Finally, Deuteronomic comments were added at various stages difficult to define precisely for each case.¹⁸

One thing is clear: in order to reconstruct the history of the *redaction* and composition of the books it is necessary first to reestablish correctly the history of the *recension* of the text. The type of text on which the Old Greek is based occasionally shows knowledge of a text in which not all of the Deuteronomic

additions had yet been made or in which these had been arranged according to a different compositional plan.¹⁹ Thus, for example, the regnal formula of Rehoboam in LXX 1 Kgs 12:24a lacks the Dtr. addition found in MT/LXX 14:21-22 and ignores the anomalous formulation found in 14:21a. Again, the narratives of the consultation of Ahijah of Shiloh and of the Assembly at Shechem are presented in LXX 12:24g-z in a pre-Dtr. form. Or again, in the LXX the account of the construction of the Jerusalem temple lacks the Dtr. addition found in MT 1 Kgs 6:11-14; this addition is demarcated in the MT by means of *Wiederaufnahme*, where the expression "Solomon built the temple and completed it" is repeated (6:9 and 14).

A final example will summarize and confirm the above conclusions. In the MT of 2 Kgs 13:10-13, and consequently in the *kaige* text of LXX^B, the initial and final formulas of Jehoash of Judah follow immediately one upon the other. No space is left, then, for any narrative material which belongs to the reign of Jehoash. The prophetic narrative of 13:14-21 and the notice of the verses 22, (23), 24-25 are found outside the framework of his reign. This is contrary to the principle of integration of literary units which governs the composition of the book. Moreover, a duplication of the concluding formula of Jehoash is reproduced in the MT/LXX^B at 14:15-16. Finally, the notice in MT and *kaige* 13:22, 24-25, taken from the Annals, appears interrupted by the Dtr. insertion of v 23:

OG (LXX ^L)		MT/LXX ^B
13:3-7, 23	Dtr. comments	13:3-7
13:10-11	accession formula	13:10-11
	epilogue formula	13:12-13
13:14-21	prophetic narrative	13:14-21
13:22, 24-25	notice	13:22, (23 Dtr.), 24-25
13:25+	epilogue formula	

On the other hand, in the text of the OG (LXX^L) and Josephus the concluding formula of Jehoash, here located after 13:14-25,

encloses the prophetic narrative and the historical notice corresponding to his reign (vv 14-25). Furthermore, this same OG text ignores the repetition of the concluding formula as found in the MT of 14:15-16. It also locates 13:23 inside the Dtr. commentary composed of vv 3-7 and 23. The notice of the victory over the Arameans, then, does not undergo the Deuteronomic interruption found in the MT (13:23). Moreover, this OG notice preserves an ending (cf. 13:25, now missing in the MT) in which reference is made to the war in Aphek. All these literary units (prophetic narrative, notice, and Dtr. comments) are linked among themselves by mutual references: all revolve around the "salvation" in the war at Aphek (*tšwʿh*, *sōtēria*, cf. 13:5,17,24-25).

In the above examples we have used an analysis which combines textual ("lower") and literary ("higher") criticism, that is, *recension history* and *redaction history*. We applied this method to the two text-types of 1-2 Kings, the proto-Massoretic and that underlying the Old Greek. This kind of analysis allows us to discover an earlier stage of the composition of the books in which distinct literary units maintain a greater degree of literary unity and integrity, and in which they are not as fragmented and riddled with interruptions as they are in the proto-Massoretic text.

III. The Construction of Solomon's Palace:

MT 1 Kgs 7:1-12 // LXX 7:38-50

J. W. Wevers, D. W. Gooding, and L. Prijs have stressed the midrashic and targumic character of the LXX translation in the books of Kings. It is now necessary to establish the criteria which will allow us to answer the question: "*Vorlage* or *Targum*?" In order to do this we now propose two further examples for discussion.

In the MT and in the OG of 2 Kgs 6:2-7:51 the differences in order of the literary units are as follows [the LXX verse numbers have their counterpart in the MT listed in brackets]:

	<u>LXX</u>		<u>MT</u>
Chronological note	6:4-5a[6:37-38a]		
Temple	6:6-34[6:2-36]	6:2-36	Temple
		6:37-38a,b	Chronological note
		7:1-12	Palace
Temple	7:1-37[7:13-51]	7:13-51	Temple
Palace	7:38-50[7:1-12]		

In the MT the description of the construction of the palace is found inserted in the middle of the account of the construction of the temple. The LXX, by contrast, first presents the narrative of the construction and decoration of the temple and only later makes reference to the palace. It appears intentionally to separate the temple from the palace. Gooding sees in this a separation of the religious from the profane and accordingly rejects this "reverent" order. He attributes it to the typical piety and pedantry of the translator in questions of chronology.²⁰

Methodologically speaking, however, an argument based on the formal aspects of a given text should take precedence over an argument based on its possible "tendencies." It also comes first in order as one applies the several critical methods. *Tendenzkritik* is very much exposed to the fantasies and the biases of each exegete. In the present case the valid formal criteria derive from a principle already demonstrated above: when a textual corruption is related to a transposition in a given text, the corruption is probably caused by, and is a sign of, that same transposition. In this case the transposition could have been made under the influence of the process of ring composition or *Wiederaufnahme*.

The proto-Massoretic text has transposed the ensemble formed by the two literary units 6:37-38a and 7:1-12a. The evidence for

these two transpositions is found in the discrepancies which have been left in the present text. The insertion of this block of material in a new context has caused the corruption of the form of the MT in the two verses which constitute the points of insertion and suture: 6:36 and 7:12b (LXX 6:34). The text of these verses is as follows:

<u>LXX^B</u>	<u>MT</u>
6:34[6:36]	6:36
καὶ ἠκοδόμησεν	וַיִּבְנֶה
<u>τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἐσωτάτην</u>	אֶת הַחֲצַר הַפְּנִימִיָּה
<u>τρεις στίχους ἀπελεκῆτων</u>	שְׁלֹשָׁה טוּרֵי גִזִּית
<u>καὶ στίχος κατεργασμένης κέδρου</u>	וְטוּר כְּרַחַח אֲרָזִים
<u>κυκλόθεν (בביב)</u>	
καὶ ἠκοδόμησε καταπέτασμα	
τῆς αὐλῆς	
<u>τοῦ αἰλᾶμ τοῦ οἴκου (תלאם הבית)</u>	
τοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ	
	TRANSPOSITION { 7:37-38a.(b)
	{ 7:1-11
7:49[7:12a]	7:12a
τῆς αὐλῆς τῆς μεγάλης <u>κύκλοι</u>	וְחֲצַר הַגְּדוּלָּה סְבִיב
<u>τρεις στίχοι ἀπελεκῆτων</u>	שְׁלֹשָׁה טוּרֵים גִזִּית
<u>καὶ στίχος κεκολλημένης κέδρου</u>	וְטוּר כְּרַחַח אֲרָזִים
	7:12b
	וּלְחֲצַר בֵּית יְהוָה הַפְּנִימִיָּה וּלְאֵלֵם הַבַּיִת

The two passages (LXX 6:34[6:36] and MT 7:12) use identical expressions to refer to the portico of the temple (*ʿl̄m hbyṭ*), the interior court (*ḥṣr ḥpnymyt*), and the type of construction composing the interior and exterior court walls (*sbyḅ šlšh ṭwry[im] gzyt wṭwr krtt ʿrzym*; in the LXX the only difference is that 6:34 [6:36] *kyklothen* = *sbyḅ* appears at the end of the sentence). This

textual parallelism is heightened by a parallelism of context. The two verses cited above, MT 7:12b and LXX 6:34[6:36], mark the transition to a similar block of material (MT 7:13-51 // LXX 7:1-37) also referring to the portico of the temple (cf. LXX 7:3[7:15] *to ailam tou oikou*) and to the interior court, in which are found the cult objects mentioned in the sequel (columns, "sea," and bronze basins, etc.). This double parallelism of text and context facilitates the movement from one text to the other and simplifies the insertion of the block MT 7:1-9(10-11) between the two, with 7:12 forming a *Wiederaufnahme* of 6:36.

As it now stands, the insertion of 7:1-11 has provoked a textual corruption in the MT in its forms of the two verses, 7:12b and 6:36, between which the foreign piece has been forcibly interpolated:

(1) The MT 7:12b has little meaning in itself and even less in its present context (7:1-12a). The context makes reference to the construction of the palace and of its large outer court. It makes no sense to refer, as does 12b, to the interior court and the portico (*ʿulam*) of the temple. This reference, however, helps smoothe the transition to the following description in MT 7:13-51 of the cult objects found in the *ʿulam* and the interior court of the temple. This shift to a description of the temple is the reason for the "addition" by *Wiederaufnahme* of 7:12b in the MT.

(2) Furthermore, the MT form of 6:36 has lost its ending, which was in part transposed to provide 7:12b in the MT. The reference to the vestibule of the temple (*lʿlm hbyṭ*) retains its original context in LXX 6:34. After the description of the *āḇḇr* and the *hēkāl* with their respective doors (6:18aβ-33[6:19-35]), we pass logically to the description of the third section of the temple: the *ʿulam* or vestibule framed by its bronze pillars (7:13-22). Such is the sequence in the LXX where the link between the references to the vestibule and those to its two pillars is expressed

by the common allusion to the "vestibule of the temple" in 6:34 [om MT] and 7:3[7:15] (*to ailan tou oikou*).

IV. The Translation Equivalent *lkn* = *ouch houtōs* (*l' kn*):
Vorlage or *Targum*?

S. R. Driver qualified as "strange" the occasional LXX translation of the particle *lkn* by an (interrogative?) *ouch houtōs*, as though one were dealing with *l' kn*: 1 Kgs 22:19; 2 Kgs 1:4,6, 16; 19:32; 21:12; 22:20.²¹ All these passages are found in the *kaige* section γδ of the Greek text of 1-2 Kings. According to L. Prijs, the "LXX" in this case employs a "targumic" interpretation of the type *'ā tiqra*, which consists in understanding a word by dividing it into two parts.

This "strange" version, however, is not the original in the OG. It is a clue which betrays a later recension of the text. Wherever it occurs, the Antiochene text, or at least some one of its representatives, such as the *Vetus Latina* or the Armenian version in its intermediate stage,²² preserves the old version.

Thus, in 2 Kgs 1:16 the Antiochene text (boc_{2e2}) has *dia touto* where we find the reviser's phrase *ouch houtōs* in the rest of the MSS of the LXX. In two other cases, 2 Kgs 1:4,6, the LXX^L offers a double reading, the reviser's reading followed by the primitive reading: *ouch houtōs dia touto*. In 2 Kgs 19:32 there is an omission in the LXX^L, but the Armenian version attests *propter hoc*; the intermediate stage of this version depends upon the proto-Lucianic text and consequently attests *dia touto* in the OG. In two other cases, 2 Kgs 21:12 and 22:20, the LXX^L now presents the reviser's translation, but again the Armenian version here joined by Lucifer (*propter hoc*) reflects the primitive Greek *dia touto*. Finally, in LXX^L at 1 Kgs 22:19 the reviser's form reappears, but significantly enough Theodoret ignores it.

In Samuel-Kings the Hebrew particle *lkn* appears only five more times: 1 Sam 2:30; 3:14; 27:6; 28:2; 1 Kgs 14:10. The first four cases correspond to the section α, non-*kaige*, of the Greek text. In 1 Sam 2:30 and 27:6 all the MSS offer *dia touto*, confirming our supposition that this was the original version of the LXX. In 3:14 the reviser's form reappears in the G MSS *oud' /ouch houtōs*, but the VL (*Palimpsestus Vindobonensis*) offers *ideo* and the Ethiopic version (Aeth^a) has *et propterea*, which attests a Greek *dia touto*. In 1 Sam 28:2 the transmitted version is *houtō*, which can equally come from *ouch houtōs* or *dia touto*. The passage in 1 Kgs 14:10 forms part of a larger Hexaplaric addition (vv 1-20) which was never part of the OG and here is taken from Aquila. Its version, *dia touto*, is in this case the typical Aquilan version.

In order to obtain a more complete view of the translations of the particle *lkn*, we need to take into account also the rendering of the expression *l' kn* from which the reviser's version is derived. In the only case of *l' kn* in a non-*kaige* section (1 Sam 30:23) the OG translation for *l' t'sw kn* is *ou poiēsete houtōs*. All the other cases of the reading *ouch houtōs* (= MT *l' kn*) are found in the *kaige* sections of the G text. This does not help to make a comparison between the possible readings of the old version and those of the proto-Theodotonic or *kaige* recension found elsewhere: 2 Sam 20:21; 23:5 (*hoti ouch houtōs* boc_{2e2} VL); 2 Kgs 7:9 (*ti houtōs* boc_{2e2}); 2 Kgs 17:9 (*adikous* boc_{2e2} VL).

However, the case of 2 Sam 18:14 is in itself very eloquent:

MT	<i>l' kn ḥylh</i>
LXX ^B	<i>touto egō arksomai ouch houtōs menō</i>
LXX ^L	<i>dia touto egō arksomai</i>
Arm	<i>propter hoc quidem praeteribo</i>

The current text of the LXX offers a double reading. The first element preserves the old version, albeit in a truncated form

without *dia*; the same form is attested by the Antiochene text, reflected in the Armenian version as well, presupposing the *Vorlage lākēn ʾāḥēllāh*. The second element corresponds to the reviser's version made according to the proto-MT.²³

Thus, in the books of Samuel-Kings the translation *lkn = ouch houtōs* is not that of the Old Greek. It corresponds instead to the later hebraizing recension represented by the *kaige* revision.

CONCLUSION: Method in Identifying the Original Text of Kings

The Hebrew, Greek, and Latin variants must be studied and assessed from the perspective of the history of the biblical text. The correct use of the principles of textual and literary criticism in restoring the *Urtext* depends in great measure upon following a correct theory of the history of the biblical text.

The new understanding of the history of the text of (Samuel-) Kings gained in the light of the MSS discovered in Cave 4 at Qumrân grounds the possibility of assigning a high value to the readings and the passages of the OG and (in the *kaige* sections) of the Antiochene text.

The OG translated a type of Hebrew text which had already been used by Chronicles and which has now reappeared in Hebrew, especially in 4QSam^{a,b,c}. Around the turn of the eras the OG was revised according to a Hebrew text of the proto-Massoretic type. This *kaige* revision in the MS tradition replaced the OG text in the sections 1 Kgs 1—2:11 and 1 Kgs 22—2 Kgs and may have left traces in the non-*kaige* section in some MSS. In those sections then, the only path capable of leading us back to the primitive form of the Greek version is that which retraces the pre-Lucianic substratum of the Antiochene MSS. Consequently, a working method consisting of a three-stage approach is needed for the establishment and exegesis of the Hebrew *Urtext* of Kings:

(1) The first stage is that of rediscovering the OG. This consists in re-ascending the path traced by the successive revisions ("proto-Lucianic," proto-Theodotonic or *kaige*, Hexaplaric, and Lucianic).

(2) The second stage is that of approaching as nearly as possible to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the first translation and its revisions.²⁴ In the dilemma *Vorlage* or *Targum* (and here we speak only for the text of Samuel-Kings) the balance weighs in favor of a non-Massoretic *Vorlage* which is reproduced with a high degree of literalness by the OG translation. This primary version does not reflect more or less isolated Greek variants from a constant proto-Massoretic text, but rather an independent type of Hebrew text which had a different development.

(3) The third stage consists in moving still farther back toward the Hebrew archetype (*Urtext*). This implies a critical *examinatio* of the two basic types of text: the one represented by the proto-Massoretic text, reflected by the *kaige* and Hexaplaric recensions, and the other represented by the Hebrew text of Chronicles (and by 4QSam^{a,b,c} in Samuel) and reflected by the OG.²⁵

This *examinatio* must be carried out before any argumentation based on possible biases in the content of the text, and it must utilize formal criteria such as the fixed structure of literary formulas and genres, the literary procedure of transposition and insertion of one passage into another by, e. g., *Wiederaufnahme*, and the general principles of composition of the books of Kings.

Editors, translators, and critics of the books of Kings have had frequent recourse to the Lucianic text in the *kaige* sections. It is all the more significant that this preference for the Lucianic text as "the better text" in these cases does not stem from a tendency favorable to it, but rather overcomes a prejudice widespread since the days of Rahlfs against the Lucianic revision and

against any possible existence of a "lucian before Lucian."²⁶ Such modern authors, then, must assign a high critical value to the type of text represented by the OG and/or by the pre-Lucianic or Antiochene text. This should not remain a merely occasional recognition, confined to those passages where the MT presents an insuperable corruption or difficulty. The two types of texts must first be studied separately on their own merits. Either or both of the two text-types may sometimes reflect previous secondary redactional activity. Consequently, the analysis of the recensional history of these texts constitutes a necessary step methodologically prior to the literary analysis of the chronologically prior history of the composition and redaction of the critically-identified *Urtext*.

NOTES

* I wish to thank Professor John Strugnell of Harvard for offering corrections in the manuscript and F. Normand Bonneau of Worcester, Massachusetts, for translating the Spanish original into English.

¹M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I: Die sammeln und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18; Halle: Niemeyer, 1943).

²H. S. Nyberg, "Das textkritische Problem des Alten Testaments am Hoseabuche demonstriert," *ZAW* 52 (1934) 241-54. A work of earlier times, as valuable as it is forgotten, is that of H. Hrozný, *Die Abweichungen des Codex Vaticanus vom hebräischen Texte in den Königsbüchern* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1909).

³J. W. Wevers, "Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12 - xxi 43," *OTS* 8 (1950) 300-22; "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22:1 - 4 K. 25:30)," *CBQ* 14 (1952) 40-56; D. W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969) 1-29; *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2* (SOTSMS 4; Cambridge: University Press, 1976); R. P. Gordon, "The Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash?" *VT* 25 (1975) 368-93.

⁴M. Noth, *Die Welt des Alten Testaments: Einführung in die Grenzgebiete der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (2d ed.; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1953) 286.

⁵W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (1955) 27-33; D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963); F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964) 281-99; "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University, 1975) 306-20; E. C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars, 1978); E. Tov, "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues," *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (1980 Proceedings IOSCS; Jerusalem: Academ, 1980) 45-67.

⁶J. A. Montgomery, *The Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1951) 249; M. Noth, *Könige* (BKAT 9/1; Neukirchenvluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968) 265; A. Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (2d ed.; Halle: Niemeyer, 1956) 2; J. Gray, *I and II Kings: A Commentary* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 1970) 301.

⁷Matt 2:3-15; cf. S. Smith, *The Statue of Idri-mi* (London: The British Institute of Archeology in Ankara, 1949) 14-5.

⁸D. W. Gooding, "The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *VT* 17 (1967) 173-89, cf. 178; R. W. Klein, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *JBL* 89 (1970) 217-8.

⁹Cf. also 1 Kgs 21:15: *wyhy kēm...ky sq̄l n̄wt wymt*.

¹⁰Cf. the text of the MSS *boc_{2e}* in 11:43: (*ēkousen*)...*hoti tethnēke Solomōn*....

¹¹J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (2d ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1895) 57; R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (7th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1925) 2.219-20; M. Noth, *Geschichte Israels* (6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 208. For the contrary view, cf. J. A. Montgomery, *Kings* (1951) 248; J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 1972) 226. For the whole discussion, cf. J. Trebolle, *Salomōn y Jeroboām: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Rey. 2-12; 14* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, Dissertationes 3; Salamanca/Jerusalén: Universidad Pontificia/Instituto Español Bíblico y Arqueológico, 1980) 226-31.

¹²Cf. E. Meyer, "Bericht der Septuaginta über Jeroboam,"

Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen; Halle: Niemeyer, 1906) 363-70.

¹³Sh. R. Bin-Nun, "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and Judah," *VT* 18 (1968) 414-32; E. Cortese, "Lo schema deuteronomico per i re di Giuda e d'Israele," *Bib* 56 (1975) 37-52; J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams: Studien zur Darstellung Jerobeams und der Geschichte des Nordreiches in der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung* (FRLANT 93; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 86; J. Trebolle, *Salomón y Jeroboán*, 84-109.

¹⁴Cf. S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (5th ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1894) 179; J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1968) 58, 73-86.

¹⁵Cf. Shenkel, *Chronology*, 69, 73, 82.

¹⁶O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) 294.

¹⁷Note the comment of J. A. Montgomery (*Kings* [1951] 434) concerning Lucian's "faculty of putting things in their right place."

¹⁸Cf. A. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*.

¹⁹This is a very promising field of research. For the moment, cf. J. Trebolle, *Salomón*, 168-85.

²⁰D. W. Gooding, "Pedantic Timetabling in the 3rd Book of Reigns," *VT* 15 (1965) 153-66, cf. 155-6; contrast Trebolle, *Salomón* 307-20.

²¹S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913) 44; cf. L. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948) 59-61.

²²B. Johnson, *Die armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch* (ConB, OT Series 2; Lund: Gleerup, 1968) 96.

²³Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*, 116.

²⁴On the whole question of the reconstruction of the Hebrew text underlying the LXX, see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).

²⁵The question about the "better text" then concerns the earlier period of the editors, rather than that of more or less careless or innovative later copyists. At that earlier stage the limits between higher and lower criticism become rather fluid and both methods must work side by side. Cf. D. Barthélemy, "Notes critiques sur quelques points d'histoire du texte," *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 21; Fribourg/Göttingen: Editions Universitaires Fribourg/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 289-303, esp. 296-7; "La qualité du texte massorétique de Samuel," *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, 1-44.

²⁶Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* (Septuaginta Studien 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911) 290-5.

A SHORT COMMENTARY ON SOME VERSES
OF THE OLD GREEK OF ISAIAH 23

Arie van der Kooij
University of Utrecht, Holland

I

As is well known, there are many and sometimes striking differences between the Massoretic text of the book of Isaiah (MT Isa) and the Old Greek of this book (LXX Isa). Several explanations for these differences have been given in the last century. Some scholars believed that the *Vorlage* of the LXX Isa was markedly different from the MT Isa.¹ Others, however, criticized this view; in their opinion most differences were the work of the translator and were due mainly to factors such as faulty knowledge of the Hebrew language, misreadings, influence of the Aramaic, attempts to produce good Koine Greek, and predilection for a free and paraphrasing translation.² To these and other supposed factors I. L. Seeligmann added a new one: a marked tendency toward contemporization by means of fulfillment-interpretation of the old oracles of the prophet Isaiah.³

My own research on the LXX Isa has led me to the conviction that this feature of the LXX Isa, as suggested by Seeligmann, is an important key not only for explaining differences between the Hebrew and the Greek text of Isaiah, but also for a better understanding of the Greek text itself. Recently I have dealt with some texts of the LXX Isa as examples of fulfillment-interpretation in *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*.⁴ In this present article

I will deal with some verses of LXX Isa 23 as another example of this kind of interpretation.

Seeligmann adheres to the view that one can discover such interpretations only "in isolated, free renderings."⁵ It is to be asked, however, whether one has to look upon free and interpretative renderings as "isolated" from their Greek context. According to Seeligmann, one should not try "to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text,"⁶ as K. F. Euler did with LXX Isa 53.⁷ Seeligmann studies the LXX Isa in relation to the Hebrew *Vorlage* exclusively and considers it unjustified to deal with the LXX Isa as a coherent text with its own meaning. Euler, on the other hand, aimed at treating LXX Isa 53 in both respects. J. M. Coste did the same with LXX Isa 25:1-5⁸ and reached the conclusion that the Greek passage in those verses, while very arbitrary in relation to the Hebrew, turns out to be a meaningful unity on its own. J. C. M. das Neves dealt in the same way with LXX Isa 24.⁹

It is in this twofold way that I will deal in this article with some verses of LXX Isa 23: (a) the Greek text in relation to "the" Hebrew text (primarily in a descriptive way), and (b) the Greek text on its own. As to "the" Hebrew text, important readings of Qumran MSS will be mentioned alongside the MT: first, readings of 1QIsa^a (contemporary with the LXX Isa), and then readings of 1QIsa^b, 4QIsa^a, and 4QIsa^c.¹⁰

II

23:1 (*The Heading*) צַר כְּשָׂמָּה - τὸ ὄραμα Τύρου.

The rendering ὄραμα (or ὄρασις) for כְּשָׂמָּה is characteristic of the LXX Isa and does not occur in the LXX elsewhere in the OT.¹¹ In the LXX Isa not only the prophecy about Tyre in our chapter but also the book as a whole (1:1, cf. MT) is called a "vision." The rendering ὄραμα is thus in line with ὄρασις of 1:1.

23:1 תרשיש חנינון אגללו - ὀλολύζετε πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος
 כִּי שָׁדַד מְבִית - ὅτι ἀπόλετο
 מִבְּנֵי - καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται
 מֵאֶרֶץ כְּתִים - ἐκ γῆς Κιτιέων
 לְמַן לְגַלְהָ - ἦκται αἰχμάλωτος.

MT-LXX: תרשיש has been rendered as Καρχηδών "Carthage." There is no rendering of מְבִית in the LXX; MT = 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, and 4QIsa^a. . . מְבִית: the LXX reflects a sense-division different from that of the MT, i.e., in the LXX two (short) sentences, in the MT one (in the MT מְבִית belongs with מְבִית [see accentuation]). לְגַלְהָ - "led captive": cf. *qal* and *hiphil* of גַּלְהָ, No rendering of לְמַן (but see below, v 2).

The first thing which is striking in this verse is the rendering "Carthage" for Tarshish, as is the case throughout chap. 23 (vv 6, 10, 14).¹² Outside this chapter, however, Tarshish has been rendered differently in the Old Greek of Isaiah: in 2:16 the words תרשיש חנינון אגללו כל are translated by πᾶν πλοῖον θαλάσσης (Tarshish as referring to the Mediterranean Sea),¹³ whereas the LXX offers πλοῖα θαρσις for תרשיש חנינון אגללו in 60:9 and θαρσις for תרשיש in 66:19 (Tarshish in both cases understood, apparently, as the name of a [maritime] country).¹⁴

In chap. 23 Tarshish is interpreted as "Carthage," that is to say, as the most famous Phoenician city on the African coast of the Mediterranean Sea, founded long before by traders from Tyre.¹⁵ The question arises why the translator wanted to introduce Carthage into his version of Isa 23: only to make clear in which sense Tarshish had to be understood in relation to Tyre (cf. LXX Ezek 27:12, 25), or to say something more?

J. Fischer has suggested that LXX Isa 23 reflects a period in which Carthage still had a dominating position in the western part of the Mediterranean Sea (between 250 and 201 B.C.).¹⁶ Seelig-

mann, on the other hand, describes the whole of our chapter in Greek as "one distressful lamentation for the destruction of the πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος"¹⁷ in the year 146 B.C.

A further analysis of the meaning of v 1 in Greek is necessary in order to answer our question and to deal with the suggestions of both Fischer and Seeligmann. "Wail, ye ships of Carthage, for x is utterly destroyed, and y no longer come from the land of the Kittim; x is led captive." Seeligmann considers "the ships" as subject of ἀπόλετο. This, however, is improbable: ἀπόλετο (singular) is in line with ἦκται αἰχμάλωτος (whereas ἔρχονται is in the plural), and αἰχμάλωτος cannot refer to πλοῖα. Something different must be the subject of the two singular verbs; the subject of ἔρχονται, on the other hand, could be the ships. Usually, one thinks of Tyre as the subject of ἀπόλετο.¹⁸ It is to be asked, however, whether the Greek of 23:1 has to be understood in the same sense as the Hebrew. This should not be decided on the basis of the meaning of the Hebrew text, as often occurs, but on the basis of the context in the Greek text of chap. 23. In this connection vv 10 and 14 are very important.

23:10 עֲבָרִי אֶרֶץ - ἐργάζου τὴν γῆν σου
 כִּי אֶרֶץ בְּחַרְשִׁישׁ - καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι
 עֹד - ἔρχεται (ἔρχονται A-26)
 ἐκ Καρχηδόνος.

MT-LXX: עֲבָרִי - ἐργάζου: via עבדי, cf. 1QIsa^a (= LXX); עֲבֹרִי 4QIsa^c (= MT). כִּי אֶרֶץ - καὶ γὰρ: via (א) כִּי; Ottley¹⁹ suggests אֶרֶץ. καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα: according to Fischer and Ziegler these words reflect the Hebrew חנינון אגללו (instead of אגללו/אגללו),²⁰ but that is too speculative; כִּי אֶרֶץ MT = 1QIsa^a (כִּי אֶרֶץ) and 4QIsa^c (כִּי אֶרֶץ). The LXX has a different sense-division from that in the MT (cf. כִּי אֶרֶץ). בְּחַרְשִׁישׁ - "Carthage" (see above); or via בְּחַרְשִׁישׁ (with the ר of ר/א) "the

Lady of the sea"? תַּיָּם...גַּיָּס - οὐκέτι. πλοῖα: not to be related to a hypothetical תַּיָּם (see above), but more probably to be related to תַּיָּם (= IQIsa^a), interpreted as תַּיָּם "harbor" (see below).

23:14 גַּיָּס - ὀλοῦζε

תַּיָּם תַּיָּם - πλοῖα Καρχηδόνας

גַּיָּס תַּיָּם - ὅτι ἀπόλετο τὸ ὄχυρωμα ὑμῶν.

MT-LXX: Tarshish - "Carthage": see v 1.

It is clear that vv 10 and 14 in Greek are closely connected with v 1. Verse 14 offers the subject of ἀπόλετο: τὸ ὄχυρωμα ὑμῶν "your stronghold" (namely, the stronghold of the ships of Carthage). Verse 10b (on v 10a see below) shows close agreement with v 1:

καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται ἐκ γῆς Κιτιέων (v 1)

καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται ἐκ Καρχηδόνας (v 10).

This parallelism seems to be intended. (In light of this I would prefer in v 10 the reading ἔρχονται of MSS A-26 *et al.* to the reading ἔρχεται.²¹ It follows that the subject of ἔρχονται in v 1 is "ships from Carthage." (The "ships of Carthage" in v 1a and v 14a, on the other hand, are ships from Carthage in the harbor of Tyre.) A parallelism between ἐκ γῆς Κιτιέων and ἐκ Καρχηδόνας is very possible: "the land of the Kittim" can refer to Greece (see 1 Macc 1:1) or to Italy (see MT and LXX Dan 11:30); this means that Carthage also and its environs in North Africa constitute a possible meaning of the term.²²

"Ships no longer come from Carthage, for their stronghold is destroyed." One would like to know which stronghold is meant by the translator. For this question we have to look more closely at v 10b (MT and LXX). In my view, the translator has interpreted the Hebrew of v 10b as follows: "for the daughter (of) Tarshish (or: the Lady of the sea [see above]), Carthage, is no longer a harbor." Thus, the stronghold is Carthage; that formerly impor-

tant center of commercial activities is utterly destroyed, and therefore ships no longer come from Carthage.

The *Vorlage* of the LXX Isa may have contained the reading תַּיָּם because IQIsa^a supports this reading of the MT. The translator then has "interpreted" this word by means of metathesis of two consonants (תַּיָּם - תַּיָּם), a well-known technique in ancient Jewish exegesis.²³ By interpreting the Hebrew text in this way he was able to write down his translation καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται (or: ἔρχονται) ἐκ Καρχηδόνας, a translation which was logically connected with the reading of his *Vorlage* and at the same time verbally connected with v 1.

Let us return to v 1. The subject of ἀπόλετο appears to be "Carthage." "Carthage is destroyed," and ships no longer come from there. It seems clear that the translator, by interpreting the text of Isa 23 in this way, refers to the total destruction of Carthage by the Romans in 146 B.C. This interpretation throws light on the choice of connecting מְבֹרָא with מְבֹרָא מְבֹרָא. The rendering ἤκτα αἰχμαλωτος then refers to the fact that the inhabitants of the city were led captive after the defeat.²⁴ The city itself was totally destroyed.

There remains one question to be answered, namely, why the translator did not translate מְבֹרָא. It may be assumed that this word stood in the *Vorlage* of the LXX Isa, because the Qumran MSS support the MT (see above). Otley remarks: "The Heb. word may have been overlooked before מְבֹרָא."²⁵ In light of the meaning of v 1 in Greek, I would suggest another and more satisfying explanation. מְבֹרָא in the sense of "from being a house" would imply that Carthage (as subject of ἀπόλετο) was a "house" for the ships of Carthage. In view of the commercial practice of that time, it is, however, probable that the author of the LXX Isa interpreted a "house" for ships with their merchants as designating an organization of a state-recognized group in a foreign port,

that is to say, outside the home harbor.²⁶ This may be the reason why the translator did not translate תבליט; Carthage was not a "house" for the ships of Carthage.

23:2-3 דמו (למ) - τίνι ὄμοιοι γεγόνασιν
 ישבאי - οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ νήσῳ
 סחר צידוך - μεταβόλοι Φοινίκης
 עבר ים מלאך - διαπερῶντες τὴν θάλασσαν
 ובמים רבים - ἐν ὕδατι πολλῶ
 נרע שחר - σπέρμα μεταβόλων
 קציר יארר תבואת - ὡς ἀμνητοῦ εἰσφερομένου
 סחר גויים - οἱ μεταβόλοι τῶν ἐθνῶν.
 MT-LXX: למ (MT v 1^{fin}) - τίνι: via למי; למ = IQIsa^a,
 4QIsa^a. דמו - ὄμοιοι γεγόνασιν: via דמ^I (דמ MT).
 סחר (v 2), שחר and סחר (v 3): these three words have
 all been rendered by μεταβόλοι (the sg. understood col-
 lectively; שחר interpreted as סחר via phonetic similarity
 of ש/ס).²⁷ צידוך - Φοινίκη: cf. צידונים - Φοινίκης
 Deut 3:9 (and see below). עבר - διαπερῶντες: the sg.
 ptcp. understood collectively (עברו IQIsa^a and 4QIsa^a).²⁸
 There is no rendering of מלאך (for the Qumran readings,
 see below). נבמים - ἐν ὕδατι: MT (-) = IQIsa^a,
 IQIsa^b, 4QIsa^a. ὡς ἀμνητοῦ...: the LXX offers a com-
 parison, the MT does not; MT = IQIsa^a, 4QIsa^a. There is
 no rendering of יארר; MT = IQIsa^a and 4QIsa^a (יורר).
 There is no rendering of נרע; MT = IQIsa^a and 4QIsa^a.
 The LXX reflects a sense-division in vv 2-3 different from
 that of the MT (with למ of v 1).

The structure of the Greek text is clear: it consists of a long
 interrogative sentence τίνι ὄμοιοι γεγόνασιν...σπέρμα μετα-
 βόλων,²⁹ and a clause with an answer ὡς ἀμνητοῦ.... By the
 inhabitants "of the isle" are meant the people of Tyre. Thus,
 whereas in v 1 ships of Carthage (in the harbor of Tyre) are ad-

dressed, vv 2 and 3 in Greek have the inhabitants of Tyre as
 their subject. The text further makes clear which inhabitants of
 Tyre the translator has in view: the μεταβόλοι Φοινίκης.
 They are the important persons of vv 2-3, as is underlined by the
 fact that the word μεταβόλος occurs three times in these two
 verses. Here this Greek word is the rendering for the Hebrew
 סחר, a unique rendering of this Hebrew word in the LXX Isa (cf.
 only 47:15: μεταβολή for סחר) and in the LXX of the OT. The
 usual translation of סחר is ἔμπορος, ἐμπορία, ἐμπόριον, as
 is the case in the rest of our chapter (see v 8 and vv 17-18) and
 elsewhere in the rest of the LXX (see, e.g., LXX Ezek 27).

The μεταβόλος is the retailer, the small business man, who
 sells in small quantities.³⁰ The word occurs but rarely, so, for
 instance, in the "Revenue Laws" of King Ptolemy Philadelphus
 (third century B.C.).³¹ Like the κάπηλος (see LXX Isa 1:22),
 the μεταβόλος stands in contrast to the ἔμπορος (see 23:8),
 who is the merchant, the trader, the big business man. It means
 that the inhabitants of Tyre were not the merchants of Phoenicia,
 but its retailers.

As a result of the rendering Φοινίκη for צידוך the Greek
 of vv 2-3 presupposes that Tyre was regarded as the metropolis
 of Phoenicia. As we know, this was indeed the case in the Hel-
 lenistic period. In this respect as well as for the interpretation
 of Φοινίκη for צידוך, the legend on Tyrian coins from the time
 of Antiochus IV is very significant: לצר אס צדנא.³²

Whereas the Hebrew of vv 2-3 does not contain such a com-
 parison, the Greek of these verses compares the retailers of Phoe-
 nicia with a harvest gathered in.³³ Is this the result of a mis-
 understanding of the Hebrew text? Ziegler remarks in connection
 with the rendering ὡς (ἀμνητοῦ): "Der Übers. kannte sich in
 der Konstruktion der hebr. Vorlage nicht aus, und hat frei ὡς
 zur Verdeutlichung eingeschoben."³⁴ This, in my view, is an

underestimation of the translator on the one hand, and on the other too "modern" a criticism of an "ancient" translator, as far as philological principles are concerned. When one reads the Greek of vv 2-3 against the background of the contents of v 1 (see above), then the meaning of these verses becomes quite clear: the retailers in Tyre have become like a harvest gathered in, because the important trading center, Carthage, is destroyed; ships with merchants and merchandise no longer come from Carthage to Tyre, so that the retailers in Tyre, instead of crossing over the sea, have to stay at home "as a harvest gathered in." They are without employment.

In order to be able to make his translation of vv 2-3, the translator evidently dealt "freely" with the Hebrew text, as in fact is often the case in the LXX Isa. He connected למל with למל , read למל as למי (via the graphic similarity of ל/מ),³⁵ and interpreted למל via the root למל^{I} . He left some minor words untranslated, and added ὥς (see the remarks above).

There is one more important word, however, which he did not translate: מלאוֹךְ . According to Ottley, the LXX has "omitted it,"³⁶ but he offers no suggestion as to the reason for this omission. Ziegler states: "LXX hat diesen Vers ganz frei wiedergegeben und kam mit מ nicht zurecht."³⁷ Although it is not quite certain which reading stood in the *Vorlage* of the LXX Isa (מלאוֹךְ IQIsa^a, IQIsa^b = MT, [מלאוֹךְ 4QIsa^a), the support for the MT of IQIsa^b, which, unlike IQIsa^a, is a conservative and accurate text-type, is in favor of the reading מלאוֹךְ . If then we may assume that this reading was in the *Vorlage* of the LXX Isa,³⁸ and if it was understood in the sense of "they filled you (Tyre)," one can imagine why it was left untranslated. It would mean that the *retailers* of Phoenicia "filled" Tyre. This, however, was not the case. It was not the μεταβόλοι , but the ἐμποροί ("merchants, traders"), who "filled" a city like Tyre. There is a text in one of Ezekiel's prophecies against Tyre, viz., Ezek 27:25,

which confirms this: ... $\text{אנרות הרשיש שרותיך מערבך ומלאי.} = \text{πλοῖα, ἐν αὐτοῖς Καρχηδόνιοι ἐμποροί σου...}, \text{ και ἐνεπλήσθης...}$. Therefore, I think, the translator could not use the Hebrew מלאוֹךְ in his interpretation of vv 2-3.

Finally, passing over the interesting vv 6-8, I return to v 10a.

23:10a $\text{עברי ארצך} - \text{ἐργάζου τὴν γῆν σου.}$

MT-LXX: see above.

According to Seeligmann, the LXX echose here the transformation of Carthage from a commercial state into an agricultural state after the destruction of its ships.³⁹ In light of the above, however, it is more probable that Tyre is meant in this passage: after the destruction of Carthage there is no longer work for the retailers in Tyre, since ships with merchants and merchandise no longer come from Carthage (see v 10b); thus there is nothing left for Tyre but tilling its land.

The rendering ἐργάζου for עברי suggests the reading עבדי . This is also the reading of IQIsa^a; 4QIsa^a (עבורי), on the other hand, agrees with the MT. Because of the fact that the expression עבד ארץ in the sense of "till the land" does not occur in biblical Hebrew (one always finds עבד אדמה),⁴⁰ the reading עברי of the MT and of 4QIsa^a must be the older and better reading. It seems more likely, therefore, to look at the rendering ἐργάζου as resulting from some kind of "interpretation" of עברי (via the graphic similarity of ר/ד)⁴¹ than to assume that the *Vorlage* of the LXX contained the reading עבדי .

This interpretation forms part of the interpretation of Isa 23 as a whole in the LXX Isa. From the fact that IQIsa^a also contains the reading עבדי , the question arises whether the author of this MS interpreted the text of Isa 23:10 (and of this chapter as a whole) in a similar way. This question, however, cannot be dealt with in this article, although, as I have tried to point out elsewhere, there is some evidence of fulfillment-interpretation in IQIsa^a also.⁴²

III

The above may have shown that it is worthwhile to study the text of the LXX Isa in a twofold way, namely, in relation to the MT Isa (including the evidence of the Qumran MSS of Isaiah) and on its own. Much more, of course, can and should be said about LXX Isa 23, but our short commentary on some verses of this chapter may suffice as an illustration of the way in which the author of the LXX Isa dealt with his Hebrew *Vorlage* and how he constructed his translation. Differences between the Hebrew and the Greek in the verses of Isa 23 which we discussed need not be explained as arising from a faulty knowledge of the Hebrew, from misreadings, etc., but are, in my opinion, rather to be seen as resulting from a well-reasoned interpretation of Isa 23 by means of certain techniques also known from other ancient Jewish exegesis.⁴³ Some additions and omissions likewise are the result of a specific interpretation of this chapter. Too often translations like the LXX Isa as well as other books in the LXX are criticized on the basis of *our* philological criteria and from *our* exegetical view of the Hebrew text.

The question of the coherence of the Greek text of Isa 23 cannot be dealt with until a full treatment of this chapter has been carried out. Yet the verses we have commented on do show a meaningful coherence. It would not be fruitful to treat the "free renderings" in our verses as "isolated" ones.

Our short commentary, further, may have pointed out that LXX Isa 23 is not only a translation, but also a specific interpretation of this old Hebrew oracle against Tyre. The Greek text (of some verses) of LXX Isa 23 reflects the author's belief that the "vision of Tyre" once spoken and written by the prophet Isaiah was fulfilled in his own time, when Carthage was destroyed and Tyre was confronted with the consequences of the downfall of her mighty daughter. What is said about Daniel can be said about the author of LXX Isa 23: evidently he was qualified (and authorized!) to

interpret visions (see Dan 1:17).⁴⁴

Finally, one does not find our exegesis of these verses of LXX Isa 23 in the earliest (Christian) commentaries on the LXX Isa (of Eusebius, Jerome, and others). They connect the contents of this chapter with the siege of Tyre by King Nebuchadnezzar (cf. Ezek 26:7). One early Christian tradition, however, has interpreted LXX Isa 23, albeit in its Old Latin translation, as referring to Carthage, for two "capitula" (nos. LVIII and LVIII) from the African branch of the VL read as follows: "Sermo Domini super Cartaginem (23,1), "Quod septuaginta annis esset deserta Carthago (23,14) et restitueretur."⁴⁵

NOTES

¹See A. Scholz, *Die Alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg, 1880); E. Liebmann, "Der Text zu Jesaia 24-27," ZAW 22 (1902) 1-56.

²See R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint I* (Cambridge, 1909); J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias der LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* (BZAW 56; Giessen, 1930); J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster, 1934).

³I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden, 1948).

⁴A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 35; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1981) 34-60.

⁵*Septuagint Version*, 41.

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom Leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. lili in der griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 4/14; Leipzig, 1934).

⁸Coste, "Le texte grec d'Isaïe XXV 1-5," RB 61 (1954) 36-66.

⁹Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaias (Cap. 24 de Isaias)* (Lisboa, 1973). L. Laberge, on the other hand, in his recent publication on the LXX Isa (*La*

Septante d'Isaïe 28-33: Etude de tradition textuelle, Ottawa, 1978) deals with the Greek text in relation to the Hebrew only.

¹⁰I thank Dr. E. Ulrich very much for sending me photocopies of 4QIsa^a and of 4QIsa^c as far as their material from chap. 23 is concerned. 4QIsa^a dates from the second half of the first century B.C., and 4QIsa^c from the middle of the first century A.D.; on this see P. W. Skehan in *DBSup* 9, Fasc. 51 (Paris, 1978) 811f.

¹¹See my *Textzeugen*, 44 and 64.

¹²Cf. LXX Ezek 27:12, 25; 38:13: Καρχηδόνιοι for שַׁרְשִׁימִי.

¹³This is the usual interpretation in the Targumim and in the Vulgate of Jerome (see also the following note).

¹⁴It is not clear which country is meant. On the problem of the identification of Tarshish (including the views of both ancient and modern writers), see now G. Bunnens, *L'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée: Essai d'interprétation fondé sur une analyse des traditions littéraires* (Etudes de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome, Tome 17; Bruxelles/Rome, 1979) 331-48: "une région occidentale indéterminée," p. 348.

¹⁵On the date of the foundation of Carthage according to the available literary sources (about 814 B.C.), see H. J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre* (Jerusalem, 1973) 188ff.; G. Bunnens, *L'expansion phénicienne*, 317-24.

¹⁶*Schrift*, 5f.

¹⁷*Septuagint Version*, 90.

¹⁸E.g., Fischer, *Schrift*, 5.

¹⁹Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah*, 2.217.

²⁰See Fischer, *Schrift*, 39; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 144. See also H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (BK 10/11, 12; Neukirchen, 1978) 857.

²¹Another point in favor of this reading is the fact that MS A in the LXX Isa is closer than MS B to the original OG of this version; see Ziegler, *LXX Isaias*, 21ff.

²²Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* I.128: "Chetimos held the island of Chetima - the modern Cyprus - whence the name *Chethim* given by the Hebrews to all islands and to most maritime countries" (in the translation of H. St.J. Thackeray in the Loeb edition).

²³See my *Textzeugen*, 68 (with other examples from the LXX

Isa), and see also E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem, 1981) 204f. On this technique as one of the types of *al-tiqre* midrash, see now C. McCarthy, *The Piquette Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO 36; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1981) 141f. In contrast, cf. Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 857): "ΠΙΔ wurde von G nicht verstanden und darum weggelassen."

²⁴See B. H. Warmington, *Karthago: Aufstieg und Untergang einer antiken Weltstadt* (Wiesbaden, 1964²) 253.

²⁵*The Book of Isaiah*, 2.215.

²⁶See P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Vol. I: *Text* (Oxford, 1972) 185f.

²⁷See *Textzeugen*, 68, and Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 200-3.

²⁸For עָבַר - διαπεράω, see also Deut 30:13 (MT and LXX).

²⁹With Ziegler; *contra* Ottley, 1.147.

³⁰See M. I. Finkelstein, "Ἐμπορος, Ναύκληρος, and Κάπηλος: A Prolegomena to the Study of Athenian Trade," *Classical Philology* 30 (1935) 331 (in Attic Greek: μεταβολεύς).

³¹See B. P. Grenfell (ed.), *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford, 1896) in col. 47, 12, and col. 48, 3.7, always together with κάπηλος; p. 142f. (commentary). For the text, see also J. Bingen (éd.), *Papyrus Revenue Laws: Nouvelle édition du texte* (SGUA, Beiheft 1; Göttingen, 1952) 18. Cf. further M. Rostovzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941) 1.243, 304. The older, Attic form (see previous note) likewise occurs rarely.

³²On Tyre as the metropolis of Phoenicia/of the Sidonians, see M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen, 1973²) 535f., Anm. 215.

³³On other examples of comparisons in the LXX Isa which the MT does not contain, see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 100-3.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 101.

³⁵See *Textzeugen*, 67, and Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 197.

³⁶*The Book of Isaiah*, 2.216.

³⁷*Untersuchungen*, 52.

³⁸One cannot take it for granted, of course, that this and other readings in the *Vorlage* of the LXX Isa were also the original ones in the Hebrew text of the book of Isaiah.

³⁹*Septuagint Version*, 91.

⁴⁰*Contra Wildberger, Jesaja*, 857, 876.

⁴¹See note 35.

⁴²See *Textzeugen*, 83-94.

⁴³See further *Textzeugen*, 66-9.

⁴⁴On this, see *Textzeugen*, 64. Cf. also the *peshet*-technique, known from the commentaries of the Qumran community.

⁴⁵See *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatan Versionem* 13: *Isaías* (Romae, 1969) 17. See also the remarks on these "capitula" on p. 9: "ad persecutiones Constantini vel filiorum eius adversus Donatistas fortasse referendum."

GUIDELINES FOR EDITIONS OF ARMENIAN BIBLICAL TEXTS

Michael E. Stone and Claude E. Cox
Hebrew University and Brandon University

Considerable experience has been gained over the past decade in the preparing of critical editions of Armenian biblical texts and associated documents.¹ Editions of a number of texts have appeared,² and the preparation of others is underway.³ This makes the standardization of procedures very desirable, so that future editions form a coherent corpus of critically edited biblical texts.

Type of Edition

Most of the editions published so far have been diplomatic, minor editions. They were based on a carefully selected group of manuscripts, designed both to present the most valuable text type and also to represent the range of developments of the Armenian textual tradition. The base text for the edition should be the best isolable text form. The procedures for the selection were set forth by M. E. Stone in a series of articles in the 1970s and first applied in the selection of a base manuscript for an edition of Isaiah, and then of the manuscripts to be used in an edition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The first published edition based on this procedure was that of the Testament of Joseph.⁴ The procedures established by Stone were refined and improved by Cox in the preliminary work for his edition of Deuteronomy and this refined method was applied in that edition.⁵ This method of preparation has been found suitable in the present state of scholarship, since the number of manuscripts is usually very high, and the

understanding of the version not sufficiently advanced for the preparation of full critical editions.⁶ Moreover, the present deplorable situation of editions of the Armenian Bible makes it desirable, at the present, to have reliable *editiones minores* of as many books as possible. The methodology developed by Stone and Cox is much more economical of time than the preparation of full critical editions.

This is, of course, only to be regarded as an interim step; once we have advanced our knowledge of the manuscript traditions, of the character of the version, and of other aspects of this study, the way should be open for a decision whether to proceed to full critical editions.

Format

The format that has been used in the editions mentioned so far is a modified form of that used for the Göttingen LXX. It is strongly urged by the writers that scholars undertaking such editions in the future use the same techniques for presentation of the text and apparatus. Sample pages are given below of *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra* and *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*. It is also to be our practice in the future to use the expanded list of sigla here published, so that all editions subsequent to Cox's *Deuteronomy* will refer to the same manuscript by the same number. It is strongly urged that, as new manuscripts are known or utilized, they be added to this list in consultation with the writers, who, in conjunction with the *Matenadaran* in Yerevan, will publish up-datings of it from time to time. The *Bulletin of the IOSCS* and the *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* have kindly agreed to serve as organs of publication for this material.

Range of Witnesses

On the basis of studies carried out so far, it seems very desirable to expand the range of witnesses which are consulted in the selection of text forms for inclusion in editions. This range

of witnesses should include: (a) manuscripts; (b) lectionaries and other liturgical books; (c) citations, particularly patristic; and (d) other witnesses, such as commentaries, inscriptions, etc.⁷

Publication and Consultation

So far, the editions have been published from camera-ready copy in the *University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies*. This has had the result of keeping the cost of the books within reasonable bounds. It is suggested that scholars involved in the preparation of editions of Armenian translations of biblical books and cognate works be in regular contact and consultation. This will permit the pooling of resources and economy of study. That is a matter particularly relevant for any planned editions to be prepared on computer. The use of mutually agreed norms in this area will be highly beneficial.⁸

A Central List of Numbers for Designating Armenian Bibles

The following list offers a number for each Armenian Bible. It is taken from *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*, pp. 16-31, which, in turn, is based on a list published in Yerevan by A. Zeytunian in 1977.

Reproduced here are only the central number, the location, and the library number of each manuscript (if the shelf and catalogue number differ, the catalogue number is given in parentheses).⁹ For further details see *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*.

4	Venice, San Lazzaro 1311(20)	13	Jerusalem, Armenian Patri- archate 1925	21	Yerevan, Matenadaran 179
8	Yerevan, Matenadaran 178	14	Yerevan, Matenadaran 345	22	Yerevan, Matenadaran 180
9	Venice, San Lazzaro 1312(17)	17	Jerusalem, Armenian Patri- archate 353	26	Yerevan, Matenadaran 177

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|-----|---|
| 28 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
1500 | 65 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
935(8) | 96 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
207 |
| 33 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
841(5) | 67 | New Julfa, All
Saviour's Vank
336(23) | 102 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 297 |
| 38 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1006(6) | 69 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
352 | 108 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2585 |
| 40 | Leningrad,
Hermitage
VP-1011 | 70 | Vienna, Mechi-
tarist Library
55(14) | 112 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 3043 |
| 42 | Vienna, Mechi-
tarist Library
71(29) | 72 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
4113 | 113 | Vienna, Österr.
Nationalbiblthk.
Cod. Arm. 11 |
| 44 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
182 | 73 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
346 | 114 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
4114 |
| 50 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
6230 | 74 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
184 | 115 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
186 |
| 55 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
353 | 81 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
354 | 116 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 2558 |
| 56 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
206 | 83 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2705 | 118 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
351 |
| 57 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1508(1) | 85 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
6569 | 121 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 428 |
| 59 | Leningrad,
Oriental Insti-
tute B1 | 93 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1270(9) | 122 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 2560 |
| 61 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1007(12) | 94 | Bzommar,
Convent of Our
Lady 310(1) | 123 | Rome,
Vatican
Armeno 1 |
| 63 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2627 | 95 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
280(10) | 129 | Bzommar,
Convent of Our
Lady 26(2) |

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| 130 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2628 | 148 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1928 | 170 | New Julfa, All
Saviour's Vank
15(1) |
| 131 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1507(13) | 149 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
4905 | 171 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
191 |
| 132 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1127 | 151 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
189 | 173 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
202 |
| 135 | Venice, San
Lazzaro Kurtian
Collection 37 | 153 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1927 | 174 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
203 |
| 136 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
187 | 156 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
200 | 176 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
6281 |
| 138 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1932 | 157 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
348 | 178 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2706 |
| 139 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2669 | 158 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
7623 | 182 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
349 |
| 141 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1634 (2) | 159 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
229(4) | 188 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
350 |
| 142 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
188 | 160 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 542 | 193 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
204 |
| 143 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1934 | 161 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
1182(7) | 194 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
205 |
| 144 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1933 | 162 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
347 | 199 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2658 |
| 146 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2587 | 164 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
190 | 200 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
2732 |
| 147 | Venice,
San Lazzaro
623(3) | 165 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
201 | 202 | Yerevan,
Matenadaran
3705 |

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| 213 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 501 | 220 | New Julfa, All
Saviour's Vank
17(3) | 231 | Dublin,
Chester Beatty
Library 553 |
| 216 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 1929 | 223 | Oxford,
Bodleian Library
Arm. d. 14 | 232 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 3438 |
| 217 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 2557 | 224 | London,
British Museum
Oriental 8833 | 233 | London, British
and Foreign
Bible Society |
| 218 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 2561 | 229 | London, Lambeth
Palace, codex
Vet. Test. 1219 | 234 | Leningrad,
Oriental Insti-
tute C29 |
| 219 | New Julfa, All
Saviour's Vank
16(2) | 230 | Dublin,
Chester Beatty
Library 552 | 235 | Jerusalem,
Armenian Patri-
archate 2559 |

NOTES

¹For a survey of the present status of studies see C. Cox, "Biblical Studies and the Armenian Bible: 1955-1980," *Revue Biblique* 89 (1982) 99-113 and "A Report on the Critical Edition of the Armenian Bible," *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* (forthcoming).

²Editions published over the past decade or so are the following: M. E. Stone, *The Testament of Levi* (Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1969); *The Armenian Version of the Testament of Joseph* (Texts and Translations 6, Pseudepigrapha Series 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975); *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 1; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980); C. Cox, *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2; Chico: Scholars, 1981).

³These include Genesis (A. Zeytunian) and 1 Maccabees (H. Amalyan); Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (M. E. Stone); Job (C. Cox); Isaiah (S. Ajamian: see Ajamian, "Deux projets concernant la Bible Arménienne, in *Armenian and Biblical Studies*, ed. M. E. Stone [*Sion* Supplement 1; Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1976], pp. 8-12); Daniel and Dodecapropheton (S. P. Cowe).

⁴M. E. Stone, "Methodological Issues in the Study of the Text of the Apocrypha and Pseud epigrapha," *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1971) 211-7; "The Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Selection of Manuscripts," *Sion* 49 (1975) 207-11; "The Jerusalem

Manuscripts of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Samples of Text," *Sion* 44 (1970) 456-65; "New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *RB* 88 (1977) 94-107; *The Armenian Version of the Testament of Joseph* (Texts and Translations 6, Pseudepigrapha Series 5; Missoula: Scholars, 1975).

⁵*The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*, cf. n. 2.

⁶M. E. Stone, *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra* is an exception. It is a critical edition, based on all but one of the known manuscripts of the work. It survives, however, in only 23 copies, of which 22 were utilized. This edition was largely completed before the methodology spoken of in this paragraph was developed.

⁷M. E. Stone and S. P. Cowe have commenced work on the preparation of a list of commentaries on biblical books preserved in Armenian. Any communication on this subject would be welcome.

⁸M. E. Stone and J. J. S. Weitenberg are currently commencing some work of this type.

⁹Leningrad Oriental Institute MS C29 and Bzommar 2 were not available for use when *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy* was written. The former, number 234, dated 1298, is a Bible; the copyist's name is Grigor; place (?). The latter, Bzommar 2, central number 129, dated 1634, was copied by Vahan the priest in Zeitun. Further, Jerusalem 2559, copied in 1622-32, has been assigned number 235, according to a communication from A. Zeytunian to C. Cox dated 20 December 1978.

Sample page from *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra*:

ՍԱՂԱԹԻՆԷԼ ԵԶՐ

3:1 Ես Սաղաթիէլ որ եւ Եզր կոչեցայ, 2 եի ի Բաբելոնի յամին երեսներորդի գերութեանն Հրեաստանի եւ աւերածոյն Երուսաղեմի: Հիացեալ կայի յանկողնի իմում եւ զմտաւածեի, վասն աւերածոյն Սիոնի եւ վասն շինածոյն Բաբելոնի՝ 3 եւ անդէն իսկ ապշեալ լինեի յոգի իմ, եւ սկսայ ասել ցԲարձրեալն բանս անգինս, 4 եւ ասացի. Տէր Աստուած իմ, ոչ դու արարեր գերկինս եւ գերկիր եւ զամենայն որ է ի նոսա: 5 Եւ յետ այնորիկ ստեղծեր անպական ձեռաւք քո զմարդն եւ փշեցեր ի նա շուռնչ կենդանի եւ եղեւ . . . առաջի քո: 6 Եւ եղեր զնա ի դրախտին փափկութեան զոր տնկեաց աջ քո. 7A որում պատուէր ետուր զի ծանիցէ զՏէրդ, եւ նա անց զայնու եւ պարտեցաւ, վասն որոյ յիրաւի որոշեցեր վաղվաղակի վասն նորա զմա՛ եւ ամենեցուն որ ի նմանէ ազգք իցեն. 8 որք անցին զաւրինաւք սրբոց քոց հրամանաց: 7B Զի եղեն ազգք եւ ազինք եւ տահմք ի նմանէ, որոց ոչ գոյ թիւ: 9 Ածեր ի վերայ նոցա

Title] Դպրութիւն Եզրայ W 2 յամի W | հրէաստանի W
 | գերութեանն---հիացեալ] W գերութեանն H om ψ |
 շինուածոյն W = J L R B M S C T 3 ապշեալ] W ափշեալ H
 | յոգի իմ] ի սրտի իմում W | եւ 2^o] W = ψ յետ այնորիկ
 H | սկըսայ W | անգին W 4 ասեմ W = ψ^m | ոչ] W
 om H = ψ 5 քո] H քոյովք W = ψ | փշեցեր W | ի
 նա] W = ψ^m յերեսս նորա H 6 եղիր W = ψ 7A որում]
 + եւ W | զպատուէրն W | ծանիցեն W = ψ | զտէրդ] թէ
 քո գործ է W = ψ | պարտեցաւ] H = T պարտեցաւ W = ψ^{rel} |
 վաղվաղակի] W = ψ om H | ամենեցուն] H = ψ ամենայնի
 W | ազգք] ed ազգ H W = ψ^m 8 զաւրինաւք] H = ψ
 զպատուիրանաւք W | հրամանացդ W 7B ազգք] W = ψ^{rel}
 ազգ H = E Q T | ի նմանէ] H = L D* : cf ψ^{rel} om W | գոյ]

Sample page from *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*:

Երկրորդումն Աւրինաց

1 Այս են պատգամք զոր խօսեցաւ մովսէս ընդ ամ իղի յայնկոյս յորդանանու յանապատին յարեւմուտս մերձ ի ծովն կարմիր: ի մեջ փառանտափողայ եւ դորոնայ եւ Կանգրուանցն եւ ոսկեկայ: մետասանօրեայ ծանապարհ ի քորեբայ ցլեառն սեիր մինչեւ ցկաղէսըառնեայ: Եւ եղեւ ի քառասներորդում ամի յամեսանն մետասաներորդում որ օր մի էր ամսոյն: Խօսեցաւ մովսէս ընդ ամ որդիսն իղի ըստ ամի որպէս պատուիրեաց նմա ար առ նոսա: 4 յետ հարկանելոյ զսեհուն արքա ամուրհացուց զընակեալն յեսեբովն: եւ զովզ արքայ քասանու զընակեալն յաստարովթ եւ յեղրային յայնկոյս յորդանանու յերկրին մովաբու: Սկսաւ մովսէս մեկնել զօրէնս զայսոսիկ եւ ասէ: 6 ար ար մեր խօսեցաւ ընդ մեզ ի քորէք եւ ասէ: շատ լիցի ձեզ բնակելո ի լերինս յայսմիկ, դարձարուք եւ շեցէք դուք աստի: եւ մտանիցէք ի լեառնն ամուր-

1. են] է 61^B: իէղի 61^B: դորանու 61^B
 Երկրորդումն - դում 13, - դու 162, Երկրորդ 174
 1. om մովսէս ընդ ամ 218: ի ի 38 174, որդիսն իղի 18 162: մերձ] pr ի 13*: փառանտափողայ 18, փառանտափողայ 288 38, փառարանտապողայ 33', փառարանտափողայ 174, փառարանտափողայ 162: դորոնայ 13, դորանայ 38 162
 2. քորէբայ 38: սեիր 13' 38 162, սուր 33' 174: եւ մինչեւ 18
 3. քասանուն 18: ի ի 38 174: որպէս] զոր 18: om նմա 18
 4. հարկանելոյն 18: զսեհուն 18' 38 162: արքա] արքայն 18: ամուրհացուց 33' 38 174, ամուրհացուց 162: յեսեբուն 288 38 162: զովզ 61-238, զովզ 18: om եւ 2' 288: յեղրային 18
 5. յերկրին 33' 38 162 174: զօրէնսս 218 174
 6. քորեք 18' 162: լիցին 218: բնակել 18, բնակեալն 238: յայսմ 38
 7. om դուք 174: լեառն 288: ամուրհացուց 18' 162, ամուրհացուց 33' 38 174

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published or in progress. (Please print or type in publishable bibliographic format.)
2. Record of Septuagint theses and dissertations completed or in preparation.
3. Reports significant for Septuagint and cognate studies. Items of newly discovered manuscripts or of original groundbreaking research will be given primary consideration. Reports should be brief and informative and may be written in English, French, or German. Greek and Hebrew need not be transliterated.
4. Abstracts of Septuagint papers read before international, national, regional, and local academic meetings. Abstracts should be previously unpublished, not more than one page (8½" by 11"; 22 by 28 cm.), double-spaced, including the time, place, and occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by March 1 to be included in that year's *Bulletin*.

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and US\$3 to M. K. H. Peters, Treasurer.
In the Netherlands, send subscription price to Dr. Arie
van der Kooij, Tortellaan 34, 3722 WD Bilthoven, Holland.
Giro: 742325.