



**BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR
SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES**

Volume 30 Fall, 1997

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, San Francisco	1
Treasurer's Report	5
News and Notes	7
Record of Work Published or in Progress	12
Varia	24
Karen Jobes Responds to Tim McLay	32
The "Accordance" Search Program for the MT, LXX, and the CATSS Database <i>Emanuel Tov</i>	36
The Greek Translation of "Yehudah" in the Book of Jeremiah <i>Paul D. McLean</i>	45
Esther's Great Adventure <i>Cameron Boyd-Taylor</i>	81

BULLETIN of the IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by
THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR
SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

Leonard J. Greenspoon
The Klutznick Chair
Creighton University
Omaha, NE 68178 U.S.A.
ljgm@creighton.edu

Immediate Past President

Eugene Ulrich
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556 U.S.A.
Eugene.C.Ulrich.1@nd.edu

Editor

Theodore A. Bergren
Dept. of Religion
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173 U.S.A.
tbergren@richmond.edu

Treasurer

Robert J.V. Hiebert
Trinity Western Seminary
7600 Glover Road
Langley, B.C. V2Y 1Y1 Canada
robh@twu.ca

Secretary

Tim McLay
Acadia Divinity College
Wolfville, NS B0P 1X0
Canada
tim.mclay@acadiau.ca

SBLSCS Series Editor

Bernard A. Taylor
University Church
Loma Linda, CA 92354 U.S.A.
taylorb@earthlink.net

Honorary Presidents

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

Vice President

Johan Lust
Katholieke Univ. Leuven
St. Michielsstraat 2
B-3000 Leuven Belgium

NETS Co-chairs

Albert Pietersma (Toronto)
Benjamin Wright (Lehigh)

Associate Treasurer

Arie van der Kooij
Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid
Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden
Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden
Netherlands

Members at Large

Anneli Aejmelaeus (Göttingen)
Johann Cook (Stellenbosch)
N. Fernández Marcos (Madrid)
R. Geoffrey Jenkins (Melbourne)
Robert A. Kraft (Pennsylvania)
Olivier Munnich (Paris)
Takamitsu Muraoka (Leiden)
Moises Silva (Westminster)
Raija Sollamo (Helsinki)
Emanuel Tov (Jerusalem)

PROGRAMS FOR THE IOSCS MEETINGS IN SAN FRANCISCO, NOVEMBER 22-25, 1997

Sunday Morning, November 23

9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. H-Union 22

Leonard J. Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

9:00 Timothy H. Lim, University of Edinburgh
Isaianic Quotations in Romans

9:30 Kristin De Troyer, Peeters Publishers
The End of the Alpha-Text of Esther

10:00 Frederick W. Knobloch, University of Maryland
*"Transcript Technique" and the Text of the Greek
Genesis*

10:30 Julio Treballe, Universidad Complutense
*Parallel Editions and Parabiblical Texts: 1 Kings 3-10
(MT-LXX-Chron)*

11:00 Discussion of *A New English Translation of the
Septuagint*

Tuesday Morning, November 25

Leonard J. Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

9:00 Katrin Hauspie, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
*LXX-Greek in Ezekiel: The Old Testament in Greek
Characters or in Greek Language?*

- 9:30 Robert Hiebert, Ontario Bible College and Theological Seminary
On the Trail of the Syrohexapla's Translator(s)
- 10:00 Effie Habas, Ben Gurion University
The Patriarchs in Jewish Inscriptions from the Diaspora
- 10:30 Karen H. Jobes, Westmont College, and Moises Silva, Westminster Theological Seminary
Septuagint Studies: The Next Generation
- 11:00 Business Meeting

Business Meeting

The business meeting was called to order on November 25, 1997 at 11:05 a.m.

1. Treasurer's report was approved as read. He reported that members and institutions were past due in their accounts by approximately \$12,000. Those owing would be contacted in the near future regarding the status of their account.
2. The President reported that the new bulletin editor, Ted Bergren, would have two bulletins ready for the coming year. That would ensure that the bulletin is current. Thanks were expressed to Melvin Peters for his contributions as previous editor.
3. The editor for the SCS series reported that two books have been published during the past year: Wevers, J.W. Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus (SCS 44) and Taylor, B.A., ed. IX Congress of the IOSCS (SCS 45). He is currently proofreading Wevers' Notes on Numbers in his series on the LXX Pentateuch. This is the last of the five and will be available next year. Two other volumes have been accepted subject to revision, and it is expected that they will be ready next year. One more is currently under review. Several other proposals

have been received and he noted that all submissions are welcome. The first volume was published in 1973 (not vol. 1), so next year will be the 25th anniversary of the series. He noted, "While we wish it longevity, the winds of change are blowing freely through the halls of Scholars Press, and the future is in a measure uncertain."

4. The President reported that he and Bob Kraft had met with Kent Richards and David Petersen about the future of our publishing with Scholars Press. They want to clarify the arrangements. Further meetings are necessary.

5. The President reported that he, Bob Kraft, and Hal Scanlin were proceeding with negotiations with OUP about NETS. Don Kraus of OUP announced on Sat. 22nd that an agreement in principle had been reached to publish NETS. Oxford will provide some development money for the project as well.

6. The President reported that the translation work is proceeding well and that 2001 is the hoped-for completion date of the project. A commentary series is being discussed as well and initial steps in planning have been taken.

7. The President reported that the incorporation of IOSCS is almost complete. Incorporation necessitated the creation of bylaws for IOSCS. Thanks were expressed to John Wevers who did the initial draft for the executive committee. The approved bylaws were distributed to the members present at the meeting.

8. The new bylaws empower the executive to meet and make some decisions via electronic mail. This will ensure that the IOSCS is more effective as an organization. The following recommendations of the Executive Committee were approved:

- a. Johan Lust nominated as Vice-President.
- b. Ted Bergren and Arie van der Kooij nominated to the Finance Committee.
- c. Bob Kraft nominated as convener of the Administrative Committee.

d. Anneli Aejmelaesus, Johann Cook, Natalio Fernandez Marcos, Olivier Munnich, Takamitsu Muraoka, Moises Silva, and Raija Sollamo nominated as members-at-large.

9. The IOSCS will meet for two days prior to the IOSOT in Oslo in 1998 and for two days prior to the International Meeting of the SBL in Helsinki in 1999. The IOSCS will not meet in Orlando in November of 1998, but will meet as usual in Boston in 1999.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim McLay, Secretary

International Organization for Septuagint
and Cognate Studies

TREASURER'S REPORT
US DOLLAR ACCOUNT
JULY 1, 1996 - JUNE 30, 1997

Account No. 25430018 - Seafirst Bank, Sumas WA

BALANCE 7/1/96 \$ 1791.15

CREDITS

10/25/96 (Reimbursement from Account no. 71447619[NETS])	125.96
11/12/96 (Deposit)	178.00
11/12/96 (Deposit)	375.00
5/27/97 (Deposit)	300.00
5/27/97 (Deposit)	369.44
5/27/97 (Deposit)	410.00

DEBITS

10/2/96 (Production costs, BIOSCS 28)	145.69
10/4/96 (Student help and mailing costs, BIOSCS 28)	40.00
10/8/96 (Mailing costs, BIOSCS 28)	137.30
10/11/96 (Printing costs, BIOSCS 28)	360.00
10/15/96 (Mailing costs, BIOSCS 28)	125.96
10/16/96 (Overdraft charge)	18.00
11/12/96 (Shipping costs, BIOSCS 28)	30.01
11/14/96 (Meeting room, IOSCS 1996 annual meeting)	60.00
11/27/96 (Mailing costs, BIOSCS 28)	64.32
2/6/97 (BIOSCS breakfast, 1996)	74.43
2/24/97 (Mailing costs, BIOSCS 28)	85.66
4/30/97 (Overdraft charge)	18.00
5/27/97 (Bank draft to 1996 essay prize winner)	263.79
6/3/97 (Deposited item returned)	10.00
6/9/97 (Deposited item returned)	10.00
6/12/97 (Cheque for deposit in new IOSCS account [Royal Bank])	500.00

6/30/97 (Balance) 406.39

Account No. 4507919 - Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville ON

CREDITS

4/21/97 (Deposit)	20.00
5/1/97 (Interest)	.01
5/15/97 (Deposit)	10.00
6/2/97 (Interest)	.02
6/10/97 (Deposit)	510.00
6/30/97 (Balance)	540.03
TOTAL BALANCE 6/30/97 (406.39 + 540.03)	946.42

SUMMARY

BALANCE 7/1/96		1791.15
7/1/96 - 6/30/97	Credits	+2298.43
	Total	4089.58
		4089.58
7/1/96 - 6/30/97	Debits	-3143.16
	Total	946.42
6/30/97	Balance	946.42

Respectfully submitted:
Robert J. V. Hiebert
IOSCS Treasurer

Audited:
Michael Sullivan, Senior Manager
Real Estate Advisory Services
KPMG

NEWS AND NOTES

A Note of Appreciation

The executive committee of IOSCS is pleased to acknowledge the ten years of exemplary service provided by Melvin Peters of Duke University as editor of the *Bulletin*. Those who have followed the progress of the *Bulletin* during this period have seen its transformation from a shortish and relatively unsophisticated newsletter of a scholarly society to a formidable scholarly voice. Under Mel's guidance, the *Bulletin* has increased not only in size and detail of coverage but also in the level and quality of its contents. We thank Mel for a job more than well done and wish him well in whatever, undoubtedly less stimulating, endeavors might occupy his attention in the future.

In this issue

The main contents of this issue are the two prize-winning essays from the LXX prize competitions of 1996 and 1997. Paul McLean's paper, "The Greek Translation of 'Yehudah' in the Book of Jeremiah," was awarded the prize in 1996, while Cameron Boyd-Taylor's "Esther's Great Adventure" won in 1997.

Details of the annual prize competition are given below.

Call for Papers

The heart of the *Bulletin* is the articles that are published in each issue. Please consider submitting, and encouraging your students to submit, articles, papers read at conferences, critical notes, and so forth.

Reviews of Web Sites

In forthcoming issues, we will be printing reviews of web sites that are relevant to Septuagint studies. If you know of a site that should be reviewed, or that you would like to review, please contact the editor (tbergren@richmond.edu). The February, 1998 issue of *Religious Studies News*, "Offline 60"

(pp. 40-41), contains an excellent review of some leading World Wide Web search engines.

Reviews of Software Packages

In the same vein, we would also like to review software packages that are relevant to Septuagint studies. If there is a package that you use regularly and would like to review, please contact the editor.

Books and Book Reviews

Book reviews are solicited. If you have published something in the field, please ask your publisher to send us a copy (the *Bulletin's* circulation is 250 scholars and 150 libraries and institutions). If there is a particular book that you would like to review, please contact the editor.

The IOSCS Home Page

Thanks to Robert Kraft and Jay Treat, IOSCS webmaster, the IOSCS now has its own home page at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/>. The page features an introduction to the Organization and information about the *Bulletin*, NETS, the Annual Prize for Papers, how to become a member, and the officers and executive committee. Also available through links from the home page are the parallel aligned Hebrew and Greek Jewish Scriptures (CATSS), the Morphologically Analyzed Septuagint (CATSS), Old Greek Variants Files (CATSS), and Internet Resources for the Study of Judaism and Christianity.

On-Line Discussion Groups

Of the on-line discussion groups currently in operation, the one most relevant to Septuagint studies is probably IOUDAIOS-L, a group devoted to the discussion of Judaism in the Greco-Roman world. Membership is by application; application is available through the group's home page at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioudaios/>. There are other, similar discussion groups for the Hebrew scriptures (Miqrā; home page at <http://shemesh.scholar.emory.edu/cgibin/miqra-app.pl>) and the New Testament (Graphai; home page at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/graphai>).

A New Edition of Hatch-Redpath

A new edition of Hatch-Redpath's Concordance to the Septuagint has been published. The new edition features a Hebrew-Greek index by Takamitsu Muraoka (also available separately), a new introduction by Emanuel Tov and Robert Kraft, and several new features within the text itself (e.g., signals attached to words that are included in the appendices). We hope to present a more detailed account in a future issue.

Essay Prize Competition

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is offering a prize of \$250 to be awarded to an outstanding paper in the field of Septuagint Studies. This field is construed broadly, and a paper may focus on any aspect of the study of the Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures. The IOSCS wants to encourage the study of these translations by younger scholars, and eligibility is thus limited to advanced graduate students or recent Ph.D. recipients (3 years or less after receiving the degree). The papers will be judged by a committee constituted of IOSCS members, and papers receiving prizes will be published in the following BIOSCS. Depending on its assessments of the papers submitted, the committee may decide not to award the prize in any given year. The deadline for submission is May 15. Papers should be sent either to Leonard Greenspoon, President IOSCS, The Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization, Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68178, or to Benjamin G. Wright, Secretary IOSCS, Department of Religious Studies, Maginnes Hall, 9 W. Packer Ave., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015.

In memoriam, Bonifatius Fischer

We are saddened to report, within fourteen months, the deaths of two leading scholars of the Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*) Bible.

Pater Dr. Bonifatius Fischer was the founder and for twenty-one years director of the *Vetus Latina* Institut in Beuron, Germany. Dr. Fischer in a very real sense set the stage for modern study of the *Vetus Latina* and has *mit Recht* been considered the Sabatier of the twentieth century. He started his

work registering Old Latin manuscripts and citations shortly after World War II and in 1949 published the *Verzeichnis der Sigel für Handschriften und Kirchenschriftsteller*, later to become the first volume in the series of critical editions of the *Vetus Latina*. Only two years later he published the first volume of the actual critical edition, which covered Genesis 1:1-9:14 (vol. 2, part 1 of the *Vetus Latina* series). The edition of Genesis was finished in 1954. Fischer not only completed this work almost single-handedly, but also devised the unique and ingenious schema for the critical edition (including full Greek text) that would become the model for all subsequent editions in the series.

The *Vetus Latina* Institut itself was founded in 1951, and soon thereafter several collaborators joined in producing the critical editions. Fischer himself now directed his attention mainly to scholarly work on the Old Latin Bible, in 1957 publishing *Die Alkuin-Bible*, which became the first volume in the scholarly series *Aus der Geschichte der Lateinische Bibel*. He continued to write historical essays and worked on the new compact edition of the Vulgate produced by the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft in 1969. Dr. Fischer was forced to retire his directorship of the Institut in 1972 due to worsening health, but continued work on a five-volume concordance of the Vulgate (1977) and on a series of four volumes, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert* (1988-91). He died on April 19, 1997 at the age of 82.

In memoriam, Hermann Josef Frede

Professor dr. Hermann Josef Frede assumed the directorship of the *Vetus Latina* Institut after the retirement of Dr. Fischer in 1972. He had been active in the affairs of the Institut for some time previously, having published the third volume in the AGLB series, *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus*, in 1961. Dr. Frede also continually updated Fischer's *Verzeichnis*, and between 1962 and 1991 produced a constant stream of *Vetus Latina* critical editions, covering Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, the Pastoral Letters, Philemon, and Hebrews. From 1972 to this year he edited the AGLB series, and was responsible for numerous volumes in it. Those like the present writer who had occasion to

correspond with him found him a continually helpful font of information and encouragement, even to young graduate students. He died on May 29, 1998 at the age of 75.

The scholarly world is immeasurably diminished by the loss of these two scholars.

**RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED
OR IN PROGRESS**

ADAIR, James. Combination/revision of Ph.D. and M.A. theses submitted for publication: "An Inductive Method for Reconstructing the Biblical Text Illustrated by an Analysis of 1 Samuel 3." Focuses on the issue of using versional evidence in the text-critical process.

BEENTJES, P. C. (1) "Wisdom of Solomon 3,1-4,19 and the Book of Isaiah," in: J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A. Beuken* (BETHL, 132), Peeters - Louvain, 1997, pp. 413-420. (2) *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of all extant manuscripts and a Synopsis of all parallel Hebrew Ben Sira texts* (VTS, 68), Brill - Leiden, 1997, viii + 183 pp. (3) "Reading the Hebrew Ben Sira Manuscripts Synoptically. A New Hypothesis," in: P.C. Beentjes (ed.), *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research. Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference* (BZAW, 255), W. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1997, pp. 95-111. (4) "God, mijn God, sla acht op mij. De Griekse vertaling van Psalm 22," in: M. Poorthuis (ed.), 'Mijn God, mijn God, waarom hebt gij mij verlaten?.' Een interdisciplinaire bundel over Psalm 22, Ten Have -Baarn 1997, pp. 55-61.

CIMOSA, Mario. (1) Observations on the Greek Translation of The Book of Zechariah, in «Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45» (ed. B.A.Taylor), Scholars Press. Atlanta, Georgia 1997, 91-108; (2) La Traduzione Greca Dei Settanta Nel Vangelo Di Giovanni, in «Bibbia E Oriente» 39,1 (1997) 41-55; (3) Da Quale Testo Tradurre Nelle Lingue Moderne L'antico Testamento (TM o LXX?). Alcuni esempi dal profeta Amos, in «Salesianum» 59 (1997) 443-462; (4) La Traduzione Greca Dei Lxx E Gli Studi Biblici Oggi, in «Bollettino di Collegamento n. 13» dell'Associazione Biblica Salesiana, Roma 1997, 55-67; (5) Da Quale Testo Tradurre Oggi L'antico Testamento (Testo Base: il TM o I LXX? Qualche esempio dal Libro dei Proverbi), in «Miscellanea di Studi in onore del prof.

D.Valentini» (in press); (6) La Traduzione Dei Lxx Usata Dal Nt: Un Esempio Di Intertestualita' (Ab 2,4 Citato In Rm 1,17; Gal 3,11; Ab 10,38), in «Miscellanea di Studi in onore del prof. J.Heriban» (in press).

CLIFFORD, Richard J. "Observations on the Texts and Versions of Proverbs," in *Wisdom You Are My Sister: Studies In Honor Of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. On The Occasion Of His Eightieth Birthday* (CBQMS 29; ed. M. L. Barre; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1997) 47-61 (examines all the versions including the Septuagint; it studies especially its techniques).

COOK, Johann. (1). THE SEPTUAGINT OF PROVERBS - Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? (concerning the Hellenistic colouring of LXX Proverbs). *Vetus Testamentum Supplementum* 69, Leiden: Brill, 1997. (2) VETUS TESTAMENTUM SYRIACE IUXTA SIMPLICEM SYRORUM VERSIONEM, PARS V, volumen 1, CONCORDANTIAE PENTATEUCHI, P.G. BORBONE - J. COOK - K.D. JENNER - D.M. WALTER (eds.), E.J. BRILL 1997. (3) "The law in Septuagint Proverbs," *JNSL* 23/1, 1997, 211-223. (4) "The Septuagint between Judaism and Christianity," *OTE* 10/2 (1997), 213-225. (5) "Aspects of the Relationship between the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job," in IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Cambridge, UK, 1995, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45: 309-328. (6) "Contrasting as a Translation Technique," in: Evans C.A. & Talmon S. (eds.), *From Tradition to Interpretation: Studies in Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. EJ Brill, 1997, 403-414. (7) REVIEWS: F.W. Golka, *Die Flecken des Leoparden: biblische und afrikanische Weisheit im Sprichwort*. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53/5 (1996), 780-783.

DE TROYER, Kristin. 1997: (1) Het einde van de Alpha-tekst van Ester. Vertaal- en verhaaltechniek van MT 8,1-17, LXX 8,1-17 and AT 7,14-41, Peeters, Leuven (will be translated into English). (2) "On Crowns and Diadems from Kings, Queens, Horses and Men" in: B.A. Taylor (ed.), *Proceedings of the IX*

Congress of the IOSCS in Cambridge 1995 (SCS 45), Scholars Press, Atlanta GA, pp. 355-67. (3) "LXX and Gender Studies. The Very Beginning of a Promising Liaison," in A. Brenner & C. Fontaine (eds.), *A Feminist Companion to Reading the Bible*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, pp. 366-386. (4) Review of: K.H. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther. Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBL Diss Ser., 153), Atlanta GA, 1996, in: *BiOr* LIV (1997) c. 459-463. 1998: (5) "Waiting for Qumran? De tweede Griekse tekst van het Bijbelboek Ester," in *Alma Mater* 1998 (forthcoming).

DINES, Jennifer M. (1) "Jerome and the Hexapla: The Witness of the Commentary on Amos" in Alison Salvesen (ed), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments. Papers presented to the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July - 3rd August 1994*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998, pp.421-36. (2) Work in progress on a short 'Introduction to the Septuagint' to be published by Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, England, as a companion volume to their series 'Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,' edited by Michael Knibb.

FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, Natalio. (1) "La reanimación del hijo de la Sunamita en el texto antioqueno." *Selon les Septante. Hommage a Marguerite Harl, sous la direction de Gilles Dorival et Olivier Munnich*, Paris 1995, 119-128. (2) "The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job." *The Book of Job*, edited by W. A. M. Beuken, Leuven 1994, 251-266. (3) "La lectura helenística del Cantar de los Cantares." *Sefarad* 56 (1966) 265-281. (4) "The Textual Context of the Hexapla." *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, edited by Alison Salvesen, Tübingen 1998, 408-420. (5) Foreword to the book of Sebastian P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, Torino 1996, *9-*11. (6) Review of John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995, in *Hebrew Studies* 38 (1997) 120-123; of Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, *La Bible d'Alexandrie. 6 Jesus (Josue)*, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf 1996, in *Sefarad* 58 (1998); of Etienne Nodet, *Le Pentateuque de Flavius Josephe*, Paris, Les Editions du Cerf

1996, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* (1998). In progress: A Greek Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text in the Historical Books.

Advertisement: Publication in 1999 of the second edition revised and augmented of my *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*, Madrid, CSIC.

N. Fernández Marcos - J. R. Busto Saiz, con la colaboración de M. V. Spottorno y S. P. Cowe, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega. III: 1-2Crónicas*, Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, *Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros* 60, 1996, LVI + 166 pp.

FISCHER, Georg. (1) *Das Trostbuechlein. Text, Komposition und Theologie von Jeremia 30-31* (Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk 1993) chapter 1. (2) "Zum Text des Jeremiabuches," *Biblica* 78 (1997) 305-328.

GREENSPOON, Leonard. (1) "It's All Greek to Me': Septuagint Studies Since 1968," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 5 (1997) 147-174 [in press] (2) "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Collection*, volume 1. Ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (STDJ; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 101-128 [in press] (3) "A Preliminary Publication of Max Leopold Margolis's *Andreas Masius*, together with his Discussion of Hexapla-Tetrapla" in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, ed. Alison Salvesen. Publisher: Mohr Siebeck (Tübingen, Germany) 39-69 [in press] (4) Entry on "Max Leopold Margolis" in *American National Biography*. Oxford University Press [in press] (5) Entries on "Masius" and "Max Leopold Margolis" in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. John H. Hayes. Abingdon Press. [in press] (6) "Between Alexandria and Antioch: Jews and Judaism in the Hellenistic Period" in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*, ed. Michael Coogan. Oxford University Press (New York City) [Nov. 1998 publication date now set; large section of LXX in this chapter]. (7) Recent LXX-related reviews for *Religious Studies Review*: a) Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* b) Nicholas de Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* c) Claude E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* d) Karen H.

Jobes, The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text e) Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, Jésus (Josué) f) Sebastian P. Brock, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel. (8) Delivered banquet speech, "It's All Greek to Me; What's It to You?," at annual meeting of the North American Patristic Society (Loyola University, Chicago, May 30, 1997) (9) I have submitted the final draft of a chapter on the Septuagint for the *History of Biblical Interpretation. Volume I: The Ancient Period*, Edited by Alan Hauser, to be published by Eerdmans. (10) I continue research on a biography of Harry M. Orlinsky. (11) I am also working on entries on "Hellenism," "Hellenistic Literature," and "Book of Joshua" for *Reader's Guide to Judaism*, to be published by Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers. (12) A chapter on Old Testament versions for the *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, edited by Craig Evans, to be published by InterVarsity Press.

JARICK, John. (1) "Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Interpretation of Ecclesiastes," in M. Daniel Carroll R., David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies (eds.), *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson* (JSOTSup 200; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 306-316. (2) "The Four Corners of Psalm 107," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997) 270-287. (3) "The Bible's 'Festival Scrolls' among the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 170-182.

KAMESAR, Adam. (1) "The Genres of the Pentateuch as Seen from the Greek Perspective," *Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997) 143-89. (2) "Philo, the Presence of Paideutic Myth in the Pentateuch, and the Kephalaia or 'Principles' of Mosaic Discourse" , *Studia Philonica Annual* 10 (1998). (3) In progress: Commentary on Philo's That the Worse Tends to Attack the Better (deals with the Greek text of Gen. 4:8-15).

KNOPPERS, Gerald N. (1) Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies.

Vol. 1: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993; Pp. xv + 302). (2) Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies. Vol. 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 53; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994, Pp. xvii + 349). (3) I Chronicles. Anchor Bible; New York: Doubleday (work in progress). (4) "Batting against Yahweh': Israel's War against Judah in 2 Chr 13:2-20," *Revue Biblique* 100 (1993) 511-32. (5) "Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and the Scroll of YHWH's Torah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994) 87-108. (6) "Sex, Religion, and Politics: The Deuteronomist on Intermarriage," *Hebrew Annual Review* 14 (1994) 121-41. (7) "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994) 572-82. (8) "Aaron's Calf and Jeroboam's Calves," in the David Noel Freedman Festschrift, *Fortunate the Eyes That See* (ed. A. H. Bartelt et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 92-104. (9) "Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Temple Dedication and the Deuteronomist's Program," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995) 229-254. (10) "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996) 329-46. (11) "'Yhwh is Not with Israel': Alliances as a Topos in Chronicles," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996) 601-626. (12) "Images of David in Early Judaism; David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles," *Biblica* 76 (1995) 449-70. (13) "The Vanishing Solomon? The Disappearance of the United Monarchy in Recent Histories of Ancient Israel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997) 19-44. (14) "Historiography and History: The Royal Reforms," in *The Chronicler as Historian* (ed. M. P. Graham et al.; JSOT Sup. 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (1997) 178-203. (15) Reviews of (a) Steven McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42) in *JBL* 112 (1993) 130-132. (b) Kim Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation in der Chronik: König Josaphat als Paradigma chronistischer Hermeneutik und Theologie* (BZAW 201) in *CBQ* 55 (1994) 780-82. (c) J. Andrew Dearman, *Religion and Culture in Ancient Israel* in *JR*

75 (1995) 109-10. (d) John Van Seters, Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis and Robert B. Coote, In Defense of Revolution: The Elohist History in CTJ 29 (1994) 536-41. (e) Donald J. Wiseman, 1 & 2 Kings in CTJ 29 (1994) 615-17. (f) Diane Edelman, King Saul in the Historiography of Judah in JBL 114 (1995) 131-33. (f) Sara Japhet, I & II Chronicles in JR 75 (1995) 255-57.

KUTZ, Karl V. "The Old Greek of Job: A Study in Early Biblical Exegesis" (Ph. D. dissertation; dir. Michael V. Fox, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1997).

LIM, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

LUST, Johan. (1) "Tools for Septuagint Studies," in *ETL* 73 (1997) 215-221. (2) "Mic 5,1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament," and "Messianism in the Septuagint" (Coll. Bibl. Lov., 1996), in C.M. Tucket (ed.), *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL, 131), Leuven, Univ. Press & Peeters, 1997, 65-88. (3) "Septuagint and Messianism, with a Special Emphasis on the Pentateuch," in H.G. Reventlow (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (Projektgruppe Biblische Theologie, Tagungen in Pforzheim, 1993 und 1994), Gütersloh, C. Kaiser, 1997, 26-45. (4) "And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain." Ezek 17:22-24 and Messianism in the Septuagint, in B. Taylor (ed.), *Proceedings of the IX Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995*, Atlanta GA., Scholars Press, 1997. (5) "A Lexicon of the Three and the Transliterations in Ezekiel," in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla. Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July - 3d August 1994* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 58), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1998, 274-301. (6) Work in Progress: Commentary on the Septuagint of Ezekiel (with K. Hauspie) (7) New Edition of the Hebrew Text of Ezekiel (BHQ) (8) The Vocabulary of Symmachus.

LUST, J., E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie, *A Greek - English Lexicon. Part 1: - , and Part 2: - ,* Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, liii + 217 pp, and 1996, lvi + 338 pp.

MURAOKA, T. (1) Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance, Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998. pp. 160. (2) "A new index to Hatch and Redpath," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 73 (1997) 257-76. (3) Work proceeding on a Septuagint lexicon on the Pentateuch to be incorporated into my earlier one on the Minor Prophets.

OLLEY, John. (1) "Texts have Paragraphs too - a Plea for Inclusion in Critical Editions." *Textus* 19 (1998) (in press). (2) "A Precursor of the NRSV? 'Sons and Daughters' in 2 Cor 6.18," *New Testament Studies* 44, 2 (1998) 204-12.

PIETERSMA, Albert. (1) "The Acrostic Poems of Lamentations in Greek Translation." *Proceedings of the VIIIth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992*. (SCS 41.). SP 1995, 183-201; (2) "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter," *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 1998 [in press]; (3) "A New English Translation of the Septuagint," *Proceedings of the IXth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Cambridge July, 1995*. (SCS 45.) Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia 1997, 177-187; (4) "The Text of the Old Testament," *International Catholic Bible Commentary*. William R. Farmer, Armando J. Levoratti, Sean McEvenue, David L. Dungan (ed.). Verbo Divino Estelle, Spain (Spanish language version); Liturgical Press Collegeville, Minnesota (English language version) [in press]; (5) "Yohanah and his Brother," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Lawrence. H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (ed.). Oxford University Press [in press]; (6) A New English Translation of the Septuagint: Psalms [completed]; (7) An Interim Critical Edition of the Greek Psalter [in progress]; (8) Reviews of: a) Gideon Bohak, Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis. SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 10. Scholars Press Atlanta,

Georgia, 1996 in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* [in press], b) Joachim Schaper, Eschatology in the Greek Psalter. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 76. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1995 in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997) 185-190, c) Bruce W. Longnecker, 2 Esdras in *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 25(1996), 372-373.

RÖSEL, Martin. (1) "Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta," *Biblische Notizen* 79, 1995, 54-69. (2) "Theologie der griechischen Bibel. Zur Wiedergabe der Gottesaussagen im LXX-Pentateuch." *Vetus Testamentum* 48, 1998, 49-62. (3) "Die Chronologie der Flut in Gen 7 8: keine neuen textkritischen Lösungen" (1998/9 zur Publikation in der *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* akzeptiert.)

SOLLAMO, Raija. "The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland." *SJOT* 10/2 1996, 159-168.

SPOTTORNO, M. V. "Would it be possible to set a limit to 7Q5?," in *Dead Sea Discoveries*. Forthcoming.

TOV, Emanuel. (1) *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever, (8HevXIIgr)* (The Seiyal Collection I) (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, "Reprinted with corrections 1995"). (2) *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997). (3) With C. Rabin and S. Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997). (4) *Der Text der Hebräischen Bibel--Handbuch der Textkritik* (trans. H.-J. Fabry; Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: Kohlhammer, 1997). (5) "The Parallel Database of the MT and LXX, Accordance computer program, Gramcord 1998" (division of the CATSS database, directed by R. A. Kraft and E. Tov). (6) "Glosses, Interpolations, and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in: S. E. Balentine and J. Barton (eds.), *Language, Theology, and the Bible--Essays in Honour of James Barr* (Oxford 1994) 40-66. (7) "Some Reflections on the Hebrew Texts from which the

Septuagint Was Translated," in: *JNSL* 19 (1993) 107-122. (8) "Different Editions of the Song of Hannah," in: M. Cogan, B. L. Eichler, and J. H. Tigay (eds.), *Tehillah le-Moshe, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, IN 1997) 149-170. (9) Reviews: G. Veltri, Eine Tora für den König Talmi-- Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur (TSAJ 41; Tübingen 1994), in: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 14 (1995) 178-183. (10) K. Bieberstein, Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch, Mit einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Hirbet Qumran in: *JSJ* 26 (1995) 185-187. (11) Bernard A. Taylor, The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns, Volume 1, Majority Text, Volume 2, Analysis (HSM 50,51; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992, 1993), in: *JAOS* 116 (1996) 551-553.

TREAT, Jay. "Lost Keys: Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and Its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1997. (Forthcoming in SBLSCS series).

ULRICH, Eugene. (1) "The Relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for Hexaplaric Studies," pp. 401-407 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July - 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998. (2) "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," pp. 79-100 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998. (3) "Raamatun Muotoutuminen Qumranin Kirjoitusten Valossa" [Finnish translation of "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran"] in *Teologinen Aikakauskirja--Teologisk Tidsskrift* 102 (1997) 316-326.

WALTERS, Stanley D. "After Drinking (1 Sam 1:9)," in Young, Gordon D., et al., eds., *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons. Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday* (Bethesda: CDL Press, 1997) pp 527-45. The words "and after drinking" in 1 Sm 1:9 MT incorporate into the text a homiletic gloss whose purpose is to bring the Shiloh story

alongside the Feast of Booths in Nehemiah 8. Both stories sustain some enlargement of force as a result. The vagueness of Neh 8's distress receives a concrete particular, and Hannah becomes a figure of all grief transformed into joy. The individual is subsumed into the communal, the priestly into the prophetic, the oracular into the scriptural. Discussion of the LXX, the Qumran texts, and the NRSV.

WEVERS, John William. (1) *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. SCS 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997. Pp. xxxix, 519. (2) "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version" in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*. Volume I: *From the Beginning to the middle Ages (Until 1300)*, edited by Magne Saebø in cooperation with C. Brekelmans and M. Haran. Part 1: *Antiquity*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. Pp. 82-107. (3) Book Reviews: Veltri, G., *Eine Tora fuer den Konig: Untersuchungen zum Uebersetungs- verstaendnis in der juedisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 41. Tuebingen, 1984. *JAOS* 116 (1996), 143. (4) - Talshir, Z., *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z*. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6. Jerusalem, 1993. *JAOS* 116 (1996), 550-551. (5) - Kamasar, A., *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible: A study of the <<Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim>>*. Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford, 1993. *JAOS* 116 (1996), 556-557. (6) - Meadowcraft, T.J., *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. Journal for the Study of the O.T., suppl. series Sheffield 198. Acad. Press, 1995. *JAOS* 117 (1997), 220. (7) - Dirksen, P.B. and Van der Kooij, A. eds., *The Peshitta as a Translation: Papers read at the II Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden 19-21 August 1993*. Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 8. Leiden, 1995. *Bibl. Orient.* 744-747. (8) Finished and accepted for publication: *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SBLSCS. Atlanta: Scholars Press. Pp. xlviii, 653. (9) "Future of Septuagint Text Studies" (10)-Aram and Aramean in the Septuagint." (11) - "The Balaam Narrative in Num 22-24 in the Septuagint."

WRIGHT, Benjamin G. (1) "Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest: Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Prieshood" in Pancratius C. Beentjes, ed. *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the first international Ben Sira Conference 28-31 July 1996 Soesterberg, Netherlands, BZAW 255*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. Pp. 189-222. (2) Paper presented at a University of Maryland conference entitled "Biblical Translation in Context.": "The Jewish Scriptures in Greek: The Septuagint in the Context of Ancient Translation Activity." (April 26, 1998).

VARIA

Dissertation Abstract

"The Old Greek of Job: A Study in Early Biblical Exegesis,"
Karl V. Kutz, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1997 (dir.
Michael V. Fox).

The earliest Greek translation of the book of Job, called the Old Greek (late 2nd century B.C.E.), is fascinating because it exhibits extensive divergences from modern translations of the book. It is an exceedingly free translation in which the translator exhibits a willingness to expand, condense, clarify, paraphrase, and harmonize in order to accomplish his objective of elucidating the Hebrew text of Job. The translator's free translation style often discloses what he, and perhaps his religious community, considered to be implicit in the text: insights that would not be revealed in a more literal translation. As a result, the Old Greek is important because it reflects perhaps the earliest articulated interpretation of the book of Job and because it illuminates, on a broader scale, the process of exegesis and translation within Hellenistic Judaism.

The translator's exegesis of the book begins with his interpretation of individual words. This has been affected by contemporary orthographic practices, abbreviated forms, unknown words, Aramaic and post-biblical Hebrew meanings for words, and other popular lexical traditions. On a larger scale we see that the translator has been subtly influenced by his religious beliefs. This is manifested both in his introduction of angels as agents of God's wrath and by a couple of affirmations of Job's hope in a future resurrection. The translator's portrayal of the characters which appear in the book is particularly fascinating. He highlights Job's piety and does not present Job as speaking "without knowledge" as we find Job doing in the Hebrew text. The translator's perception of Job's character is heavily influenced by the Lord's final commendation of Job as one who has spoken what is right (42:7-8). Job's three friends are essentially the same as in the Hebrew text, except in the Old Greek they fall silent because

they recognize that Job truly is righteous. As a result, when Elihu begins criticizing Job, the Old Greek gives the impression that he too is wrong. Job's wife has been portrayed in a more sympathetic manner than in the Hebrew text and the Adversary seems to be viewed as a demonic figure.

Report on the "Symposium über den Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen"

Robert J. V. Hiebert
Trinity Western Seminary

This report on a Psalter symposium convened by the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen is followed by an edited, annotated version of the program.

On July 23-26, 1997, the Septuaginta-Unternehmen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen convened a "Symposium über den Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen" in this lovely university town in central Germany. The purpose of this gathering was to help lay the groundwork for the preparation of a new edition of the Septuagint Psalter in the Göttingen Septuaginta series, one that will conform to current standards for the preparation of a critical edition and will therefore represent a significant advance over Alfred Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis* which was published in 1931. In its invitation to participants in the symposium, the leadership of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen (Prof. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Herren Udo Quast and Detlef Fraenkel) expressed a desire to establish contact with specialists in the field--especially experts on the daughter versions--who would be willing to serve in an advisory capacity to those spearheading the preparation of this edition of the Psalter. The Unternehmen, under its current mandate, is scheduled to complete its work on this massive project by the year 2015.

An international group of approximately 50 scholars participated in the symposium which featured thirteen Vortragen, several reports, and frequent opportunities for discussion of the presentations that were made. A range of

topics having to do with the textual history, translation technique, and exegesis of the Septuagint Psalter and its daughter versions as well as with the issues and problems associated with the preparation of the critical edition were addressed. For those who are interested in this area of research, the "Symposium-Beiträge" will be published in a forthcoming volume of the *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens*.

Of course, the four days of this symposium were not devoted exclusively to formal scholarly sessions. There were also many opportunities for informal interaction with colleagues in the field of Septuagint studies. Furthermore, the members of the "Göttinger Septuaginta-Team" were most gracious hosts. Among the highlights in this regard were the receptions at the Akademiehaus, the Burg Plesse overlooking the beautiful Leine-Tal, the historic Lagarde-Haus, and the Ratskeller flanking the square at the center of the city. All in all, the event was both a delightful and profitable experience.

Program

Mittwoch 23.7.1997

Tagungsort: Die Kleine Aula der Georg-August-Universität, Wilhelmsplatz 1 und Septuaginta-Unternehmen im Akademiehaus, Theaterstrasse 7

17 Uhr 00 Eröffnung

Präsident der Akademie der Wissenschaften Prof. Rudolf Smend

Vortrag

Vorsitzende Prof. A. Aejmelaeus

Prof. Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto

"The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter"

Führung im Septuaginta-Unternehmen (U. Quast, D. Fraenkel)

Donnerstag 24.7.1997

Tagungsort: Max-Planck-Institut für Strömungsforschung, Bunsenstrasse 12

9 Uhr 00 Psalmenlesung

9 Uhr 15 Einführung in die Editionsarbeit

Udo Quast, Septuaginta-Unternehmen

10 Uhr 00 Vetus Latina im Psalter

Vorsitzender Prof. Eugene Ulrich

1. Vortrag: Dr. Eva Schulz-Flügel, Vetus Latina Institut, Beuron

"Hieronymus, Feind und Überwinder der Septuaginta? Untersuchungen anhand der Arbeiten an den Psalmen"

11 Uhr 15 2. Vortrag: Prof. Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, Abbaye de Maredsous

"Le psautier latin des origines au XIIe siècle. Essai d'histoire"

Korreferat: Prof. Robert Hanhart

Diskussion

14 Uhr 30 Koptische Psalmenübersetzungen

Vorsitzender Prof. John Wm. Wevers

1. Vortrag: Prof. Peter Nagel, Universität Bonn

"Der sahidische Psalter - seine Erschliessung und Erforschung 90 Jahre nach Alfred Rahlfs' Studien zum Text des Septuaginta-Psalter"

15 Uhr 15 2. Vortrag: Dr. Jürgen Horn, Göttingen - Halle

"Die koptische (sa'idische) Überlieferung des alttestamentlichen Psalmenbuches"

Diskussion

17 Uhr 00 Aethiopische Psalmenübersetzung

Vorsitzende Prof. A. Aejmelaeus

Vortrag: Prof. Michael Knibb, University of London

"The Ethiopic Psalter"

Diskussion

Freitag 25.7.1997

Tagungsort: Max-Planck-Institut für Strömungsforschung,
Bunsenstrasse 12

9 Uhr 00 Psalmenlesung

9 Uhr 15 Syrische Psalmenüberlieferung
Vorsitzender Prof. Arie van der Kooij

1. Vortrag: Dr. Robert Hiebert, Ontario Theological
Seminary
"The 'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter: Its Text and Textual
History"

10 Uhr 00 2. Vortrag: Dr. Konrad D. Jenner, Peshitta Institute,
Leiden

"Syrohexaplarische Zitate in Quellen ausser den
individuellen Hexapla-Psaltern"

Diskussion

11 Uhr 30

In lieu of the scheduled Vortrag on the Arabic translation
of the Psalter by Prof. P. S. Koningsveld of the
University of Leiden, who unfortunately could not attend,
there was a discussion concerning the first Vortrag ("The
Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter,"
Prof. Albert Pietersma) which, due to its public nature,
had not been opened up for discussion.

Chair: Prof. John Wm. Wevers

Invited Participant: Herr Udo Quast

14 Uhr 30 Armenische Psalmenübersetzung
Vorsitzender Prof. Albert Pietersma

Vortrag: Dr. Claude Cox, Barrie, Ontario
"The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual
Criticism of the Old Greek Translation of Psalms"

15 Uhr 45 Georgische Psalmenübersetzung

Vortrag: Dr. Anna Charanauli, Tbilisi, Georgien

"Georgische Psalmenübersetzung"

17 Uhr 15 Hexapla-Probleme im Psalter
Vorsitzender Prof. Albert Pietersma

(The invited speaker, Dr. Gerard Norton of the
University of Birmingham, was unfortunately unable to
attend due to illness. In lieu of his Vortrag, a discussion
of hexaplaric issues took place.)

Einleitendes Referat: Detlef Fraenkel
"Hexapla-Probleme"

Samstag 26.7.1997

Tagungsort: Max-Planck-Institut für Strömungsforschung,
Bunsenstrasse 12

9 Uhr 00 Psalmenlesung

9 Uhr 15 Vorlage-Probleme im Psalter
Vorsitzende Prof. Raija Sollamo

1. Vortrag: Prof. Peter Flint, Trinity Western University
"The Variants of the Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls against the
Massoretic Text and the Septuagint Psalter"

10 Uhr 00 2. Vortrag: Prof. Eugene Ulrich, University of
Notre Dame

"The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Implications for an
Edition of the Septuagint Psalter"
Diskussion

11 Uhr 30 Septuaginta-Psalter
Vorsitzende Prof. A. Aejmelaeus

Vortrag: Prof. Arie van der Kooij, University of Leiden
"Zur Frage der Exegese im LXX-Psalter. Ein Beitrag zur
Verhältnisbestimmung zwischen Original und
Übersetzung"

Korreferat: Frank Austermann, Göttingen

"Septuaginta-Exegese am Beispiel der Untersuchung des LXX-Psalter"
Diskussion

Conference on "Biblical Translation in Context"

This conference took place at the University of Maryland in College Park on Sunday, April 26, 1998. It was sponsored by the Joseph and Rebecca Meyerhoff Center for Jewish Studies and co-sponsored by the Comparative Literature Program. Relevant portions of the program are excerpted below.

BIBLICAL TRANSLATION IN CONTEXT

Welcome

Dr. Hayim Lapin, Director, Jewish Studies Program

Dr. Frederick W. Knobloch, Jewish Studies

Session I, 10:15-12:00

The Bible in the Ancient World

Chair: Dr. Adele Berlin, University of Maryland

Jewish Scriptures in Greek: The Septuagint in the Context of Ancient Translation Activity

Dr. Benjamin G. Wright, Lehigh University

"What the Hebrews Say": Translation, Authority and the Story of Susannah in Early Christianity

Dr. William Adler, North Carolina State University

"Their Faces Shine with the Brightness of the Firmament":

Study Houses and Synagogues in Targumic Literature

Dr. Steven Fine, Baltimore Hebrew University

Session II, 1:30-3:30

Crafting a Bible for Contemporary America

Chair: Dr. Hayim Lapin, University of Maryland

Top Dollar, Bottom Line: Marketing English-Language Bibles within the Jewish Community

Dr. Leonard Greenspoon, Creighton University

Announcement of IOSCS 1999 Meeting in Helsinki/Lahti

1999 International Meeting 16-21 July 1999 Helsinki / Lahti, Finland

23-25 July 1999 St. Petersburg, Russia

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Call for Papers

In conjunction with the Society of Biblical Literature's International Meeting in Helsinki and Lahti Finland, 16-21 July, the Department of Biblical Studies at the University of Helsinki and the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies are jointly sponsoring two days of sessions devoted to the Septuagint and related topics. These sessions will take place in Helsinki on Friday, July 16, and Saturday, July 17, 1999. There is a concentration on translation technique, but papers on other topics are also welcome.

Please submit a proposal containing the author's name, academic institution, and the title of the proposed paper. A summary or abstract of the paper should also be enclosed. This summary should be no more than 250 words in length and must be double spaced. It should state the problem, the essential background, and the conclusions.

The deadline for paper proposals is 15 October 1998. Please send your proposal to Raija Sollamo (addresses below). Professor Sollamo can also provide further information or details.

Raija Sollamo

Faculty of Theology

P.O. Box 33 (Aleksanterink. 7)

FIN - 00014 UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Finland

Email: raija.sollamo@helsinki.fi

Karen Jobes Responds to Tim McLay

The 1995 issue of *BIOSCS* included an article by Karen Jobes, "A Comparative Syntactic Analysis of the Greek Versions of Daniel: Test Case for New Methodology," which was awarded the 1995 prize for an outstanding paper in Septuagint studies by the IOSCS.¹ In the 1996 issue of *BIOSCS* Tim McLay critiqued the methodology presented in that article.² Dr. Jobes briefly responds to his critique:

I wish to thank Dr. McLay for his critique of my article, for it is always gratifying to know that one's work is being seriously read and considered by others. The major difference between us is that he thought I was writing about the relationship between the Greek texts of Daniel, when I was actually writing about exploring a methodology that will allow the direct comparison of the syntax of Greek texts, regardless of their relationship, and will identify syntactical features that must be accounted for by any hypothesis proposing a relationship between the texts. McLay's focus is understandable, for he has recently published a fine work on the very topic of the relationship of the Greek texts of Daniel, in which he argues that Theodotion is not a recension of OG Daniel.³ He fails to appreciate that I was not arguing in support of the theory that Theodotion is a recension of the OG, but merely using that idea as a working hypothesis to test my methodology to see what specific characteristics of the syntax one must explain if one is arguing for a genetic relationship between the texts. What I found is that my methodology "produces results that are consistent with current theories about the Greek versions of Daniel reached by other means"⁴ but of course does not prove a genetic relationship. McLay misunderstands me to say that this methodology "may be employed to determine whether there is a genetic relationship

¹ K. Jobes, "A Comparative Syntactic Analysis of the Greek Versions of Daniel: A Test Case for New Methodology," *BIOSCS* 28 (1995) 19-41.

² T. McLay, "Syntactic Profiles and the Characteristics of Revision: A Response to Karen Jobes," *BIOSCS* 29 (1996) 15-21.

³ T. McLay, *The Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel* (SCS 43: Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

⁴ Jobes, "Comparative Syntactic Analysis," 36.

between two texts" (emphasis mine).⁵ In fact, I did not use the word "determine" in this context at all. As I said in my article, the most any methodology can do is "provide information useful in confirming or refuting hypotheses" about the character and relationships of the Greek texts.⁶

McLay focuses on the data concerning the frequency of occurrence of prepositions, specifically *κατά* and *ὑπό*, to critique my methodology, and chooses those two because they occur infrequently. My analysis showed that the eight prepositions examined occur in about the same relative frequency in both OG and Theodotion. This similar relative frequency of occurrence could occur simply because two independent translators used the most natural Greek prepositional phrases, supporting McLay's hypothesis. For instance, McLay uses the data concerning *κατά* to argue against the revision theory by showing that four occurrences are within the deutero-canonical additions, and that examination of those outside can, in his opinion, be equally well explained as independent translations that use the same preposition.⁷ (He mistakes criterion #5, *κατά* in all occurrences, to mean in all occurrences other than the accusative, subtracts the number of occurrences of criterion #4 from #5, and then accuses *me* of using too few counts, which I do not do. However, his misunderstanding of how I used the criterion in my analysis does not invalidate his main point.) On the other hand, *contra* McLay, similar relative frequency of occurrence would also be expected if Theodotion were a revision of OG but the reviser(s) left prepositional phrases more-or-less untouched. The value of syntactic profiling is that it shows at a glance that changes to the prepositional phrases were not a major element in the reviser's work.

In exploring an alleged relationship between two texts, the differences in their syntax is probably more to the point than their similarities. In his critique, McLay ignored the five major shifts in syntax that my methodology revealed. If Theodotion Daniel was produced by one or more revisions of the OG text, then the syntactic profiles indicate that the three largest changes resulting from those revisions that shifted the syntax toward the MT were:

⁵ McLay, "Syntactic Profiles and Revision," 16.

⁶ Jobes, "A Comparative Syntactic Analysis," 36.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

- (1) replacing postpositive conjunctions, such as $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, with a coordinating $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$
- (2) removing the Greek definite article from nouns with a possessive pronoun, and
- (3) removing adverbial participles or replacing them with some other construction.

On the other hand, the syntactic profiles also identify two elements of the syntax of the Theodotion text that shift away from the MT. If Theodotion is a recension of the OG text, which is our working hypothesis, then someone also must have:

- (1) moved dependent genitives to precede rather than follow their substantives, and
- (2) added attributive adjectives, but apparently in accord with Hebrew convention by positioning them most often to follow rather than precede the noun they qualify.

With this very specific information in hand, one could return to the texts of Daniel to compare occurrences of the dependent genitives and attributive adjectives, looking to see if these changes fall within certain portions of the text, for instance the portions for which there is no extant Hebrew, or exhibit some other pattern. The distribution of the changes made throughout the text would then suggest the direction of further investigation of how such differences in syntax between the two texts can best be explained.

McLay faults me on not taking this next step in the analysis of the Daniel texts to examine each occurrence that contributes to the shift in syntax: "There is only one other criterion in which Jobs indicates that she has actually checked the passages where the words occur..."⁸ McLay thinks I should have been working on further enlightening the relationship of the texts of Daniel, when I was primarily interested in testing and proposing the methodology of profiling the syntax of the texts. The tone of his remark unfairly suggests my negligence, without appreciating that my interests were simply different than his.

My point was not to argue for or against the hypothesis about the relationship of the texts of Daniel, but simply to show that syntactic profiles focus the questions and narrow the field for further research. They do not prove the working hypothesis, but rather present data that must be accounted for by any hypothesis claiming to explain the relationship between two or more Greek texts. The overall syntax of the texts must

⁸ McLay, "Syntactic Profiles and Revision," 17.

be considered, not just one specific element that happens to be congenial to one's theory. My methodology provides an overall profile of the syntax against which interesting deviations, irregularities, etc. can be evaluated for their value in text critical decisions or for enlightening the relationship between the texts.

One of my goals in syntactic profiling was to develop a methodology that presents large amounts of syntactic data in a format that allows the direct comparison of two or more texts and facilitates discussion about its interpretation and implications for the relationship between the texts. McLay's engagement of my article demonstrates that the syntactic profiles have indeed stimulated and facilitated discussion as intended. For this, I am grateful to him.

THE ACCORDANCE SEARCH PROGRAM FOR THE MT,
LXX, AND THE CATSS DATABASE

Emanuel Tov

The following description is meant as an introduction to the use of the *Accordance* computer program utilizing the MT, LXX, and CATSS database (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies; R. A. Kraft and E. Tov, directors). It takes into consideration constant use of the printed manual of *Accordance* and presupposes prior knowledge of the nature of the CATSS database. The parallel alignment of the MT and LXX in that database is described, i.a., in the following publications:

J. R. Abercrombie, W. Adler, R. A. Kraft, and E. Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS), Volume 1, Ruth* (SCS 20; Atlanta, GA 1986)

E. Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies—The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible, CATSS Volume 2* (JNSL, Supplementary Series 1; 1986)

E. Tov, "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint," in: N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid 1985) 221–242.

1. Background

The CATSS database, as well as the MT and LXX 'text panes,' can be accessed with the aid of the Macintosh *Accordance* program,¹ as of July 1998 without col. b of the Hebrew, and without the linkage with the CATSS files of morphological analysis of the Greek and Hebrew words. Nevertheless, the internal morphological analysis of *Accordance* allows the user access to many of the data which otherwise would have been obtained by a linkage between the main file of parallel data and the morphological analyses of the CATSS database. Complete listings of individual Greek and Hebrew words can now be provided with the aid of the internal *Accordance* predetermined lemmas (morphologically and lexically tagged) and can be displayed accordingly with or without the context of the verse.

¹ Thanks are expressed to Roy Brown, the programmer of *Accordance*, and to F. Polak for improving my description of this tool. For more information about *Accordance*, please contact Paul Miller: pmiller@gramcord.org.

In this way all the individual words of the Hebrew and Greek Bible can be concorded with their equivalents in the other language. Furthermore, the grammatical analysis and the search possibilities of *Accordance* allow bilingual grammatical searches.

At the word level alone, the new type of concording retrieves much more information than Hatch-Redpath (HR), as that tool does not include all the Hebrew and Greek words. Thus, the user now has access to all the equivalents of such Greek particles as *δέ* and *ἀλλά* and of all the Greek pronouns, and in these cases the Hebrew parallel data are available as well. The *Accordance* program further avoids the various pitfalls of HR's recording system, and it can execute searches of parts of Hebrew or Greek words, such as Hebrew prefixes and suffixes and Greek preverbs.² Beyond HR, *Accordance* enables searches of combinations of words and of grammatical categories (see below). In the MT and LXX 'text panes' of *Accordance* (but not in the MT/LXX file) searches can be executed on any text unit in the LXX or the Hebrew Bible (all of the LXX, one or more biblical books, or any combination of verses). Searches can also be conducted on the comments in CATSS in the Greek and Hebrew text relating to translation technique, the relation to the Qumran scrolls, and underlying Hebrew variants.

Accordance furthermore provides the user with brief standard equivalents (not always reliable) in English of all the words in the Hebrew and Greek texts. This information is provided in the text files by placing the pointer on the text word. The lexical box at the bottom of the screen provides the Hebrew or Greek text word together with the lemma word and its brief morphological analysis (thus by clicking on *ויאמר* in MT, the lexical box provides the different English equivalents of *אמר* as well as their morphological analysis). More extensive lexical information can be culled from entries in LSJ and the LXX lexicon of Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie³ for the Greek words and in BDB for the Hebrew words. This information is provided by first selecting the word in MT, and by subsequently selecting a lexical source (BDB, LSJ, or the LXX lexicon) in the Amplify Palette, usually on the right side. The program usually makes the correct connection between the text

² Words prefixed by *-ו* are searched for in the MT/LXX tool with the use of a 'wild card' according to the sequence of the Hebrew as: ? <within 2 words> *ו*.

³ J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I-II (Stuttgart 1992, 1996).

word in the running text of MT and the entries in BDB. Thus if *הוֹצֵא* in *הוֹצֵא* is selected, the relevant entry of *יָצָא* in BDB is displayed. This search can also be applied to the MT/LXX text, but as the Hebrew in that text is not connected with an underlying morphological analysis, often the wrong entry from BDB is displayed.

In *Accordance*, lexical searches can be executed on the Greek (LXX1) or Hebrew (HMT) text panes separately or on the MT/LXX tool (= CATSS). The principles guiding these searches in the text files are:

- a. Words can be selected from the text and placed in the search box.
- b. Words can be defined in the search box.
- c. Words can be called up from the list of predetermined words, in the Options box in the main menu, under Enter Lexical Forms (e.g. *הָרַג*) or Inflected Forms (e.g., *הָרַגְתִּי*).
- d. Complex searches can be performed in the Construct window.

The principles for these searches are more or less identical when searching in MT, LXX, or the combined MT/LXX tool, but in the latter text (treated by *Accordance* as a tool, rather than a text) the options are more limited as it is not linked with the list of predetermined lemmas.

The following files may be opened:

- a. the MT/LXX tool (the parallel alignment of CATSS without col. b) by selecting the appropriate item from the New Window Palette, usually on the upper right side. Alternatively this text can also be opened by clicking on the 'Open ...' item in the Edit menu.
- b. MT (HMT), reflecting codex L.
- c. the LXX (LXX1), reflecting the edition of Rahlfs.
- d. any combination of these text panes, or a combination with one of the English translations, SP, or the Vulgate. Within *Accordance* all these texts are linked, so that they can be scrolled down together, always showing the same verse in Hebrew/Greek, Hebrew/English, MT/SP, etc. as the first item on the screen. Also dissimilar texts can be linked with the 'Tie To' command. Any second text can be added to the first one by selecting the appropriate file in the menu File, New Text Pane (e.g., HMT + Sam. Pent. or HMT + MT/LXX) or by selecting them separately. Subsequently the 'Tie To' command in the Windows menu should be invoked in order to link these dissimilar files.

The texts are presented as complete verses, and not as individual words as in the CATSS database. The combination

of the MT (HMT) and LXX (LXX1) text panes is very significant in the perusal of *Accordance*, as the separate Hebrew and Greek files allow for more search possibilities than the MT/LXX tool.

Beyond the general equivalents of verses in the MT and LXX text panes, *Accordance* also provides equivalents at the level of individual words (lines in the CATSS database), by using the MT/LXX tool. The sophistication of *Accordance* allows the user many possibilities short of a full morphological analysis, so that the lack of the CATSS morphological analysis of Greek and Hebrew is felt less. Furthermore, by using the 'Tie To' command, the HMT and MT/LXX text panes can be combined, so that the morphological analysis of the HMT text pane can be used in order to show the complete MT/LXX contexts in the parallel window. The same possibility also exists in the reverse direction: single equivalents can be called up in the MT/LXX tool, while the full context can be viewed in the parallel window in the text pane of either the HMT or LXX.

2. Principles of search in the lemmatized Hebrew and Greek texts

i. Word searches

The principles of searching words or forms in the two types of text files differ, because the text panes of MT (HMT in *Accordance*) and LXX (LXX1) use predetermined lemmas (morphologically and lexically tagged), while the MT/LXX tool is not lemmatized, and hence its search options are limited.

Searches in the HMT and LXX1 text panes are executed by opening these texts and by filling in the word in the search box as described above (the Search mode itself is activated by first clicking on Mode). In this search Hebrew vocalization and Greek accents are disregarded, so that the results refer to the Hebrew consonants or Greek letters only. A simple search thus often produces more items than asked for. This limitation pertains to nouns, adjectives, and particles, and to a lesser degree to verbs. However, by combining data from different sets of information within *Accordance*, specific searches can nevertheless usually be performed, with the exception of the search for some homographs (Hebrew words belonging to the same grammatical category, such as *דָּבַר* and *דָּבָר*). Thus a search⁴ for the three consonants *דב* can be accompanied by the definition Noun in the Tags menu (in this case referring to both

⁴ The search alphabet is based on the transcription alphabet of the CATSS database. Thus in Hebrew א = A, ב = B, ג = G, etc., and in Greek, α = A, β = B, γ = G, etc.

דָּבָר and דָּבַר , but in most other cases referring only to a single noun)⁵ or Verb. In the case of Greek homoglyphs, εν can be defined as either Preposition (producing a list of occurrences of εν) or Adjective (producing a list of occurrences of εν). This amplified description is obtained by combining the regular search with the possibilities provided by the Tags menu. In this way tailor-made searches can be conducted for specific verbs or nouns. Thus present tense forms of λέγω can be searched for as λέγω@[VERB present]. The optimum for this search is obtained by opening both the HMT and LXX1 text panes (with the aid of the New Text Pane menu). This procedure enables the scrolling down together of the two text panes. The combination of these two text panes is needed, as the MT/LXX tool cannot be used directly with the grammatical tags.

An example of a complex search of data which cannot be accessed with the extant printed research tools is the search for any combination of two or more words such as על פי (על פי).⁶

The following issues should be considered as well:

1. Searches for the Greek base forms, such as κύριος for the noun or ἔρχομαι for the verb automatically list all inflected forms as well, thus including κυρίου, etc. for κύριος and such forms as ἐλεύση and ἤλθοσαν for ἔρχομαι.

2. Searches can be conducted on any combination of Hebrew and Greek characters, including 'wild cards,' as explained in the *Accordance* manual. Wild cards for single characters are indicated by '?'. Thus in the LXX text pane a search for στ? will produce listings for both ὅτι and ὅτε. Likewise, a wild card in the middle of word refers to any single letter. Thus ב?ר will list any Hebrew word starting with a *beth* and ending with a *resh*, with a single letter in the middle. The slash separating between morphemes in the database itself (e.g., ה /ו) is disregarded in this search.⁷

3. The wild card * refers to any number of letters. The search of *ερχομ* (with a star at both ends) provides all the inflected forms of that verb, including preverbs (ἐξέρχομαι, προσέρχομαι, etc.), and including inflected forms which have

⁵ In this search, *Accordance* provides the results for the following items under דָּבָר, which cannot be distinguished: word, plague, pasture, Debar, Debar.

⁶ This search yields the following results for the LXX: διὰ ὀνόματος (3 x), διὰ προστάγματος (8 x), διὰ φωνῆς (10 x), ἐκ (1 x), ἐπί (6 x), ἐπί στόματος (4 x), ἐπί στόμα (1 x), ἐπί τῷ στόματι (2 x), καθάπερ (1 x), κατά (3 x), κατά τὰ εἰρημένα (1 x), κατά στόμα (1 x), μετὰ (1 x).

⁷ This implies, for example, that for this type of search בְּרִית/בְּרִית consists of four letters only when the search refers to בְּרִית or בְּרִית.

no consonants in common with ερχομ, such as ἀπελεύση and διήλθωμεν.

4. In the Construct panel the same results can be obtained without the use of stars: When the Greek text is displayed, one should select in the File menu New Construct, Greek. LEX is placed in the bottom left window, together with ερχομαι from the list of lexical forms. The search is then started after the two windows are first linked with LINK in the Options menu under Enter Commands. In the same way all infinitives of this verb can be listed by listing 'infinitive' in the space under the Greek verb, or all non-infinitive forms by selecting the NON box for the infinitives. In a similar way all occurrences of קָרָה can be concorded in the Hebrew construct window, starting with the bottom right window. Or, all forms of the type וְיָבֹא are concorded in the New Construct window as a combination of the LEX form ב and VERB, inf. constr., combined by the command WITHIN 1-1 words.

5. Combined searches can be extended to more than one item (commands: AND, NOT, FOLLOWED BY, PRECEDED BY, OR). Thus, use of the AND command (Options: Commands) allows the user to find all verses in which λέγω and κύριος occur together, or all verses in which forms of λέγω are immediately FOLLOWED BY κύριος. The same pertains to more complex searches such as οὕτως <WITHIN 2 Words> λέγω <WITHIN 2 Words> κύριος.

6. *Secondary* searches on the results of initial searches can be executed with the aid of the CONTENTS command in the OPTIONS menu. In the last mentioned example in paragraph 4, many equivalents of the combination of ב and the inf. constr. are provided, which can be tabulated further. If from this list the equivalent ὅτι is singled out, the following procedure needs to be followed after the initial results have been concorded: another search menu needs to be opened (FILE, NEW, SEARCH WINDOW). In this search window, write 'ὅτι <AND> [CONTENTS SEARCH],' both to be selected from the OPTIONS, COMMANDS.

ii. Grammatical searches

Accordance includes an analysis of all the Greek and Hebrew words defining each of these words grammatically (e.g., for דָּבָר : noun, plural, masculine, construct). The program allows for a search of all the words belonging to a specific grammatical category. Thus the user can ask for all nouns, or more in detail, all plural nouns, or in still greater detail, all

plural masculine nouns, or all plural masculine construct nouns (such as דְּבָרִי), etc. These searches can be executed with or without the equivalents in the other language. After the Hebrew or Greek text is chosen, the search can be performed on any of the grammatical categories listed in the Tags menu. At a second stage the parallel Hebrew or Greek text can be linked to the results of this search, so that all the bilingual contexts are presented.

The Hebrew tagging allows, i.a., for a specialized search of forms with a directional *he*, paragogic *he* (both under 'suffix' in the Tags menu), infinitive absolute forms of the Hebrew verb, construct nouns, dual forms of nouns, relative and interrogative pronouns, suffixes, conjugations of the Hebrew verb, etc. Tagging of the Greek allows for similar searches, such as a specific tense or aspect of the Greek verb. Thus, the frequency of the aorist optative can be researched in this way.

Special searches can be executed by combining specific Greek or Hebrew words with grammatical categories. In the Construct window these searches can be combined with various commands such as NOT (under the word searched, not next to it), WITHIN, INTER, AGREE (all in the central box). In this way one can list, for example, προσεύχονται FOLLOWED BY 'Noun' in order to examine the *rectio* of that verb. The subjunctive forms of the verb not preceded by οὐ or μή can be listed in this way (Accordance User's Guide, 9.8).⁸ The construction ἐν + infinitive (actually = ἐν + τῶ + inf.) can also be concorded in this way, with or without elements intervening between ἐν and τῶ (Accordance User's Guide, 9.9). The latter search is executed by writing ἐν in the left box, followed by 'VERB, infinitive' in the adjacent box and below WITHIN (1-2 words) in the central box. In another instance, examples of θεός without an article within five words before the noun are listed (Accordance User's Guide, 9.14).⁹ By the same token all entries of אמר or דבר which are NOT verbs can be concorded.

3. Principles of search for the unlemmatized MT/LXX tool

Words in the unlemmatized MT/LXX tool (= CATSS) cannot be accessed with the same sophistication as the separate LXX

⁸ Central box WITHIN, left bottom box οὐ, μή, crossed out by NOT, and adjacent box: VERB, subjunctive.

⁹ Central box WITHIN, left bottom box 'art.' crossed out by NOT, and adjacent box θεός.

and MT text panes. However, some simple searches can be executed by searching for strings of letters in either language.

These searches are executed in the MT/LXX tool by locating equivalents either in the context of a complete verse or as individual lines of the CATSS database. For this purpose, in the MT/LXX tool, the box Entry is opened and either 'Hebrew' or 'Greek' is selected in this box. Subsequently a Hebrew or Greek word or combination of letters in the text is selected and copied in the search box. Alternatively any combination of letters can be written in the search box. Subsequently, the results are displayed in lists of individual equivalents in the MT/LXX tool or of lists of such equivalents within their context of the complete verse. For the first line on each screen the text reference is provided in the reference box. The results of the search for על includes such forms as עלִי, עלֶיךָ, but not בעל or ועל, so that the results form a reasonable basis for research, although inferior to the results obtained in the separate LXX or MT text panes. On the other hand, the results include the parallel elements in the other language.

In the Hebrew text in the MT/LXX tool, the different morphemes are separated by a slash. These slashes are treated as word separators, so that a search for אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל should be phrased as

אֱלֹהֵי <WITHIN 2 WORDS> יִשְׂרָאֵל

In the MT/LXX tool, the results are listed for the database as a whole, and cannot be subdivided into individual books of the Bible.

i. Special searches and notations

Special searches include an analysis of all paragraph divisions in the MT text (פ or ס) which can be searched in the HMT text pane.

In the CATSS database, special notations refer to select categories in translation technique and other data. Searches of these notations can be made on all the special notations in the Hebrew and Greek columns of the CATSS database, relating to the translation character of the LXX and its relation to the Qumran scrolls, as well as textual variations. These searches can be executed in the MT/LXX tool, in the 'Entry' box under Comments. A search for '?' lists all these comments according to the sequence of the text. Specific details which can be searched for include:

c = {c}	conjectures in the Greek text
d = {d}	doublets

d = {...d}	distributive use in the translation
p = {p}, {...p}	difference between MT and LXX in particle/preposition
r = {...r}	element repeated in the translation
s = {s}	superlative
t = {t}	transcriptions
nd, ad ,nad, v, etc.	subdivisions in the renderings of inf. constr. denoted as {!}nd, etc.
sp = <sp>	agreement between the LXX and SP against MT
q = <q4b>	agreements with Qumran scrolls, in this case relating to 4QNum ^b
.yw	interchange between <i>yod</i> (MT) and <i>waw</i> (LXX), etc.
.m	metathesis
.y-	the LXX omits a <i>yod</i>
.j	the LXX joins two words

At this stage the following important components of the CATSS base elements cannot be searched for: . { --- --+ !. The next release of *Accordance* will address these issues.

ii. Special display

The Amplify Palette in the top right corner of the text panes allows for special presentations of the search results:

1. The 'Plot' option provides a graphic chart displaying the results of the search data according to book and chapter. For example, this presentation enables the user to see graphically in which chapters in Genesis the *hiph'il* forms of the verb are found, and in which chapters and books in the Torah ערה occurs. The 'Table' option provides the actual numbers of occurrences in each of the biblical books.

2. The 'Analysis' box, to be used in conjunction with the 'Analysis display' in the Options menu, lists the individual searches alphabetically, a feature which is of help in grammatical analyses.

3. Under 'Parsing' the morphological information for each of the words is provided.

4. The box 'Old Testament' provides parallels from the books of the Hebrew Bible, if extant.

5. The box 'Speech' activates the speech representation of any element on the screen, in English, Greek, or Hebrew, including the recitation of the complete Bible text, or the parallel alignment of CATSS.

THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF יְהוֹרָה IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

Paul D. McLean

INTRODUCTION

This essay examines the Book of Jeremiah and focuses on the ways in which the Hebrew word יְהוֹרָה has been translated into Greek.¹ For comparative purposes it will be appropriate to use the Hebrew text of Jeremiah represented primarily by the Masoretic text (MT).² The main witness to this text is the printed edition of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). The corresponding Greek translation is found in the Septuagint (LXX), whose best modern witness to the Book of Jeremiah is the critical edition of 1957 prepared by Joseph Ziegler in the Göttingen *Septuaginta*.³ The latter is a monumental work of text critical analysis.

As one works with Ziegler's splendid edition, one cannot but grow in admiration for his accomplishment and the judicious

¹ I am grateful to Prof. Al Pietersma (University of Toronto), who read a first draft of this paper and offered helpful comments at a number of points.

² The extant fragments of Hebrew Jeremiah from Caves 2 & 4 at Qumran have no substantial bearing on the problem we are posing. Where the Qumran fragments do read יְהוֹרָה, they always agree with the reading in MT. The only variant is in Jer 43:5, where 4QJer^d is minus the phrase יְהוֹרָה לְטֵרַבַּיִן (MT), κατακαλεσθησεν ηη (LXX); cf. Emanuel Tov, "Jeremiah," in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997): 204. In this verse although LXX agrees with 4QJer^d in not reading יְהוֹרָה, it is otherwise closer to the text of MT than the text of 4QJer^d. The minus in LXX is duly noted below.

³ Ziegler, Joseph, ed., *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*, vol. XV in *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

decisions he made, having surveyed all the Greek manuscript (Mss) evidence, to determine the lemma-text for his reconstruction of the Old Greek (OG). At the same time, since Ziegler's lemma-text is an eclectic one, it cannot be read as "carved in stone." It too must be read critically, as the scholarly community seeks as best it can to establish the OG translation of Jeremiah. In the course of the text-critical discussion below, we try to understand why Ziegler made the choices he did for the lemma-text of the OG. We also present reasons why corrections need to be made to Ziegler's lemma-text in 13:9, 23:6 and 51:5 MT (=28:5 LXX).⁴

Our first task will be to enumerate briefly instances in the Greek lemma-text and Mss which reflect minuses or pluses in relation to the absence or occurrence of יהוּדָה in the corresponding Hebrew text. This analysis will begin to demonstrate the kind of textual variants preserved in later Greek Mss.

Secondly, and more central to this essay, we will analyze the different ways in which יהוּדָה has been translated into Greek in the OG. In the vast majority of verses it is rendered by the Greek lexeme *Ιουδα* (or inflected *Ιουδας*?). Methodical study of this noun in its different case functions will lead us to conclude that the inflected forms are, in fact, the result of later inner-Greek textual transmission. That is to say, the translator of the OG rendered יהוּדָה for the most part by the transliteration *Ιουδα* (no case inflection). The methodology used herein presents itself as a suggestive way of deciding the question elsewhere in the LXX, Did the translators of the OG render a given Hebrew lexeme with a transliteration or with an inflected Greek form?

⁴ Verse references in this paper are according to the Hebrew order. A second reference in parentheses refers to the location in the LXX. Exceptions to this practice occur when listing variants according to Ziegler's edition, which follows the LXX order.

The essay uncovers a number of verses in which יהוּדָה is rendered by *Ιουδαία*, and at least one occasion when it is translated with *Ιουδαίος*. There even appears to be a feminine form of *Ιουδα*. Other variations will be mentioned in the course of the study. These features of the OG add, in a small way, to our understanding of the translator's technique in the Book of Jeremiah. There are also clues which may shed some light on how the translator was influenced by his *Sitz im Leben* as a Jew living in the Egyptian Diaspora.

VARIANT MINUSES AND PLUSES IN THE GREEK TEXT

Minuses Collated in the Greek Critical Apparatus:

According to BHS, the lexeme יהוּדָה occurs a total of 183 times in the Book of Jeremiah. Of these instances three are prefixed with the preposition *א* (4:5; 5:20; 22:30), one is prefixed with the preposition *ב* (40:11), and four are prefixed with the conjunction *ו* (30:3; 40:1; 51:5; 52:3).

Of these 183 occurrences we discover that a corresponding *Ιουδα* is absent 34 times in the OG.⁵ In these 34 verses additions are found in Q-Text Mss⁶ and/or Hexaplaric Mss and/or Lucianic Mss. These seem to reflect subsequent attempts to revise the OG in the direction of the Hebrew. It goes beyond the limits of our study to analyze the *extent of variation among these Greek revisions*. cursory examination of the evidence does suggest, however, that Mss in the Q-Text make fewer additions than Lucianic Mss, which in turn make fewer additions than Hexaplaric Mss.⁷

⁵ The references are as follows: 17:1; 22:11; 24:1; 26:1,19; 27:1,18,20,20,21; 28:4; 29:2; 32:1,2,3,4; 33:14,16; 34:6; 36:9,28,29,32; 39:4,6,10; 42:15; 43:5; 44:11,12,24; 49:34; 52:3,27.

⁶ For the grouping of manuscripts, see the Introduction to Ziegler's edition of Jeremiah.

⁷ The question Ziegler raises on p. 63ff. of his Introduction to Jeremiah, as to whether the Q-Text is older than the Hexaplaric Text and whether the former rests on a different Hebrew Vorlage, still awaits detailed study and final resolution.

It is important to note the *kind of variations* which appear within these later Greek additions. Together with the vast majority of *uncontested* verses in LXX, the later additions almost always read *Ιουδα* (in the genitive case). One should note, however, the following exceptions found in Ziegler's critical apparatus (i.e. these are non-lemma readings):

1) 33:16 MT (40:16 LXX) "In those days Iudaia (η Ιουδαία) will be saved and Ierusalem will live in safety." Under the asterisk in *O L*. The use of "Iudaia" in these two recensions reflects the common Greek name for the land of Judah in post-exilic and early Christian times.

2) 42:15 (49:15) "Therefore hear the word of the Lord, O remnant of Iudaia (οι καταλοιποι της Ιουδαίας), thus said the Lord..." Under the asterisk in *O*, in addition to *O-233 L-449 Arm = MT*. Again use is made of the common Greek name for the land of Judah.

3) 44:11 (51:11) "Therefore thus said the Lord, 'Behold I am setting my face against you unto disaster, to destroy all Iuda(s) (τον παντα Ιουδαν (Ιουδα 311))..." Under the asterisk in *O*, in addition to *O-233 L' Arm Tht. = MT*. The final -ν in the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions reflects the view of the revisers that *Ιουδαν* is the accusative form of the inflected noun *Ιουδας* (i.e. a First Declension masculine singular noun) and thus not the transliteration *Ιουδα*. (We will return to this question in greater detail below.)

4) 44:24 (51:24) "Hear the word of the Lord, all Iuda(s)/Iudaia (πας Ιουδα (Ιουδας 544 ; πασα Ιουδαία *O*) who are in the land of Egypt..." Under the asterisk in *O*, in addition to *O L' 544 Arm = MT*.

5) 52:27 "and Iudas (Ιουδας) went into exile out of its land." In *O-Q^{me}-86^{me} L' Arm = MT*. The Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions again reflect the view of the revisers that *Ιουδας* is an inflected noun, not a transliteration.

In sum, the data from later Greek additions in the Q-Text, Lucianic Mss and Hexaplaric Mss show a preference for the addition of *Ιουδα* to correspond with Hebrew *יהודה*. This fits to a large extent with what we shall see to be the typical correspondence between the OG and the Hebrew. However, there are variations from this reading. In the five exceptions above, we see: (a) *Ιουδαία*, the common Greek name for the land of Judah, and/or (b) inflected forms of *Ιουδας*. From (b) we are alerted to the fact that later Greek Mss understood *Ιουδα* (genitive case) as an inflected form of the noun *Ιουδας*, not the transliteration *Ιουδα*.

Pluses Found in Lemma-Readings in the Greek Text:

There are 5 verses in Jeremiah with the plus *Ιουδα* in the Greek text, i.e. there is no corresponding *יהודה* in MT. As can be seen from the Mss evidence listed below, each variant reading demonstrates Hebraizing corrections in Hexaplaric and other Mss. Again it would appear that the revisers understood the Greek word *Ιουδα* as an inflected form of *Ιουδας*, rather than as a transliteration. We shall argue below that this is a feature of later inner-Greek transmission, not a true representation of the OG. The verses are:

13:13 *Ιουδα(ν)* (accusative case) under the obelus in *O-Q-86; >90 = MT*

19:3 *Ιουδα* (genitive case) under the obelus in *O-Q-86; > A-410 311-62 91 233 613 La^w Sa Aeth Arab = MT*

21:3 Omit *βασιλέα Ιουδα* *Q-V-26-46-86'-130-534-538-544 O-233 L'-36 La^w Arm Cyr. = MT*

36:2 (43:2) *βασιλέως Ιουδα* under the obelus in *O-86*

40:5 (47:5) Omit *ἐν γῆ Ιουδα* *S-130 Q^{bx}-26-544 O L'-538 Bo Aeth Arm Tht. = MT*

Special Instances:

For the sake of completeness, we mention briefly three special instances which do not fit the above categories of minuses or pluses.

1) 6:19 *Ιουδα* appears neither in the Hebrew nor the OG of this verse. However, it does surface in Greek Mss relegated to the critical apparatus.

Variants: *Ἰδού* = MT] *Ιουδα* S*; *Ιουδα* S^{ca} A 239 Arab. Manuscript Sinaiticus shows evidence of textual corruption. A corrector of S appears to have introduced the reading *Ιουδα*, a reading which is not semantically impossible in the context, though there is little textual support for accepting it as the OG.

2) 34:9 (41:9) Instead of *יהודי* MT reads the gentilic *בִּיהוּדִי* "a Judean", which LXX renders as *ἄνδρα ἐξ Ἰουδα* "a man out of Iuda". The reading is contested as follows:
ἐξ Ἰουδα B-S-106¹-130-538 Q^{lac} Syh^{lac}-86^{ms}-233¹ verss.] *ἐξ ἰουδαίων* 62; *ἐξ ἰσραηλ* (*ἱεροσολημ* V 311-62 86^{ms}) rel.
 There is strong support for Ziegler's lemma-text as the OG.

3) 43:9 (50:9) Instead of *יהודי* MT reads the plural gentilic in *לְעֵינֵי אַנְשֵׁי יְהוּדִים* "...in the sight of the Judeans (lit. the men, the Yehudim)". LXX renders the phrase as *κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνδρῶν Ἰουδα* "...in the sight of the men of Iuda."

Examples (2) and (3) show that *Ιουδα* can stand opposite a Hebrew lexeme related to, but other than *יהודי*, at least in these two instances.

VERSES NOT INVOLVING MINUSES OR PLUSES

We now turn our attention to those verses which do not involve minuses or pluses in the Greek text (or the few special instances mentioned above). This comprises the heart of our study. The total number of verses to be considered is 149. These can be categorized into four main groups, wherein

Hebrew *יהודי* is rendered as: (a) the transliteration *Ιουδα* or one of the inflected forms of the First Declension noun *Ιουδας*; (b) a possible feminine form of *Ιουδα*; (c) a semantic equivalent *Ἰουδαία*; and (d) another semantic equivalent *Ἰουδαίος*. The majority of occurrences are in group (a) to which we now turn.

A) DID THE OLD GREEK USE THE TRANSLITERATION *Ιουδα* OR INFLECTED FORMS OF *Ιουδας* ?

The Greek lexeme *Ιουδα(ς)* occurs a total of 139 times in Jeremiah. Of these readings 68 are not contested (i.e. all extant Mss contain the identical reading), 36 are mildly contested (i.e. there are additional phrases, transpositions, or omissions in some Mss), and 35 are strongly contested (i.e. there are important textual variants like spelling changes or different words).

After a survey of the evidence, we are led to pose the question, Did the translator of the OG represent *יהודי* by the uninflected transliteration *Ιουδα*, or did he render it with inflected forms of the First Declension masculine singular noun *Ιουδας*, or did he use both? The way to answer this question is to group the evidence according to the case functions of the Greek noun, then analyze the results. We are reminded that the declension of *Ιουδας* is:⁸

- Ιουδας* -- Nominative
- Ιουδα* -- Genitive (the so called Doric Genitive)
- Ιουδα* -- Dative
- Ιουδαν* -- Accusative
- Ιουδα* -- Vocative

⁸ R. F. Funk's translation of F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, (Chicago: University Press, 1961) Sections 53&55; and J. W. Wenham, *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1965) p. 44. Accent marks are of no help in deciding the question, since they entered Greek Mss at a much later stage in textual transmission.

The Genitive Case -- Transliteration Ιουδα or the Inflected Form Ιουδα?

The vast majority of the readings in Jeremiah are instances where Ιουδα occurs in the genitive case. Some examples are common phrases such as: βασιλέως Ιουδα (1:2,3; 15:4...), τὰς πόλεις Ιουδα (1:15; 4:16...) and ἄνδρας Ιουδα (11:2; 18:11...). Unfortunately, these verses offer no help in answering the question we have posed, because the inflected form of the Doric genitive is identical to the Hebraizing transliteration Ιουδα.

The Dative Case -- Transliteration Ιουδα or the Inflected Form Ιουδα?

The dative form Ιουδα occurs in the following verses: 4:5; 5:20; 22:30; 26:2 (in the critical apparatus) and 40:11.⁹ The use of iota-subscript and the accent system was a later development in the Greek Mss tradition.¹⁰ Hence, there is no leverage for making decisions about whether Ιουδα, when found in situations where it must be read as a dative, is a transliteration or an inflected form.¹¹

The Vocative Case -- Transliteration Ιουδα or the Inflected Form Ιουδα?

⁹ The only variant of interest is in 40:11. There Hexaplaric and Lucianic Mss reflect a revision of OG τῷ Ιουδα to the popular identification of Judah in the wider Greek speaking world as Judea, thus ἐν τῇ Ιουδαία.

¹⁰ Funk-Blass-Debrunner, p. 8, notes that for Mss B the accent system first appears in a systematic way in a corrector from the X or XI century.

¹¹ Neither Rahlfs nor Ziegler mark the lexeme with iota-subscript or accentuation. However, the English-Greek edition of LXX by Brenton and the concordance by Hatch & Redpath signal these later additions (although not consistently in the former). With respect to Hebrew names, the method used by Rahlfs and Ziegler is to be preferred, since it reflects an earlier stage in the development of the language.

Ιουδα functions as a vocative in the following: 2:28; 11:13; 44:24 (under the asterisk) and 44:26.¹² As with the genitive and dative cases, so with the vocative. The spellings are identical. It is clear then, that we must be especially attentive to the lexeme when it functions in the nominative and accusative cases, since these are the only two cases clearly de-marked from the transliteration Ιουδα (by final -ς and final -ν, respectively). The majority of instances are in the accusative case, so we begin there.

The Accusative Case -- Transliteration Ιουδα or the Inflected Form Ιουδαν ?

The first four references below deal with Ιουδαν as it appears among the *variants* in Ziegler's critical apparatus. We hurry to dispense with these verses, before turning our attention to the more significant *lemma-readings* in (5) - (13).¹³

1) Jer. 9:25 MT= יהודה Zi= Ἰουδαίαν Ra= Ἰουδαίαν
Variants: Ἰουδαίαν O Tht.^P] τὴν ἰουδαίαν 613; ἰουδαν V-86^{MT}-
544-710 L-198-407-233-311 Aeth Arab Arm Iust.Chr. Tht.^P ;
τὴν (>B) ἰδομαίαν rel.: cf. 43:31 Ps. 62:1

The lexeme follows the preposition ἐπὶ and is clearly in the accusative case.¹⁴ What is important to observe here is that Mss from the Q-Text, the Lucianic recension, some versions and some Church Fathers all read Ιουδαν. Whatever the OG may have been, these later witnesses understand the lexeme as an *inflected form*, not as a transliteration. This is consistent

¹² The last two verses reflect some Hexaplaric variation from "all Iuda who are/dwell in the land of Egypt" to "all Iudaia..."

¹³ For an explanation of the notation used in citing the Mss evidence, see Ziegler's Introduction to Jeremiah. It will be informative to compare Ziegler's lemma-text with that of Rahlfs; thus Zi = Ziegler, and Ra = Rahlfs.

¹⁴ For a full text critical treatment of this verse, see below under Section C, The Translation of יהודה as Ιουδαία -- A Semantic Equivalent for Ιουδα?

with the same phenomenon we observed above (under Minuses and Pluses).

2) Jer. 22:30 MT= ביהודָה Zi= ἐν τῷ Ιουδα Ra= ἐν τῷ Ιουδα

Variants: ἐν τῷ Ιουδα] του Ιουδα S Aeth; εν τω οικω A Sa Arab Arm; επι Ιουδαν Tht.

The OG is in the dative case. Theodoret's accusative reading again testifies to a later Greek witness which understands the lexeme as an *inflected form*.

3) Jer. 37:1 (44:1) MT= יהודה Zi= τοῦ Ιουδα Ra= τοῦ Ιουδα

Variants: τοῦ Ιουδα] τον Ιουδαν 26 239 (Ιουδα); MT = in the land of Judah

There is strong attestation for the genitive as the OG, and weak attestation for the accusative in the tenth and eleventh century Mss 26 and 239. Mss 26 inflects the lexeme, while Mss 239 is likely a spelling mistake which happens to match the transliterated form.

4) Jer. 44:11 (51:11) MT= יהודה Zi= --- Ra= ---

Variants: τον παντα Ιουδαν (Ιουδα 311) included under the asterisk in O, in addition to O-233 L' Arm Tht. = MT

Neither Ziegler nor Rahlfs regards the variant as the OG. As we are growing accustomed to see, the majority of Hexaplaric and Lucianic Mss render the Hebrew equivalent as an *inflected form*.

Who is Correct, Ziegler or Rahlfs?

It is important to analyze the following nine verses (#5 - #13) together, as Ziegler's edition would seem to suggest. At least this will help us to understand the reasoning behind his choices for the reconstructed lemma-text of the OG. By way of initial

observation, we note that in every verse Ziegler reads accusative Ιουδα (i.e. he treats Ιουδα as a transliteration), while Rahlfs reads the *inflected* accusative form Ιουδαν (except for the puzzling verse 30:4). Whose readings accurately reflect the OG? The analysis proceeds by making annotations after each verse, wherein we try to evaluate the merits of the lemma-text on a verse-by-verse basis. After #13 we sum up the results and come to an overall conclusion.

5) Jer. 12:14 MT= יהודה Zi= τὸν Ιουδα Ra= τὸν Ιουδαν

Context: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποσπῶ αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν Ιουδα ἐκβαλῶ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν

Variants: Ιουδα S*-130 198] Ιουδαν B S^c A-410 Q-V-26-46-86'-239-534-544-613 C' : cf. 13:13 14:19 20:4 37:4 (=30:4 MT) 38:27 (=31:27) 39:35 (=32:35) 42:17 (=35:17) 43:2 (=36:2); οικον Ιουδα O-233 L'-449-538 106 Sa Aeth Arab Arm Tht. = MT

Ziegler bases his choice for the lemma-text on the *minority reading* in S*-130 198. S* is clearly at odds with B and S^c, which Ziegler groups together in the B-Text. Mss 130 and 198 are *codices mixti* and thus, we would argue, offer mixed attestation to the reading Ιουδα.¹⁵ The majority of Mss evidence, as reflected in other members from the B-Text, as well as the A-Text, Q-Text, and Catena Group, supports the inflected accusative form Ιουδαν. Mss belonging to the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions read the genitive form in οικον Ιουδα. What gives here?

The argument on behalf of Ziegler's choice is that the original reading in S contains the OG *transliteration* Ιουδα; whereas the majority of Greek Mss have adopted the *inflected form* (so Rahlfs). In support of Ziegler, one can argue that the inflected readings arose due to later Greek usage, which preferred the use of the inflected noun over a Hebraic transliteration.

¹⁵ Mss 130 and 198 provide mixed support in #6 - #13; moreover, they do not always agree with S*.

Against Ziegler's choice for the lemma is the fact that S (i.e. both original and corrector) reflects the inflected accusative form *Ιουδαν* elsewhere (see #7, 10, 11, and 12 below). This complicates the picture, since S is not consistent within itself on this point. If S* reflects the OG transliteration in #5, why the presence of inflected forms in the other verses? One can reply that the Mss which lay before the copyists of S were simply not perfect in regard to spelling. The OG pops out now and again.

Or in defence of Rahlfs' reading against Ziegler's, is it not simpler to suggest that S* reflects a mechanical error, where final -ν was omitted by accident during the process of copying? Taken by itself, the arguments for the lemma-text in this verse could go either way. However, in light of the following verses, Ziegler's solution seems more plausible.

6) Jer 13:13 MT= --- Zi= τὸν Ιουδα Ra= τὸν Ιουδαν
Context: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ πληρῶ ... καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς προφήτας καὶ τὸν Ιουδα καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ἱερουσαλημ μεθύσματα ...
Variants: Ιουδα S* 407] Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14.
καὶ τὸν Ιουδα(ν) under the obelus in O-Q-86; >90 = MT

Like #5 Ziegler has chosen the *minority reading*, where S* stands almost alone (407 is grouped with *l*) and is at odds with other Mss in the B-Text, as well as every other text group. (Ziegler's method of notation makes it unclear which, if any, of O-Q-86 may also support the minority reading.) In defence of Ziegler against Rahlfs one can ask, if *Ιουδαν* were really the OG, why would S* drop the final -ν? Another mechanical error due to the following *καὶ*? Possible, although from the combined evidence of #5 - #13 improbable. Arguing on the basis of inner-Greek transmission, it seems simpler to account for a move by later copyists from an original Hebraic transliteration *Ιουδα* to the more common inflected form *Ιουδαν*, rather than vice versa.

7) Jer. 14:19 MT= η̄ηηη Zi= τὸν Ιουδα Ra= τὸν Ιουδαν .
Context: μὴ ἀποδοκιμάζων ἀπεδοκίμασας τὸν Ιουδα
καὶ ἀπὸ Σιων ἀπέστη ἡ ψυχὴ σου
Variants: Ιουδα V-130] Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14.
Aquila Syh τὸν Ιουδα , suggests that Aquila adopted the Hebraic transliteration, not the inflected Greek form.

Ziegler again chooses the *minority reading*, this time with the support of V (from the Q-Text group) and 130. One observes that S and V have here switched sides of the equation. If Ziegler is correct, *minority* support for the transliteration *Ιουδα* as the OG is also *mixed* support. Does this show of mixed support weaken or strengthen Ziegler's position?

If, on the other hand, we accept the weight of Mss evidence in #5 - #7, Rahlfs is correct in choosing the inflected form *Ιουδαν* as the OG. Such would be to argue that a *minority* of Mss reflect copying mistakes in a *mixed* manner, wherein the final -ν is occasionally dropped. Although this line of argument is possible, the presence of the transliteration in *early* Mss keeps us open to Ziegler's line of reasoning.

8) Jer. 20:4 MT= η̄ηηη η̄η η̄ηη Zi= πάντα Ιουδα Ra= πάντα Ιουδαν
Context: καὶ σὲ καὶ πάντα Ιουδα δώσω εἰς χεῖρας βασιλέως Βαβυλώνος
Variants: Ιουδα B-S*-239-410 62 46 Or.III 166 (τὸν Ιουδα)] Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14

In this verse minority textual support has grown somewhat in strength. The B-Text is represented by B-S* and in part by the *codices mixti* 239-410, while 62 is associated with the Lucianic recension *l*, and 46 is linked with the Q-Text. Origen's commentary also reflects the transliterated form. The combined evidence here adds greater weight to the argument which Ziegler appears to delineate.¹⁶ We also note that Rahlfs

¹⁶ I am unaware of any published argument by Ziegler to this effect, other than the clues he leaves in his critical apparatus.

in his edition has chosen to stay with the reading in A, *contra* the relatively stronger support of B-S*. Thus far, Rahlfs is consistent in reading the lexeme as an inflected form (but see #9 below).

9) 30:4 (37:4 LXX) MT= πτητη βρη Zi= Ιουδα Ra= Ιουδα
Context: Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οὓς ἐλάλησε κύριος ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα Οὕτως εἶπε κύριος...
Variants: Ιουδα] Ιουδαν V-26-86 O-233 L'-538^(ms) c-239-613: cf. 12:14; pr. ἐπι O-86^{ms} 407 130 613 Syp Arab.: cf. MT; pr. προς 62-198 = MT

This verse (out of #5 - #13) provides the greatest number of Mss and Text-groups in support of Ziegler's choice of Ιουδα as the OG. Thus the transliterated form is strongly attested by Mss in the B-Text, A-text, and Q-Text groups (apart from V-26-86). We note that 233, 538, 239, and 613 are all *codices mixti*. Most Hexaplaric, Lucianic and Catena Mss reflect the inflected Greek form. The argument for later inflection on the basis of inner-Greek transmission (see #6 above) still holds.

One should carefully observe that this is the only time when Rahlfs chooses the transliterated form for his lemma-text. Why, apart from a rigid adherence to Mss B, S and A? Is it possible that in this verse Ιουδα following the preposition ἐπι is not in the accusative case, but in the genitive or dative? This could explain the omission of the final -ν in Rahlfs' text. However, this possibility is contradicted by 35:17 and 36:2 (below), where we see Rahlfs choose ἐπὶ Ιουδαν for his lemma-text. Furthermore, in Jeremiah the object of the preposition in the grammatical construction λαλέω + ἐπι + (obj. of prep.) always occurs in the accusative case.¹⁷

Rahlfs' text is truly puzzling! Here he opts for Ιουδα, apparently on the strength of Mss support from all of B, S and

¹⁷ See Jer (LXX order) 10:1; 11:17; 16:10; 18:7,9; 19:15; 27:1; 28:12,62; 33:13,19; 37:4; 39:42; 42:17; 43:7; 45:1; 47:2; 49:19. The use of the dative in 20:9 and 23:25 is not comparable to the verse in question.

A. However, in #13 below where B*, S* and A all reflect Ιουδα, Rahlfs chooses his more common reading Ιουδαν. To our knowledge 30:4 (37:4 LXX) is the only time where Rahlfs' reading reflects the transliterated form, rather than the inflected form. Again why?

A second appeal to context does not seem to answer the question in a definitive manner. In 30:4 (37:4) Rahlfs reads ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα, while in 36:2 (43:2) he reads ἐπὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐπὶ Ἰουδαν. Could it be that, in the former verse, the absence of the preposition immediately before Ιουδα caused the translator of the OG to render Ιουδα in its transliterated form? Not likely, since Ιουδα is still governed by the preposition. In #12 and #13 below, where the lexeme in question follows immediately after the preposition, Rahlfs' text suggests that the OG chose the inflected form with final -ν. We remain puzzled by Rahlfs' choice for the text in 30:4 (37:4). This inconsistency weakens his choice for the lemma, and adds support to Ziegler's choice.

10) 31:27 (38:27) MT= πτητη Zi= τὸν Ιουδα Ra= τὸν Ιουδαν
Context: καὶ σπερῶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὸν Ιουδα σπέρμα ἀνθρώπου ...
Variants: Ιουδα B* O L' 764 26 Iust. Tht. Aug.] Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14; pr. (sub-asterisk Q^{ms}) οικον O- Q^{ms} -86^{ms} L' Arm Tht. = MT

Ziegler's notation (on the left side of the bracket]), though graphically correct, is semantically misleading here. With the addition of οικον in O- Q^{ms} -86^{ms} L' Arm Tht., the case function of Ιουδα shifts from accusative to genitive, i.e. "the house of Iuda." Ιουδα is then the correct form, whether the word is a transliteration or an inflection. What is problematic is the reading Ιουδα or Ιουδαν preceded immediately by the accusative inflection of the article. One could adjust Ziegler's notation to include the semantic distinction by reading:

τὸν Ιουδα B* 764 26 Iust. Aug.] τὸν οικον Ιουδα O- Q^{ms} -86^{ms} L' Arm Tht. = MT; τὸν Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14.

As above, Ziegler goes with the *minority* reading as reflected in B*, 764 (part of the Catena group), and 26 (part of the Q-Text). Again the *minority* reading shows *mixed* support.

11) 32:35 (39:35) MT= $\pi\eta\eta\eta \eta\kappa$ Zi= τὸν Ιουδα Ra= τὸν Ιουδαν
Context: τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ βδέλυγμα τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ ἐφαμαρτεῖν τὸν Ιουδα

Variants: Ιουδα B* A 130] Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14.

πρὸς τὸ ἐφαμαρτεῖν τὸν Ιουδα] α' ὡστε εξαμαρτεῖν τον <Ιουδα> σ' ὡστε εξαμαρτεῖν με <τον Ιουδα> 86

The *minority* reading is reflected with mixed support in B* (at odds with S and others in B-Text), A (the sole uncial in A-Text) and 130 a *codex mixtus*. One observes that this verse and the ones in # 9 and #13 are the only three in which A lends support to the reading Ιουδα in the accusative case. There is also evidence that Aquila and Symmachus prefer the transliterated form over the inflected form. This is in keeping with their Hebraizing tendencies. Or should one say that on this point they accurately reflect the OG!

12) 35:17 (42:17) MT= $\pi\eta\eta\eta \eta\kappa$ Zi= ἐπὶ Ιουδα Ra= ἐπὶ Ιουδαν
Context: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φέρω ἐπὶ Ιουδα καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ἱερουσαλημ πάντα τὰ κακά ...

Variants: Ιουδα Zi.] τον Ιουδαν L³¹¹; Ιουδαν rel.; cf. 12:14

In this verse there is no Mss support for Ziegler's preferred reading Ιουδα. Therefore he is compelled to emend the text in light of what he has observed thus far. This is to suggest that all Mss adopted the inflected Greek form at some point during inner-Greek transmission history, and thus covered up the original reading of the OG, which has surfaced in at least one of the main text groups up to this point.

Against Ziegler's emendation, one could argue that he is guilty of "textual improvement", given the desire on logical grounds for a unified textual witness to the transliteration Ιουδα. How can we be sure that the original translator of the OG was

consistent in his rendering of the accusative form on every occasion?

The argument against Ziegler's emendation loses considerable force when we note, in addition to the sustained argument above, that only three verses separate this one and the one in #13 below. Why should the translator of the OG render ἐπὶ Ιουδαν here (as reflected in the uncials B, S and A), and then four verses later translate ἐπὶ Ιουδα (again as reflected in B, S and A)? Surely it is more plausible to argue that the final -ν in #12 entered the text during inner-Greek transmission, rather than at the hands of the original translator of the OG.

13) 36:2 (43:2) MT= $\pi\eta\eta\eta \eta\gamma$ Zi= ἐπὶ Ιουδα Ra= ἐπὶ Ιουδαν
Context: ... οὓς ἐχρημάτισα πρὸς σέ ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ ἐπὶ Ιουδα καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ...

Variants: Ιουδα B*-S*-130 A] Ιουδαν rel.: cf. 12:14

The reading Ιουδα is supported by B*-S*-130 and A. The fact that the correctors of B and S (B^c and S^c), as well as Mss from the Q-Text, the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions, and the Catena group all read the inflected Greek form Ιουδαν, strengthens Ziegler's argument. It is easier to account for the inflected form as the result of later inner-Greek transmission, than to suggest that later Mss would depart from the preferred Greek form and return to the older form of a Hebraic transliteration.

Summary re the Accusative Case:

By way of summary, we observe that in the nine verses above (#5 - #13), strongest support for the transliterated Hebraic form Ιουδα comes from the B-Text. S* supports this reading 5 times, and B* supports it 5 times. #7 and #12 are the only two instances not supported by Mss from the B-Text. The former is supported by a reading from the Q-Text, while the latter compels Ziegler to offer a textual emendation.

Admittedly, the Mss evidence for *Ιουδα* (so Ziegler) or *Ιουδαν* (so Rahlfs, except for #9) in the accusative case is somewhat complicated. Attestation for the transliteration is of a *mixed, minority* nature. Still, it is easier to account for the rise of the inflected form through later inner-Greek transmission history, than to posit the inflected form as the OG. On the whole we are swayed by Ziegler's presentation of the evidence, and thus would side with him against Rahlfs. This position is not, however, without its own difficulties. This is particularly true in regard to the need to emend the text in #12 on logical grounds, without any Mss support.

The Nominative Case -- Transliteration *Ιουδα* or the Inflected Form *Ιουδας* ?

The question now poses itself, how does Ziegler's implicit argument for the transliteration *Ιουδα* in the accusative case stand up, when one considers verses where *πληρη* must clearly be translated in the nominative position of syntax? The eight verses in which the lexeme functions in the nominative are listed below, together with their respective variants.¹⁸ Our analysis follows at the end of the list.

1) 13:19 MT= *πληρη* Zi= *Ιουδας* Ra= *Ιουδας*
Context: *ἀπώκλιση Ιουδας, συνετέλεσεν ἀποικίαν τελείαν*
Variants: *Ιουδας, (συνετ.)*] *omnis iuda* Hi.: cf. MT. Also 62 544 read *Ιουδα* cf. 12:14

One notes the possibility of dittography, which could account for the final -s in *Ιουδας*, i.e. perhaps the original reading was the transliteration *Ιουδα*, even though weakly attested.

2) 23:6 MT= *πληρη* Zi= *Ιουδας* Ra= *Ιουδας*
Context: *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ σωθήσεται Ιουδας*
καὶ Ἰσραὴλ κατασκηνώσει πεπορθῶς

¹⁸ For the sake of completeness we have included #4 and #8, where the nominative form is found only in the critical apparatus, and not in the lemma-texts of either Ziegler or Rahlfs.

Variants: *Ιουδας*] *η Ιουδαια* Tht.^p = 40:16

3) 26:19 (33:19) MT= *πληρη* *ληρη* Zi= *πας Ιουδα* Ra= *πας Ιουδα*
Context: *μὴ ἀνελῶν ἀνείλεν αὐτὸν Εὐεκίας καὶ πᾶς Ιουδα;*
Variants: *Ιουδα*] *Ιουδας* 62-198-311 490 26 233 710: cf. 47:15 51:27

4) 31:24 (38:23-24) MT= *πληρη* Zi= *Ιουδα* Ra= *Ιουδα*
Context: *Εὐλογημένος κύριος ἐπὶ δίκαιον ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν πόλεσιν Ιουδα καὶ ...*
Variants: *ἐν (+ ταις B) πόλεσιν Ιουδα* B A-410 Arab] *εκει Ιουδας* L': cf. MT; *εν τη (γη 233 Hi.) Ιουδαια (Ιουδα 233) rel.* (Aug.)

We recall that the nominative case occurs here in the critical apparatus, not in the lemma-text which reads the genitive.

5) 40:15 (47:15) MT= *πληρη* *ληρη* Zi= *πᾶς Ιουδα* Ra= *πᾶς Ιουδα*
Context: *μὴ πατάξῃ σου ψυχὴν καὶ διασπαρῇ πᾶς Ιουδα οἱ συνηγμένοι πρὸς σέ ...*
Variants: *πᾶς Ιουδα* B*-S* 62 Bo Aeth] *πας Ιουδας* B^c-S^c-130-239 Q-V-26-46-86^{xl}-534-710: cf. 33:19; *παντες οι Ιουδαιοι* rel.

6) 44:27 (51:27) MT= *πληρη* *ψηρη* Zi= *πᾶς Ιουδα* Ra= *πᾶς Ιουδα*
Context: *καὶ ἐκλείψουσι πᾶς Ιουδα οἱ κατοικοῦντες ...*
Variants: *πᾶς Ιουδα*] *πας ανηρ Ιουδα* O-Q^{ms} 62 Arm Chr. = MT: cf. v. 26; *πας Ιουδας* 233: cf. 33:19

7) 51:5 (28:5) MT= *πληρη* Zi= *Ιουδας* Ra= *Ιουδας*
Context: *διότι οὐκ ἐχέρευσεν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ιουδας ἀπὸ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ...*
No variants concerning *Ιουδας*.

8) 52:27 MT= יהודא Zi= --- Ra= ---
 Context: και απωκισθη Ιουδας απο επανωθεν της γης αυτου
 ...
 Variants: O-Q^{ms}-86^{ms} L' Arm add the whole clause, including
 Ιουδας, = MT.

As with #4, this clause is not part of the lemma-text, but is to be found in the critical apparatus (thus we show no diacritical marks).

Analysis of #1 - #8:

#3, #5 and #6 reflect the transliteration Ιουδα. This is true in both Ziegler's and Rahlfs' editions. However, the verses in #s 1, 2 and 7 read the inflected Greek form Ιουδας (final -ς indicates the standard nominative ending for First Declension masculine singular nouns). What is unusual is that again this is true for both Ziegler's and Rahlfs' editions! The evidence appears to contradict itself, and in both editions. Our task now is to try to make sense of this situation.

First, the evidence for the transliteration Ιουδα. In #3 there is strong Mss attestation for this reading. The oldest Mss B, S, and A support this reading, as do Mss from every one of the six text-groups posited by Ziegler. The following Mss reflect Ιουδας: 62-311 (Lucianic), 490 (Catena group), 26 and 710 (Q-Text), and 198 and 233 (*codices mixti*). It would appear that these Mss have been affected by the preference (postulated above) in later inner-Greek transmission for the inflected Greek form, rather than the earlier (original?) Hebraic transliteration.

Ziegler suggests drawing a line to link #3 and #5. In #5 we see the same phenomenon observed when analyzing the accusative case (note especially #13); that is, the attestation of the Hebraic transliteration Ιουδα by B* and S*, and a subsequent shift to the inflected Greek form Ιουδας by the correctors of B and S (B^c and S^c). Further support for the Hebraic form is provided by the Bohairic and Aethiopic versions (both grouped under the

B-Text) and Mss 62 (grouped under *l*). Mss of the Q-Text (Q-V-26-46-86^{xl}-534-710) register strong support for the inflected Greek form, as do Mss 130 and 239 (*codices mixti*). Again this indicates the preference postulated above in later inner-Greek transmission for the inflected Greek form. We notice that Mss belonging to the A-Text, the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions, and the Catena group read παντες οι Ιουδαιοι = "all the Jews". This appears to be a semantic equivalent, which adopts the more common way non-Jewish Greeks would refer to Jews.¹⁹

Ziegler also draws a line from #s 3 & 5, to #6. Again there is strong support from the earliest Mss and all the text-groups for the Hebraic transliteration Ιουδα. Hexaplaric Mss reflect a Hebraizing correction πας ανηρ Ιουδα, which transforms Ιουδα from the nominative into the genitive case. Mss 233 (a *codex mixtus*) shows the preference for the inflected Greek form (cf. the discussion of #3 above).

On the whole, the line connecting #s 3, 5 and 6 demonstrates strong Mss support for the Hebraic transliteration Ιουδα when it occurs in the nominative position of syntax. These observations add further support to the argument with respect to the accusative case, that the translator of the OG rendered יהודא with the transliteration Ιουδα.

We turn our attention now to those examples of the nominative case where, instead of the transliteration, both Ziegler and Rahlfs have chosen to read the inflected form Ιουδας for their respective lemma-texts.

In #1 the only exceptions to the reading Ιουδας are found in Jerome's Vulgate, and the Mss 62 (part of the Lucianic recension) and 544 (Q-Text). These three all reflect the transliteration Ιουδα. In #2 the sole departure from the

¹⁹ The Q-Text readings here lend support to the thesis that the Q-Text may derive from a revision which took place between the translation of OG and the later Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions. See footnote #7.

inflected reading is that of a part of Theodoret's Greek commentary, weak attestation indeed. In #7 there is unanimous support among all Mss for the inflected form. (The variants in #4 and #8 also register support among Lucianic and Hexaplaric Mss for the inflected form *Ιουδαζ*.) In sum, the textual evidence for the verses in #'s 1, 2 and 7 is overwhelmingly in favour of the nominative inflection *Ιουδαζ*.

How do we reconcile this evidence with the show of support for the transliteration in #'s 3, 5 & 6? If Ziegler's theory is correct, the translator of the OG rendered יהודה by the Hebraic transliteration *Ιουδα*. We accepted this theory tentatively for the accusative case. Now for the nominative case we find that half of the verses support the argument, while half of the verses refute it.

If the argument we have been mounting for the original transliteration is correct, should not the lemma-readings in #'s 1, 2 and 7 all be emended from *Ιουδαζ* to *Ιουδα*, in order to reflect accurately the reconstructed OG? Ziegler resorted to emendation on logical grounds in Jer 35:17 (42:17 LXX) for the accusative case (#12 above). Why did he not emend the text for #'s 1, 2 and 7 in the nominative case? Should one follow the more cautious approach, seen in both Ziegler and Rahlfs, and simply let the Mss support speak for itself? Or does the sustained argument, based as it is on methodical analysis of the case function of *Ιουδα(ζ)*, compel us to emend these three texts?

Further reflection on the conflicting Mss evidence (#3, 5 & 6 versus #1, 2 & 7) can detect no grammatical or semantic reasons in support of the inflected forms.²⁰ If anything, the

²⁰ For example, could *Ιουδαζ* be some allusive reference to Judas Maccabeus? Such an interpretation in these verses does not fit the respective contexts at all. I have also considered Emanuel Tov's revision theory (cf. his *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, 1976) as a possible way of accounting for the Mss evidence, but again to no

argument is strengthened when we note that in #1, the final *-ζ* could have entered the text at a later date via dittography. It would appear that the inflected form entered the text at a very early stage in the transmission of these three verses. Analysis of the accusative and nominative cases compels one to conclude, we would argue, that the inflected forms *Ιουδαν* and *Ιουδαζ* entered later Greek Mss through a growing preference on the part of copyists for inflected Greek forms. On the other hand, the original translator of the OG consistently rendered יהודה with the transliteration *Ιουδα*. Hence, Ziegler's lemma-text should be corrected in verses 13:19, 23:6 and 51:5 (28:5 LXX) from *Ιουδαζ* to *Ιουδα*.

B) A FEMININE FORM OF *Ιουδα* ?

Four times in Jeremiah 3:7,8,10,11 *Ιουδα* appears at first glance to be a feminine noun, marked by the feminine form of the article, thus ἡ ἀσύνθετος *Ιουδα* (3:11 is in the genitive²¹). None of the verses is contested. We delineated Ziegler's implicit argument above, and concluded that *Ιουδα* is in fact a transliteration, not an inflected masculine noun of the First Declension. These verses further substantiate our point. The transliterated nature of *Ιουδα* means that it can be treated as a feminine noun when the context demands it. This is precisely the case here. In 3:6ff "faithless Iuda" is depicted as an adulterous wife. To answer the question posed by the sub-title, No, *Ιουδα* is a transliteration.

C) THE TRANSLATION OF יהודה AS *Ἰουδαία* -- A SEMANTIC EQUIVALENT FOR *Ιουδα*?

The lexeme ἡ *Ἰουδαία* (in various inflected forms) appears as a translation for יהודה five times in Ziegler's lemma-text, and is listed eleven times in variant readings in the critical apparatus.

avail. *Ιουδα* / *Ιουδαζ* provides no leverage for an argument on either side of the "revision debate" in Parts A and B of Jeremiah.

²¹ If *Ιουδα* were a true feminine noun, we would expect to see final *-ζ* in the genitive case. We do not!

(Rahlfs agrees with Ziegler's lemma-text each time.) The five verses which read an inflected form of Ἰουδαία are: 7:2; 9:25; 14:2; 17:20 and 34(41):21.²² First, some text critical remarks, then a study of the semantics for each verse.

Text Critical Remarks:

Two verses in Ziegler's lemma-text are more contested than the others, and should be reviewed before accepting the readings as the presumed OG. The variants of 9:25 are:

Ἰουδαίαν O Tht.^P] την ιουδαιαν 613;

ιουδαν V-86^{xl}-544-710 L-198-407-233-311 Aeth

Arab Arm Iust.Chr. Tht.^P ;

την (>B) ιδουμαιαν rel.: cf. 43:31 (LXX) Ps. 62:1

The minority reading Ἰουδαίαν in Origen's Hexapla and parts of Theodoret's commentary is largely at odds with: (a) the reading Ἰουδαν reflected in Mss of the Q-Text and the Lucianic recension, and (b) Mss from all the other textual families, which read την (>B) Ἰδουμαιαν. The reading in (a) reflects the common translation in Jeremiah of יהודה as Ιουδα. By comparison, the lemma is the more difficult reading. The reading in (b), though strongly supported by the early Mss B, S, A and Q, reflects what appears to be an early variant. In this list of foreign nations (Egypt, ---?, Edom, Ammon, and Moab) one expects a reference like Ἰδουμια, not Ἰουδαία.²³ By comparison, the lemma is the more difficult reading and should be accepted as original. (Rahlfs' edition agrees with Ziegler's lemma, though the former includes articulation.)

²² The 11 variant readings are found in: 22:18; 23:6; 24:5; 31:23,24; 33:16; 40:5,11; 42:15; 44:24,26 (MT order).

²³ To our knowledge this is the only verse in the LXX where Egypt and Iudaia are listed together and linked by a coordinating conjunction. Idumaia is listed among other foreign nations elsewhere in Jeremiah 29:8-23; 32:7; 34:2; 47:11 (LXX verse order). The following texts also show confusion in later Greek Mss in reading Hebrew יהודה as either Idumaia or Iudaia: 1Sa 17:1; Psa 62:1; Is 7:6; 36:1; 44:26; Jer 43:31 (LXX verse order).

The variants of 34:21 (41:21 LXX) are:

τῆς Ἰουδαίας] Ἰουδα A C'-613 534 Arab

The lemma points to the only time the translator used the expression "king of Iudaia"; whereas the variant (weakly attested in A, the Catena group, 613, 534 and Arabic) indicates later revision of the text in the direction of the much more common expression in Jeremiah, "king of Iuda".²⁴

The lemma readings in 7:2, 14:2 and 17:20 are in no doubt at all. Thus we concur with both Ziegler and Rahlfs in the readings which they have chosen as the reconstructed OG.²⁵

Semantic Analysis:

We now turn to a semantic analysis of the verses which read Ἰουδαία as the OG.

1.) Jer 7:2

עמד בשער בית יהוה וקראתם שם את־יהוה הנה ואמרתם

שמעו דברי־יהוה כל־יהודה הבאים בשערים האלה להשחית את־יהוה:

"Stand in the gate of the LORD's house, and proclaim there this word, and say,

Hear the word of the LORD, all you people of Judah, you that enter these gates to worship the LORD." (NRSV)

ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου πάσα ἡ Ἰουδαία (LXX)

²⁴ The phrase "king(s) of יהודה" occurs about 65 times in the Hebrew text of Jeremiah. LXX lacks the phrase 19 times. In every verse except for 34(41):21, LXX reads "king(s) of Ιουδα".

²⁵ A text critical evaluation of the variant readings Ιουδαία (any form) listed in Ziegler's critical apparatus shows that the lemma Ιουδα, is contested by Ιουδαία in only 11 verses out of 139. The revision from Ιουδα to Ιουδαία occasionally takes place in early uncial Mss (e.g. 24:5; 31:23,24), but is more frequent in later Mss and the recensions (e.g. 22:18; 31:23,24; 33:16; 40:5,11; 42:15; 44:24,26). Thus, there is a growing preference in later Greek Mss to use Ιουδαία, the common designation in the Greek speaking world for the land of Judah, rather than using the Hebraic transliteration Ιουδα.

One immediately observes that MT is a fuller text than LXX. Taken by itself, it is difficult to adjudicate whether LXX reflects a proto-Masoretic text which was subsequently supplemented in MT, or whether LXX represents an abridgment of the Hebrew.²⁶ In either case יהוה / 'Ιουδαία is clearly a personification, in that it is all the *people* of יהוה / 'Ιουδαία who are commanded to "*hear* the word of the LORD" (so NRSV properly interprets in its translation). We return to this notion of personification in a moment.

How does the translator render the bound form יהוה-לְיִהוּדָה elsewhere in Jeremiah? Five times he uses the appropriate inflection of πᾶς plus the Hebraic transliteration Ιουδα (cf. 20:4; 26:19; 36:6; 40:15; 44:26), twice the phrase does not appear in LXX (44:11,24), and only one other time in 17:20 does the translator use an inflection of πᾶς plus the lexeme used in 7:2, 'Ιουδαία. (See below on 17:20.²⁷) Is it possible to distinguish a semantic difference between the translator's use of πᾶσα ἡ 'Ιουδαία (7:2) or πᾶσα 'Ιουδαία (17:20) versus πᾶς Ιουδα in the verses listed? Suffice it to compare 44(51):26 where LXX reads:

ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου πᾶς Ιουδα οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ

The command is identical to 7:2, except that πᾶς Ιουδα is further designated as those "who live in the land of Egypt". Does this extended designation determine that πᾶς Ιουδα speak only of *exiled* Judeans, wherever the shorter term may occur? No, because the term is also used to designate Judeans who live in the land of Judah (e.g. 20:4; 26(33):19). Thus, πᾶς Ιουδα can apply either to exiled Judeans or to those Judeans still living in their homeland, depending on the context. There is no

²⁶ See for example the discussion in W. McKane, *Jeremiah*, (ICC) vol. 1, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), pp. 158ff. McKane favors the first position.

²⁷ The absence of the article in 17:20 makes no semantic difference between this verse and 7:2.

inherent reason, therefore, why the translator could not have used πᾶς Ιουδα in 7:2, as he did in 44:26. This suggests that the lexemes 'Ιουδαία and Ιουδα can function as semantic equivalents.

Although the two lexemes can be included within the same semantic domain, we wonder if the translator's usage points to a slightly different nuance. Could it be that πᾶς 'Ιουδαία is a personification of the *land*, while πᾶς Ιουδα is a personification of the *nation*? The end result is still the same. However, the former signifies the people who dwell within a geographical location, whereas the second points more to the ethnicity of those same people. This may explain why πᾶς Ιουδα is used in 44(51):26 rather than πᾶς 'Ιουδαία. One can speak of "all Iuda (the nation) who live in the land of Egypt"; whereas to say "all Iudaia (the land) who live in the land of Egypt" is a contradiction in terms. If this is so, the two lexemes are "semantic equivalents," but in this qualified sense.

2.) Jer 17:19-20

This text also suggests that 'Ιουδαία and Ιουδα can function as semantic equivalents, although the nuanced distinction between *land* and *nation* may still apply. Moreover, the passage reflects the translator's concern for matters of style. To illustrate these points, it is helpful to compare our translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts:

MT: ¹⁹Thus said the LORD to me: Go and stand in the People's Gate, by which the kings of Judah enter and by which they go out, and in all the gates of Jerusalem, ²⁰ and say to them: Hear the word of the LORD, you kings of Judah (יהודה), and all Judah (בְּלִי-יהודה), and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who enter by these gates.

LXX: ¹⁹ Thus says the Lord: Go and stand in your people's gates, by which the kings of Iuda enter and by which they go out, and in all the gates of Ierusalem, ²⁰

and say to them: Hear the word of the Lord, you kings of Iuda (Ιουδα), and all Iudaia (πᾶσα Ἰουδαία), and all Jerusalem, who enter by these gates.

As in 7:2 πᾶσα Ἰουδαία refers to the *people* of the land of Judea who are commanded to "hear the word of the Lord". The people are also designated as those who "enter by these gates".²⁸ In this particular context the translator's choice of Ἰουδαία (rather than the more common Ιουδα) helps to avoid the repetitious use of "all Iuda" immediately after the phrase "kings of Iuda" (thus, ...βασιλεῖς Ιουδα καὶ πᾶσα Ἰουδαία...). Another passage where the translator avoids repetition (assuming MT is the same as the *Vorlage* of LXX) is 26(33):19. There MT reads, "Did Hezekiah King of Judah and all Judah actually put him to death?" while the translator drops the reference to "King of Iuda" and translates, "Did Hezekiah and all Iuda actually put him to death?"²⁹ The semantic equivalent Ἰουδαία for Ιουδα allows the translator to produce a more felicitous translation of the repetitive Hebrew. In short, the translator was attentive to matters of style.

3.) Jer 9:25

As mentioned in the text critical discussion above, Ἰουδαία occurs in a list of foreign nations:

²⁴ The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will attend to all those who are circumcised only in their foreskins:

²⁵ Egypt, Iudaia (καὶ ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίαν), Edom, the sons of Ammon and the sons of Moab..." [our translation]

²⁸ In LXX "these gates" seems to be a reference to the city gates of Jerusalem. The text of MT is difficult. It could be a reference to the city gates, or possibly to both the city gates and a gate in the Temple used by kings and laity, not the priests. See the commentaries for further discussion.

²⁹ Other instances where LXX avoids the repetition of Ἰουδαία in the same verse are 24:1; 27:20; 28:4; 36:9; 43:5. There are, however, signs of repetition in LXX in 19:3 (less so in 25:1; 26:18; 32:32; 34:7; 40:15; 44:9,14,26,28 and 52:31).

Here καὶ ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίαν corresponds to the Hebrew כְּתִיב־עַל־יְהוּדָה. The latter occurs in this exact form one other time in Jeremiah 36(43):2. There the translator has chosen to use the expression καὶ ἐπὶ Ιουδα in the following context:

"...and write upon it these words, which I proclaimed to you concerning Ierusalem, and concerning Iuda and concerning all the nations..."

Comparison of these two passages shows again that Ἰουδαία can function as a semantic equivalent for Ιουδα, both of which can be associated with other nations. Is it possible in 9:25 that the translator has chosen to use Ἰουδαία rather than Ιουδα, because the former was the more common name in the Greek speaking world outside of Judah, by which to refer geographically to the land between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea? That is, the Hebraic transliteration Ιουδα may have been considered somewhat parochial to list it along with nations on the international stage. If so, the translator's choice from the two possible lexemes has been affected slightly by the immediate context.

4.) Jer 14:2

אֲבָלָה וְיִהְיֶה וְשַׁעֲרֶיהָ אֲמָלְלוּ קָרְרוּ לְאָרֶץ וְצִוְחָהּ וְרוּשָׁלַם עָלֶיהָ (MT)

Judah mourns and her gates languish;
they lie in gloom on the ground, and the cry of Jerusalem goes up. (NRSV)

ἐπένοθησεν ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ αἱ πύλαι αὐτῆς ἐκενώθησαν καὶ ἐσκοτώθησεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἡ κραυγὴ τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀνέβη (LXX)

Elsewhere in Greek Jeremiah it is ἡ γῆ "the land" which mourns (cf. 4:28; 12:4; 23:10).³⁰ This observation fits well with our hypothesis, that Ἰουδαία is a personification of the *land*, while Ιουδα is a personification of the *nation*. In 14:2 it is the

³⁰ Sion is also told to "return mourning to your cities" (LXX 38:21).

land called ἡ Ἰουδαία which mourns. She mourns together with "her gates".³¹ The latter indicates walled cities and their gates, within the bounds of the land of Iudaea.

5.) Jer 34:21 (41:21 LXX)

Finally, we consider Jer 34:21 in the larger context of chapter 34 (41). One observes the following nine phrases which occur in the span of only 23 verses:

all the cities of Iuda (v. 1), king of Iuda (v. 2), king of Iuda (v. 4), the cities of Iuda (v. 7), the cities of Iuda (v. 7), the leaders of Iuda (v. 19), king of Iudaia (v. 21), the cities of Iuda (v. 22), king of Iuda (35:1).

The phrase in question in 34:21 stands out against the background of chapter 34. Why did the translator not choose to use the standard default *Iouδα*, especially since the phrase "king of Iuda" is so common in Jeremiah?

Was the translator affected by something in the immediate context? The Greek text of Jer 34:21 can be translated as follows:

"And I will give Sedekias king of Iudaia, and their leaders into the hands of their enemies, and the power of the king of Babylon *shall come upon* those who run away from them."

The verse speaks directly of Iudaia and its king, in relation to one of its international neighbors, Babylon. This may account for the translator's choice of *Ἰουδαία*--the geo-political term well known in international Greek speaking circles--rather than the local, more Hebraic expression, *Iouδα*. (One can contrast

³¹ To our knowledge there is only one verse in LXX where *Iouδα* is linked directly with "gates"; cf. 2Ch 14:6(7). It was thus *theoretically* possible for the translator to use his favorite lexeme *Iouδα*. Does *Ἰουδαία* ever appear with a reference to "gates" elsewhere in LXX? That is, can one establish a preference for this latter combination in Greek usage? It does, only in 1Mac 9:50; 13:33 and 15:39. The terminology was thus shared by the writer of Maccabees, although the context there speaks of *building up* strong cities in *Ἰουδαία*. Other than this, there appears to be no definitive connection between the usage in Jeremiah and in Maccabees.

the references to "Sedekias king of Iuda" in 34:2,4.) The translator may have been influenced by geographical rather than ethnic thinking in 34:21. Beyond this, we are hard pressed to offer an explanation for the translator's choice of *Ἰουδαία* in a passage that uses *Iouδα* eight times.³²

In summary, we conclude from the five passages above that *Ἰουδαία* could function as a *semantic equivalent* for *Iouδα*, although the two lexemes strictly speaking point to slightly different entities. *Ἰουδαία* was a geo-political designation for the land of Judah. Before the exile it was ruled by a king and contained numerous walled cities, in addition to the capital city of Jerusalem. By extension *Ἰουδαία* could be personified, so that it was capable of hearing the word of the LORD, as well as mourning. This use of personification appears to be nuanced, so that the translator can personify the *land* (*Ἰουδαία*) or personify the *nation* (*Iouδα*). The end result of either personification is still the people. That the translator had two terms (unlike the Hebrew) by which he could designate the land or the nation, made it possible to be more sensitive to the context. *Ἰουδαία* could be used to avoid the infelicitous repetition of *Iouδα*, or to designate the land of Judah in relation to its international neighbors.

D) THE TRANSLATION OF יהודה AS Ἰουδαίος -- ANOTHER SEMANTIC EQUIVALENT FOR *Iouδα* ?

In addition to the translation equivalents *Iouδα* and *Ἰουδαία*, the translator of the OG renders יהודה once by ὁ Ἰουδαίος (in the

³² Study of the distribution of the lexeme *Ἰουδαία* in LXX shows that the word was commonly used in inner-Testamental times. It appears in 1Mac 26 times, more than any other book in the LXX. The frequency in other books is as follows: 1Sa - 5; 2Sa - 1; 2Ch - 7; 1Es - 23; Ezr - 4; Jdt - 8; 2Mac - 11; 3Mac - 1; Psa - 6; Pro - 1; Joe - 1; Zec - 1; Isa - 12; Jer - 5; Lam - 1; Ezk - 1; Dan - 5; Bel - 1. In 1Mac *Iouδα* occurs about 30 times, of which 20 are in the phrase "land of Iuda" and 5 in the phrase "cities of Iuda". Use of such qualifications or the term *Ἰουδαία* was necessary in 1Mac to distinguish these from the person of Judas Maccabeus.

dative plural form) in Jer 26:2 (33:2 LXX).³³ The verse reads as follows:

(MT) כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה עִמָּךְ בְּחֹצֵר בֵּית־יְהוָה וְדַבַּרְתָּ עַל־כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה
הַבָּאִים לְהַשְׁתַּחֲוֹת בֵּית־יְהוָה אֵת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ
לְדַבֵּר אֲלֵיהֶם אֶל־הַגֹּרֵעַ הַדָּבָר:

Thus says the LORD: Stand in the court of the LORD's house, and speak to all the cities of Judah which come to worship in the house of the LORD all the words that I command you to speak to them; do not hold back a word. (RSV)

Οὕτως εἶπε κύριος Στήθι ἐν αὐλῇ οἴκου κυρίου καὶ χρηματιεῖς ἅπανσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς ἐρχομένοις προσκυνεῖν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου ἅπαντας τοὺς λόγους οὓς συνέταξά σοι αὐτοῖς χρηματίσαι μὴ ἀφέλης ῥῆμα (LXX)

The variants of the phrase in question are as follows:

ἅπανσι(ν) τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις B-S] πασι(ν) τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις
A-410 Q^{lat}-130 Co. Aeth. Arab.: cf. 51:1; + παντι Ἰουδα
106; παντι Ἰουδα rel.

There is strong textual attestation for the reading Ἰουδαίοις from the early Mss B-S, A, and Q, as well as 130, 410 and some versions. (As Ziegler notes, the same expression occurs in LXX 51:1. There the corresponding Hebrew is כָּל־הַיְהוּדִים לְךָ.) The Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions, plus the Catena group, use the standard default Ἰουδα in what amounts to a partial revision (there is no mention of "cities") of this unique reading of Hebrew עַל־כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה. If one considers inner-Greek textual transmission, it is easier to account for the reading in the recensions as stemming from the lemma, rather than vice

³³ Inflected forms of ὁ Ἰουδαῖος also appear five times among the variant readings in Ziegler's critical apparatus: 34:9; 40:15; 44:26,26,28. The variant reading οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in the critical apparatus of 40:15 (=47:15) provides a good example of a later (Hexaplaric) reading which was influenced by the context. Jer 40:11-16 speaks of both Ἰουδαῖοι (v.11) and Ἰουδα (v. 11, 12, 15, 15). יְהוּדָה could be rendered by either term in later inner-Greek textual transmission, as the context suggested it.

versa. In sum, the lemma ἅπανσι(ν) τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, chosen by both Ziegler and Rahlfs, has strong claims to be the OG.

This is the only time in Jeremiah when the lemma stands opposite עַל־כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה. How does the translator deal with the Hebrew expression in other contexts? He uses the standard equivalent ἐπὶ (πάσας τὰς) πόλεις Ἰουδα "... (all the) cities of Iuda" (cf. 1:15; 4:16; 34(41):7; and 44(51):2).³⁴ Assuming that MT is basically the same as the *Vorlage* of LXX, can one detect any reason why the translator departed from this standard equation in 26:2? Again it would seem that the immediate context has affected the translator's word choice. In 26:2 he made a *semantic adjustment*, to avoid a literal translation of "cities" coming to worship. The adjustment from the standard "cities of Ἰουδα" to the people who come from those cities, namely "the Ἰουδαῖοι Jews/Judeans", offers a plausible explanation of the translator's method.³⁵

CONCLUSIONS

Evidence for the translation of יְהוּדָה into Greek in the Book of Jeremiah is both numerous and complex. Questions about quantitative differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts, and the *reasons* for these textual pluses or minuses are best discussed elsewhere. For example, one would like to know if it can be shown that the *Vorlage* of LXX was different than proto-MT, or if there are signs that the translator decided to either abridge or supplement the translation at various points. What we did observe was that variant readings in these instances do not reflect the transliteration Ἰουδα, but rather

³⁴ עָרֵי יְהוּדָה is regularly translated with πόλις Ἰουδα. See 7:17,34; 9:10; 10:22; 11:6,12; 17:26; 25:18(=32:4); 32:44; 33:10,13; 34:22; 44:6,17,21. Three exceptions unrelated to the lemma above are 34:1; 36:9 and 40:5. Even in these verses the standard default Ἰουδα is used, not Ἰουδαία.

³⁵ Comparison of the Greek and Hebrew texts of Jer 44(51):1 & 44:26,27 demonstrates that πᾶς Ἰουδα and πᾶς Ἰουδαῖοι can also function as a synonymous word pair, i.e. "all Iuda / all the Jews...who live in the land of Egypt."

inflected forms of Ἰουδαῖς or else the semantic equivalent Ἰουδαία. We submit that the translator of the OG used the transliteration Ἰουδα as the "standard default" translation of יהודה. It is later Greek Mss which show a growing preference for inflected forms of Ἰουδαῖς.

One important focus in this study was a close analysis of Ἰουδα(ν) where it exists in the accusative case. In his edition Rahlfs has chosen the inflected form Ἰουδαν for the accusative, except for the puzzling instance in 30:4 (37:4 LXX) where he appears to accept the transliterated form Ἰουδα. On the other hand, Ziegler connects a string of *mixed, minority* Mss readings to suggest, it would seem, that the translator of the OG consistently rendered יהודה not as an inflected Greek form, but as a Hebraic transliteration Ἰουδα. Strongest Mss support for this position comes in a *mixed* manner from the B-Text group. The logic of the argument has compelled Ziegler, rightly, to emend one verse (35:17 = 42:17 LXX) from Ἰουδαν to Ἰουδα.

Analysis of Ἰουδα(ς) in the nominative case supports Ziegler's view of the transliteration Ἰουδα in three verses. However, the picture became complicated when we noted the inflected form Ἰουδαῖς in another three verses. On logical grounds neither Ziegler nor Rahlfs gives an entirely satisfying answer to the question, Which of these two forms was the OG? We have argued that sustained analysis of the lexeme in both the accusative and nominative cases compels one to conclude, that Ἰουδαν and Ἰουδαῖς entered Greek Mss through a growing preference on the part of *copyists* for inflected Greek forms. However, the *translator* of the OG consistently rendered יהודה with the Hebraic transliteration Ἰουδα. Hence, Ziegler's lemma-text should be corrected in verses 13:19, 23:6 and 51:5 (28:5 LXX) from Ἰουδαῖς to Ἰουδα.

If our analysis is correct, a subsequent step would be to apply the same methodology to analyze the translation of יהודה in other books in the Old Testament. In particular, one would like to determine if other translators used the transliteration Ἰουδα,

or whether they used the inflected noun Ἰουδαῖς as their standard default. Similarly for other nouns (e.g. the names of people or places) which may or may not be transliterations. It cannot be assumed *a priori* that each translator operated in the same way. For First Declension masculine nouns like Ἰουδα(ς), there must of necessity be examples where the given lexeme functions syntactically in the nominative and/or accusative cases, in order to raise the possibility that the translator used a transliteration in the OG. (Otherwise, it is not clear if the lexeme in question is merely an inflected form of the genitive, dative or vocative cases.) It would not surprise us, if יהודה was transliterated in other Old Testament books. If so, we have an analytical way to determine whether or not other critical editions in the Göttingen *Septuaginta* should be corrected on this point.

This study also uncovered five verses where the translator departed from the "standard default" translation of יהודה as Ἰουδα. In those verses the choice was made to render the Hebrew with a *semantic equivalent* Ἰουδαία. Having two terms available in Greek for referring in a nuanced manner to the land (Ἰουδαία) or the nation (Ἰουδα), the translator could be sensitive to the immediate context of a given verse. It appears that Ἰουδαία was used both stylistically to avoid repetition of Ἰουδα, as well as to designate the land in relation to its international neighbors. The translator employed this alternative lexeme rather sparingly. When he did use it, lexical choice was conditioned by the context, at least in a limited way, rather than pre-determined by some larger translation scheme.

We suggested that the translator used the two lexemes within the same semantic domain, but with a slightly different nuance. In particular, Ἰουδαία was used as a personification of the *land*, while Ἰουδα was a personification of the *nation*. Semantically, both terms point to the *people*. However, the former signifies people who dwell within a set geographical location, whereas the second points more to the ethnicity of those same people. What may be significant for Septuagint studies is the following

possibility: The choice between *Ιουδα* or *Ἰουδαία* may have been influenced by the translator's *Sitz im Leben* as a Jew living in the Egyptian Diaspora. If so, we see from the predominant use of *Ιουδα*, that the translator of Jeremiah was more concerned for his people's ethnic identity than their identification in geographical terms.

Finally, we observed one occasion when *עָרֵי יְהוּדָה* ("cities of Judah") was translated by (the dative form of) *Ἰουδαίοι* ("Jews / Judeans"). The immediate context affected the translator's word choice. In the context of 26:2 he made a *semantic adjustment*, so that people not cities are clearly portrayed as going to worship. This context-sensitive adjustment from the standard default "cities of *Ιουδα*" to "the *Ἰουδαίοι*", together with all our other findings above, offers a plausible explanation of the translator's technique in the Book of Jeremiah.

ESTHER'S GREAT ADVENTURE:

Reading the LXX version of the Book of Esther in light of its assimilation to the conventions of the Greek romantic novel.

Cameron Boyd-Taylor

Recent scholarship has established a case for characterizing the major additions to LXX-Esther in reference to the Greek romantic novel of late antiquity. Such a comparison has undoubtedly deepened our appreciation of the literary sensibilities which were brought to bear on the text during the course of its transmission. None the less there is still a tendency to focus on the content of the additions while begging the question posed by the literary integrity of the Greek text in its final form. In effect, the possibility that the redaction history of LXX-Esther reflects a more or less coherent assimilation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* to new literary models is overlooked. Yet, given the novelistic character of the Greek additions to Esther, it is likely that the *Tendenz* of its overall redaction will, at the very least, be illuminated by comparison with the method and aims of the Greek novel. The question addressed in the present paper is whether or not a specific divergence of LXX-Esther from the MT, namely 2:7, points to a larger redactive strategy and if so whether this strategy has generic implications for the resulting narrative, i.e. whether LXX-Esther is best comprehended under the designation of romantic novel.¹

¹ Following Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957) 303-314, I will treat the prose romance as a genre distinct from the novel proper. According to Frye, the essential difference between the two lies in their approach to characterization: while the typical 'novelist' describes an interplay of personalities against the background of detailed social description, the typical 'romancer' creates stylized figures which expand into archetypes. While, as Frye concedes, no work is pure, it is none the less important to identify the fundamental conventions of a given narrative as either romantic or novelistic. In this respect, the so-called novels of late antiquity are by and large all romances, as is the story of Esther in both its MT and LXX manifestations.

What has Jerusalem to do with Alexandria?
The literary background of the Greek novel

One might say that the Greek novel has, once again, come of age.² Long consigned to the margins of scholarship, what was perhaps the most popular genre of late antiquity has recently become the focus of considerable intellectual labor. While it is true that this change in attitude does not signal the aesthetic rehabilitation of the prose romance as such, though this too may yet happen, the curiosity of serious readers has undoubtedly been whetted. For many, the appeal of this literature lies in the place it holds in the Western literary tradition. After all, behind the Greek novel we see the advent of a distinct literary culture, one in some ways remarkably like our own. In this respect, B. E. Perry has made the observation that twice in the history of Western literature the novel has

In his *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976) 3, however, Frye makes a distinction between the naive and sentimental romance which is of considerable importance for the present study. The sentimental romance is simply a more extended and literary development of the formulas of naive romance. For Frye, sentimental romance begins with the works of Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, Longus and Xenophon of Ephesus. In the course of the present paper I will argue that LXX-Esther should be read against the background of this literary development. Since in recent scholarship the genre represented by these works has been increasingly adverted to as "the Greek novel," I will strike a terminological compromise and speak of 'the Greek romantic novel.' Furthermore, I will call the sort of literary developments characteristic of these fictions 'novelistic.' If this is seen to imply that the sentimental romance enjoys some affiliation with the novel proper, this is not entirely misleading.

² In this regard one should note the significant publication of B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, University of California Press: 1989), which contains new translations of all the major Greek texts commonly designated as either romance or novel, i.e. Chariton *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon *An Ephesian Tale*, Achilles Tatius *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Longus *Daphnis and Chloe*, Heliodorus *An Ethiopian Story*, Pseudo-Lucian *The Ass*, Lucian *A True Story*, Pseudo-Callisthenes *Alexander Romance*, Anon. *Apollonius King of Tyre*, as well as two summaries, that of Antonius Diogenes *The Wonders Beyond Thule*, and Iamblichus *A Babylonian Story*, and all the edited papyrus fragments to date, i.e. *Ninus, A Phoenician Story, Metiochus and Parthenope, Iolaus, Sesonchosis, Herpyllis, Chione, and Calligone*. Each translation is accompanied by an introduction, bibliography and explanatory footnotes.

emerged as the most significant literary vehicle of popular sensibility, i.e. in late antiquity, and in early modernity.³ To us as heirs to a literary culture which is now unquestionably dominated by prose narrative, the question of the origins and development of the Greek novel is a pressing one.

It is this fascination with the origins of the novel which partly explains the increased scholarly interest in a kindred body of literature, namely, the indigenous prose narratives of the Hellenistic period. These romantic fictions, composed on the colonial fringes of Hellenistic literary culture and by and large ignored by the learned, display many of the marks of novelistic development. Often predating the canonical novels of late antiquity, this literature promises to grant us considerable insight into the background of the genre. Not only do these works bear upon our understanding of the socio-cultural underpinnings of the Greek novel, they also illuminate the various formal innovations which went into its making. This is especially true of the corpus of literature known as the Jewish novella.

There is a growing consensus that while the Greek romantic novel is to an extent formally unprecedented in antiquity, it nevertheless exhibits considerable material continuity with earlier Near Eastern literature.⁴ Indeed, in many cases one

³ B. E. Perry, in *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967) 84, defines novelistic literature as the exploitation of a serious story of personal adventure in prose as an independent form of literary entertainment; hence, the literary phenomenon he envisions covers both the genre of sentimental romance and that of the novel. Perry would argue that in Western prose literature, novelistic development occurred first with the advent of the ideal Greek romance and later with the appearance of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* in 1740.

⁴ G. Anderson, in *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (Totowa: Barnes and Noble, 1984) 19, writes "I am content to say that the material of Graeco-Roman novels was already 'ancient storytelling' and that the decision to write the first Greek novel was the decision to communicate to a Greek readership what was already there, without necessarily any decision about its form...the key factor is that the narratives were already there..." While Anderson overstates his case, his insight is sound; namely, that the Greek novel, while representing a distinct literary development, exhibits a remarkable continuity with the naive romances, i.e. the folk-tales and legends, which it draws upon for its

might say that traditional stories have been appropriated to new literary ends. In this regard, the five extant Jewish novellas, Esther, Judith, Tobit, Joseph and Aseneth, and Third Maccabees, are of particular significance.⁵ Located at the threshold of an emerging literary culture, these works bear some of the key features of what would become one of its most popular genres.⁶ Furthermore, there are numerous other Jewish

sources.

⁵ W. L. Humphreys, "Novella," in *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable: Narrative Forms in Old Testament Literature* (ed. G.W. Coats; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985) 82-96, 85, identifies three novellas in the Hebrew Bible, namely, the story of Samson in Judges 13-16, the story of Joseph and his brothers in Genesis 37-50, and the Book of Esther; he identifies two in the apocrypha, the books of Judith and Tobit. L. M. Wills, "The Jewish Novellas," in *Greek Fiction* (ed. J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman; London: Routledge, 1994) 223-238, 226, identifies as Jewish novellas the books of Esther, Tobit, Judith and Joseph and Aseneth as well as Daniel 1-6. I would suggest that any preliminary investigation into the form of the Jewish novella should restrict itself to the works which have come down to us independent of a larger literary framework. In this regard, I follow Perry, *Ancient Romances*, 44, who stresses that a necessary feature of the novel (or sentimental romance) is that it is published apart by itself for its own sake as a story. Consequently, the Jewish corpus should be restricted to Esther, Tobit, Judith, and Joseph and Aseneth, but should likely include Third Maccabees, a text often overlooked in discussions of the genre. Of course, one might argue that the Canon itself (whether Hebrew, Greek or Latin) constitutes a distinct literary framework for certain of these works; but even then, I would point to the uneasy relationship between this genre and canonical formation as further evidence for its literary integrity. For a brief but insightful discussion of Third Maccabees with reference to the literary techniques of Greek romance, see M. Hadas, *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953) 13-15. Two significant studies relevant to the aims of the present paper have since come to my attention. For a comprehensive study of Jewish narrative of the Hellenistic period in relation to the Greek novel, see L. M. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995). Also see R. Pervo, *Profit with Delight* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), who provides an excellent introduction to the genre-critical study of the ancient novel as it bears on our reading of Jewish and early-Christian literary compositions.

⁶ Biblical scholars differ in their approach to the issue of genre. Humphreys, "Novella," 84f, locates the novella in an intermediate position between the novel and short story as they are currently understood by English speaking authors. The ancient Jewish novella, like the novel,

narratives, embedded in larger literary contexts, which likewise have a novelistic character.⁷ These texts provide an important control for our study of the extant novellas. Of considerable interest to the literary historian is the existence of numerous and varied tellings of the same story. Since the literary interdependence of these versions can very often be established, it is possible to study the deployment of novelistic interests and techniques over the successive reworkings of a given narrative.⁸ This allows us to see how source materials were deliberately refashioned over time to keep pace with changing literary sensibilities.

As L. M. Wills suggests, the Jewish novellas constitute a unique laboratory for discerning the processes by which indigenous narratives of various kinds were transformed into popular Hellenistic literature.⁹ This renders them of inestimable significance for our appreciation of later literary developments. Of the extant Jewish novellas, the Book of Esther is of particular interest because of the sheer number of translations and recensions which bear significantly on the whole issue of

offers a development of character and situation through the depiction of events, but like the short story it is a relatively concentrated form, usually focusing on a small number of characters and narrating a single chain of events. He also suggests that it is of the essence of the novella that it is not confined to public events but moves also in the private realm. Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 224, prefers to identify discrete literary elements, and cites as features of the Jewish novella its entertaining plots, increasing number of women characters, internalizing psychological focus, interest in domestic setting and values, and manipulation of emotions.

⁷ As M. Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938) 44-104, has shown, the story of Pentephres' wife in the Testament of Joseph 3-9 (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) reflects in a particularly striking manner the general trend of novelistic development. Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 225-228, makes a good case for treating Dan 1-3, the story of Bel and the Dragon, and Susanna along novelistic lines. One might also treat the story of the Tobitads retailed by Josephus (*Antiquities*, 12) as an example of the Jewish novella. In this regard, see E. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988) 231-234.

⁸ Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 225. Wills notes that it is precisely the changes that are introduced into their sources that reveal most clearly the common direction and ethos of the Jewish novellas.

⁹ See Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 225.

the text's redaction in antiquity. In the present investigation we will consider two key versions of this narrative, namely, the MT and the LXX. My contention is that each text bespeaks a key juncture in literary history. Between the two works it is possible to trace a subtle shift in literary sensibilities and habits of reading; yet, subtle though it may be, this shift represents nothing less than the advent of a Greek novel.

Redaction as a modality of reading:

Instances of interpretation in the transmission of Esther

In antiquity, the Book of Esther enjoyed considerable scribal attention. It was evidently composed in Hebrew, and the autograph is likely to be adequately attested by the MT. There are however two distinct Greek versions, the A-text and the LXX, which in addition to countless minor variants of greater or lesser significance contain substantial blocks of material absent in the MT.¹⁰ While the additions relative to the MT found in the A-text are clearly derived from the LXX, it is possible to argue that where the A-text follows the MT it bears independent witness to a Semitic *Vorlage* and to this extent is independent of the LXX.¹¹ Furthermore, since the blocks of material found in the LXX do not necessarily come from the same hand, it is possible that there were a series of Greek redactions predating the extant LXX edition.¹² One notes that

¹⁰ Of the two distinct Greek versions which come down to us, the LXX-text or B-text of Esther is attested by the majority of witnesses, i.e. thirty-six MSS including the great uncials from the third to fourth centuries, while attestation to the A-text or AT ("alpha-text," so-named by Lagarde who took it for a Lucianic recension of the majority text) is limited to four medieval MSS (MSS 19, 93, 108 and 319 as denoted by the Göttingen sigla). See K. H. Jobes, *The Alpha Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS 153, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 1-2. For a general discussion of the Greek additions to Esther, see C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (The Anchor Bible; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977). See also idem, "On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther," *JBL* 92 (1973) 382-393. For a recent discussion of the redaction history of Esther, see M. Fox, *The Redaction of the Books of Esther* (SBLMS 40, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

¹¹ See Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther*.

¹² It is also possible that an ongoing history of Semitic redaction and suppletion lies behind some of the Greek additions. R. A. Martin, "Syntax

Josephus retails a version of the story based on the Greek text but which agrees with the Old Latin (also based on the Greek) against the LXX in the omission of A:12-17 and C:17-23, again suggesting the possibility of an earlier Greek version.¹³ At C:16 the OL itself has a 134-word addition which may be from this early version, though this is speculative. A medieval Aramaic text comes down to us which is apparently dependent upon the Greek but which oddly enough omits C:2-4 and 8-9 while providing parallels to C:5, 6, 7 and 10. It is not impossible that the influence of a Semitic text, independent of the extant LXX but later than the MT, lies behind these omissions and alterations, as Moore has in fact argued; but, again, this is speculative.¹⁴ Lastly, we might note that the targumic and midrashic commentaries on the Esther scroll may also be seen to reflect later Semitic reworkings of the narrative.

For the purposes of the present paper, only the MT and LXX versions will be under discussion. While the source-critical relationship of the A-text of the Book of Esther to both the MT and the LXX is still a matter of scholarly debate, there is little doubt that the MT transmits an earlier version of the text than does the LXX. The apparent lack of Greek influence on the substance of the MT, together with the style of its Hebrew, would place it close in time and spirit to the earliest stage of composition, perhaps sometime in the late Persian period.¹⁵ On the other hand, the LXX version evinces a literary style and religious outlook compatible with a second to first century BCE Greek speaking context.¹⁶ D. Clines considers the LXX to

Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther," *JBL* 94 (1975) 65-72, has argued on syntactical grounds that additions A, C, and D each represent translations of a Semitic *Vorlage*, while B and E represent Greek composition.

¹³ Josephus, *Antiquities*, 11.6.8.

¹⁴ See Moore, "On the Origins," 393.

¹⁵ In this regard, R. Gordis, "Studies in the Esther Narrative," *JBL* 95 (1976) 43-58, points to the familiarity of its author with Persian law, custom and language of the Achaemenid period. See C. A. Moore, *Esther: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (The Anchor Bible; Garden City: Doubleday, 1971) LVII, LIX. But see also E. Bickerman, *Four Strange Books of the Bible* (New York: Schocken, 1967) 170-186, who places the author in the second or third century BCE.

¹⁶ See Moore, "On the Origins," 383. The Palestinian provenance of the

be the most thorough and substantial of all of the five distinct reworkings of the Esther story he posits.¹⁷ For this reason, the differences between LXX-Esther and the MT are of considerable literary-historical significance. Since the key to appreciating these differences is undoubtedly to be found in the large blocks of material peculiar to the LXX version, it is especially interesting that these additions tend to push the MT narrative in what is a decidedly novelistic direction.¹⁸

C. Moore observes that the LXX version of the Book of Esther differs from the MT in four significant ways: i) it contains a number of additions, ii) it makes many omissions, iii) it is inconsistent with the substance of the MT at certain points, and iv) it contains several explicitly stated religious concerns.¹⁹ The question as to what sort of redactive interests lie behind these differences is an important one, and has received considerable scholarly attention in recent years.²⁰ Yet, while differences of types (i) and (iv) figure prominently in the discussion of this issue, those of types (ii) and (iii) are generally ignored. This is perhaps due to an unwillingness to accord LXX-Esther its own integrity as a literary composition, an unwillingness which is reflected in the lamentable but long-standing practice of treating the so-called Greek additions to Esther independently of the narrative. It ignores the fact that these additions are not discrete interpolations but features of a larger redactive process which ultimately reshaped the Semitic *Vorlage*. The task of understanding the *Tendenz* of this process

Greek text, attested by the colophon, is not out of the question; but whether the translation and redaction of Esther happened in Palestine or the Diaspora, cultural forces peculiar to the larger Hellenistic world would have been at work.

¹⁷ D.J.A. Clines, *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* (JSOT SS 30; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) 168.

¹⁸ Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 229f. A very different conclusion is drawn by Clines, *The Esther Scroll*, 169, who holds that the primary effect of the LXX expansions is "to assimilate the book of Esther to a scriptural norm." As I see it, Clines' position on this matter is weakened due to the nebulous character of 'scriptural norm' as a literary-critical concept.

¹⁹ Moore, *Esther*, LXI.

²⁰ See for instance Clines, *Esther Scroll*, 168-174; M. V. Fox, *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991) 270-273; Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 228-231.

will be hampered as long as scholarly attention remains focused on the content of the additions to the exclusion of other features of the text. Rather, differences between the LXX and the MT should be investigated to the end of identifying the global features of the LXX redaction. Only then will the distinct character of the LXX be seen for what it is: a creative reworking of its source.

As I have indicated, the present investigation limits itself to a specific discrepancy between the LXX and MT of Esther, namely the LXX's evident reconstrual of the Hebrew text at 2:7. What is at stake in this variance, I will now attempt to show, is nothing less than a deliberate revision of the source narrative, one consistent with other alterations, omissions and additions. My contention is that these changes are part of a coherent redactive strategy, one which serves to assimilate the underlying Semitic narrative to certain literary trends prevalent in the Hellenistic period.²¹

At 2:7 of the LXX text we are told that upon the death of her parents Esther entered the household of Mordecai and that ἐπαίδευσεν αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα....²² The plain sense of the Greek would seem to be that Mordecai raised Esther with the intention of marrying her, i.e. he raised her "for a wife." Yet, the MT, which more than likely agrees with the *Vorlage* of the LXX for this passage, reads לָקַח מֶרְדֳּכָי לָהּ לְבָתָהּ. We might gloss this as "Mordecai took her as his daughter." At first blush, it would appear that the translator has introduced the

²¹ I should note at this point that since I will be discussing a number of distinct versions of what is essentially the same story, so as to avoid confusion I will not transliterate proper names from the ancient languages but rather follow the conventions of English Bible translation, e.g. Mordecai rather than Mardocheaios (which would be the standard transliteration of the LXX form of the name).

²² This is the critical text offered by R. Hanhart, *Esther* (Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum, VIII, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966; 2nd ed., 1983) 144. There are two particularly interesting variants for this text, both of which construe Mordecai's relationship to Esther as an explicitly paternal one. MS 583 reads ελαβεν αυτην μαρδοχαιος εαυτω εἰς θυγατερα while MS 93 reads παιδευσεν αυτην εαυτω εἰς θυγατερα. Evidently there were scribes who were dissatisfied with the interpretation offered by the Old Greek text.

idea of marriage into the narrative without a linguistic warrant from the Hebrew text. As I intend to show, this is indeed how the peculiarity of the LXX text is best accounted for. Yet, since it is conceivable that the discrepancy between these two readings represents an aporia in the Greek text, 'noise,' as it were, in the process of translation, it is necessary to determine whether this might in fact have been the case. It could be that γυνή arose for נָא through either a misreading of the Hebrew text or an inept use of the Greek construction εἰς γυναῖκα. Since the burden of the argument falls squarely on those who would make the case for attributing an interpretative move to the Greek translator, the null hypothesis must first be tested before we can proceed with our discussion.

It might be argued that the Greek text should be read in light of the MT. This would mean that εἰς γυναῖκα be glossed something like "until she reached womanhood." But this proves to be an altogether unsatisfactory reading of the Greek. For one thing, it ignores the item ἐαυτῆ; if Mordecai simply raised her to adulthood there would be no further reference to his own interest in the matter. Secondly, it must construe the εἰς phrase temporally rather than causally. This is not impossible, yet it is not what we would expect. Thirdly, this reading must treat the noun γυνή as designating a stage in the life of a woman, i.e. the age of maturity, womanhood. Yet there is simply no linguistic evidence to support such a move. Although some translators have opted for this solution, it is clearly not a viable one for scholarship.

In his Anchor Bible commentaries, C. Moore is willing to take εἰς γυναῖκα at face value, glossing it as "for a wife," but he goes on to identify it as a "problem" for the Greek text.²³ Moore then retails the argument that γυνή arose from a misreading of לְבָה ('for a daughter') as לְבֵית ('to a house').²⁴ Now, in Rabbinic Hebrew while בֵּית stands primarily for 'house,' through a play on words it takes on the secondary meaning of 'wife.'²⁵ Hence, according to Moore, the Greek

²³ Moore, *Esther*, 20f; idem, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 186.

²⁴ This argument is generally attributed to P. Haupt, "Critical Notes on Esther," *AJSL* 24 (1907f.) 97-186.

²⁵ E. Segal, *The Babylonian Esther Midrash: A Critical Commentary*

translator of Esther misread the Hebrew of 2:7 as "took her for a wife."

There are two problems with this account of the matter. For one thing, even if we accept Moore's hypothesis that the translator thought he saw נָא on the scroll before him, his decision, by no means inevitable, to construe this item as a reference to the prospective marriage of Mordecai and Esther is perhaps better described as an interpretative judgment rather than a simple misreading of the Hebrew. Yet, such hermeneutic issues need not be addressed in order for us to assess Moore's position, for as it turns out his hypothesis is falsified linguistically by the context of the text in question. For some reason, Moore, in both of his commentaries, renders this as "he took her to himself for a wife."²⁶ What he neglects to point out is that the LXX replaces the Hebrew verb נָקַח with παιδεύω. Together with the preposition εἰς, this Greek verb conveys the sense of rearing or educating for some purpose, i.e. to some end.²⁷ Hence, what is at stake in the Greek text is not the mistaken rendering of a single item, but the recasting of an entire clause. The deliberate character of this recasting is made evident at 2:15 where the LXX omits the MT's לְקַח לָהּ לְבָת. On Moore's hypothesis, we would not expect such consistency. Clearly, if in recasting 2:7 the translator was misreading the Hebrew text, he was doing so in a creative way, for his divergence from the MT has a pattern to it suggestive of a certain willfulness; indeed, as I will argue, it suggests nothing less than a conscious transformation of the dramatic premises of the narrative.

M. V. Fox recognizes the deliberate character of the LXX version, and rightly treats the reading as an interpretative move

(Brown Judaica Studies 292; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 51. See also L. B. Paton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908) 171.

²⁶ Moore, *Esther*, 20; idem, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 186.

²⁷ The construction is admittedly a bit awkward, but its meaning is plain enough. It is a good example of a translator creatively exploiting the resources of the Greek language in order to articulate a novel interpretative move. See LXX-PsSol 16:11 and LXX-Jer 26:28 for analogous (though not strictly parallel) usage.

rather than as a mistake.²⁸ For Fox, however, LXX-Esther 2:7 represents a "secondary change" motivated by a sense of propriety. It is not therefore to be seen as part of a larger narrative interest at work in the Greek text; rather, it is a strictly local phenomenon. Fox goes on to cite b.Meg. 13a as an independent confirmation of the LXX reading and the sensibilities it reflects. On the authority of R. Meir, the rabbinic text may be seen to imply that Mordecai took Esther not "for his own daughter" but "as a wife."²⁹ Fox suggests that the Greek and Talmudic interpretations both attempt to "...obviate something of the impropriety of Mordecai taking an unmarried girl into his house...."³⁰ Hence, the impetus for both readings is to be located in common scribal attitudes. This point is worth considering in detail.

The textual support provided by the Talmud for R. Meir's reading of לביה for לבח at Esther 2:7 is a putative parallelism at 2 Sam 12:3, which is part of the parable of the Poor Man's Ewe told by the prophet Nathan to King David.³¹ E. Segal is probably correct in locating the basis of this midrash in the MT's use of the phrase "as a daughter" to signify a marital relationship in both contexts, allegorically in the case of the ewe of Nathan's parable, who is not a spouse but who represents one, and figuratively in the case of Esther, who is in fact a spouse.³² The somewhat strained character of this parallel might suggest that the midrash it warrants was not motivated

²⁸ Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 275.

²⁹ The rabbinic text reads "...in the name of R. Meir: Do not read 'for his own daughter' [levat] but 'as a home' [levayit]." As Segal, *Babylonian Esther*, 51, notes, by this R. Meir may simply have meant that Mordecai brought Esther "into his household"; Segal suggests that this reading might better account for the the citation of 2 Sam 12:3 which follows, though I am not convinced by this line of argument. Within the Babylonian Esther-Midrash and works influenced by it there is ample evidence that subsequent tradition read b.Meg. 13a as saying that Mordecai and Esther were married to one another. For the sake of the present discussion it is not necessary to determine whether this was R. Meir's intention.

³⁰ Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 275.

³¹ For a critical discussion of the rabbinic text, see Segal, *Babylonian Esther*, 48-52; also, see Paton, *Commentary*, 171.

³² Segal, *Babylonian Esther*, 49.

by the language of the verse itself. Indeed, Segal thinks it unlikely that R. Meir was attempting to solve any particular exegetical difficulty at this specific point in the text. Rather, the midrash would seem to reflect an interest in the larger narrative context of the verse. The rabbinic interpretation would then be analogous in principle to the LXX reading.

There is little doubt that the narrative situation described by the MT of Esther 2:7 would have been perceived as morally ambiguous by ancient readers, as indeed it might well be by moderns.³³ It is this ambiguity, I would suggest, which gave the ancient interpreter room to manoeuvre, and made possible the sort of interpretative judgment we see exercised in both the LXX and the Babylonian Talmud. In this regard, Fox's discussion of the matter is highly illuminating. Yet, I would suggest that depicting Mordecai and Esther as betrothed would have been a peculiar way of solving the specific problem of offended proprieties. As Fox admits, it makes Esther's involvement with the king "tantamount to adultery."³⁴ This is especially true for the Talmudic reading of the text, which seems to assume that at the time Esther entered the king's harem she was married. It therefore strikes me as unlikely that the signal issue behind this midrash was a felt need on the part of the rabbinic tradition to, as it were, impugn the narrative. If such had been the case, one might expect to find some reference to the issue in all the standard midrashim. As it happens, it is found only in the Babylonian Esther-Midrash, in which, incidentally, it figures prominently.³⁵ Within the various interpretative traditions arising from the Book of Esther, the reading attributed to R. Meir might thus be seen as a relatively localized one. As such, it shows no sign of being a scribal reflex, i.e. a spontaneous conformity of the text to common rabbinic assumptions. It looks more like a creative negotiation of the narrative, an interpretative judgment found to be compelling by subsequent readers and so diffused throughout a local exegetical tradition.

³³ Paton, *Commentary*, 171, notes that commentators have traditionally been troubled to see how Mordecai could take a girl of his own generation into his house as a daughter.

³⁴ Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 275.

³⁵ Segal, *Babylonian Esther*, 51.

On my reading of the evidence, the parallel between the LXX-Esther 2:7 and b.Meg. 13a is therefore of considerable literary interest. What it suggests is that the impetus for both these readings of the Hebrew text may be located in the structure of the narrative itself. Indeed, as I see it, the parallel attests to an interpretative warrant in the text, i.e. an invitation to some of its earliest and most influential readers to elaborate the narrative in a specific way. Allow me to nuance this point somewhat.

At least within the narrative world of the Hebrew story, Mordecai and Esther were ideal candidates for marriage. Hence, Fox will remark that although Mordecai took her as daughter "as cousins they could have married."³⁶ Given the sensibilities assumed by the narrative, they were inherently suited for one another; in the ancient Near East, first-cousin marriages were considered highly desirable. L. B. Paton points out that according to Semitic custom, a cousin on the father's side was the most suitable of all persons for one to take as a wife.³⁷ This is reflected in Aramaic usage, which treats "daughter of a paternal uncle" as a synonym for "wife." It is therefore likely that any reader of the Hebrew *Vorlage* inclined to narrative elaboration would have found the description of Esther as *מרת מרדכי* highly suggestive to say the least.³⁸

³⁶ Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 30.

³⁷ Paton, *Commentary*, 171.

³⁸ Segal, *Babylonian Esther*, 52, notes that later Jewish sources are consistent in treating Esther as Mordecai's niece. Both the OL and Jerome's Latin text follow this understanding of their relationship. Segal, 51f, suggests that this tradition has a Pharisaic provenance, and was originally intended to provide biblical support for the controversial practice of niece-marriage. Segal's argument is plausible, and if the text was in fact used by the Pharisaic party as a warrant for such marriages, it would account for the absence of the Esther scroll at Qumran, where this practice was prohibited. At the same time, I remain dissatisfied with Segal's suggestion that the tradition that Esther was Mordecai's niece arose alongside the idea that they were married, for it suggests that these two interpretative moves must share the same provenance. Rather, it seems more likely that the marriage motif was introduced into the narrative earlier and in circumstances distinct from those which prompted its use in Pharisaic polemics. Indeed, it could only have been at such a time as the marriage motif had gained some exegetical authority that the Pharisaic party could then appeal to Esther 2:7 in support of a specific sort of

It is also important to note that the fact of the adoption was in itself no barrier to marriage. Mordecai's adoption of his future wife would have been thoroughly appropriate in the cultural context assumed by the story. Fox appreciates this, and suggests that underlying the interpretation of the LXX and b.Meg. 13a is "the practice of adoption-marriages."³⁹ In such marriages, a man would adopt a girl with the intention of marriage when she attained the age of maturity.⁴⁰ It seems to me that precisely this intention is captured by the LXX's *εἰς* construction at 2:7. Fox does not see any hint of this practice in the book of Esther itself, and locates the impetus for this reading in the realm of scribal anxiety. Yet, as I have argued, this sort of explanation is by no means satisfactory. The translator shows considerable freedom with his source: if Mordecai's propriety was at stake, surely Esther's was too, and he could have spared the propriety of both by introducing a wife for Mordecai. This, of course, he does not do; there is no mention whatsoever of Mordecai's family, which in itself, as Paton notes, is highly peculiar.⁴¹ Instead, the LXX construes the relationship between Mordecai and Esther in a manner which if anything contributes further moral ambiguity to the narrative.

What we have with the LXX and Talmudic readings of MT-Esther 2:7, I would submit, are two independent witnesses to what semiotic critics term overcoding.⁴² The scenario depicted

marriage, i.e. niece-marriage.

³⁹ Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 275.

⁴⁰ For this custom, see MT-Ezek. 16.

⁴¹ Paton, *Commentary*, 171.

⁴² For a lucid treatment of overcoding and intertextual frames see U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader*, (Hutchinson: London, 1979) 17-23. It is important to note that the particular frame consulted by a reader will depend upon his or her literary culture. In this regard, F. Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1979) 45, speaks of the "paradox applying to all narrative that although its function is mnemonic it always recalls different things. The mode of recall will depend in some measure on the fashion of a period- what it seems natural or reasonable to expect a text to say." The interpretative agreement between LXX-Esther and later Jewish interpreters, who lacked the kind of freedom exercised by the Greek translator, is significant and underscores just how compelling the latent sense of Esther 2:7 was for its early

by the MT and most importantly the language of that depiction are evidently such as to have cued certain ancient readers to go beyond the manifest text and consult an intertextual frame, i.e. a specific narrative scheme affording interpretative purchase on the text. The frame which was in fact consulted by the Greek redactor might best be described as that of the 'frustrated betrothal,' a stock scenario from Greek romance in which the resolution of a marriage is indefinitely delayed through various plot complications. The rabbinic interpreter, on the other hand, had recourse to a frame with precedent in folk narrative, that of the 'violated marriage,' a scenario in which a young woman is scandalously taken from her lawful husband by royal sanction. What is important is that LXX-Esther and b.Meg. 13a represent parallel instances of what is essentially a narrative development. Quite simply, while the Hebrew read לבת the narrative context implied לבית to certain key readers. After all, the circumstances of Esther's adoption in the MT are highly suggestive. This invitation to interpret would have been reinforced linguistically by the construction ... ל... ל... לקחה, variants of which in classical Hebrew prose can be idiomatic for marriage.⁴³ While the Greek translator was free to alter the entire clause in accordance with his interpretation of Esther as Mordecai's intended spouse, the Talmudic reading faced certain constraints, and assuming Esther to be Mordecai's wife, made appeal to a play on words. That such a response to the text proved compelling for others is indirectly confirmed by subsequent tradition. Paton reminds us that the LXX reading found widespread acceptance in ancient commentaries.⁴⁴

At this point, I should stress that by speaking of its intertextuality I am making no claims as to authorial intention in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX-Esther, rather I am simply drawing attention to a feature of the narrative which encouraged interpretative judgment amongst some of its most significant readers. The failure to make this distinction led Paton to abandon his own insight into the matter: while he takes seriously the possibility that Esther is Mordecai's wife,

interpreters.

⁴³ For an example of such usage, see MT- 1 Sam 25:39 לקחה לו לאשה.

⁴⁴ Paton, *Commentary*, 171.

even within the narrative world of the MT, he ultimately dismisses this hypothesis on the grounds that only virgins were gathered for the king; since Esther was one of those selected, she must have been a virgin.⁴⁵ Moore likewise points out that only virgins would have been taken to the king's harem.⁴⁶ Such an objection confuses the matter by putting the question of authorial intention to the text, properly a question for psychology, when the issue is in fact a literary one.

My argument is not that the author of the *Vorlage* meant one thing, said another, and in so doing happily introduced an aporia into his narrative. What I am proposing is that for whatever reason there is a certain amount of ambiguity latent in his depiction of Esther and Mordecai's relationship, ambiguity which gives rise to certain tensions in the narrative. These tensions remain in the MT. The narrator may use the word "daughter" in speaking of Esther's adoption, and "virgin" in speaking of the abduction of nubile girls into the king's harem, but this does not spare one the task of interpretation. Other signals in the text invite the reader to ponder Esther's true relationship with Mordecai, and then trace the implications of this relationship through the ensuing narrative. Considerable dramatic tension arises from the concentration of disparate roles in one character - Esther is at once cousin and daughter, mistress and virgin, wife and queen - and this tension motivates the reader to consult whatever stock of relevant narrative schemes is provided by the prevailing literary culture. Readers must ever grapple with the literal ambiguities of texts and they do so quite often through recourse to such schemes, narrative scenarios which they may then write into the text before them; the reader is a redactor only because he or she is a competent reader first and foremost.

As I have indicated, Moore wants to imply that while the Hebrew text "makes perfectly good sense," the LXX version of Esth 2:7 is lacking in this regard.⁴⁷ On my understanding of the matter, however, this is to misread the overcoding of the narrative. I would suggest that while the Hebrew text is decidedly and perhaps deliberately ambiguous on the issue of

⁴⁵ Paton, *Commentary*, 171.

⁴⁶ Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 186.

⁴⁷ Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 186.

Mordecai and Esther's true relationship, the LXX and b.Meg. 13a attempt to address this ambiguity by teasing out what they evidently took to be a key aspect of its dramatic structure. I should note that neither reading removes the moral tensions surrounding the relationship; in fact, both readings intensify this aspect of the story, and in so doing they develop certain themes latent in the Hebrew text.

Specifically, Esther's closer relationship with Mordecai intensifies the moral and emotional dilemma occasioned by her assumption of the Persian throne. According to b.Meg. 13a, Esther and Mordecai were married at the time. This of course makes her relationship with the gentile king adulterous, and her royal status something approaching a travesty. Admittedly effective at a thematic level, at the level of plot this reading does not square well with the king's explicit intention to marry a virgin. As I read it, the LXX avoids this problem altogether. Since she was still only betrothed to Mordecai, Esther is not an entirely unsuitable partner for the king, and their marriage is technically legitimate. At the same time, precisely because of their betrothal, the LXX narrative introduces heightened dramatic interest into Mordecai and Esther's continued relationship after her marriage. The reader is invited to imagine the kind and degree of affection which persists between this thwarted couple, and speculate as to its ultimate significance for the outcome of the story.

It is important to note that felicitous as its interpretation may be, the LXX did not need to construe the matter of Esther and Mordecai's relationship as it did. Unlike later Talmudic commentators, the Greek translator would seem to have had a high degree of license in such matters; he was less bound by the text.⁴⁸ The fact that he chose to read it as he did is therefore

⁴⁸ As Moore, *Esther*, LXI, observes, this is a translation which is not bound to the exact wording of the Hebrew but is free to paraphrase. At the same time, it follows its source verse by verse and on the whole remains true to its basic sense. I should note that for the purposes of the present discussion, it does not matter whether or not the redactor I posit for the departure of LXX-Esther 2:7 from the MT was himself the translator. Either way, I would argue that it is both legitimate and useful to identify what we might call the 'customary method' of the translation, for I assume that even in the event that there were multiple contributors to its final form, LXX-Esther can be treated as a unitary work which is at once a

of some interest; here we have an instance of a deliberate interpretative judgment of some consequence for the overall shape of the narrative. Unlike Fox, who, as I have noted, treats LXX 2:7 as part of a strategy aimed at protecting certain moral proprieties, I would argue that this variant is of direct consequence to the LXX's telling of the story.⁴⁹ This is to say, it is a literary fact; it bears on our understanding of how the narrative was actually read by its translator, and how it was meant to be understood by its new audience.

In this regard, I have spoken of LXX 2:7 in terms of the negotiation of overcoded texts. This notion is not intended as a hermeneutic sleight of hand, some virtual text created for the purposes of a metatextual game. Rather, overcoding is a demonstrable semiotic phenomenon, and one which may with some confidence be situated in historically conditioned, and therefore historically identifiable acts of reading, that is, in the efforts (by no means arbitrary) of specific readers to make sense of the story before them through recourse to their knowledge of other narratives. The intertextual frame one selects in the course of negotiating a given text is hardly the fruit of interpretative whim, but rather is a function of one's habits of reading. It is the consequence of a judgment, which, I want to stress, is informed by a set of literary expectations held more or less in common by the literary culture of a certain time, place and social context. One makes sense of a text according to the "fashions of a time."

It is therefore helpful to see intertextuality in terms of the reader's creative assimilation of a given act of reading to a family of related acts normative for his or her reading community. Faced with an invitation to interpret, the reader draws upon previous literary experience. This way of putting the matter has immediate bearing on our understanding of LXX-Esther, for I would like to suggest that the Greek translator elected to read 2:7 as he did out of literary assimilation of the narrative to the popular fiction of his time,

translation and redaction of a Hebrew *Vorlage* adequately attested by the MT. Hence, it is not misleading to speak of 'translator' or 'redactor' in the singular, and indeed to use these terms equivocally, with the caveat that a process and not necessarily a person is understood by these terms.

⁴⁹ Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 275.

namely, the prose romance of late Hellenism. His construal of Esther and Mordecai's relationship as a betrothal should thus be seen in relation to the literary expectations of the new Jewish readership then emerging in late Hellenism of which he was a part. In effect, whether consciously or not, the translator of LXX-Esther rendered it a new sort of narrative for a new sort of reader.

Cosmopolitan, middle-class, Greek-speaking, these readers, just as their gentile counterparts, would likely have found the sentimental portrayal of character congenial to their sensibilities. In its suggestion that Esther and Mordecai were intimately related, the translator of LXX-Esther introduces just such a dimension into the narrative. The source of sentiment in romantic narrative is to be found in the theme of threatened relationship, a theme usually conveyed through the deployment of a separation-motif. In LXX-Esther, with the introduction of this motif, the intertwined but distinct plot functions of royal-patron (Esther) and courtier-client (Mordecai) are fused into a single locus of dramatic urgency. From their physical separation to their symbolic union, it is the estrangement of the protagonists one from another which propels the Greek narrative forward. Their every word and gesture thereby takes on a certain erotic valence. In their mutual alienation from one another, Esther and Mordecai become incomplete halves of an ideal whole figured by the image of marital union; this figure, in turn, carries much of the dramatic burden of the narrative and emerges as one of its key symbols.

If I am at all correct in my understanding of the matter, for one to correctly read the variant at LXX-Esther 2:7 is to appreciate the literary achievement of the translation as a sentimental romance. To put the matter differently, with the introduction of the separation-motif there is a clear warrant in the text to read the subsequent narrative against the background of a certain body of Hellenistic literature, i.e. to interpret it according to a specific body of literary conventions. As these are the very conventions which would later be embodied in the Greek novel, this genre becomes our best point of reference for appreciating the literary character of LXX-Esther. By the same token, as an early instance of this genre, Esther becomes a privileged window on a key socio-literary development

hitherto shrouded by the vagaries of history.

What has Alexandria to do with Jerusalem?

Reading LXX-Esther in light of the Greek romantic novel

One of the most distinctive features of the Greek romantic novel is its deployment of the separation motif. Typically, the plot is motivated by the violent separation of a young heterosexual couple whose one desire is to be together.⁵⁰ This desire animates all subsequent action, giving it whatever dramatic significance it may have. In effect, two intertwining stories are told: each the tale of a lover's attempt to be reunited with the beloved. These two distinct narrative threads, which may criss-cross in unexpected ways throughout the telling of the story, are fused in a dramatic moment of resolution as the story ends with the two protagonists reunited. Depending upon the sophistication of the novel, the character of each protagonist and the quality of the relationship they share may well have undergone some development over the course of their separation. Still, such development is somewhat rare, and one would by no means call it a feature of the Greek novel. The craft of these works lies squarely in the author's deft manipulation of a succession of plot complications, all of which serve only to delay the inevitable reunion of the lovers; the art of these novels lies in the suggestiveness of their plot complications, the metaphorical quality of these delays as they bear upon the fundamental theme of estrangement. Working

⁵⁰ Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, 7, suggests that the impulse behind this genre is to be found precisely in its erotic themes. While there were undoubtedly nonerotic forms of the Greek novel, the core works of the genre were likely to have been love-romances. Of the five extant Greek novels of antiquity, two are rightly located by T. Hagg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1983) 3, in the earlier, more popular style of sentimental prose fiction which evidently flourished in late Hellenism, namely Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and Xenophon's *An Ephesian Tale*. Of the two, Chariton's novel is decidedly the earlier. It is therefore the earliest extant Greek novel, and as such our best point of comparison for LXX-Esther. A detailed literary analysis of the two is therefore in order. While such an undertaking is beyond the scope of the present paper, the subsequent discussion does take into account the privileged role of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* as a literary control for any treatment of the novelistic features of LXX-Esther.

with a familiar stock of character-types and plot-devices, the author is free to fashion a tightly wrought symbolism.

Now, at first blush, one might contend that the Book of Esther shows no resemblance to such tales of separated lovers. Yet, I would submit that in its underlying dramatic structure the signal aspects of romantic narrative are all present, and that, in this respect, there is a formal continuity not only between MT-Esther and LXX-Esther, but between MT-Esther and the Greek novel of late antiquity. In order to show this, it is of course important that I be clear about what I mean by romance. Let me then briefly draw attention to the work of Northrop Frye, whose discussion of this topic is undoubtedly the most illuminating to date.⁵¹

For Frye, at least as I read him, the key to the structure of romantic fiction is its projection of a bipolar imaginative universe wherein one pole is an idyllic-world where human desires and ideals find their proper scope, and the other a night-world (often symbolized by human sacrifice) where these ideals are frustrated. What is important to note about Frye's distinction is that it is grounded in the experience of social norms and their violation. The night-world is not a tragic one so much as an object of moral abhorrence, it is a place where normal social aspirations are frustrated or perverted; and while the day-world is in an important sense paradisaical, it often has a decidedly secular quality, being the place where social aspirations find fulfilment. Romantic narrative is set in motion by the metaphorical descent of its protagonist from the idyllic-world to the night-world; what drives its dramatic unfolding is the irresistible draw of the idyllic-world upon those who have descended. In the sentimental romance, the image of marital union tends to provide the master figure for existence in the idyllic-world; hence, the night-world becomes, quintessentially, the place of separation.

With Frye's schema in mind, let us now turn to the story of Esther as it is told in the MT version. Commentators have often remarked on the double-stranding of the plot, which turns on a

⁵¹ See Frye, *Secular Scripture*, for the text of his important Norton lectures of 1975 wherein he treats romance as a literary modality characterized by certain archetypal patterns.

certain parallelism between Mordecai and Esther.⁵² There is much truth in this observation, but it should not be allowed to obscure the fact that MT-Esther is a nationalist romance and it is the Jewish nation which is really its protagonist.⁵³ Hence, it is the parallel between Mordecai's fate and that of the nation which is at the centre of the narrative; Mordecai's predicament at court is a dramatic embodiment of the fundamental predicament of the nation in a state of captivity. The story is set against the backdrop of the Eastern diaspora, and so we might speak of the Jewish nation having entered a night-world to which Haman's insidious plot is correlative.

Mordecai is decidedly the hero of the romance in its earliest version.⁵⁴ Esther's role in this tale is twofold. At one level, she is the patron at court who can influence the king; at a more profound level, however, she performs the sacrifice required by the logic of romantic narrative, the sacrifice which frees the protagonist from subjugation to the night-world and restores him to his proper realm. It is through Esther's intercession that Mordecai and the Jewish people enter the idyllic-world of communal well-being symbolized by the establishment of the feast of Purim and dramatically embodied in Mordecai's final advancement at court, which not only marks his personal vindication but stands as an assurance of peace and prosperity for his people.

Given its literary roots in Ancient Near Eastern court-tales, it is not surprising that the Book of Esther evinces a romantic structure. Such popular stories trade on the same mytho-poetic figures as romance, and, as G. Anderson has argued, when they are taken up into the extended prose narratives of a literate

⁵² See Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 228f.

⁵³ Braun's *History and Romance* provides a fine introduction to the nationalistic romances of the early Hellenistic era. He makes the astute observation (pg. 3) that such "popular narrative literature is the spiritual bread without which no proud people can stand the pressure of alien domination, and it is individual heroic figures in whom the feeling and longing of the masses come to a concentrated expression." Unfortunately, he does not discuss late Persian romances such as Esther.

⁵⁴ Moore, *Esther*, LI, notes that it is only in the LXX version "that Esther steals the show from Mordecai...." The earliest reference to Purim outside of the Esther scroll, II Mac 15:36, mentions only Mordecai. As Moore concludes, he is evidently the "greater hero" for the Hebrew text.

culture, their formal characteristics come with them.⁵⁵ At the same time, a nationalistic romance such as MT-Esther is more than an extended folk-tale; it represents a different sort of undertaking, making distinct claims on the reader. In particular, it expects the reader to identify closely with the predicament of its protagonist, the nation, in its descent into the night-world of displacement and subjugation, and then to share vicariously the joy of its restoration to the idyllic-world of socio-religious integrity. The romance accomplishes this by depicting both worlds in terms familiar to the historical circumstances and political aspirations of its readership.

The period which intervened between the publication of MT-Esther and LXX-Esther was clearly a time of profound socio-cultural transition. Since there is only fragmentary evidence for the production or editing of Jewish prose narrative during this period some have spoken of a "Dark Age" in Jewish literature.⁵⁶ Of course, it is unlikely that there was a break in literary activity as such; yet, history is silent, and this might suggest that Jewish literary culture was without a coherent force or direction at this time. One thing is clear, however, namely, that during this period of latency, a new class of Jewish readers was emerging, a cosmopolitan one firmly situated in the 'push and shove' of life in the great Hellenistic empires. And so by about 200 BCE, with the renewal of significant Jewish literary activity, we would expect an accommodation on the part of Jewish authors to the imaginative needs of this generation.⁵⁷ We need not posit a dramatic change in the substance of Jewish story telling; the same sorts of stories no doubt continued to be told, stories based on biblical and Persian epic models. Yet, with the advent of a new readership, these stories were likely construed to serve new purposes.⁵⁸ The redaction of LXX-Esther is to be understood in terms of these purposes.

⁵⁵ Anderson, *Ancient Fiction*, 38.

⁵⁶ Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 224.

⁵⁷ Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, 8, draws a connection between the transformation of late Hellenistic society to the values of a cosmopolitan world and the transformation of prose fiction in the direction of the novel.

⁵⁸ Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 225.

One generalization which can be made with some confidence is that LXX-Esther was part of a growing body of literature serving the needs of a Graeco-Jewish retainer class whose socio-economic interests were bound more or less to the affairs of empire. Its readers were likely to have been members of the massive entrepreneurial and administrative apparatus which arose within the imperial hierarchies. Some would have been involved in trade and commerce. But together they shared the new values of urban existence in the imperial context. In this way, their aesthetic sensibilities mirrored certain broader trends in late Hellenism. These new sensibilities would ultimately find popular literary expression in the Greek romantic novel, which reached its definitive form by at least the first century BCE, and it is not unlikely that LXX-Esther at once anticipates and reflects this development.⁵⁹

On my understanding, the redactive *Tendenz* of LXX-Esther is one of creative appropriation; the work stands as a fresh retelling of a nationalist romance for an audience who expected a sentimental treatment of this traditional subject. To achieve this, the redactor introduced the motif of separation. In effect, he exploited the romantic structure of its Semitic *Vorlage*, but oriented it in the direction of contemporary literary taste. While scribal proprieties required some subtlety on the part of the redactor in recasting his source, he introduced sufficient cues into the new version of the story to render its structural implications clear to his implied reader.

In the canonical Greek novels, the separation motif typically trades on an explicit erotic attachment between the two protagonists. This of course was not an option for the redactor of LXX-Esther, whose source did not really invite such a development. Yet, the relationship between Mordecai and Esther, however defined, is integral to the structural core of MT-Esther, and, as I have suggested, for the ancient reader it no doubt bespoke a certain intertextuality. To introduce the separation motif, it was necessary only to tease out the

⁵⁹ G. P. Goold, in his translation of *Chariton* (Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1995) 2, locates the publication of this the earliest extant novel between 25 B.C.-A.D. 50 on the basis of both linguistic and historical considerations. He provides a succinct introduction to the issue of dating.

fundamental attachment implicit in this relationship. The signal device for depicting such attachment in the Greek novel was the promise of marriage, and this, I would argue, was precisely the device used in Greek Esther.

As we have seen, Esther is described as the daughter of Mordecai's uncle, and is therefore a first cousin. We are told by the narrator that upon the death of her parents, she entered Mordecai's household; Mordecai was evidently single. This state of affairs might have been sufficient for a subtle allusion to a deeper attachment, but if the separation motif was to become part of the very texture of his narrative the redactor of LXX-Esther would need to anchor it in his characterization of the two protagonists. What was required was some kind of explicit notice, so at 2:7 the narrator informs the reader that Mordecai raised his ward ἐς γυναικα. In this way, with the introduction of a single detail, the tone of the narrative is profoundly transformed. The court tale of a pious Jew whose life is put in jeopardy by the machinations of a resentful gentile becomes a story about the separation and symbolic restoration of a betrothed couple. Hence, the movement of the plot takes on an entirely different emotional valence: amatory fulfilment and its frustration become a key dynamic within the unfolding narrative.

At the outset of the story, Esther is presumably still living in Mordecai's household; that these two protagonists are Jewish, while the other actors in the narrative are gentile, heightens the reader's sense that their relationship is of symbolic as well as dramatic significance. Esther's departure to the royal harem, motivated by the affairs of a gentile court, has therefore the figural quality of violation; it marks the transition to a night-world. It is important to note that in MT-Esther, Esther's assumption of royal status in a gentile court is in itself morally unproblematic; for the redactor of LXX-Esther it is a source of great tension.⁶⁰

In LXX-Esther, Esther and Mordecai both share a deep alienation. This mood pervades the redaction, but the economy

⁶⁰ Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 186, observes that the MT treats Esther's selection for the harem "as a stroke of good luck." This attitude is in stark contrast to the sentiments expressed in the Greek addition LXX-Esther C:25-30, where Esther is seen to abhor her royal status.

with which it is introduced is remarkable; through the introduction of a number of striking details the redactor is able to achieve considerable dramatic effect.⁶¹ While this dimension of the Greek version may partly reflect the piety of a new generation of diaspora readers, and specifically the changes in attitude toward gentiles which are characteristic of this period, it also reflects the generic conventions of the sentimental romance. Whereas in the symbolic economy of the nationalist romance only the protagonist enters into the night-world, in the sentimental romance both members of a betrothed or married couple are drawn into the world of alienation.

Given that the night-world of sentimental romance is figured preeminently by separation, the visit of Mordecai to the precincts of the royal harem takes on a heightened dramatic significance in LXX-Esther. Here the betrothed couple is at once together, but separated by a palace wall and the arbitrary royal power it represents. This is at once a striking image and the symbolic key to the novel. The picture of Mordecai outside the harem gives concrete form to all the sentiments associated with the motif of violent separation; to use a favorite term of T. S. Eliot, it is their 'objective correlative.'

Violated relationship, figural or otherwise, has consequences in sentimental romance, and the threat to Mordecai, graphically captured in the image of Haman's guillotine, should be seen, regardless of its explicit motivation in the plot, to flow symbolically out of Esther's departure into the night-world. In a sense, so too does the threat to the Jewish nation; for the descent of Mordecai and Esther into the night-world of the gentile court is of cosmological significance: it is like another fall of man.⁶² The very order of things is

⁶¹ Some of these details trade on the conventions of earlier Jewish compositions. In this regard, Clines, *Esther Scroll*, 171, notes certain elements of the prayers in addition C which echo the prayers of supplication at Ezra 9:6-15 and Neh. 1:5-11; 9:6-37. To borrow Clines' words, they depict quintessentially the piety of "distressed Israelites." This is precisely what we would expect in a sentimental romance oriented to a Jewish audience. What is significant from a literary point of view is that such details contribute a subjective dimension to Esther and Mordecai's predicament, notably, a climate of personal alienation and distress.

⁶² Clines, *Esther Scroll*, 172, points out that with addition A the focus of the narrative is shifted from an historical to a cosmic level. Fox, *Character*

threatened, and an underlying imperative to restore what has been lost enters the narrative. Of course, in her efforts on behalf of Mordecai, Esther is also faced with the threat of death; this finds dramatic occasion in her audience with the king, where, incidentally, we might note that the motif of human sacrifice is heightened in the Greek redaction.⁶³

Both Mordecai and Esther emerge as distinct protagonists in the course of the narrative; each is tested by the course of events.⁶⁴ Yet, for all that, both are essentially complementary figures for the erotic union which they anticipate, a reality proleptically symbolized by the intertwining of their respective stories. In a sense, it is the primordial status of their relationship, and the scandal of its violation, which drives the Greek narrative to its inevitable conclusion; it is this, and not the psychological motivation of its characters, which gives the narrative dramatic conviction. The destinies of the two protagonists are irrevocably intertwined. Hence, the demise of the antagonist Haman means not only the deliverance of Israel from certain destruction but also the juncture of the two plot lines: the novella's resolution can only be adequately conveyed through the symbolism of reunion, that is, by the feast of Esther and Mordecai and the implicit promise of their marriage.⁶⁵

and *Ideology*, 271, also speaks of a "cosmic drama."

⁶³ One should note that at LXX:Esther D:7 (an addition), the climactic moment in the story when Esther first approaches the king on behalf of Mordecai, she is met with his "wrath," collapses, and in a sense dies a symbolic death. It is only after God's intervention that the King receives her and she recovers. Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 272, remarks that such swooning as we see at D:7 "is a favorite device in Hellenistic romance." Though, in comparing Esther to "a delicate Victorian," he overlooks the sacrificial symbolism at work in the narrative.

⁶⁴ Moore, *Esther*, LIII, observes that it is in the LXX version of the story that the "wise Mordecai" and "courageous Esther" emerge as identifiable characters. The introspective style of addition C is particularly significant in this regard.

⁶⁵ At 10:3 LXX-Esther reads (without explicit warrant from the MT) ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος διεδέχετο τὸν βασιλέα Ἀρταξέρξην which, unlikely as it sounds, should be glossed "and Mordecai succeeded King Artaxerxes," i.e. to the throne. This would imply that Mordecai and Esther ultimately ruled as King and Queen. This, I might add, is a fitting end to a sentimental romance.

Of course, Eros does not figure ostensibly as a motive in the double-stranding of Esther and Mordecai's stories; LXX-Esther differs here from what have come down to us as the canonical Greek novels. What is ostensibly at stake for the redactor is the undying fidelity of the couple to God and their solidarity as Jews over against the threat posed by Haman. In this respect, LXX-Esther retains some of its character as a nationalistic romance. The figuration of its idyllic and night-worlds is closely bound-up with the destiny of the Jewish nation; but the shift of dramatic interest from Mordecai alone to Mordecai and Esther is indicative of a sentimental treatment of the subject and the move towards a more novelistic literary idiom. While this is true of the dramatic structure of LXX-Esther, it is also true of many of the literary devices employed by the redactor. This becomes all the more evident when we compare specific features of the redaction with the methods of the Greek novel. To the end of stimulating further discussion on the subject, I will briefly review the novelistic character of some of the additions to LXX-Esther, treating three distinct sorts of material: descriptions of dreams, transcribed letters, and prayers.

LXX-Esther begins with the narration of a dream sequence (addition A) which anticipates allegorically the general outline of the ensuing narrative.⁶⁶ As T. Haag notes, dreams of a more or less directly symbolic kind are a common feature of the Greek novels.⁶⁷ Along with omens and oracles, they may act as local plot devices, motivating the action one way or another,

⁶⁶ I should note that Moore, "On the Origins," 386ff, postulates a Semitic *Vorlage* for the narration of the dream (A:4-10) as well as its prelude (A:1-3), while holding that Mordecai's discovery of the plot against the King is Greek in origin (A:11-17). This hypothesis in turn finds empirical support in Martin's study "Syntax Criticism," 65. At the same time, Moore's conclusion, 389, namely, that the dream represents an independent composition adapted to the story of Esther, is by no means inconsistent with the present argument.

⁶⁷ Haag, *The Novel*, 13. Haag, 111, refers to dreams as "highly functional elements" in the novel. He points out that this device is taken up from the literary apparatus of epic. In epic, however, the dream is usually a plot device, while in the Greek novel the dream very often takes on a symbolic character which extends beyond the level of plot to characterization, figuration and theme.

but quite frequently (as in LXX-Esther) the description of a dream sequence serves to prefigure larger patterns of events. In this way, a level of foreshadowing is introduced into the narrative which goes well beyond the immediate setting of the dream.⁶⁸ This creates a certain amount of dramatic expectation or suspense. Haag observes that with the Greek novel the suspense is not so much as to what will happen as to how it will happen.⁶⁹ In this way, the reader's attention is drawn less to the anticipated moment of narrative closure, and more to the actual unfolding of events.

This kind of foreshadowing also gives the Greek novel a dramatic coherence it might otherwise lack. The various elements of the dream may be linked thematically to the overall narrative; often as not, key motifs are introduced. Thus, in Greek Esther we find that the great theme of eschatological reversal is introduced through the dream-imagery of the fall of the great ones and the ascendancy of the humble ones. In the Greek novel, dreams are often presented through the figural consciousness of a character. In effect, the reader is invited to adopt the character's perspective; this occurs at the outset of LXX-Esther, and sets the tone for the rest of the story. Given the degree of indeterminacy in the symbolism of the dream, both reader and character share a certain foreboding as to the events which will unfold.

Historical verisimilitude is a key aspect of the novel, and the transcribed letters of Greek Esther (additions B and E) do contribute a certain historical quality to the work.⁷⁰ Of course, epistolary fiction was a popular Hellenistic genre in its own right.⁷¹ Letters attributed to great figures could be used to

⁶⁸ Haag, *The Novel*, 49, speaks of Achilles Tatius' use of dreams to spread a "net of foreshadowings" over his whole narrative." M. Delcor, "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Hellenistic Period" in *The Hellenistic Age*, (The Cambridge History of Judaism, Vol. II, ed. W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 452, points out that LXX-Esther uses Mordecai's dream in much the same way as Heliodorus uses such material.

⁶⁹ Haag, *The Novel*, 111.

⁷⁰ Moore, "On the Origins," 384f, is confident that the letters are Greek in origin and are fictitious. As we might expect, Martin's "Syntax Criticism," 65, supports the idea that they are Greek compositions.

⁷¹ Haag, *The Novel*, 126, suggests that by the first century CE accidental

illuminate historical events, but often they served purely literary ends. This genre is particularly apt at depicting character; through the tone and style of the letter, through its construal and interpretation of events, a unique perspective is fleshed out. What is remarkable about the first royal letter of Greek Esther in this regard is its convincing expression of anti-Jewish attitudes. We might note the formal sophistication of the letter; there is here in evidence a sheer delight in the craft of epistolary composition. Such creative use of a subgenre is typical of the novel, which often brings disparate literary forms into play.⁷² The style of the letters in Greek Esther also serves a larger rhetorical strategy, namely that of establishing the status of the implied author. As Wills notes, the letters place the novel in a world of literary attainment, a pretension running through most of the Greek novels.⁷³

Finally, Esther's prayer (addition C:12-30) deserves attention.⁷⁴ The use of prayer for depicting figural consciousness is a popular novelistic device; it gives the author a chance to present a self-disclosure of character. At the same time, the Greek novel often uses prayer, as it uses oracles and cultic practice, to create a certain impression of piety. There is some uncertainty amongst scholars as to the significance of this religious tone in the extant novels, but there is no doubt as to its prevalence.⁷⁵ The penitential ritual which accompanies Esther's prayer is likely meant to convey a peculiarly Jewish

collections of letters were giving way to the epistolary novel proper. The author of the Alexander Romance evidently incorporated a collection of letters into his narrative framework.

⁷² See Perry, *Ancient Romances*, 47, who calls the Greek novel "the open form *par excellence* for the open society." Like the epic it is the least concentrated of literary forms.

⁷³ Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 230.

⁷⁴ Moore, "On the Origins," 391f, evidently considers Esther's prayer to be a composition intended for the place and purpose it presently serves in LXX-Esther. Yet Martin, "Syntax Criticism," 65, concludes from his study that it is the translation of a Semitic *Vorlage*. It is not unlikely, however, that Martin's results point rather to the use of a Semitic literary model by a Greek author.

⁷⁵ Haag, *The Novel*, 103, observes that in Xenophon, the least sophisticated of the extant novels, almost every important event in the narrative is occasioned by reference to the gods.

piety, yet there may well be more going on here.⁷⁶ One is struck by the deliberately erotic character of the imagery. It is likely that what we have in this scene is a particularly subtle instance of intertextuality: the author of Greek Esther alludes to the sort of voyeuristic images of female sexuality which would become common in the Greek novel, while at the same time depicting an act in which female sexuality is ritually self-repudiated.⁷⁷ An erotic motif is thereby subverted by a religious one, and the voyeurism latent in the scene is displaced by a rather effective manipulation of the reader's perception of female bodies: a passive object of vision becomes the active subject of dramatic action. Such refinement of technique is the mark of a decidedly novelistic work.

What a brief review of some of the key additions to LXX-Esther emphasizes is that in its Greek form the narrative was ultimately reconceived as a sentimental romance. But once we allow LXX-Esther its integrity as a distinct literary achievement, the questions we put to it must be framed accordingly. In rehearsing the novelistic character of the major additions I have followed a long-standing scholarly practice of treating these sections independently of the overall redaction. Given their distinctive formal characteristics, there is clearly some sense in proceeding in this way, and, undoubtedly, by looking specifically at the larger blocks of additional text we gain a vivid sense of the sensibilities and interests which came to bear on the Greek translation. Yet, as I have argued, it is methodologically unsound to persist in treating the additions independently of the redactive *Tendenz* of the LXX text. Even if it was reshaped by many hands before reaching its extant form, this composition is more than the sum of its interpolations.

As I have maintained, the six major additions to LXX-Esther are really just the most telling features of what is arguably a strategic reworking of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The fundamental coherence of this revision is reflected in the numerous subtle and not so subtle interpolations, omissions

⁷⁶ Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 230, observes that the motif is paralleled in every Jewish novella but Tobit, and may be tied to the larger themes of national penance and renewal.

⁷⁷ See Wills, "Jewish Novellas," 230.

and alterations which together give the Greek text its identity as an independent literary composition. I would urge the conclusion that through the process of its Greek translation and redaction the Hebrew narrative attested by the MT was globally reconstrued as an altogether different kind of text for a different kind of reader. As contemporary readers of LXX-Esther we are invited to bring our literary expectations into line with the generic properties of this distinct work and read a classic tale anew. In short, what is called for is a full-scale commentary on LXX-Esther which is attentive its literary genre. Esther has stepped through the looking-glass of Greek sentimental romance, and she will never be quite the same again.

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Records of work published or in progress.
(Please print or type in publishable format.)
2. Records 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 AND DUES**

Send name, address, and U.S. \$10 per annum to:

Dr. Robert J.V. Hiebert
Trinity Western Seminary
7600 Glover Road
Langley, B.C. V2Y 1Y1 Canada
E-mail: robh@twu.ca

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
E-mail: avdkooij@cit10.wsd.leidenuniv.nl
Payment by Giro account 74 23 25