BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 24   Fall, 1991

MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

20 November, 1990—Mariott Hotel, New Orleans

Programme

9: 00 — 11: 30 Eugene Ulrich presiding

Julio Trebolle Barrera, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, "The Text-Critical Value of the Old Latin and Greek Lucianic Readings in the Books of Joshua and Judges"

Christopher D. Stanley, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, "The Significance of Rom 11: 3-4 for the Text-History of LXX Reigns"

Bernard A. Taylor, Rochester, NY, "The CATSS Variant Database: An Evaluation"

Michael Thomas Davis, Princeton Theological Seminary, "ἕως παρακεκλεμένοι or ὡς ἐνυπναζόμενοι?: Study of the Rise of Variant Translations"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the President, Eugene Ulrich at 11: 00 a.m.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

2. Ulrich reminded members that we will meet next year in Kansas City together with the Society of Biblical Literature. In 1992 we will meet in Paris on July 17 and 18, the Friday and Saturday prior to the opening of the IOSOT sessions (which run from July 19-24). Ulrich announced that Robert Hanhart has retired as Director of the Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen and that Anneli Aejmelaeus has been appointed to replace him. Ulrich also urged members to provide whatever assistance they can to Cecile Dogniez and her colleagues, who are preparing an updated bibliographical survey of materials related to the Septuagint. Dogniez can be reached at 4 Rue de Bazeilles, 75005 Paris, France.

3. In his report as *BIOSCS* editor, Melvin Peters expressed hope that volume 23 would appear during the 1990 calendar year. He also requested that he receive a copy of all Series publications. A suggestion was made to expand the list of those receiving Series publications to include other members of the Executive Committee as well.

4. Greenspoon presented the treasurer's report.

5. Ulrich reported that Scholars Press has established a new series with the title Early Judaism and its Literature. Bill Adler, who previously served as an editor of our SCS monograph series, will edit this new series. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that we retain the name of our series, since we will continue to publish in the area of "Cognate Studies." On behalf of SCS monograph editor Claude Cox, Ulrich presented the following progress report: (1) Robert J. V. Hiebert's monograph, *The "Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*, was published as SCS 27; (2) T. Muraoka edited *The Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, which appeared as SCS 28; (3) John Jarick's, *Gregory Thaumaturgos' Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes*, is SCS 29; (4) J. W. Wevers' *Notes on the Text of Greek Exodus* appeared as SCS 30; (5) J. J. S. Weitenberg and A. De Leeuw van Weenen compiled *Lemmatized Index of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy* as SCS 32; (6) Claude is editing *The VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Leuven, 1989)*; there have been difficulties with this manuscript relating to the question of camera-ready copy, but Cox expects to publish this volume next year; (7) Cox anticipates receiving for publication J. Jarick, ed., *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance to the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes*; (8) Another manuscript is also expected: G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, ed., *The Septuagint, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint (Manchester, July-August 1990)*; (9) Over the past year, Cox rejected three manuscripts on the basis of readers' reports. [Since the last Bulletin, Theodore Bergren's *Fifth Ezra: The Text, Origins and Early History* appeared as SCS 25; Benjamin Wrights's *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* also appeared as SCS 26. These volumes were "in press" and "soon to be sent to the press" respectively at the time of the 1989 business meeting-- Greenspoon].

The following slate of officers was unanimously elected for a period of three years:

President: Eugene Ulrich

Vice President: Robert Hanhart

Secretary-Treasurer: Leonard Greenspoon

Editor of the Bulletin: Melvin Peters

Publications Editor: Claude Cox

Honarary Presidents: Harry M. Orlinsky, John Wm Wevers

Immediate Past President: Albert Pietersma

Members at large: Anneli Aejmelaeus, Robert A. Kraft, Emanuel Tov

Walter R. Bodine has indicated his desire to resign as Associate Editor of the Bulletin. Bernard Taylor was selected to replace him.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11: 45 a. m.

Respectfully submitted
Leonard Greenspoon
Secretary Treasurer

IOSCS TREASURER'S REPORT
July 1, 1990 — June 30, 1991

Initial Balance (6/30/90) $633.91

Payments Received			+ $2575.05
7/06/90		282.00	
7/6	(int)	2.70	
7/18		165.00	
8/1		138.00	
8/7	(int)	3.74	
8/24		208.00	
9/7	(int)	4.64	
10/5	(int)	4.28	
10/19		119.00	
11/6	(int)	5.44	
11/14		208.00	
12/6	(int)	5.81	
1/7/91	(int)	6.45	
1/17		229.00	
2/6	(int)	6.56	
3/6	(int)	5.99	
4/4	(int)	6.03	
4/23		48.00	
5/6	(int)	4.78	
5/28		278.00	
5/31		160.00	
6/6	(int)	3.63	
6/14		214.00	
6/27		248.00	

Expenses			-$1523.02
9/10/90	(supplies)	21.69	
2/15/91	(printing)	76.83	
3/4	(mailing)	30.00	
4/17	(printing)	750.00	
4/24	(mailing)	134.00	
4/25	(mailing)	238.95	
5/3	(mailing)	30.00	
5/27	(mailing)	31.29	
6/14	(supplies)	155.93	
6/26	(mailing)	55.00	

Balance as of
6/30/91..$1685.94

NEWS AND NOTES

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The IOSCS meets in **Paris, 17-18 July 1992**, prior to the XIV Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (19—24 July 1992) and prior to the inaugural meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies which will meet Saturday evening and Sunday, 18—19 July, 1992.

The International Organization for Qumran Studies (IOQS), formed in Groningen in 1989, will hold its first meeting with the Congress of the IOSOT on Saturday evening (immediately following the IOSCS Meeting) and on Sunday, 18—19 July 1992. Those interested in membership should send their (1) Name, (2) Address, and (3) Membership Fee ($5 or 500,-ptas.) to the following address

> Qumran Instituut
> Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
> Nieuwe Kijk in 't Jatstraat 104
> 9712 SL Groningen
> HOLLAND

New Books by IOSCS members

Professor Bernard Grossfeld of the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee recently published *The Two Targums of Esther*, Volume 18 in the Aramaic Bible Series. Grossfeld provides a straightforward, idiomatic translation of the original Aramaic for the Targum Rishon and the Targum Sheni with comments on the so-called "Third Esther Targum." The work is available through the Liturgical Press, Collegeville MN.

Steven L. McKenzie (*BIOSCS* 19, 15-34) of Rhodes College announces the publication of *The Trouble With Kings: The Composition of the*

Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History VTSup 42, Leiden: Brill 1991. The book offers the most up-to-date survey of research on the Deuteronomistic History (DH) and the most recent detailed analysis of the lengthy variant version of Jeroboam's reign in LXX^B at 1 Kings 12:24a-z. It offers a fresh perspective on the original shape of the DH based on recent scholarship and the author's own critical investigation.

New Books Received

Claude E. Cox ed., *VII Congress of the International Organization for the Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1991 is now available. It contains twenty five papers delivered at the Leuven Congress in August 1989 preceded by an introduction by the editor. The introduction consists of terse helpful summaries of the papers which were presented by scholars from ten countries. One characterization of the volume is that it "represents the present state of the discipline." The accuracy of that statement is easily evident at the formal level. Nowhere in the volume is any ancient language transliterated; clear pointed Hebrew, accented Greek along with Syriac and Armenian together with many neat detailed charts are scattered throughout. At a more substantial level, the volume is impressive because of the variety of interests represented therein (and, by extension, in the discipline)—translation technique (Aejmelaeus, Sollamo , Voitila); the use of computers for LXX research (Postwick/Bajard, Tov, Marquis, Martin); the revisers of the LXX (Jenkins, Spottorno, Fernández Marcos); the LXX of particular books (Cook, Flint, van der Kooij, Sipila, Cox, Martin, Annandale-Potgieter, Spottorno, Trebolle); lexicography and lexical modification in the course of revision (Muraoka, Harl); the use of Greek for the textual criticism of the Hebrew text or in modern English translations (Trebolle, Greenspoon); analysis of particular texts (Lefebre, Busto Saiz); Qumran, subversions, Josephus etc., (Lefebre, Cowe, Flint, Annandale-Potgieter); the process of editing the Greek Pentatuch (Wevers). Cox should be applauded for his exceptional work and we can all be proud of the state of our discipline.

Harry M. Orlinsky and Robert G. Bratcher *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution* Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1991. This work, co-authored by our esteemed Honorary President, is a volume in the SBL Centennial Publications. While much of the volume is concerned with the translation of the Bible in more recent times, the first chapter touches on the LXX.

A CONCISE LEXICON OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Professor Johan Lust of the Catholic University in Leuven announces the preparation of a concise lexicon of the Septuagint, the first volume of which (a-i) is in progress. He supplied the following description of the project:

> Set up in association with the CATSS-project, our lexicon of intermediate size will cover all words in Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint. It will provide statistics telling the reader how often a word occurs in the different books of the Greek Bible. For this purpose we classified those books into five groups: The Pentateuch, the Early Prophets, the Later Prophets, Psalms and Wisdom (including Ezra, Nehemiah), and those Books which do not occur in the Hebrew Bible. A sixth figure will give the sum total. The succinct Lexicon will further supply up to five references of biblical texts in which a given word occurs.

> These data will be followed by a translation and a short discussion of some special cases. Attention will be given to those passages in which the LXX differs from the MT, having misread the Hebrew, or read it differently, or having used a slightly divergent text. Special Greek expressions will also be noted. Exhaustivity is not intended.

> The work will be complemented with a list of difficult word forms and their lemma. This will help the user to determine under which lemma he has to look for the translation of a difficult form. More importantly,

bibliographical information will be added. For each word, references will be given to recent lexicographical bibliography, when available.

Those interested in the progress of this worthwhile project or are interested in sample pages of the first volume may contact the editor of *BIOSCS* or contact Professor Lust directly at:

> Catholic University in Leuven
>
> Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid
>
> Sint-Michielsstraat 6
>
> 3000 Leuven, BELGIUM
>
> Bitnet # FAAAA08 at BLEKUL 11

RECORD OF WORK
PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

Bodine, Walter R. **Review of**: Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lane, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990. in *Hebrew Studies* 31 (1990) 253-259.

Fischer, B. *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel*. 18. *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*. IV. Varianten zu Johannes. Freiburg: Herder, 1991.

Flint, Peter W. "The Psalters at Qumran: Their Relationship to the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, in progress [Dir.: E. Ulrich].

Fox, Michael V. *The Redaction of the Books of Esther. On Reading Composite Texts*. SBL Monograph Series 40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Frede, Hermann J. (ed.). *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 25 (Pars II). *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos*. Freiburg: Herder. (1) 9. Lieferung: Heb 10:28-11:37 (1991). (2) 10. Lieferung: Heb 11:37–13:10 (1991).

Greenspoon, Leonard J. (1) "Recensions, Revisions, Rabbinics: Dominique Barthélemy and Early Developments in the Greek Traditions. *Textus* 15 (1990) 153-167. (2) "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship," *BIOSCS* 20 (1987), pp. 20-28. (3) "A Book 'Without Blemish': The Jewish Publication Society's Bible Translation of 1917," *JQR* 79 (1988), pp. 1-21. (4) "Mission to Alexandria: Truth and Legend about the Creation of the Septuagint, the First Bible Translation," *BibleReview* 5 (August 1989), pp. 34-41. (5) "Biblical Translators in Antiquity and in the Modern World: A Comparative Study," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60 (1989), pp. 91-113. (6) "It's All Greek to Me: The Septuagint in Modern English Versions of the Hebrew Bible" Pp. 1-21 in Claude Cox. ed., *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and CognateStudies (Leuven 1989)*, Atlanta: Scholars Press 1991. (7) "From the Septuagint to the New Revised Standard Version: A Brief Account of Jewish Involvement in Bible Translating and Translations," in *The Solomon Goldman Lectures*. Publisher: Spertus College. [In Press] (8) "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?" in *The Septuagint, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint (Manchester, July-August 1990)*, ed. George J. Brooke and B. Lindars. [in press]. (9) Entry on "Max Leopold Margolis" in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. John H.

Hayes. Publisher: Abingdon. [in press]. (10) Entries on "Achan," "Rahab," "Aquila," "Theodotion," "Symmachus," and "Versions, Greek" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. Publisher: Doubleday. [in press]. (11) Entry on "Max Leopold Margolis" in *Reform Judaism in America*, ed. Lance Sussman, Kerry Olitzky, and Marc Raphael. Publisher: Greenwood. [in press]. (12) Entry on "Max Leopold Margolis" in *American National Biography*. Publisher: Oxford University Press. [in preparation] (13) **Reviews of: a)** Stephen Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel* in *CBQ* 49 (1987), pp. 121-123. **b)** Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS): Volume 1, Ruth* in *RelSRev* 13 (1987), p. 164. **c)** Sven Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* in *RelSRev* 13 (1987), p. 164; and in *JBL* 107 (1988), pp. 126f. **d)** Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* in *The Journal of Religion* 68 (1988), pp. 139f. **e)** Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS): Volume 1, Ruth* in *CBQ* 50 (1988), pp. 298-300. **f)** Leslie John McGregor, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity* in *JBL* 107 (1988), pp. 126f. **g)** P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* in *RelSRev* 14 (1988), p. 244. **h)** Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinen 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987* in *CBQ* 51 (1989), pp. 778-779. **i)** Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* in *JBL* 108 (1989), pp. 700-702; and in *OTA* 12 (1989), p. 229. **j)** Luci Berkowitz and Karl A. Squitier, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, third edition, in *American Reference Books Annual* 22 (1991), pp. 451-452. **k)** Natalio Fernandez Marcos and Jose Ramon Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega: Vol. 1, 1-2 Samuel* in *CBQ* [in press]. **l)** James A. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament, with Additions and Corrections* in *RelSRev* **m)** Takamitsu Muraoka, ed., *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* in *RelSRev* **n)** Everett Fox, *Genesis and Exodus: A New Rendition* in *RelSRev* **o)** Rene Peter-Contesse and John Ellington, *A Translator's Handbook on Leviticus* in *RelSRev* **p)** Emanuel Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies: The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* in *OTA* 11 (1988) **q)** Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus betwewen Jerusalem and Rome* in *OTA* 12 (1989), p. 212. **r)** John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* in *OTA* 12 (1989), p. 231. **s)** George J. Brooke, ed., *Temple Scroll Studies* in *OTA* 13 (1990), pp. 112f. **t)** Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Vol. II: Poets* in *OTA* 13 (1990), p. 113. **u)** Jeremy Hughes, *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology* in *OTA* 13 (1990), p. 304. **v)** Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism in Antiquity: Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian* in *OTA* 13 (1990), p. 305. **w)** Friedrich Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular* in *OTA* 14 (1991),p. 219. **x)** Philippe Cassuto, *Qere-Ketib et listes massoretiques dans le manuscrit B 19a* in *OTA* **y)** Detlef Fraenkel et al., eds., *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren; aus Anlass*

seines 65. Geburtstages in *OTA* **z)** Madeleine Taradach, *Le Midrash: Introduction a la litterature midrashique (Drs dans la Bible, les Targumim, les Midrasim)* in *OTA* (14) Reports that he is preparing for publication several of Max Margolis' unpublished works, including the introduction to his Greek text of Joshua and his monograph on Masius and also working on several projects involving the history of Bible translating.

Gryson, Roger (ed.). *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 12. *Esaias.* Freiburg: Herder. (1) Fascicule 5: Isa 10:20--14:13 (1990). (2) Fascicule 6: Isa 14:13–22:5 (1991). (3) Fascicule 7: Isa 22:5-26:20 (1991).

Lust, Johan. "The Demonic Character of Jahweh and the Septuagint of Isaiah" in *Bijdragen* 40 (1979) 2-14 (2) "Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript" *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517-533. (3) "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and in Greek" *ETL* 49 (1983) 5-25. (4) "The Old Testament: Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism" *ETL* 60 (1984) 25-33 (5) "Messianism and Septuagint. Ez 21, 30-32," Pp. 174-191 in J. Emerton ed., *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983*. Leiden, 1985. (6) " The Use of Textual Witnesses for the Establishment of the Text. The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel." ; "The Final Text and Textual Criticism. Ez 39,28"; "Ezekiels [sic] Manuscripts in Qumran. Preliminary Edition of 4Q Ez a and b." Pp. 7-20; 48-54; and 90-100 in J Lust ed., *Ezekiel and his Book* (BETL 74) Leuven, 1986. (7) with D. Barthélemy, D. W. Gooding, and E. Tov, *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Venture.* (OBO 73) Fribourg/Göttingen, 1986. (8) "The Computer and the Hypothetic Translators of Ezekiel." Pp. 265-274 in *Actes du Premier Colloque International: Bible et Informatique: Le Texte* (Travaux de linguistique quantiatitive, 37) Paris/Genève, 1986. (9) "The Cult of Molek/Milchom. Remarks on the Greek Translation of Hebrew 'melek'" *ETL* 63 (1987) 361-366. (10) "Exegesis and Theology in the Septuagint of Ezekiel. The Longer 'Pluses" and Ezek 43: 1-9." Pp. 201-232 in C. Cox ed., *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* SBLSCS 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987. (11) "De bijbel van de christenen: De Septuaginta." Pp. 3-10 in *VBS-Info*, 20, 1989. (12) "J. F. Schleusner and the Lexicon of the Septuagint." *ZAW* 102 (1990) 256-262. (13) "Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ezechiel." *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14. (14) "For That Man Shall His Blood Be Shed". Gen 9,6 in Hebrew and in Greek." in *Festschrift D. Barthélemy* (OBO) [in press]. (15) "Molek and ἄρχων" in *Phoenicia and the Bible* (Studia Phoenicia, IV) Leuven, [in press] (16) "ἕδρα and the Philistine Plague." In George Brooke and Barnabas Lindars eds., *The Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings.* SBLSCS Atlanta: Scholars Press [in press]. (17) "Translation Greek and the Lexicography of the Septuagint. Some Remarks on the Melbourne Symposion." ; (with E. Eynikel) "Deuro and Deute in the LXX" *ETL* 67 (1991) [in press] (18) "Messianism and the Septuagint of Jeremiah" Pp. 87-122 in C.

Cox ed., *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* SBLSCS 31 Atlanta: Scholars Press 1991 (19) *A Concise Lexicon of the Septuagint* first volume (a-i) [in progress] see News and Notes. (20) "Theological Accents in the Septuagint of Daniel." (Contribution to the NIAS Symposion, May 22, 1991) [in progress]. (21) "The Greek Texts of Daniel 4-6." for the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense: *The Book of Daniel* (Ed. A Van der Woude), Leuven, 1991. [in progress]

Milik, J. T. [See under VanderKam, J. C.]

Moore, Carey A. "Scholarly Issues in the Book of Tobit Before Qumran and After : An Assessment" *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 5 (1989) 65-81.

Olofsson, Staffan. (1) *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint.* Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990. (2) *God is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint.* Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 31. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.

Pietersma, Albert. (1) *Jannes and Jambres the Magicians. Papyrus Chester Beatty XVI, with New Editions of P. Vindob. 29456+29428verso and BL Cott Tib BV 87.* (nearly complete; to be submitted to Chester Beatty Monographs). (2) *A Coptic (Sahidic) Manuscript of Luke and 2 Corinthians in the Chester Beatty Library.* (with S. Comstock) [in progress]. (3) "Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter." Pp. 262-86 in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J. W. Wevers eds., *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren.* MSU 20 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1990. (4) "Origen's Corrections and the Text of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV." Proceedings of the Stellenbosch Symposium on the Septuagint, Sept. 17 1990 [in press]. (5) "New Greek Fragments of Biblical Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Library," *BASP* 24 (1987) [1990] pp. 37-61. (6) "Coptic Martydoms in the Chester Beatty Library," *BASP* 25 (1988) [1990] pp. 143-63 (with S. Comstock). (7) "A Sahidic Lectionary of the New Testament and Psalms," *BASP* (with S. Comstock) [in press]. (8) "Coptic Texts in Chester Beatty: Pshoi of Jeremias and Cephalon, *BASP* (with S. Comstock) [in press]. (9) "The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres." Proceedings of the XIII Congress of the IOSOT, Leuven 1989. [in press]. (10) Review of: *Hamburger Papyrus Bil. 1. Die Alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus Bilinguis 1 der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg* (CAHIERS D'ORIENTALISME XVIII), ed. by B. J. Diebner and R. Kasser. Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1989. in *Chronique d'Egypte* [in press].

Tov, Emanuel. "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint." Pp. 215-233 in *Translation of Scripture. Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Institute* May 15–16, 1989. Philadelphia: *JQR* Supplement, 1990.

VanderKam, J. C. and Milik, J. T. "The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication." *JBL* 110/2 (1991) 243-270.

Vegas Montaner, Luis. (1) "Testamento de Moisés." Pp. 215-275 in A. Díez Macho, ed., *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, vol. V. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1987. (2) "Testamento de Abrahán ." Pp. 439-527 in A. Díez Macho, ed., *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, vol. V. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1987. (3) "Computer-Assisted Study of the Relation between *1QpHab* and the Ancient (mainly Greek) Biblical Versions." Pp. 307-323 in F. García Martínez, ed., *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community: Proceedings of the Gronigen Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls (20-23 August 1989).* Vol. 1 *Biblical Texts.* Paris: Gabalda, 1989 [=*Revue de Qumrân* 14/2 No. 54 (December 1989) 307-323]. (4) "Congreso Internacional sobre Qumrân en Gronigen," *Sefarad* 50 (1990) 249-257. (5) "Nuevos Textos bíblicos procedentes de Qumrân. Implicaciones exegéticas," in *Actas del III Simposio Bíblico Español* (I Simposio Luso-Español) (Lisboa 1989) [in press]. (6) "Some Features of the Verbal Syntax in the Qumran *Hodayot*," in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds., *Proceedings of the Madrid Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls (18-21 March 1991).* Madrid: Univ Complutense--Brill [in press].

Wenthe, Dean O. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1991 [Dir.: E. Ulrich].

Zipor, Moshe A. (1) "Notes sur les chapitres XIX a XXII du Levitique dans la Bible d'Alexandrie (LXX) *ETL* (1991) (2) Reviews of: a) Emanuel Tov, with collaboration of R. A. Kraft, and a contribution by P. J. Parsons *Discoveries in the Judean Desert VII: The Greek Minor Prophets from Nahal Hever (8HeverXIIgr),* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990 in *IEJ* 1991 ; b) E. Tov, *The Textual Criticism of the Bible: An Introduction* (The Biblical Encyclopedia Library) Jerusalem: 1989 in *IEJ* 1991 (3) A Greek-Hebrew Concordance to Leviticus with the CATSS Project [in progress]. (4) "The Massoretic 'Eighteen Tiqqune Soferim': The Birth and Transformations of a Tradition" *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1990) 51-58.[Hebrew]

THE PERFECT INDICATIVE IN SEPTUAGINT GENESIS

Timothy P. Scher, Cincinnati, Ohio

Rabbi Zacharias Frankel's recognition of different translation techniques in the books of the Septuagint has been justly heralded by J. Wevers as a milestone in Septuagint studies.[1] Since Frankel's time (the mid-nineteeth century) much progress has been made along the way as an impressive number of works analyzing the character of the language of the Septuagint have appeared. Of these works a considerable number have focused on the peculiarities of the Greek verb in the Septuagint. Paramount, of course, is Soisalon-Soininen's analysis of the infinitive in the Septuagint.[2] There is also Helbing's extensive research into cases governed by the verb in the Septuagint.[3] Other Septuagint studies with more limited scope have examined the verb in

---

[1] John Wevers, "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies," *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (18, 1985), 16-38, p. 20.

[2] I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B 132, 1). Helsinki, 1965.

[3] R. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta. Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Κοινή.* Göttingen, 1928.

---

conditional sentences,[4] the imperative,[5] verbs governed by neuter plural nouns,[6] and Greek equivalents for the Hebrew infinitive absolute.[7]

In general, scholarly interest in the Greek verb as it is used in the Septuagint has revolved around the infinitive and the verb in particular syntactic environments. The syntax of finite verb forms, especially as they are used in independent clauses in the Septuagint, has drawn little attention.[8]

The sheer number of finite forms, even within a single book, makes any such grammatical study a monumental task. However, until the character of finite verb in the Septuagint is fully examined, our knowledge of the language of the Septuagint will be substantially curtailed. This article considers just one of the finite forms in the Greek verb system: the perfect indicative. The data presented here is limited to Genesis 1-15, which can be regarded as a

---

[4] J. Sterenberg, *The Use of the Conditional Sentence in the Alexandrian Version of the Pentateuch.* Munich, 1908.

[5] F. Mozley, "Notes on the Biblical Use of the Present and Aorist Imperative", *JTS* 4 (1903) 279-282.

[6] I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Konstruktion des Verbs bei einem Neutrum Plural im griechischen Pentateuch", *VT* 29 (1979) 189-199.

[7] H. Kaupel, "Beobachtungen zur Übersetzung des Infinitivus absolutus in der Septuaginta (G)", *ZAW* N.F. 20 (1945-8 [1949]) 191-192. R. Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch", *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS).* pp. 101-114. H. Thackeray, "The Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX", *JTS* 9 (1908) 597-601.

[8] In his 1981 dissertation, H. Sailhamer studied the Greek equivalences for all the Hebrew verb forms within Psalms 3-41, with the exception of the infinitive. The scope of his work did not include an examination of the syntax of the Greek verb within that collection of Psalms. See J. Sailhamer, "The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41", Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California, 1981. H. Thackeray's *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1909) was never completed; his first volume included only a preliminary discussion of syntactical features (pp. 23-25) which he planned to investigate fully in a later volume. The brief grammar by Conybeare and Stock (a part of their *Selections from the Septuagint*, Boston: Ginn and Co., 1905) considered only the most striking divergences of the Septuagint from Attic Greek (paragraphs 72-84).

representative portion of that book supplying more than one thousand verbal correspondences between the Hebrew text and the Greek translation.[9] But even this brief analysis suggests that a syntax analysis of the entire verb system within a given book of the Septuagint would be a very worthwhile undertaking.

The Perfect Indicative in Genesis 1-15

In Septuagint Genesis 1-15, the Greek perfect indicative appears eight times altogether; all but two instances are in independent clauses in direct address. In every case the perfect indicative renders the Hebrew suffix conjugation, which likewise signifies a complete situation[10] but without the special nuances of the Greek perfect.

In classical Greek the perfect stem signifies that at a certain point in time a state exists which is the result of a completed action. The perfect indicative is quite common in dialogue, where it signifies past conditions which still exist at the moment of speaking. In Genesis it is especially appropriate where God addresses mortals, bestowing upon them some permanent condition. For example, in the creation account, the Greek translation displays the perfect tense when God gives vegetation to mankind for food.

1:29   καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός ʾ Ἰδοὺ <u>δέδωκα</u> ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον

σπεῖραν σπέρμα . . .

ויאמר אלהים הנה <u>נתתי</u> לכם את כל עשב זרע זרע. . .

---

[9]The Hebrew text follows BHS; the Greek text is from the critical edition of Genesis prepared by J. Wevers for the Göttingen Septuagint Project (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

[10]For a good discussion, with examples, see B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana 1990), pp. 480-483.

The perfect tense is also used when, after the Flood, God gives the animals to mankind for food.

9: 2 . . . ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῖν <u>δέδωκα</u> = <u>נתנו</u> בידכם. . .

9: 3   ὡς λάχανα χόρτου δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰ πάντα

. . . כירק עשב <u>נתתי</u> לכם את כל

After Adam and Eve have eaten from the tree of knowledge, the perfect indicative is used when God speaks of the lasting powers humanity has gained for itself.

3:22 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός ʾ Ἰδοὺ ʾ Ἀδὰμ <u>γέγονεν</u> ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν . . .

ויאמר יהוה אלהים הן האדם <u>היה</u> כאחד ממנו . . .

Finally, in the divine revelation to Abraham concerning the destiny of his descendants, the perfect indicative expresses a past condition that remains true at the moment of speaking.

15:13-16 καὶ ἐρρέθη πρὸς ʾ Ἀβράμ . . . οὔπω γὰρ <u>ἀναπεπλήρωνται</u> αἱ

ἁμαρτίαι τῶν ʾ Ἀμορραίων ἕως τοῦ νῦν

ויאמר לאברם. . .כי לא <u>שלם</u> עון האמרי עד הנה

In two instances within Septuagint Genesis 1-15, the perfect indicative appears within a subordinate clause (an indirect question and an indirect statement respectively). In both cases the tense of the question and of the statement is retained as the translator imagined each in its direct form."

8:8 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ <u>κεκόπακεν</u>

τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς

וישלח את היונה מאתו לראות <u>הקלו</u> המים מעל פני האדמה

retaining the tense of the direct question, "Has the water receded?"

8:11 καὶ ἔγνω Νωε ὅτι <u>κεκόπακεν</u> τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς

וידע נח כי <u>קלו</u> המים מעל הארץ retaining the tense of the

direct form, "The water has receded."

This use of the perfect in subordinate clauses accords with classical

usage which retained the tense of the original statement. E.g.[11]

ἧκε δ' ἀγγέλων τις ὡς τοὺς πρυτάνεις ὡς 'Ελάτεια <u>κατείληπται</u>

Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 169 "Someone had come with the report

that Elates had been taken."

φανερῶς εἶπεν ὅτι ἡ μεν πόλις σφῶν <u>τετείχισται</u> Thucydides 1, 91

"He said that their city had already been fortified."

As can be observed from the above examples, the distinct properties of

the perfect indicative in the classical period were still appreciated in the Greek of

Septuagint Genesis. Since the suffixed verb form of the Hebrew does not

intrinsically denote past action with continuing effect in the present, the translator

had to decide upon this nuance chiefly from context, though sometimes–as in

15:16 above–it is suggested by an adverbial element (עד הנה). In all the

above instances, the translator took advantage of the semantic range available in

the Greek verb system and rendered as perfect indicative a Hebrew form which

he normally (148 times)[12] rendered as aorist indicative. The translation retains,

as in the classical period, a clear distinction between the aorist and perfect tenses.

What is striking here is that this clear distinction is sustained at a time when it

---

[11]The examples and their translation are taken from W. Goodwin, *Syntax of The Moods and Tenses of The Greek Verb*. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1890, § 669. 2.

[12]Of these 148 instances, 86 are in independent clauses; 62 in dependent clauses.

was breaking down in Greek literature contemporary with the Septuagint

translation of Genesis.

The Perfect Indicative in Hellenistic Greek

In the late classical, early Hellenistic period the perfect began to trespass

into the sphere of the aorist. B. Mandilaras explains:

> As we know the perfect concentrates the verbal aspect in the present. This particular function is a characteristic of the perfect in the Classical writers. The perfect then in its development undertook some additional functions: at first it was used to differentiate a situation resulting in the present from an action which happened in the past (already in Classical times); but ignoring the present situation or the present result the perfect tended to be connected with the beginning of the action; this refers to the past, and consequently the perfect was entering the sphere of the aorist.[13]

From third century Ptolemaic papyri Mayser offers examples in which

the perfect is used alongside the aorist with apparently little difference in

meaning from it (perfects are <u>underlined</u>, aorists appear in **bold** face):[14]

οὐδένα λόγον **ἐποιήσαντο**, ἀλλὰ <u>ἐγβεβλήκασί</u> με ἐκ τῶν κλήρων

Magd. 12, 8 (218 B.C.E.) "they made no response, but expelled me

from the province"

ἐπέθετο ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς καὶ τὰς χεῖρας <u>ἐπενηνόχασιν</u> τοῖς ποιμέσιν

PSI IV 380, 4 (249 B.C.E.) "the tribesmen attacked us and captured the

leaders"

---

[13]B. Mandilaras. *Studies in the Greek Language*. Athens, 1972, p. 16.

[14]E. Mayser, *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1926-1934. II 1, 139-141.

ἀπέδοντο αὐτὴν καὶ εἰς Ἰόπην καταγηΐοχεν καὶ εἰς Αὔρανα

ἀπεδήμησεν PSI IV 406, 14 (3rd century B.C.E.) "he gave her up

and brought her back to Iope and went away to Hauran"

In all three examples above, the perfect is connected with an aorist

syntactically and seems to share its tense value. However, the writer's point of

view is often very difficult to determine in the abbreviated texts of the papyri and

it cannot be ruled out that the perfect in the above instances emphasizes some

present circumstance. This may be the case in the first two examples above, but

seems less so in the third one.

This mixture of tenses can also be observed in the writings of the

historian Polybius (203-120 B.C.E.) who uses the same formula sometimes

with the perfect and sometimes with the aorist. But again, the perfect may give

some degree of emphasis:[15]

> (aorist)
>
> κατάπερ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων ἐδηλώσαμεν 3. 48. 6 "as we
>
> described in volumes prior to these"
>
> (perfect)
>
> κατάπερ ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις δεδηλώκαμεν 3. 10. 1 "as we
>
> described in earlier volumes"

---

[15]This example and others are provided by J. Foucault, *Recherches sur la Langue et le Style de Polybe*, Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1972, pp. 134-135.

On the other hand, the perfect is undoubtedly used with the tense value

of the aorist when there is some indication of past time in the clause. E.g.

> ἀπέσταλκα αὐτὸν πρὸς σὲ τῆι ς τοῦ Φαρμοῦθι P. Petrie ii2 (2), 5-6
>
> (221 B.C.E.) "I sent him to you on the sixth day of Pharmouthi (a
>
> month in the Egyptian calendar)"[16]

In papyri from the third century B.C.E. the ratio of perfects to aorists is

nearly one-to-one. 42 letters from that period exhibit 91 perfects and 78 aorists;

43 official documents exhibit 66 aorists and 45 perfects. The ratio of perfects to

aorists increased in papyri from the second and first centuries of that era.[17]

In the New Testament, the perfect indicative sometimes appears

alongside the aorist. In such instances it may bear the same meaning as the

aorist.[18] E.g.

> Revelation 5:7 καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ εἴληφεν ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου
>
> ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου "he came and took (the scroll) from the right hand of the
>
> one seated on the throne"
>
> 2 Corinthians 11:25 τρὶς ἐραβδίσθην, ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, τρὶς
>
> ἐναυάγησα, νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα "I was flogged three
>
> times, stoned once, shipwrecked three times, spent a day adrift on the
>
> sea"

---

[16]This example and others like it are provided by B. Mandilaras (*Studies in the Greek Language*), p. 18.

[17]B. Mandilaras, *Studies in the Greek Language*, pp. 18-19.

[18]The examples are from Blass-Debrunner, (*A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Translated and revised by R. Funk. University of Chicago Press, 1961), §343.

But the same caution applies here as with the above examples from the papyri, so that sure examples of this use of the perfect in the New Testment are few. Moreover, in that literature the perfect is never found with statements of past time, which clearly reveal an aorist sense.[19]

In general, the perfect with aorist meaning appears to be a product of the spoken language in the post-classical period. It is certainly exhibited in the non-literary Greek of that period (the papyri), but evidence for it in literary works of the time is less strong.

The Relative Infrequency of the Perfect Indicative
in Septuagint Genesis 1-15

The Greek of Septuagint Genesis 1-15 yields no examples of this encroachment of the perfect indicative into the sphere of the aorist. The perfect is employed only where its unique semantic signification is naturally appropriate; the aorist remains the ordinary tense of narration. In Septuagint Genesis 1-15, therefore, we find extended sequences of aorists with no intermingling of perfects (such as in 2 Corinthians 11:25 above). E.g.:

3:6-7 καὶ εἶδεν ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι καλὸν ξύλον . . ., καὶ λαβοῦσα τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ ἔφαγεν · καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ'αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔφαγον. καὶ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο, καὶ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι γυμνοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἔρραψαν φύλλα συκῆς καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς περιζώματα

---

[19]See the discussion in Mandilaras (*Studies in the Greek Language*), pp. 47-48.

ותרא האשה כי טוב העץ. . .ותקח מפריו ותאכל ותתן גם
לאישה עמה ויאכל ותפקחנה עיני שניהם וידעו כי עירמם
הם ויתפרו עלה תאנה ויעשו להם חגרת

The absence of the perfect indicative in the <u>narrative</u> portions of Septuagint Genesis 1-15 can be attributed to at least two factors. In the first place, the translation uses the aorist indicative (with a coordinating conjunction) as the <u>normal</u> correspondent for a characteristic feature of Hebrew narrative: extended sequences of clauses joined by a special form of the conjunction (ו + doubling).[20] While such sequences can be found in the literary Greek of the classical period[21]as well as within the highly vernacular style of the papyri,[22] their frequency in the Greek Genesis and the Septuagint in general is surely due to the influence of Hebrew narrative style. Secondly, those responsible for the Greek translation of the Hebrew sacred scriptures may have wanted to avoid the mixture of aorist and perfect tenses characteristic of non-literary compositions in the post-classical period.

Conclusion

In sum, the text of Septuagint Genesis 1-15 does not imitate the mixture of perfects and aorists characteristic of the non-literary productions of Hellenistic times; it retains the classical distinction between the two tenses. The

---

[20]In Genesis 1-15, the aorist indicative with a conjunction renders the prefix conjugation + waw consecutive 343 times out of a total of 376 instances of that construction.

[21]For examples, see Kühner-Gerth II 2, 232-234.

[22]See Mayser II 3, 184-186.

identification of this feature in the Greek of Genesis 1-15 brings us one more step along the way to understanding of the language of the Septuagint. Studies in translation technique have revealed many distinctive characteristics of Septuagint Greek, especially those which are distinctive by mere occurrence. But subsequent comparison of the data from these studies with non-translation Greek may yield further characteristics of the Septuagint distinctive by frequency or by infrequency, as is the case with its use of the perfect indicative.[23]

---

[23]In recent times, R. Martin has studied the relative frequency or infrequency of certain idioms as a way of assessing the degree of Semitic influence in Greek documents. To date, he has identified seventeen syntactical features that, through their frequency or infrequency, would distinguish original Greek compositions from Greek translated from a Semitic source. See R. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 3), Society of Biblical Literature, 1974; R. Martin, *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 10), Edwin Mellen Press, 1987.

SOME SEPTUAGINTAL PLUSES IN JUDGES 20 AND 21

P. E. Satterthwaite
University of Transkei, South Africa

The recensional history of LXX in Judges has been the subject of a number of studies.[1] These studies have established that the LXX mss KZdglnoptvw (especially KZglnow), along with the Old Latin Version[2], are the most generally reliable witness to the Old Greek (i.e., the earliest form of LXX) in Judges. Further, it has been suggested that this manuscript group derives from a *Vorlage* at points different from MT, indicating that the Hebrew text in the intertestamental period was to an extent still fluid.[3]

In this article I discuss a number of passages found in the LXX mss Zglnoptvw and Old Latin in Judges 20 and 21, which do not occur in MT, in any other LXX mss, or in any of the other ancient versions. These 'pluses', which occur in Ju 20.19, 28, 31, 33, 37, and 21.7, 9, 22, and on which little has previously been written,[4] support the first of the two conclusions mentioned above. However, I shall argue that they most likely do not derive from a variant

---

[1]See A.V.Billen, 'The Hexaplaric Element in the LXX Version of Judges', *JTS* 43 (1942), 12-19; *idem*, 'The Old Latin Version of Judges', *JTS* 43 (1942), 140-149; I.Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen der Septuagint-Übersetzung des Richterbuches* (Helsinki, 1951); W. R. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges* (Chico, 1980); B. Lindars, 'A Commentary on the Greek Judges?', *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23 (Atlanta, 1987), 167-200.

[2]The Old Latin version of Judges may be consulted in the edition of U.Robert, *Heptateuchi partis posterioris version Latina antiquissima e codice Lugdunensi* (Lyons, 1900).

[3] On this see Billen, *JTS* 43 (1942), 16, 146-148; Soisalon-Soininen, 110-117; Bodine, 134-136; Lindars, 171-173.

[4]With the exception of 20.31, discussed by Moore (*Judges: the Polychrome Bible*, 69-70), and 21.22, discussed by Lindars (190-191).

Hebrew *Vorlage*; and that in any case they do not represent a text superior to, or more original than, MT.[5]

The events related by Judges 20 and 21 are as follows: Judges 20 describes a punitive war waged by the Israelites against Gibeah and the tribe of Benjamin as a consequence of the Gibeathites' brutal treatment of a Levite and his concubine (described in Ju 19). On the first two days of battle the Israelites are defeated, but on the third day they defeat the Benjaminites by means of an ambush and destroy all but 600 Benjaminite males. Ju 21 relates how wives are found for these survivors so that the tribe may not pass out of existence. Scholars have perceived various difficulties in this account, not all of which need concern us here. However, it is relevant to note that most scholars believe the account of the battle on the third day (20.29-48) to be confused and repetitious. The passage in 20.29-48 is generally analysed into two accounts which, it is held, have been conflated to give the present text.[6] More recently this majority view has been challenged by Revell,[7] who argues (convincingly, in my view) that the various repetitions of these verses are to be explained on the grounds that this is an unusual narrative, in which the activities of three groups in the battle (Israelites, Benjaminites, and the Israelite ambush) have to be woven into one account; once allowance has been made for this fact, 20.29-48

[5]This note is a reworking of part of a thesis submitted to the University of Manchester in 1989 under the title *Narrative Artistry and the Composition of Judges 17-21*. My supervisor for this thesis was Professor Barnabas Lindars.

[6]See, for example, the comments of Soggin (*Judges* [London, 1980] 293-294), who discusses two differing source-analyses of these verses.

[7]"The Battle with Benjamin (Judges xx 29-48) and Hebrew Narrative Techniques" *VT* 35 (1985) 417-433.

can be seen as a unitary account. Be this as it may, it is clear that these verses could have posed problems for readers in antiquity, just as they have for some modern-day readers. Some of the pluses to be discussed below seem to have arisen as a result of this. The pluses share certain common features. I will first consider the passages separately, and then make some general remarks.

20.19, 31

The pluses in 20.19 and 31 seem to have a common origin, as they are at many points similar. They are best discussed together. I underline those parts of the two pluses which appear to be similar to each other.

LXX mss generally translate the last three words of v.19 (ויחנו על הגבעה) by παρενέβαλον ἐπί Γαβαά. In place of these words Old Latin has : venerunt in Gabaa ut pugnarent et dederunt eis fili Istrahel mille viros obsidentes civitates in via Gabaon applicaverunt et mandavit eis omnis synagoga dicens Abite ad eum qui super insidias est et erit quando prodire coeperint fili Beniamin de civitate et vos secus latenter commiscetis vos et introibitis illo et tolletis pacem et revertemur super eos et percutiemus illos et exiit Beniamin ex Gabaa in ovviam Istrahel.

LXX mss translate v.31a ויצאו בני־בנימן לקראת העם הנתקו מן העיר by some form of the following: καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ Βενιαμεὶν εἰς συνάντησιν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐξεκενώθησαν τῆς πόλεως. After this Zgknloptvw add ἀπέστειλαν δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ χίλιους ἄνδρας εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ ἐνετείλαντο αὐτοῖς λέγοντες Πορεύεσθε πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνέδρων τόπον, καὶ ἔσται ὅταν ἐκπορεύωνται ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμεῖς εἰσελεύσεσθε ἐκεῖ καὶ

ἀρεῖτε πυρσὸν εἰς ὕψος <u>καὶ ἐπιστρέψομεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς.</u> καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ

Βενιαμεὶν <u>εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ λαοῦ</u> καὶ ἐξειλκύσθησαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως.

The men referred to in these two additions appear to be the ambush party deployed by the Israelites on the third day of fighting. This group is said to have been sent in the direction of Gibeon (Gabaon, Old Latin).[8] The fact that the group here is only 1,000 in number, whereas at 20.34 the figure for the ambush party is 10,000, need not be taken to indicate that a different group is in view: a word such as עשׂר could easily have dropped out of a Hebrew original. That the plus derives from a Hebrew original seems likely in view of the following Hebraic features: et mandavit eis omnis synagoga dicens / καὶ ἐνετείλαντο αὐτοῖς λέγοντες; et erit quando prodire coeperint / καὶ ἔσται ὅταν ἐκπορεύωνται.

Since the ambush party is not deployed until the third day's fighting, the information in these pluses makes much better sense at the point in the account where LXX mss insert it (in v.31 in the account of the third day's fighting) than at the point where Old Latin inserts it (in v.19, before even the first day's fighting has got under way). The fact that very similar material has been inserted at two different points suggests that the two pluses go back to one source, most likely a marginal note suggesting an addition, which two different scribes have incorporated at two different points in the text. A further feature of the additions also supports this suggestion. The final words of the two additions (καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ βενιαμειν εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐξειλκύσθησαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως / et exiit Beniamin ex Gabaa in ovviam Istrahel)

---

[8]The place name appears to have dropped out of LXX mss which only say εἰς τὴν ὁδόν.

do not fit their context very well: in the LXX addition at v.31 they repeat almost exactly the words of v.31a which they follow, with no obvious literary gain; in the Old Latin addition in v. 19 they are completely out of place, as by v.19 the Israelites have not even presented themselves for battle. Perhaps these words were originally not part of the addition which the person responsible for the marginal note intended to make to the text, but a citation quoting the portion of text (v.31a) after which the addition was to be made. Once these words are removed, the LXX addition at v. 31 fits its context very well, detailing the instructions given to the ambush group before it springs into action. In MT we have to wait until the group enters the conflict to learn (from their actions, described in vv.34ff.) what its instructions were. This is not a serious omission: indeed, one could argue that the description in vv.34ff has a heightened impact for not having been prepared for previously. However, the fact that in the account found in MT no instructions are given to the ambush group may have been what gave rise to this plus.[9]

20.28

In v.28 LXX gklnoptvw and Old Latin expand considerably the question (Εἰ προσθῶμεν ἔτι ἐξελθεῖν . . .) which the Israelites address to Yahweh after the fighting on the second day, inserting two sentences before it: ἵνα τί Κύριε

---

[9]The Old Latin addition suggests that the ambush party had been given the preliminary task of laying siege to cities before attempting to take Gibeah from the rear: they are described as *obsidentes civitates*, words for which there is no equivalent in LXX. This does not make very good sense tactically, but can perhaps be understood as an attempt on the part of the scribe responsible for Old Latin to explain the later reference to a group described as אשׁר מהערים (v. 42), which has been found puzzling (see the discussion in D. Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament I* OBO 50/1, Göttingen, 1982).

ἐγενήθη ὁ θυμὸς σοῦ καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ σοῦ ἐν Ἰσραηλ; ἡμεῖς δε ἐξήλθομεν ἐξάραι τοὺς ποιησάντας τὴν ἀσεβείαν ταύτην καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐφύγομεν ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν δεύτερον τοῦτο καὶ νύν / ut quid Domine facta est indignatio et ira ista in Istrahel et nos pueri tui hic concollecti sumus ut tollamus filios iniquitatis qui fecerunt inpietatem in Istrahel et ecce fugimus a faciae (sic) eorum bis et nunc. There are slight differences between the Latin and the Greek forms of this plus; ἡμεῖς δε becomes et nos pueri, making the protest yet more poignant; τοὺς ποιησάντας τὴν ἀσεβείαν ταύτην becomes filios iniquitatis qui fecerunt inpietatem in Istrahel. The plus has the following Hebraic features: ἵνα τί / ut quid; ἐγενήθη ὁ θυμὸς σοῦ / facta est indignatio ista; ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν / a faciae (sic) eorum.

The plus is very appropriate at this point. The whole course of events on the first two days, in which the Israelites have twice been told to go into battle against the Benjaminites and twice been defeated, has been exactly such as to raise in the reader's mind questions such as are expressed in this addition.

20.33

MT in 20.33b reads ‏וארב ישראל מגיח ממקומו ממערה־גבע‎. The majority of LXX mss at this point read (with some unimportant variations): καὶ τὸ ἔνεδρον Ἰσραὴλ ἐπήρχετο ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Μαρααγαβε. LXX Zglnoptvw expand the phrase ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ in a variety of ways: ἐξανάσταντα ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπίσθεν αὐτῶν (gln); ἐξανάσταντα ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπίσθεν αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθον απὸ τῶν ὀπίσθεν αὐτῶν (Zow); ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν ἐξανάσταντα ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπίσθεν αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθον απὸ τῶν ὀπίσθεν αὐτῶν (ptv). The significant element απὸ τῶν ὀπίσθεν αὐτῶν occurs in all these mss.

It is perhaps a hebraism (= ‏מאחריהם‎ ?). These pluses all say that the ambush group was located behind the Benjaminite force. They thus clarify the reference of ‏ממקומו ממערה־גבע‎.

20.37

MT in 20.37a reads: ‏והארב החישו ויפשטו אל הגבע‎ At this point most LXX mss read (with some difference in vocabulary): καὶ τὸ ἔνεδρον ἐκινήθη, καὶ ἐξέτειναν ἐπὶ τὴν Γαβαά. . . . In place of these words LXX Zglnoptvw have: καὶ τὸ ἔνεδρον ὥρμησεν ὑπὲρ αὐτούς καὶ ἔκοψαν τοὺς καταβαινόντας, καὶ ἐξεχύθη ἐπὶ τὴν Γαβάα. This plus contains no obvious hebraisms. Its point appears to be that the ambush group, having arrived on the scene, attacked not only Gibeah but also the Benjaminites as they were coming down from Gibeah. This, however, seems bad tactics (why dissipate the force of the surprise attack by attacking the advancing Benjaminites from behind before attacking Gibeah?) and in any case does not fit with the later course of the narrative, according to which the Benjaminites only become aware of the ambush after Gibeah has been captured and fired. It does not seem possible, therefore, that this plus was part of the original Hebrew. How, then, did it arise? Possibly the answer lies in the fact that MT in vv.34 and 37 appears to repeat itself: in v.34 the ambush group is said to arrive in front of Gibeah, but this step is described again in v.37a. I follow Revell[10] in explaining this repetition by reference to the multiple shifts of viewpoint which Ju 20 contains, which involve going over some of the same material twice. It is possible,

---

[10]*VT* 35 (1985), 430.

however, that a scribe found the repetition difficult, and sought to remove what he saw as redundancy by inserting words after ὥρμησεν to explain that this action was not (like the earlier action described in v.34) a dash to reach the city, but a sudden attack on the Benjaminites who had left the city.[11]

21.7

MT at this point reads: מה נעשה להם לנותרים לנשים ואנחנו

LXX ghkl (partim) נשבענו ביהוה לבלתי תת־להם מבנותינו לנשים

noptvw add after the end of the verse: ὅτε ἐξαπεστείλαμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγοντες παράδοτε ἡμῖν τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ποιήσαντας τὴν κακίαν ἐν Γαβάα ἵνα θανατώσωμεν αὐτούς καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν.

The phrase ἐξαπεστείλαμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγοντες is a hebraism. The plus explains how and when the vow concerning intermarriage came to be made, that is to say, after the Benjaminites had refused to respond to the request to hand over the Gibeathites. It seems somewhat verbose here, however, and is also suspiciously similar to 20.13, from which it may well be derived.

21.9

MT reads: ויתפקד העם והנה אין־שם איש מיושבי יבש גלעד

LXX ghknoptvw add after the end of the verse: ὅτι ὅρκος ἦν ἐπὶ τὸν μὴ ἀναβαίνοντα θανάτῳ θανατωθῆναι αὔτον.

---

[11]It is possible that a similar train of thought led to the omission of the first five words of v. 34 (καὶ ἦλθον ἐξ ἐναντίας Γαβάα) in Zglnow; for the removal of these words means that in Zglnow the ambush's dash towards Gibeah is described only once, in v. 37, after the attack on the Benjaminites, which may have seemed more logical.

The phrase θανάτῳ θανατωθῆναι is a hebraism. This plus explains how it is that a punitive expedition is sent against Jabesh Gilead (they had violated an oath and thus incurred the penalty of death). However, as v.5 has already mentioned this oath in very similar words (which are to be found at that point in ghknoptvw), the plus is not really necessary in order to understand vv.9ff. It is most likely a pedantic explanatory addition.

21.22

MT reads: כי לא אתם נתתם להם כעת תאשמו. After this LXX ghknoptvw add: καὶ ἁμάρτημα οὐκ ἔσται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ πράματι ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη ἱνὰ μὴ πορεύθωσιν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνησιν λάβειν ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν.

Up to this point in Ju 21 no-one has mentioned the possibility that if wives are not found for the Benjaminite survivors, they will marry non-Israelites. Lindars notes that this plus contains unusual stylistic features: ἁμάρτημα is not otherwise attested in Judges in LXX A or B, and δικαιοσύνη is only attested in LXX A and B at Ju. 5.11. He suggests that the words might have been added by someone who wished to stress the undesirability of mixed marriages.[12]

Conclusions

Insofar as they contain a text different from that of MT, which has not, therefore, been subject to the type of later correction towards MT which is at

---

[12] Lindars, 190-191.

points discernible in the LXX of Judges,[13] these pluses support the view that ZKglnoptvw tend to preserve the Old Greek.

All these pluses could derive from Hebrew originals, and some of them clearly do so; though if anything should be based on the unusual vocabulary Lindars notes in the plus in 21.22, then perhaps we should explain this plus as a note made in Greek to a Greek manuscript. The pluses in 20.19/31 seem to derive from marginal note, as argued above; and all the pluses could have a similar origin. What, however, is the status of the material they contain? Do they attest to a *Vorlage* closer to the original Hebrew than MT?

At least three of these pluses (20.37; 21.7; 21.9) seem to me to yield a text inferior to MT. I have suggested that each of them could have arisen as notes intended to explain features of MT, or to alleviate perceived difficulties in MT. Another three of the pluses (20.19/31; 20.33; 21.22) seem to me to yield a text which is as good as MT; though none of them are in my view necessary; and, once again, given MT, we can explain how they came to be made. The plus in 20.28 seems to me a more insightful addition than these latter three, in that it makes explicit a question which MT genuinely raises. Nonetheless, it is not essential in order to understand the passage, and one can explain how it might have come to be made, given MT. It is, perhaps, the kind of expansion which one might make in expounding a text. Conversely, it is less easy to explain how the plus might have been omitted had it been part of the original Hebrew.

At no point, in other words, does it seem to me that these pluses would improve MT if inserted at the point where they occur in LXX or Old Lat. At

---

[13] For this, see Lindars, 172.

times they expand MT in an intelligible way, but they are not necessary in order to understand the text. At times they yield a reading inferior to MT. There is little reason to suppose that these readings were ever part of the main text of a Hebrew version of Ju 20-21.

These pluses, therefore, are not, properly, clear evidence for the existence of a different *Vorlage*: in this regard a distinction surely must be drawn between marginal notes and the main text; and if all these pluses are removed from the mss in which they occur, we are left with a text to all purposes identical with MT in Judges 20-21. The pluses are perhaps better taken as evidence that readers of Judges 20-21 in antiquity, like some of their modern counterparts, found aspects of these chapters puzzling, and sought to alleviate the difficulties they perceived by means of a series of explanatory notes. That is, they tell us more about the history of exegesis of Ju 20-21 than they do about the original Hebrew text of this passage.

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published or in progress.
   (Please print or type in publishable format.)

2. Record of Septuagint and cognate theses
   and dissertations completed or in progress.

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, and regional academic
   meetings. Abstracts should be previously
   unpublished, not more than one page,
   double-spaced, including the time, place, and
   occasion of the presentation.

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

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and US $8 to:

Dr. Leonard Greenspoon, IOSCS Secretary-Treasurer

Dept. of Religion and Philosophy

Clemson University

Clemson, South Carolina   29634-1508   USA

In the Netherlands, send subscription price to:

Dr. Arie van der Kooij

Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden

The Netherlands

Payment by Giro account   74 23 25