



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

Volume 32 Fall, 1999

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, Helsinki	1
Treasurer's Report	3
News and Notes	6
Record of Work Published or in Progress	11
Varia	18
On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel <i>Ronald S. Hendel</i>	31
Reassessing the Text-Critical Value of LXX-Genesis 1: A Response to Rösel <i>William P. Brown</i>	35
Review of N. Fernández Marcos' <i>Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia</i> <i>Moisés Silva</i>	40
Web Reviews: The CATSS Database <i>Tim McLay</i>	44
Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis <i>Frederick Knobloch</i>	47
The Septuagint and the Magical Papyri: Some Preliminary Notes <i>Alexis Leonas</i>	51
Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies <i>John William Wevers</i>	65

BULLETIN of the IOSCS

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

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

Johan Lust
Katholieke Univ. Leuven
St. Michielsstraat 2
B-3000 Leuven Belgium
johan.lust@theo.kuleuven.ac.be

Immediate Past President

Leonard J. Greenspoon
Creighton University
Omaha, NE 68178 U.S.A.
ljrn@creighton.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
St. Stephen's University
St. Stephen, NB
E3L 3E2 Canada
tmlay@ssu.ca

SBLSCS Series Editor

Melvin K. H. Peters
Dept. of Religion
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708 U.S.A.
melopete@acpub.duke.edu

Honorary Presidents

John Wm. Wevers (Toronto)
Albert Pietersma (Toronto)
Eugene Ulrich (Notre Dame)

Vice President

Benjamin G. Wright
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, PA 18015 U.S.A.
bgw1@lehigh.edu

NETS Co-chairs

Albert Pietersma (Toronto)
Benjamin Wright (Lehigh)

Associate Editor

Frederick W. Knobloch (LaSalle)

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)
Jan Joosten (Strasbourg)
Robert A. Kraft (Pennsylvania)
Olivier Munnich (Paris)
Takamitsu Muraoka (Leiden)
Moisés Silva (Gordon-Conwell)
Raija Sollamo (Helsinki)
Emanuel Tov (Jerusalem)
Kristin de Troyer (Claremont)

PROGRAM FOR THE IOSCS MEETING IN HELSINKI, JULY 16-17, 1999

Friday 16th July

Morning session - Main Building of the University, room 10

Albert Pietersma presiding

- 9.00-10.00 Raija Sollamo, Prolegomena to Septuagint Syntax
10.00-11.00 Anneli Aejmelaeus, Characterizing Criteria for the
Characterization of Septuagint Translators
11.00-12.00 Frank Austermann, ἀνομιὰ im Septuaginta-Psalter.
Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von
Übersetzungsweise und Theologie

Afternoon session - University Main Building, room 10

Anneli Aejmelaeus presiding

- 13.30-14 Jan de Waard, Some Unusual Translation
Techniques Employed by the Greek Translator(s)
of Proverbs
14.-14.30 Trevor Evans, Relative Frequencies of Imperfect
and Aorist Indicatives in the Greek Pentateuch:
The Manifestation of a Hebraism
14.30-15 Eugene Ulrich, Translation Technique in the
Septuagint of Isaiah
15-15.30 Albert Pietersma, A Commentary on Septuagint Ps
1

Evening sessions

Group A - University Main Building, room 10

Eugene Ulrich presiding

- 16.30-17 Bénédicte Lemmelijn, Two Methodological Trails
in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of
the Septuagint

- 17-17.30 Kristin De Troyer, "Blood of purification" or "unclean blood". A reflection on the Greek translation of Leviticus 12
- 17.30-18 P.D.M. Turner, The Translator(s) of Ezekiel Revisited: idiosyncratic renderings as a clue to Old Greek inner history
- 18-18.30 Robert Kraft, Exploring and Exploiting the Internet for Septuagintal Studies

Group B - University Main Building, room 12

Takamitsu Muraoka presiding

- 16.30-17 Paul Danove, The Grammatical Constructions of ἀκούω and Their Implications for Translation
- 17-17.30 Johann Cook, Ideology and Translation Technique - Two sides of the same coin?
- 17.30-18 Cornelis den Hertog, Observations on translation technique in the Greek Leviticus
- 18-18.30 Evangelia Dafni, אִישׁ הַרְוֹת - ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος (Hos. 9,7)

Saturday 17th July

Morning session - University Main Building, room 10

Jan de Waard presiding

- 9.00-10.0 Takamitsu Muraoka, Translation techniques and beyond
- 10.00-11.00 Staffan Olofsson, Death shall be their shepherd - An interpretation of Ps 49:15 in MT and LXX
- 11.00-11.45 Anssi Voitila, The Use of the Imperfect and Translators' Concept of the Hebrew Verbal System in the Greek Pentateuch

Afternoon session - University Main Building, room 10

Raija Sollamo presiding

- 13.00-13.15 Kristin de Troyer, MS 2648 & 2649: a Joshua and a Leviticus Papyrus from the Schøyen collection
- 13.15-13.45 Seppo Sipilä, The renderings for ו and כ in the LXX of Joshua
- 13.45-14.45 Archimandrite Januarij, The Problem of the Bible textual Tradition in Russia

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

TREASURER'S REPORT
U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNT
JULY 1, 1998 - JUNE 30, 1999

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

BALANCE 7/1/98 5150.18

CREDITS

7/2/98 (Interest)	4.37
8/3/98 (Interest)	4.91
8/10/98 (Deposit)	470.00
9/1/98 (Interest)	5.21
9/16/98 (Deposit)	10.00
9/16/98 (Deposit)	120.00
9/29/98 (Deposit)	60.00
10/1/98 (Interest)	5.24
10/20/98 (Deposit)	210.00
11/2/98 (Interest)	4.51
11/6/98 (Deposit)	37.66
11/6/98 (Deposit)	140.00
11/16/98 (Deposit)	242.00
12/1/98 (Interest)	4.45
12/4/98 (Deposit)	104.00
12/15/98 (Deposit)	280.70
1/4/99 (Interest)	4.46
1/20/99 (Deposit)	120.00
1/29/99 (Deposit)	130.00
2/1/99 (Interest)	2.83
2/11/99 (Deposit)	10.00
2/11/99 (Deposit)	468.00
2/19/99 (Deposit)	10.00
2/19/99 (Deposit)	268.00
3/1/99 (Interest)	2.13

3/5/99 (Deposit) 300.00
 3/19/99 (Deposit) 188.00
 3/31/99 (Deposit) 144.00
 4/1/99 (Interest) 2.87
 5/3/99 (Interest) 2.90
 5/12/99 (Deposit) 448.00
 6/1/99 (Interest) 3.10
 6/2/99 (Deposit) 286.00
 6/10/99 (Deposit) 78.00

Total 4171.34

DEBITS

7/16/98 (BIOSCS editor's budget) 31.00
 10/6/98 (Returned item: account closed) 30.00
 11/24/98 (Cheque to 1998 IOSCS essay prize winner)
 250.00
 11/30/98 (Cheque did not clear) 50.00
 12/7/98 (Reimbursement to former treasurer of personal funds
 deposited) 400.00
 12/21/98 (Cheque did not clear) 50.00
 12/21/98 (Reimbursement to president for legal fees re: IOSCS
 incorporation) 31.80
 1/12/99 (Printing and mailing costs, BIOSCS 30) 3500.00
 4/6/99 (Department of Treasury fee for tax exempt status)
 150.00
 5/25/99 (Legal fees) 20.00
 6/9/99 (Returned item: cheque did not clear) 60.00
 6/15/99 (Returned item: cheque did not clear) 68.00
 6/28/99 (Accountant fees pertaining to IOSCS incorporation)
 791.87

Total 5432.67

BALANCE 6/30/99 3888.85

SUMMARY

BALANCE 7/1/98 5150.18

7/1/98 -- 6/30/99 Credits +4171.34
 Total 9321.52

7/1/98 -- 6/30/99 Debits --5432.67

Total 3888.85

6/30/99 BALANCE 3888.85

Respectfully submitted:
 Robert J. V. Hiebert
 IOSCS Treasurer

Audited:
 Bruce Guenther
 Associated Canadian Theological
 Schools

Frederick Knobloch, Emanuel Tov, and Jay Treat mentioned in the "Work in Progress" section of this issue.

IOSCS Commentary Series

The IOSCS-sponsored Commentary Series on the Septuagint is proceeding apace. The Executive Committee has established an organizational structure for the project, consisting of (a) a Board of Advisors and (b) an Editorial Board. The membership of these boards is listed on the IOSCS website (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/>).

German LXX Translation Project

Late last year a group of scholars decided to launch a translation of the LXX into German. The main editors are Prof. Martin Karrer of Wuppertal and Prof. Wolfgang Kraus of Koblenz. Among the co-editors who are responsible for different parts of the LXX are H. J. Fabri, H. Engel, N. Walter and M. Rösel.

The editors are preparing a two-volume set containing the translation and an accompanying volume with scholarly introductions to every book and notes and comments to difficult or interesting verses. The project is sponsored by the German Bible Society and the "Evangelische Kirche im Rheinland", one of the major Protestant churches in Germany. The German Bible Society will publish the volumes. We aim to finish the task in 2005/6.

In the range from NETS to La Bible d'Alexandrie we will be nearer to NETS than to the French project, but without being bound to a German translation of the Hebrew text.

Announcement of a Research Project on the Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Deuteronomy

At the chair of Prof. Cornelis Houtman at Kampen Theological University, a research project is planned for the next two years. Its concern is the investigation of the Coptic (Sahidic) version of Deuteronomy. Prof. Houtman is preparing a commentary on Deuteronomy.

During the last years of his life, the late Prof. J. L. Koole (who died in 1997) worked through the entire Sahidic text of Deuteronomy. He compared this version with the Massoretic

text and with the critical text and apparatus of the Göttingen Septuagint (ed. J. W. Wevers). His many careful observations are preserved on a set of cards for nearly every part of Deuteronomy.

Prof. Koole's familiarity with the Coptic language reached back to the time when he prepared his dissertation on the reception of the Old Testament by the Christian Church (1938[!]), in which a discussion of Coptic-Gnostic material was included.

In its present form, however, the material is not yet ready for publication. The Kampen University has therefore launched a two-year research project to work over the material and to prepare it for publication. The most suitable form seems to be a monograph, which, along with the Halle dissertation of Bodo Seidel, may prove to be a valuable companion for students of this important daughter version of the Septuagint of Deuteronomy.

Cornelis G. den Hertog

Additional Institution offering Courses in the Septuagint

The following note, submitted by Peter J. Gentry, is to update the section in IOSCS 27 (1994), p. 13, entitled "Courses in LXX in World Institutions."

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Louisville, KY) offers a Ph.D. (Biblical Studies, Old Testament, or New Testament) where one may major in Septuagint. This would include a course on Septuagint and courses on Hellenistic Greek (e.g., Maccabees) at the doctoral level focusing on both linguistics of Hellenistic Greek and the literature of Second Temple Judaism. The course on Septuagint is described as follows:

An introduction to the critical study of the Septuagint, with an assessment of its variant manuscript readings in relation to known Hebrew manuscripts. Special attention will be given to the characteristics of Hellenistic Greek represented by the Septuagint (phonology, morphology, and syntax).

Downloadable LXX Modules Available

Nelson Chin (nchin@mediaone.net) reports that LXX modules in both English and Greek are now available for downloading from the Online Bible. The addresses are as follows:

<http://www.ccel.org/olb/tolbss/components/translations/english.html#LXX>

(Septuagint) in English

<http://www.ccel.org/olb/tolbss/components/translations/greek.html>

Japanese LXX Translation Project

Dr. Gohei Hata, a Japanese biblical scholar, is working on a translation of the LXX into Japanese. Further details were unavailable at the time of press.

In memoriam, Eligius Dekkers

Dom Eligius Dekkers, founder of the *Corpus Christianorum* and author of the renowned *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, died on December 15, 1998 at the Abbey of Saint Peter at Steenbrugge. Dom Dekkers, who authored or edited more than 470 books and articles, was known for producing works for a more popular audience as well as his technical, scholarly writings. He entered the Abbey of Saint Peter in 1933 at the age of 18, and served as its abbot from 1967 to 1978.

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS
--

LA SEPTANTE EN FRANCE announces the following publications of French Septuagint scholars (by courtesy of Prof. dr. Cécile Dogniez):

Ouvrage paru :

Suzanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco, volume XVI, pars 2, ediderunt J. Ziegler, O. Munnich. *Versionis iuxta Theodotioneus fragmenta adiecit D. Fraenkel*, Göttingen, 1999.

Ouvrages à paraître :

La Bible d'Alexandrie, Les Proverbes, par Marc D'Hamonville, à paraître aux Editions du Cerf en 2000.

Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie, édité par Marguerite Harl et Cécile Dogniez, à paraître aux Editions du Cerf en 2000 (Edition bilingue avec une réimpression du texte grec d'A. Rahlfs et reprise de la traduction des 5 premiers volumes de la Bible d'Alexandrie, accompagnée de notes abrégées).

Article à paraître :

Marguerite Harl, "La Bible d'Alexandrie et les débats actuel sur la LXX", conférence faite à Fribourg lors de la Journée en l'honneur d'A. Schenker.

Du Judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien de Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival et Olivier Munnich, publié aux Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1988, est entièrement disponible sur Internet (www.tradere.org).

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* (ed. M. Barre; CBQMS 29; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1997) 47-61.

COOK, Johann. A. Articles. (1) Apocalyptic terminology in Septuagint Proverbs. *JNSL* 25/1 (1999), 251-264. (2) The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs. *Vetus Testamentum* 49/4 (1999), 448-461. (3) Contextual exegetical interpretations in the Septuagint Proverbs. *JNSL* 25/2 (1999), 132-146. B. Book reviews. (4) W. J. Vogelsang, *The rise & organization of the Achaemenid empire - the Eastern Iranian evidence*, E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1992 in *JNSL* 25/1 (1999), 301-303.

FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, Natalio. (1) "A vueltas con el léxico del griego de traducción". *Homenaje a C. Serrano. Manuales y Anejos de Emerita*, Madrid: CSIC 2000. (2) Review of A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VT Suppl 71, Leiden/Boston/Köln 1998), in *JSJ* 31 (2000). (3) Translation into Italian by Donatella Zoroddu of my *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*, 2nd revised and enlarged edition, Madrid: CSIC 1998, to appear in Brescia: Paideia Editrice 2000. (4) Translation into English of the same book by Wilfred G. E. Watson, to appear in Leiden: Brill, 2000.

KNIBB, Michael A. *Translating the Bible: The Ethiopic Version of the Old Testament* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1995; Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1999).

KNOBLOCH, Frederick W. "The Challenges of Translating a Translation: Rendering the Proper Nouns of the Jewish-Greek Scriptures." In *A Multifform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright. Pp. 31-40. SBL Homage Series 24; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.

KNOPPERS, Gerald. "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and I Chronicles 9," *Textus* (forthcoming).

KUTZ, Karl. Working on an exegetical commentary on the Old Greek of Job.

LUST, Johan. 1998. (1) Quotation Formulae and Canon in Qumran, in A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn (eds.), *Canonization and Decanonization* (Studies in the History of Religions, 82), Leiden, Brill, 1998, 67-77. (2) Messianism in the Septuagint: Is 8,23b-9,6 (9,1-7), in J. Kracovec (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998, 147-163. (3) The Book of Baruch: A Note of a Magisterial Monograph, in *ETL* 74 (1998) 78-82. (4) A Lexicon of the Three and the Transliterations in Ezekiel, 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. (5) A Lexicon of Symmachus' Translation of the Psalms, in *ETL* 74 (1998) 78-82. 1999. (6) David dans la Septante, in L. Desrousseaux & J. Vermeulen (eds.), *Figures de David à travers la Bible* (Lectio divina, 177), Paris, Cerf, 1999, 243-263. (7) Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 1-2, in *ETL* 75 (1999) 5-31. (8) Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 3, in *ETL* 75 (1999). (9) Exile and Diaspora. Gathering and Return in Ezekiel (MT and LXX), in J.-M. Auwers & A. Wénin (eds.), *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. FS P.-M. Bogaert* (BETL, 144), Leuven, Univ. Press & Peeters, 1999, 99-122. (10) Coppens, Jozef (1896-1981), in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. I, (ed. J. H. Hayes), Nashville, Abingdon, 1999, 218. (11) Hoonacker, Albin van (1857-1933), in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. I, (ed. J. H. Hayes), Nashville, Abingdon, 1999, 508-519. Work in progress. (12) *Biblia Hebraica editio quinta* (critical edition of the Hebrew text of Ezekiel). (13) The Septuagint Text of Ezekiel: Translation and Notes: French version in the series *La Bible d'Alexandrie* ed. M. Harl a.o., Paris; English version (NETS?). (14) Revised edition of *The Greek - English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. (15) Preparatory work on a lexicon of Symmachus.

MARQUIS, Galen. (1) "The Text-Critical Relevance of the Three in the Book of Jeremiah - An Examination of the Critical Apparatus of the Hebrew University Bible Project Edition," *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Rich Seminar; Oxford

Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994; TSAJ 58; ed. Alison Salvesen; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 255-273. (2) In collaboration with Frank Pollak, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint: Vol. 1: The Pentateuch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000) (in press). (3) In collaboration with John Jarick, *A Bi-Lingual Concordance to the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Book of Ecclesiastes*.

MCLAY, Tim. (1) "It's A Question of Influence: The Old Greek and Theodotion Texts of Daniel." *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*. Edited by A. Salvesen; Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 1998. (2) "Kaige and Septuagint Research." *Textus* 19 (1998) 1-11. (3) "Syntactic Profiles and the Characteristics of Revision: A Response to Karen Jobes." *BIOSCS* 26 (1996) 15-22. (4) Review of A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, Leiden: Brill, 1998. In *JBL* (forthcoming; available on Scholars Press website).

MURAOKA, Takamitsu. The LXX lexicon project, that of incorporating data from the Pentateuch into my existing lexicon for the Twelve Prophets and making a unified lexicon, is making good progress. Both Genesis and Exodus are behind me.

OLLEY, John. (1) Supervision of a Ph.D. student on "Early Jewish Interpretation and Use of Ezekiel 36-48." (2) Article on "Animals in Ezekiel and Isaiah - a comparison" (including LXX), for Earth Bible series (being published by Sheffield Academic Press). (3) Early Christian use of Ezekiel (at collating data stage).

PERKINS, Larry. Working on the NETS volume for Exodus.

PIETERSMA, Albert. (1) "John William Wevers." *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. (2) "Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter." *Proceedings of the Congress of the IOSCS, Oslo 1998*. In press. (3) "The Provenance of the Greek Psalter." Festschrift article. Sheffield. (4) *A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)*:

Psalms. (Including Prayer of Manasses; and, with B. Wright, the general introduction to NETS.) In press.

RÖSEL, Martin. "Die Septuaginta und der Kult. Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri," in: Chr. Uehlinger, Y. Goldman (Eds.), FS A. Schenker (to be published in 2000 in OBO with other articles on the LXX, including papers by M. Harl, Z. Talshir and P. Bogaert).

SALEY, Richard J. *The Samuel Manuscript of Jacob of Edessa: A Study in Its Underlying Textual Traditions*. Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 9. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998.

SCHENKER, Adrian. (1) «Et comme le sacrifice de l'holocauste il les agréa» (Sg 3,6). Les premières comparaisons du martyre avec un sacrifice dans l'Ancien Testament, N. Calduch-Benages - J. Vermeylen, éd., *Treasures of Wisdom. Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom (Festschrift M. Gilbert)* (BETL 143; Leuven: University Press, 1999) 351 - 356. (2) "Diatheke pour berfit. L'option de traduction de la LXX à la double lumière du droit successoral de l'Égypte ptolémaïque et du livre de la Genèse", J.-M. Auwers - A. Wénin, éd., *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert* (BETL 144; Leuven: University Press, 1999) 125-131. (3) "Le contrat successoral en droit gréco-égyptien et la diatheke dans la Septante", *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte (ZAR)*, 2000, forthcoming. (4) Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2-14, *Cahiers de la Revue Biblique (CRB)*, Paris: Gabalda, 2000, XV - 159 p., forthcoming.

SIPILA, Seppo. (1) "John Chrysostom and the Book of Joshua" *LX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Cambridge, 1995. Ed. by B.A. Taylor. SBLSCS 45. Atlanta, GE. 1997, 329-354. (2) "Max Leopold Margolis and the Origenic Recension in Joshua." *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments. Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994*. Ed. by A. Salvesen. TSAJ 58. Tübingen

1998, 16-38. (3) "Ostrakonit Shlom Moussaieffin kokoelmassa: ikkuna muinaiseen arkipäivään." *Yhdessä Petri Kasarin kanssa. Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 103 (1998), 324-329. (4) "Theodoret of Chyrrus and the Book of Joshua. Theodoret's Quaestiones Revisited." *Textus* 19 (1999), 157-170. (5) Between Literalness and Freedom. Translation technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges regarding the clause connections introduced by waw and ki. [Dissertation] Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 75. Helsinki 1999.

TALSHIR, Ziporah. (1) Has published a book on 1 Esdras in the SCS series. (2) A text critical commentary on 1 Esdras is to be submitted to the same series.

TOV, Emanuel. Books: (1) *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997). 289 pp. (2) *Der Text der Hebräischen Bibel—Handbuch der Textkritik* (trans. H.-J. Fabry; Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: Kohlhammer, 1997). xxxiv + 376 pp. (3) *The Greek and Hebrew Bible—Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 72; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999). xxxix and 570 pp. Articles: (4) With R. A. Kraft, "Introductory Essay," to: E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, MI 1998) xi-xix. (5) "Sense Divisions in the Qumran Texts, the Masoretic Text, and Ancient Translations of the Bible," in: J. Krasovec (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible, International Symposium on the Interpretation of the Bible* (Ljubljana/Sheffield 1998) 121-146. (6) "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah," *Eretz Israel* 24 (Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem 1999) 55-63. (7) "Opisthographs from the Judean Desert." In *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright. Pp. 11-18. SBL Homage Series 24; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999. (8) Articles "Aquila," "Lucian," "Symmachus," "Theodotion" in: J. H. Hayes, *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville 1999).

TREAT, Jay. (1) "A Fiery Dove: The Song of Songs in Codex Venetus 1." In *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright. 275-301. SBL Homage Series 24; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999. (2) Ph. D. dissertation under revision for publication by SBL: *Lost Keys: Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses*.

WEVERS, John William. Books: (1) *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998. Pp. xlviii, 653. Articles, Refereed: (2) The Balaam Narrative according to the Septuagint, *Lectures et Reflectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert*, Édité par J.-M. Auwers et A. Wénin. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovanesium CXVIV (1999), 133-144. (3) Articles in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* edited by John H. Hayes, Vol. 2. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999. (a) Lagarde, Paul Anton de, 42b-43a; (b) Rahlfs, Otto Gustav Alfred, 365b-366a, and (c) Septuagint, 437b-462a.

Dissertation Abstracts

1) "Is wisdom a mediatrix in Ben Sirach? A study of the wisdom poems." J. F. Rogers, D. Phil., University of Stellenbosch, 2000 (dir. Johann Cook).

The figure of Woman Wisdom appears in several key poems in Sirach, namely Sir 1:1-10, 1:11-30, 4:11-19, 6:18-37, 14:20-15:10, 24:1-34 and 51:13-30. Woman Wisdom is a metaphor that employs feminine imagery to speak of the tradition as taught by the sages and contained within the sacred writings of Judaism. Ben Sira uses it to show that the Jewish tradition is the pathway to genuine piety. The metaphor functions to reinforce the implicit claim of conservative scribal circles to be the legitimate interpreters of the tradition.

The personification of wisdom is the basic trope underlying the presentations of Wisdom. This feminine personification is then filled out with a number of metaphors, rendering Woman Wisdom an easily recognisable entity in the text despite the wide range of imagery applied to her. The wisdom personified includes both the content of the Jewish tradition and the disposition to live in conformity with that tradition, summed up in the fear of the Lord. This tradition is seen as the distillation of universal wisdom. The gender of Woman Wisdom is rhetorically important in those poems where wisdom is presented as a desirable goal to be passionately and zealously sought. But Ben Sira does not exploit the metaphor 'wisdom as woman' as a conceptual tool for reflection on wisdom in and of itself or in its relationship to God. In Sir 24 the feminine dimension of the Wisdom figure recedes; Wisdom is personified as an angelic figure and her gender becomes simply a fact of grammar. The metaphor 'wisdom as angel' may be an attempt to picture wisdom in the closest possible association with the Lord and in the most exalted position

possible without compromising monotheism. Angels are also portrayed as mediators in Second Temple writings.

The movement and action of Wisdom, God and human beings relative to each other in the Wisdom poems provides hints that the Jewish tradition plays a vital role in the relationship between God and humanity. God relates to human beings by revealing to them wisdom, which finds its most perfect expression in the Jewish written tradition. How a person relates to this tradition will determine how God relates to that person. Conversely, it is impossible to find wisdom if one does not have the correct attitude toward God and if one does not live according to the tradition. Since all wisdom is from God, there is no wisdom outside of what God gives, and the wisdom God has given is embodied in the traditions of Israel.

2) An Analysis of Conditional Clauses in the LXX Leviticus: Revealing the Translation Technique of the Translators. Chester A. Hall, M.A. Thesis, Columbia Biblical Seminary.

One focus of LXX studies over the last few years has been the examination of the translation technique exhibited by the various translators of the books of the LXX. A pioneer in this field is Ilmari Soisalon-Soisinen of the University of Helsinki, who contributed much to this area of LXX study and has engendered further study by his students. A student of Soisalon-Soisinen who is a current leader in this field of LXX study is Dr. Anneli Aejmelaeus, director of the LXX project at Göttingen.

On the basis of her study of parataxis in the Pentateuch of the LXX, Aejmelaeus developed a profile of translation technique characteristics that she observed in the translators of this section of the LXX. She found that the translator of the book of Leviticus "seem[ed] to be recklessly free in small details, without, however, mastering the larger context. He [did] not particularly concern himself with the Greek idiom, being more fastidious, however, with the Hebrew original, even to its exact word order."

With this translator profile in view this thesis examined selected Hebrew conditional sentences as they were translated in the LXX by the following criteria:

- A. The translator's mastery of the larger context
- B. The translator's consideration of Hellenistic Greek usage
- C. The translator's imitation of the Hebrew word order
- D. The translator's stereotyping tendencies for both grammatical structures and lexical considerations.

Further, this thesis developed a systematic method for the study of other Hebrew syntactical structures used in conditional sentences as rendered by the LXX translation and provided a limited selection of published Greek papyri to use as a basis for judging the LXX translators' conformity to contemporary Hellenistic Greek usage.

The data produced from this limited syntactical study demonstrated that the translator of Leviticus appeared to be at home and familiar with the spoken Greek of his time. As much as possible, he desired to produce "good Greek" and tried to conform to the contemporary Greek in use as often as the target language allowed, without sacrificing the sequence of the Hebrew words. In fact, the translator sought as much as possible to conform his translation to the Hebrew word order, thereby displaying a high regard for the holy text and accepting the responsibility of diligently conveying its content. He was well aware of the context of the verses he was translating and gave careful attention to often complex details. He attempted consistently to use the same word and syntax for the same Hebrew words and constructions. Additionally, the findings support the contention that only one translator was involved in the translation of the Leviticus material.

- 3) "Towards the establishing of the historical context of Septuagint Proverbs." P. F. D. Krige, M. A. Thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 1999 (dir. Johann Cook).

Two New (Projected) Introductions to the Septuagint

Two sets of authors have recently announced forthcoming introductions to the Septuagint.

- 1) Profs. Moisés Silva (Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary) and Karen Jobes (Westmont College) will publish their textbook, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, with Baker Book House. Publication is anticipated by November, 2000. The contents are as follows:

Introduction: Why Study the Septuagint?

- The Septuagint and the Hebrew Bible
- The Septuagint in the Christian Church

PART 1: THE HISTORY OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Chapter 1: The Origin of the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions

- Defining Our Terms
- The First Greek Translation
- The Later Greek Translations

Chapter 2: The Transmission of the Septuagint

- Recensions of the Septuagint
- Witnesses to the Septuagint Text

Chapter 3: The Septuagint in Modern Times

- Printed Editions
- The Contents of the Septuagint

Chapter 4: The Septuagint as a Translation

- From One Language to Another
- Interpretation in the Septuagint

PART 2: THE SEPTUAGINT IN BIBLICAL STUDIES

Chapter 5: The Language of the Septuagint

- Semitic Influence in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint
- Semitic Influence in the Syntax of the Septuagint

Translation Technique

Chapter 6: Establishing the Text of the Septuagint

The Aims of Textual Criticism

Assessing Internal Evidence

Assessing External Evidence

Chapter 7: Using the Septuagint for the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible

The Transmission of the Hebrew Text

The Septuagint versus the Masoretic Text

The Greek Text of Samuel-Kings

Chapter 8: The Judean Desert Discoveries and Septuagint Studies

The Greek Biblical Texts

The Hebrew Biblical Texts

Chapter 9: Septuagint and New Testament Language

Text

Interpretation

Chapter 10: Interpreting the Septuagint

Genesis 4:1-8

Isaiah 52:13 to 53:12

Esther 5:1-2 with Addition D

PART 3: THE CURRENT STATE OF SEPTUAGINT STUDIES

Chapter 11: Our Predecessors -- Septuagint Scholars of a Previous Generation

Chapter 12: Current Studies in Linguistic Research

Lexicographical Research

Syntactical Research

Chapter 13: Reconstructing the History of the Text

The Quest for the Original Greek Text

Recensional History of the Greek Translation

Chapter 14: Theological Development in the Hellenistic Age

Principles and Methods

Messianism and the Septuagint

Eschatology and the Septuagint

Influence of Hellenistic Philosophy on the Septuagint

Theological Tendency of the Three

Appendix A: Major Organizations and Research Projects

Appendix B: Selected Reference Works

Appendix C: Glossary

Appendix D: Table of differences in versification

Indices

2) Prof. Jennifer M. Dines (Heythrop College, UK) is working on a short introduction to the LXX as a companion volume to Sheffield's 'Guides to the Pseudepigrapha' series, edited by Michael Knibb. The following is a "working outline."

A GUIDE TO THE SEPTUAGINT

Chapter 1 Introductory

1. Why a book on the LXX in this series?

1.1 Brief account of origins of LXX among Greek-speaking Jews in 3rd-1st centuries BCE, showing how it reflects their needs and interests;

1.2 Importance of the LXX in the history of the Bible and of biblical interpretation (these points to be further developed in Chapter 6).

1.3 Importance of LXX for textual criticism of Hebrew Bible.

2. Defining the area of study: what do we/should we understand by 'the Septuagint'?

2.1 Terminology (LXX and/or OG?)

2.2 Scope (3rd century BCE - 5th century CE).

2.3 Content: different perceptions, ancient and modern.

Witness of MSS.

2.4 Questions of 'Canon'.

3. Sources.

- 3.1 Earliest evidence (Jewish)
- 3.2 Major codices & MSS (Christian)
- 3.3 Printed editions
- 3.4 Witness of 'daughter versions'.
4. Outline of history of scholarship; most significant recent developments.
5. Resources. Editions; reference tools etc.
6. Select Bibliography.

Chapter 2 The Origins of the LXX

1. Outline and evaluation of the main theories
 - 1.1 ancient (Ep Arist; Philo; Christian sources)
 - 1.2 modern ('political'; 'liturgical', 'educational' reasons for enterprise)
2. Evidence: what seems knowable about when, where, why, by whom and for whom the scriptures were translated into Greek; including sketch of 'Targum' v. 'Urtext' debate and its resolution in the wake of the discovery of the Dodekapropheton Scroll.
3. Select Bibliography

Chapter 3 History of the Text

1. Early Revisions and Recensions:
 - 1.1 Jewish: further discussion of 'The Kaige'; 'proto-Lucian'; 'The Three' etc.
 - 1.2 Christian: esp. Origen's Hexapla; Jerome and the trifaria varietas.
2. Select Bibliography.

Chapter 4 The Language and Style of the LXX

1. The nature and range of the Greek of the LXX; relation to Koine (was there a special 'Biblical Greek?'); internal and external evidence (esp. papyri).
2. The competence of the translators (examples). Stylistic variations (examples of broad differences - more on the technicalities in next Chapter)
3. Select Bibliography.

Chapter 5 Translation Technique & the Problem of Vorlagen.

1. What is meant by 'translation technique' and why it is important.
2. What is meant by 'literal' and 'free' translation; criteria for distinguishing?
3. Why it is so difficult to establish the precise Hebrew text being translated.
4. Theories of translation ('transmitting' v. 'interpreting'). Which is most appropriate to the LXX translators? Scholarly debate and alignments (question of when Hebrew text was considered sacrosanct).
5. Select Bibliography

Chapter 6 The Contribution of the LXX

1. A witness to biblical interpretation in the late Second Temple period; selected examples.
2. A source for biblical interpretation in Greek-speaking Judaism and Christianity (NT and early Patristic writings, to 5th century CE); selected examples.
3. Select Bibliography

Chapter 7 Conclusion

The place of the LXX in contemporary biblical and pseudepigraphical studies. Main questions for future development.

Conference Announcement and Schedule

THE BIBLE FROM ALPHA TO BYTE

University of Stellenbosch, 17-21 July 2000

Sponsored by: AIBI- Association Internationale Bible et Informatique

Organized by: Dept. of Ancient Studies, Prof. Johann Cook (President)

Under the auspices of: The University of Stellenbosch, SOUTH AFRICA

Invitation:

The Association Internationale Bible et Informatique and the University of Stellenbosch invite you to attend the Sixth International Conference on the Bible and Computers. In the

wake of the new millennium we decided to broaden the scope of the conference. It will be held at the building of the Faculty of the Humanities of the University of Stellenbosch from Monday 17 July to Friday 21 July. The conference languages will be English and French.

Registration forms may be obtained from Prof. Johann Cook (Dept of Ancient Studies, University of Stellenbosch, Private Bag XI, Matieland 7602, SOUTH AFRICA), tel. 0027-21-8083207 (w) or 0027-21-8082465 (h), fax: 0027-21-808-3480 and e-mail: cook@akad.sun.ac.za.

Note: The SBL International Conference will take place in Cape Town immediately after the AIBI-6 Conference 24-28 July. Please visit our website at <http://www.sun.ac.za/as>

A. AIBI-6 WORKSHOPS

MONDAY 17 JULY:

08h00-09h00 Registration

09h45 Welcome by the Vice-Rector of the University of Stellenbosch – Prof. WT Claassen

10h00-11h00: Workshop: Forbes: Pattern Recognition Methods in Biblical studies I

11h15-12h30: Workshop: Forbes: Pattern Recognition Methods in Biblical studies II

14h30-16h30: Workshop: Bothma/Cornelius/Venter: Multimedia and the Bible

1) 14h30-15h30: Introduction and presentation on multimedia
TEA: 15h30-15h45

2) 15h45-16h30: Practical demonstration of programmes

16h30-17h45: Workshop: Talstra: Computerised linguistic analyses - QUEST II

TUESDAY 18 JULY:

09h00-12h30

Workshop (French): Müller/Brunet/Evrard: Statistics and texts with emphasis on the Bible I

Workshop: Talstra/Van der Merwe: Linguistic analyses with QUEST II of Deuteronomy 4

Workshop: Bothma/Cornelius/Venter: Multimedia and the Bible: Hands-on workshop: "Princes and paupers"

Workshop: Electronic publishing: JR Adair (TC), H Simian-Yofre (ed. Biblica) and DJ Clines (Sheffield)

14h30-17h30:

Workshop A: 14h15-16h00

Forbes: (English): Pattern Recognition Methods in Biblical studies III

Müller/Brunet/Evrard(French): Statistics and biblical texts II

Workshop B: 14h15-17h30

Peshitta project Leiden (CALAP) - Talstra team (W Th van Peursen)

Workshop C: 16h15-17h30

The new Logos - towards a universal electronic library

TJ Finney (Perth): "From manuscripts to classical scaling maps and other multi-variate destinations".

19h00: Cornelius/Venter - Africa awakes - a family Odyssey (a multi-media retelling of the story of a biblical family).

B. AIBI-6 CONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY 19 JULY:

08h00 Registration for AIBI-6

09h00: Welcome by the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities – Prof. IJ van der Merwe

1. THE HEBREW BIBLE

09h15 Keynote address: Eep Talstra (Amsterdam): The computer and the study of the grammar of the Hebrew Bible – 1 Reigns 21 a case study.

10h30: FI Andersen (Melbourne) & AD Forbes (Palo Alto): Attachment preferences in Biblical Hebrew.

11h00: Luis Vegas Montaner (Madrid): Towards a computer-assisted classification of discourse types in the Psalms.

11h30: Jürg Egger (Fribourg): Iconographic seal-amulet image database

12h00: Reinier de Blois (Netherlands): Semantic Domains For Biblical Hebrew

12h30: M-T Ortega-Monasterio & M Gómez-Aranda (Madrid): Critical editions of Medieval Biblical commentaries and Masorahs: The cases of Abraham Ibn Ezra and the Masorah of a Spanish manuscript

PARALLEL SESSIONS

Session A (general)

14h30: K De Troyer (Claremont): 4Q550 in the context of Darius traditions. The need for integration of different tools.

15h00: Guadalupe Seijas de los Rios-Zarzosa (Madrid): Towards a computer-assisted classification of discourse types in Proto-Isaiah.

15h30: F Polak & T Sutskov (Tel Aviv): Parameters for stylistic analysis of prose texts in Biblical Hebrew.

16h15: Javier del Barco del Barco (Madrid): Towards a computer-assisted classification of discourse types in Amos.

16h45 AD Forbes (Palo Alto) & FI Andersen (Melbourne): The Syntactic distances among Biblical texts.

17h15: Jan Kroeze (Potchefstroom): Developing a mutli-level analysis of Jonah using *html*.

Session 2

14h30 T Sutskov (Tel Aviv): The functions of the leading word in Judges 19-21.

15h00: Y Gitay (Cape Town): The computer and biblical rhetoric

15h30: Tamar Zewi (Haifa): Is there a tripartite nominal sentence in Biblical Hebrew?

16h15: Janet Dyk (Amsterdam): Linguistic aspects of the Peshitta translation of 1 Kings.

16h45: Susanne Gillmayr-Bucher (Innsbruck): Relecture of Biblical Psalms.

17h15: Marc Vervenne (Leuven): Bible translation in the Netherlands

THURSDAY 20 July:

THE GREEK BIBLE INCLUDING THE VERSIONS

08h30-09h15: Keynote addresses: A Pietersma (Toronto): A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint

09:h15-10h00: J Lust (Leuven): Computerised analyses of the Septuagint – LXX Ezekiel a case study

10h00: FH Polak (Tel Aviv): Pluses and Minuses of the Septuagint on the Pentateuch

10h45: Johann Cook (Stellenbosch): Towards a computerised exegetical commentary on LXX Proverbs

11h15: Tim Glover (Melbourne): The passive in Hebrew as reflected in the Septuagint

11h45: Willem Smelik (London): Computerised research on the Targumim

FRIDAY 21 July:

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND BIBLE TRANSLATION

Keynote addresses: 08h30 – 09h15: D Trobisch (Bangor): From manuscript to database – a computerised perspective on Romans 16

09h15-10h00: TJ Finney (Australia): Computer-oriented transcription, collation and analysis of the New Testament manuscript tradition (starting with Hebrews).

Parallel Sessions

Session 1

10h00: RF Poswick & Y Juste (Maredsous): A critical view on some basic statistical tools applied to Bible texts.

10h45: Chris Fahner & Jeen Poeder (Dialektos): The Son of man revisited.

11h15: Jessie Rogers (Stellenbosch): Wisdom as mediatrix in the New Testament

11h45: W Th van Peursen (Leiden): Textual problems in the Syriac version of Sirach.

Session 2 (Bible translation)

12h15: B Nieuwoudt (Johannesburg): Introduction to IT project management.

10h00 Christo van der Merwe (Stellenbosch): Information technology and biblical information in Bible translation

10h45: Philip Davies (Sheffield): The Wycliffe project at the University of Sheffield.

11h15: Percy van Keulen (Leiden): A new English translation of the Peshitta

11h45: Kees de Blois (UBS): Paratax – An ideal translator's tool

12h15: V Zinkuratire (Nairobi): African understanding of Biblical Psalms.

12h45: Closing panel (Talstra, Forbes, Cornelius, Pietersma, Lust, Poswick, Trobisch, Finney, Thom, Smelik)

13h15: Conclusion of conference

On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel

Ronald S. Hendel

University of California, Berkeley

Recently in these pages, Martin Rösel has written: "In my view the Septuagint version of Genesis is primarily a document of an early stage of the exposition of the book. In contrast to this (and in contrast to Prof. Hendel's book) the text-critical value of Gen-LXX should be regarded as less important."¹ As one of Rösel's interlocutors on this issue, I wish to raise some points about the nature and cogency of this position. In so doing I would emphasize the primacy of methodological perspicuity in such issues, and, as well, the utility of open argument to test the adequacy of our methods.

First, Rösel is no doubt correct in describing the Septuagint of Genesis as "a document of an early stage of the exposition of the book." Any translation is shot through with interpretation, and, as such, belongs to the history of the reception and exposition of that book. Thus far there can be no reasonable dispute.

Rösel's position is more robust, however, since he holds that Gen-LXX is *primarily* an exposition of the Hebrew Genesis, which he seems to equate with MT. If this is so, then the variations between Gen-LXX and MT are the marks of the exegesis of the Gen-LXX translator and have no text-critical value. This is essentially the position of John Wevers and a number of other commentators on Gen-LXX, as Rösel notes.

The chief theoretical objection to this position is that it yields a contradictory analysis of the translation technique of the

¹M. Rösel, "The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998) 62.

Gen-LXX translator.² In most passages, the technique is extremely literalistic in its unit-by-unit conservation of the Hebrew, producing a difficult text characterized by Greek words and Hebrew syntax. From the point of view of the ordinary Greek reader, this must have seemed barbaric Greek, a kind of pidgin Hebrew-Greek. A characteristic example (and a personal favorite), excessively literal in its lexical equivalents and syntax, is Gen 11:1, καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἓν, "and all the earth was one lip," translating word for word the Hebrew, וְהָיָה כָּל הָאָרֶץ שֵׁפָה אֶחָד. Many more such literalistic calques could be adduced.

Yet, according to Rösel's position, at many points the Gen-LXX translator deviated from the Hebrew text that he was reproducing so conservatively and paraphrased, harmonized, or recomposed. At one moment conservation was the chief imperative, at the next moment free revision. This translation technique, if accurate, could be described as wildly inconsistent. While a comparison with the technique of some of the Targums is possible, the latter were presumably read side by side with the Hebrew, providing a control on the Targumic exegetical departures.

It is more plausible, when the data permit, to posit a relatively consistent translation technique for the LXX translator. This means considering seriously, in any given instance of deviation from MT, whether Gen-LXX may deliberately be conserving a Hebrew text that differs from MT. In several of the examples adduced by Rösel in his recent article, this possibility is given further credence by the fact that ancient Hebrew biblical texts are extant that share the same reading, viz. the Samaritan Pentateuch and/or Qumran texts.

For example, he cites Gen 7:2-3 for two instances in which the Gen-LXX translator "corrects this [i.e. MT] text."³ The following lists the textual evidence for these two variants.⁴

²On the translation technique of Gen-LXX, see more fully, R. S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1-11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 16-20 and references.

³Rösel, "Text-Critical," 65.

⁴From Hendel, *Text*, 85, 134.

Gen 7:2 שָׁנִים M S G (δύο)] + שָׁנִים S G (δύο) Syr Vg

Gen 7:3 הַשָּׁמַיִם M S G (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ)] + הַשָּׁמַיִם S G (τῶν καθάρων) Syr^{mss} LAB 3:4

The variant in Gen 7:2 is shared with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and also with the Syriac Peshitta and the Latin Vulgate. These agreements give us grounds to suppose that the Gen-LXX translator worked with a parent text that had this reading, which he conserved in Greek.

Similarly, the variant in Gen 7:3 is shared with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and also with some Peshitta manuscripts, and is reflected in the Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo. The same supposition, that the Gen-LXX translator translated this phrase from his Hebrew *Vorlage*, must be considered seriously.

Both variant readings are, arguably, scribal harmonizations, with שָׁנִים שָׁנִים (Gen 7:9, 15) and הַשָּׁמַיִם (7:2), הַשָּׁמַיִם (8:20), respectively. On this Rösel and I are in accord. But it is more parsimonious to ascribe these harmonizations to an earlier scribe in the Hebrew textual tradition than it is to suppose that the Gen-LXX translator made them independently, in conscious departure from his Hebrew *Vorlage*. The view that these are inner-Hebrew harmonizations adequately explains both the shared readings with the other versions and a consistent analysis of the Gen-LXX translation technique. In this and other cases, the simpler and more consistent solution with the greater explanatory scope should be preferred.

Another example adduced by Rösel is the plus in Gen-LXX of Gen 1:9, καὶ συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ὠφθη ἡ ξηρα.⁵ Part of this plus is arguably preserved in the Hebrew in 4QGen^k, though Rösel disputes this point. But Rösel overlooks the most convincing datum in Gen-LXX that points to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of this reading. As Julius Wellhausen first noted, the preposition αὐτῶν refers to a plural noun, presupposing Hebrew

⁵Rösel, "Text-Critical," 65-67; cf. Hendel, *Text*, 25-27, and references.

מים, not Greek ὕδαρ.⁶ The plural possessive pronoun (αὐτῶν = הם-) preserves the details of a Hebrew text, yielding the characteristic Hebrew-Greek of Gen-LXX.

A final example, also treated by Rösel, further illustrates this methodological issue. In Gen 7:11, he argues (following Wevers) that "יום is not translated for idiomatic reasons."⁷ The textual correspondences are as follows:⁸

Gen 7:11 מים עשר יום M S Jub 5:23] עשרים G (εκαδὲ)

The Gen-LXX reading differs from MT (and other texts) in two regards: reading the number 20 instead of 10 and omitting the word for "day" (יום = ἡμέρα). This is the only instance in Gen-LXX where the latter equivalence is omitted. It is, I have argued, easier to posit a simple scribal error in the Hebrew - misreading מים עשר יום as עשרים - than to assume two unmotivated departures by the Gen-LXX translator. In this instance again, the more parsimonious explanation should be preferred.

In sum, it is more plausible and cogent methodologically to describe Gen-LXX as, in general terms, a careful conservation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* than to explain each deviation from MT as the free composition of the Greek translator. Yet even as conservation, Gen-LXX is also exposition.⁹ The choice of Greek equivalents for Hebrew words and phrases is charged with interpretation. The LXX is a product of the Hellenistic age and reflects, as all translations do, its own Zeitgeist. But this condition does not preclude the text-critical utility of Gen-LXX as a relatively reliable conservation of its Hebrew parent text.

⁶J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 184.

⁷Rösel, "Text-Critical," 69.

⁸See more fully, Hendel, *Text*, 54-55; idem, "4Q252 and the Flood Chronology of Genesis 7-8: A Text-Critical Solution," *DSD* 2 (1995) 72-79.

⁹This is the nuanced position of R. Hanhart, e.g., "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences," *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (eds. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992) 339-79, esp. 342-43.

Reassessing the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis 1:

A Response to Martin Rösel

William P. Brown
Union-PSCE, Richmond, Virginia

In a recent article, Martin Rösel argued that the text-critical value of Gen-LXX is relatively minimal *vis-à-vis* the more "problematic" books of Samuel and Jeremiah.¹ While Rösel is correct from a comparative standpoint, his sweeping judgment that the LXX of Genesis does not reflect a *Vorlage* that is substantially different from the MT is open to question. Indeed, ambiguity creeps into his conclusion when he concedes that in Gen 4:8 the LXX, with its plus, preserves the better text.² Can that also be said of other plusses in the LXX, even those commonly considered to be characteristic of harmonization?

Much of the focus of Rösel's argument is on Genesis 1, and well it should be, since this chapter has been the focus of much text-critical debate, and two scholars in particular have flip-flopped in their assessment of the LXX regarding Gen 1:9.³ In light of allegedly similar instances throughout the book of Genesis (he mentions only four total, all attested in the flood story), Rösel concludes that Gen 1:9 of the LXX is simply another example of harmonization on the part of the translator. In making his case, Rösel discounts the important witness of 4QGen^k, which attests to the *Tatbericht* (report of action), a plus in the LXX. Although he raises several questions intended to cast doubt on this witness, Rösel offers no alternative proposal as to where this fragment could be located. Indeed, its placement at the end of 1:9 is clear, since the verbal form attested in the fragment is apocopated, betraying preterit aspect rather than the imperfect form featured in the *Wortbericht*

¹ M. Rösel, "The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998) 62.

² Rösel, 69-70.

³ See Rösel, 66nn. 17-18.

(report of command) in 9a.⁴ Moreover, his claim that 4QGen^k is "otherwise in line with the MT, especially in those cases where the LXX shows its additions,"⁵ is not all that significant in Gen 1, since those "additions" are limited to one unambiguous case in 1:14. Granted, 4QGen^k agrees with the MT against the LXX plus of three words in 1:14 (על הארץ להאיר), a variant also attested in the Samaritan Pentateuch (and most probably in 4QGen⁸¹).⁶ Yet, in that same verse, 4QGen^k agrees with the LXX against the MT with the addition of the *lamed* prepositional prefix (וּלְיָמֵינוּ).

But such manuscript evidence, scant as it is, for a different Hebrew textual tradition represented by the LXX is only icing on the cake. The external evidence that Rösel demands for establishing the textual priority of the LXX is, in fact, too high, for it appears that he requires a Hebrew manuscript that contains all the significant plusses of LXX-Gen before he can be convinced otherwise. Because of the general dearth of extant Hebrew manuscripts—as compared, for example, to the plethora of New Testament Greek manuscripts—text critics of the Hebrew Bible must adjudicate the evidence on *both* internal and external grounds, and primarily on the former in many cases. Rösel, too, builds his case ultimately on internal grounds when he notes certain tendencies (i.e., harmonizing, exegetical, and linguistic) in the LXX of Genesis, while chiding others for not presenting sufficient external evidence to make an opposing case.

Such a double standard becomes all the more clear when Rösel dismissively suggests that 4QGen^k is "the most important argument for [William Brown]'s reconstruction of the older text of Genesis 1."⁷ Far from it, the strength (or weakness) of my analysis rests primarily on *internal* evidence, namely, the theological differences between the two textual traditions. Genesis 1:9, I argue, is part of a constellation of variants that

⁴ To suggest that the form is simply a matter of "vocalic" variation is misleading (Rösel, 66). The final ה in this case serves a grammatical function.

⁵ Rösel, 66.

⁶ J.R. Davila, *DJD* XII, 77, 59-60.

⁷ Rösel, 66; W.P. Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3*, SBL Diss. Ser. 132, 1993.

betray a theological *Tendenz* on the part of the MT, one that highlights divine activity and, in turn, suppresses the creative role of certain elements in creation, particularly the waters. Is it simply coincidental that such instances of "harmonization" in the LXX of Gen 1 also evince significant theological implications in the MT? The following major variants between the MT and LXX—unlike the instances of LXX harmonization that Rösel notes outside Gen 1—pertain to the overall structure and, consequently, theology of the passage.

1. The displacement of the execution or transition formula (וַיְהִי כֵן) from the end of v. 6 to the end of the *Tatbericht* in v. 7 in the MT stresses, in effect, the creative initiative of God, whereas its presence in the LXX of v. 6 underscores the role of the firmament or dome (רִקיעַ) in dividing the waters (cf. v. 3b-4).⁸ As a result, the formula in the MT takes on the rather *unique* function of confirming the *Tatbericht*, which depicts God creating the firmament. (Compare 1:9, 11, 15, 20, 24, and 30, in which the formula customarily follows the *Wortbericht*.)

2. More significantly, the minus of the approbation formula in v. 7 of the MT has the rhetorical effect of delaying divine approval of the waters' role in creation until the third day, when the land is formed by the gathering of the waters (v. 10). The approbation formula in the MT is not given until the waters are bounded by the land.⁹

3. The minus of the *Tatbericht* in v. 9 of the MT deflects attention away from the active role of the waters in the formation of the dry land.¹⁰

⁸ For a detailed analysis, see Brown, 85-92, 98-99, 126-27.

⁹ See Brown, 99, 127, and Rashi's commentary on this verse (A.B. Isaiah and B. Scharfman, *The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English*, vol. 1, Brooklyn, 1949).

¹⁰ Those who consider the MT defective typically regard this minus as the result of homoeoarchton (Davila, 76; R.S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1-11. Textual Studies and Critical Edition*, 1988, 27). Although possible, scribal error is by no means the only explanation. See Brown, 77-79, 97, 100, 127.

4. The LXX in v. 20 depicts the waters having a hand in the creation of *both* reptiles (ἔρπετά) and birds (πετόμενα), whereas the MT indicates no genetic connection between the waters and “winged creatures” (הַיַּעַר).¹¹

Are these variants simply “comparable harmonizations” to Gen 6:19-20 and 7:3, as Rösel suggests?¹² Clearly not, since a discernible theological *Tendenz* emerges from a careful comparison of both textual traditions of Gen 1.

In sum, that the LXX presents a more structurally uniform text of the priestly creation account is obvious. The fact, in and of itself, has led most text critics, including Rösel, to minimize the text-critical value of the Greek witness. However, two complicating factors necessitate a re-evaluation of the LXX of Gen 1. First, the variants noted above in Gen 1 are more extensive in nature than most of the other harmonizing instances found elsewhere in the LXX of Genesis. Second, such variants reflect a pattern of theological reflection that is pointedly evident in the MT, namely, a concern to heighten the role of divine activity at the expense of the role of creation itself, particularly that of the waters. In light of these factors, a more plausible case can be made that the MT reflects a *deliberate* disruption of an originally consistent structure, as reflected in the *Vortage* of the LXX. Such a move was made in the transmission of the text in order to minimize primarily the

¹¹ A. V. D. Kooij questions my reconstruction of the VorLXX for 20bα because “one would expect a hiphil, and a different word order” for הַיַּעַר יִבְרָא (JSJ 61, 1996, 132). First, van der Kooij seems unaware that the Piel stem of hollow verbs can take on a causative sense, as one finds for הַיַּעַר in Ezek 32:10. Secondly, word order in this case is irrelevant to the syntax, since chiasmic parallelism is clearly operative. To be sure, any reconstruction from the LXX is speculative, but what is indisputable is that the LXX understands the initial verb (from ἐξάγειν) to have a double object that includes “birds.” Moreover, the verb corresponds to its Hebrew counterpart הַיַּעַר, which can bear *transitive* force in at least two cases: Exod 7:28 and Ps 105:30, as confirmed by the Peshitta’s use of the *Aphel* stem! See Brown, 105-6.

¹² Rösel, 65n. 11.

creative role of the waters, while preserving much of the tenor and ethos of the creation account.¹³

¹³ As for the possible ideological reasons behind such a move, see Brown, 207-239.

Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia, by Natalio Fernández Marcos. 2^a edición revisada y aumentada. Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 23. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1998. Pp. 408, paper.

When this work was initially published in 1979, it immediately took its place as a major contribution to Septuagintal studies, synthesizing as it did an enormous amount of literature. The present edition is, we might say, bigger and better. Not only is the book more than fifty pages longer, but it is also clear that the author has thoroughly revised and improved the text.

Although the structure of the work remains the same, Fernández has added two new chapters. Part I, which has an introductory character, includes chapters on the nature of Biblical Greek within the Koine and on the LXX as a translation. Part II (chaps. 3-6), on LXX origins, provides a full discussion of the *Letter of Aristeas* and other ancient sources, followed by a chapter on modern theories regarding the origins of the Greek Bible. A new fifth chapter is devoted to the use of the LXX for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and pays special attention to the evidence from Qumran. This part ends with a treatment of the problems presented by the existence of "double texts," that is, LXX books that have survived in two translations.

Parts III (chaps. 7-11) and IV (chaps. 12-19) deal respectively with the LXX in Jewish and Christian tradition. The former discusses Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion/Kaige, other ancient versions, and Jewish translations into Medieval and Early Modern Greek; the latter covers textual transmission generally, Origen, Lucian, Hesychius, other revisions, ancient quotations, ancient *quaestiones* and commentaries, and the *catenae*. Part V, on Christian origins, includes a chapter on the Hellenistic character of LXX religion, another one on LXX and NT, and a new chapter 22 on early Christian literature (with emphasis on the production of the daughter versions).

It should be evident that the author has pretty much covered the waterfront. More important, however, his treatment is not superficial. Fernández displays an enviable knowledge of

complex subjects and is able to provide reliable syntheses of current debates. In addition, each chapter includes a very full bibliography (with items listed in chronological order, a common practice that is about as useful as it is annoying).

Although a number of errors have been corrected from the first edition, one still comes across the occasional misspelled name (e.g., "Deisman" on the very first page of chapter 1) and not a few typos and stylistic inconsistencies. There are also some factual errors, but even these are not of great consequence. On p. 125, for example, we are told that *kitteruni* is translated by LXX with *periekyklōsan me* (it's rather the second verb in the verse, namely, *perieschon*); Fernández's point, however, which has to do with Aquila's odd rendering of the Hebrew verb, is not affected by this lapse. Again, on p. 93, papyrus 967 is at one point referred to as 987, but in context the reader can easily correct this glitch. There are others. Such infelicities, while distracting, should not be interpreted as evidence of carelessness in matters of substance. It is plain that the author has been painstaking in collecting, understanding, and documenting his evidence.

Spanish scholars, all too often, fall into the trap of thinking that good style consists of writing sentences that are as long and as syntactically ambiguous as possible. Fernández, happily, avoids this tendency. Although readers who have only a basic knowledge of Spanish will no doubt stumble here and there, I think they will find his writing relatively clear and simple. This is important even for native speakers of the language. Given the complexity of the subject matter, a lucid exposition should be a high priority, and to a large extent Fernández succeeds in providing coherent and intelligible descriptions.

Perfection is of course impossible. On p. 139, for example, the author makes the unqualified statement that, as far as literalism is concerned, Symmachus certainly surpasses the LXX. The very illustrations he proceeds to give, however, show exactly the opposite tendency (e.g., cases where LXX follows the parataxis of the Hebrew but Symmachus uses a participle).

A more important illustration has to do with the way Fernández depicts the recent development of scholarship with regard to the crucial question of how to account for the

differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text. The bottom of p. 80 gives the distinct impression that throughout the first half of the century these differences were typically explained by an appeal to translation methods. The author's subsequent discussion informs the reader that, primarily as a result of the discoveries in the Judean Desert, the pendulum has swung in favor of interpreting such variations as evidence of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. But the historiography of twentieth-century LXX scholarship is not that simple.

What Fernández fails to make clear -- indeed, what scholars of the current generation often tend to lose sight of -- is that the relative distrust of the LXX for text-critical purposes exemplified by such specialists as M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and J. W. Wevers, for instance, was itself a reaction against the facile appeal to the LXX for emending the Hebrew text that was quite common, even *dominant* in some circles, during the first decades of the century. This unfortunate use of the LXX (as Fernández himself knows well, p. 89) is especially evident in the standard, almost universally used, editions of *Biblia hebraica* -- to say nothing of many highly regarded and frequently consulted commentaries.

It is therefore misleading to suggest (and one hears this sort of thing all the time) that the history of the text-critical use of the LXX is neatly divided into two periods: the pre-Qumran period that explained almost all variations as evidence of the translators' manipulation, and the post-Qumran period that gives greater weight to a variant parent text. Younger LXX specialists who, because of the new textual evidence, are now reacting against the work of Wevers and others must not stop reminding themselves that, even today, much Hebrew Bible scholarship continues to appeal to the ancient versions in a haphazard fashion.

I hasten to add that Fernández's own approach to the text-critical use of the LXX is marked by balance and caution. With regard to this question, as well as the other subjects covered in his book, he is a consistently trustworthy guide. This volume does for today -- and in a most effective way -- what S. Jellicoe's *The Septuagint and Modern Study* accomplished three

decades ago. It is gratifying to learn that it will soon be published in an English translation. Take up and read.

Moisés Silva, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, S. Hamilton, MA 01982

[ed. note: The English translation to which Prof. Silva refers, by Wilfred Watson, is scheduled to appear from Brill in 2000.]

WEB REVIEW: THE CATSS DATABASE

Tim McLay
St. Stephen's University

As I sit down to write this review I am reminded of how fascinating it was to download the scriptures on my computer. During my student days, before deciding to focus my studies on the Septuagint, I remember well reading about the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study) project initiated under the direction of Robert Kraft and Emanuel Tov and CCAT (Center for the Computer Analysis of Texts), which had copies of the scriptures available on diskette. Within a short time I had obtained my own copies of the MT and NT on disks. It was even more thrilling when I bought my first search program that worked in MSDos. Less than two years later I had a better program and the Septuagint! I was even more amazed when I learned of the world of the internet and that I could access sites like CCAT and gopher around. Nowadays, I take all of this for granted, but Septuagint scholars owe a great deal to the pioneering efforts of these persons and others who paved the way to free access and use of texts and materials to benefit research.

The CCAT site is maintained by the University of Pennsylvania at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu>. Originally the computer host was created to serve CCAT, but it was soon adapted to help meet the specialized computer needs of the faculty and instructors in the School of Arts and Sciences at Penn. Thus, the main page that appears for the address <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu> is intended to help faculty and instructors primarily in the humanities to use technology to assist them in instruction and research. This is also why there are numerous links to other departments such as Religious Studies and Classics, to which we will return later.

From the CCAT main page one can choose from the side menu either CCAT or Resources on CCAT. The first choice really only gives basic information about the center and leads to the resources. The main attraction of the resources for those

interested in the Septuagint are the text archives, which hold the Septuagint files from the CATSS database. However, there are a few other classical texts and writings from the apostolic fathers that are available to read as well as other religious texts.

There are three types of files in the CATSS database. First, there are the morphologically analysed files for all of the books of the LXX.

The files are based on the critical editions of the Göttingen series where available; elsewhere the text of Rahlf's is adopted. These files provide the basis for all of the computer search software on the LXX that is available, but they can be obtained free from CCAT, along with your agreement not to use the files for commercial purposes. (Unfortunately one cannot download, but they can be individually copied.) Of course, unless you really know your way around writing software you are going to need to purchase a program if you plan to spend much time using the files, because they are written in beta code. There is a file available from CCAT that will transform the beta code into Greek characters with diacritics, but it will not perform searches or provide parsings. The second group of files provides a parallel alignment between the OG and MT of the translated books and the third contains the variant readings for a growing number of Septuagint books. Once again, these files are all in beta code, but the variant files in particular can be indispensable for the researcher (like myself) who does not happen to have all of the Göttingen texts on his or her shelf.

Although the variant files are available on-line I was interested to find that there is no link to them from the e-resources page. So I chose the link to the Religious Studies department. From that page one can select Religious Texts and Resources, which leads to a variety of useful links, including a selection of religious texts, the ATLA Religion database, a guide to internet resources, and the LXX files. However, once again, there were no links to the variant files. The key to accessing the variant files is through Robert Kraft's homepage, which is linked here under faculty, or earlier on the CCAT information page.

Kraft's page (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/kraft.html>) provides a wealth of information. Besides the links to the

biblical texts there is access to links to other web sites and electronic resources, papyrological resources, and course materials in the area of Christian origins. James O'Donnell's page is comparable in what it offers for classicists. There are no doubt other features of this site that someone with different interests will find appealing, and the numerous links to other sites will keep some people surfing for hours. One is well advised to bookmark the sites that are most useful so that they can be accessed as needed.

The site was accessed for this review on Jan. 12, 2000. Thanks also to Jay Treat for providing background information on CCAT.

Web Review:
Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen
Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens

Frederick Knobloch

The University of Heidelberg's Institut für Papyrologie makes available on the Web an interactive database of the published nonliterary Greek papyri from Egypt, together with numerous ostraca and documents on a wide variety of other materials. The *Gesamtverzeichnis (HGV)* is especially useful for obtaining a list of extant documents from a chosen span of time or from a given place of origin (or find spot), including documents that merely mention a particular date. Using the main database, the *Hauptregister*, one can, to give a simple example, produce a chronologically ordered list of the documents from Alexandria dating to the time of Ptolemy II. At the time of writing the *Hauptregister* included 48,069 records, up from the August, 1998 total of 37,650 mentioned in the site's introductory page. In fact, the number rose as this review was written. As implied by its name, the project began with a focus on papyri, but has now expanded to include well over 14,000 nonliterary documents on other materials.

The top-level display of the *Hauptregister* presents an abbreviated version of its contents, listing documents by principal publication, date, place, and title (if any; this is the title as given in the original publication). Clicking on any individual record number displays the rest of the database fields: material, photo references, other publications, remarks, and a brief description of contents. The editors, Dieter Hagedorn, James Cowey, and Renate Ziegler, have taken special care to verify the dating of the documents, so that the dates given in *HGV* are at times corrections of published dates.¹

¹ Notice of these revised dates is published in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* (James M. S. Cowey, "Heidelberg Documentary Papyri Project" in *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists* [ed. Adam Bülow-Jacobsen; Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 1994], 609-612, p. 610).

HGV attempts to list all published photographs. There are also references to online resources where they are available, including, naturally enough, digitized images in the "Griechische Papyri der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung." Even more significant are the efforts to coordinate Heidelberg's offerings with other online projects, as illustrated by the *Hauptregister's* record for P.Mich. III 185. A link from the *Hauptregister* takes one to digitized images and an English translation of the papyrus, together with general information about it, on the University of Michigan's APIS site, which is linked in turn to the Greek text of P.Mich. III 185 on the Perseus/Duke site. (Admittedly, this level of coverage of a papyrus is still the exception.)

HGV does not contain the full text of Greek documents, so that one cannot find particular Greek words, as is possible on the Perseus site (see my review in *BIOSCS* 31), but content summaries enable the user to locate many, at least, of the texts that concern a particular subject. The editors stress that the content summaries are not complete or systematic. Nevertheless, they are valuable in that they transcend the wording of a particular document and the language of the document's original publication. By way of illustration, a search for "oil" in the *Originaltitel* field yielded 50 documents like "Nikon to Panakestor concerning Loss of Castor Oil" and "Account of Oil"; but a search for "Öl" (with the unlauded character) in the *Inhalt* field yielded 473 documents, including those whose English title mentions oil.

The database allows very detailed searches, in that the user may request a record that contains—or does not contain—items specified in any or all of 17 search fields. Prior to any serious searching, a careful reading of the editors' "Search Tips," available in German and English, is a necessity if pitfalls are to be avoided. The unwary user who, for example, searches for documents written in the year 157 by putting "157" in the year field will miss documents with dates like "156-157." Even after the tips have been digested some mysteries remain. Experimentation reveals that the last search field, somewhat cryptically named "Link1FM," searches internet links; but it seems to accept only numbers as input. A search for "122"

yields six texts like P.Köln II 122 and SB XIV 12201, all with internet links.

Search results can be arranged by as many as four of nine possible criteria (publication, volume, number, year, month, etc.). A chronological sort using the "ChronGlobal" criterion does a reasonably good job of arranging diverse chronological indicators such as "276 v.Chr., 23. Nov."; "ca. 270 v.Chr."; "nach 269 - 268 v.Chr."; and "vor 266 - 265 v.Chr." One surprise worth noting, however, is that all of the documents dated, for example, "Mitte III v.Chr." appear at the end of the numerical dates for the century, where they might be missed. Conceivably, then, texts dated to the mid-third century B.C.E. could appear after a screen of hits whose dates extend into the low 200s.

A second searchable database, this one of "mentioned dates," was last updated in October, 1998 and lists 9288 documents that refer to a date other than the document's own date of writing. This database apparently contains only the identification of the document (e.g., P.Köln VI 259) and the mentioned date; one must go to the *Hauptregister* and search for the document to find other information about it. The *Erwähnte Daten* database is searchable for year(s), month(s), and day.

Each search in the two interactive databases generates what appears at first to be a subdatabase consisting only of hits, and indeed a sort performed at this stage will operate only on the hits. A search made from a screen of hits, however, does not further refine the search, but rather operates on the full database. Therefore, while one can easily find, for example, documents whose material is not papyrus, or is not parchment, there does not seem to be a direct way to list documents whose material is not papyrus and not parchment, as this would involve a two-step search, two searches of the "material" field. There are, however, indirect means for discovering what materials are represented, and it may be useful to mention a couple of them here as illustrations of further kinds of database queries that are possible. A search for "<papyrus" in the material field will list materials that precede "papyrus" alphabetically, while a search for a range like "a...b" will return a list of documents on agate, lead (*Blei*) and bronze. Search hits

are presented in a table that can be printed with serviceable results.

In addition to the interactive databases, the website contains simple text files that list the contents of the *Hauptregister* by century, in chronological order. These ready-made lists are convenient, but date to August, 1998, and so do not contain everything that a user-generated list would.

The site also has a brief *Einführung*, and a commercial help file in German, French, and English for FileMaker Pro 4.0, the database program. Some minor frustrations seem to be attributable to the program. Navigation in the databases is impractical except by searching, as there is apparently no way to move to a particular record number. (A window entitled *Datensatzbereich* tells which records are currently displayed, and rather deceptively allows one to input a record number, but will not take one to that record.) It is ostensibly possible to move around the database by using the mouse to drag a slide bar on a tiny icon, but in such large databases one is likely to arrive thousands of records away from the intended location. One can then page through, 25 records at a time, scrolling down at each page to reach the "Zurück" or "Weiter" button--a very slow process. Nor is it possible to search for a record number, so that returning to a record previously accessed is accomplished by searching for the document's "name" (e.g., BGU I 14) or other search criteria that originally produced the record. Perhaps my use of the database was atypical, but the editors may want to consider adding a search field for record numbers.

While response times were reasonable, *HGV* is perhaps outgrowing its hardware, in that users are requested, in the Search Tips, not to try resource-intensive activities like chronologically sorting the entire database, because of the time involved and the resulting inconvenience to others who may be trying to use the database.

This valuable resource may be found on the Web at <http://Aquila.papy.uni-heidelberg.de/gvzFM.html>, and was accessed for this review in January, 2000.

The Septuagint and the Magical Papyri: Some preliminary notes

Alexis Leonas
Paris, France

The aim of these notes is to call attention to the connection between the LXX and the corpus of the Egyptian Magical Papyri¹. Beside the extensive use of biblical divine and angelic names, we do find in the Magical Papyri direct and indirect Septuagint quotations, expressions typical of biblical Greek, and finally the LXX transliterations of Hebrew used as *voces magicae*. The problems raised by these quotations can have interesting textual as well as cultural-historical dimensions. Various papyri scholars have already indicated the link between these texts and the Septuagint, but the theme has not yet been studied from the proper perspective of Septuagint Studies².

New Testament scholarship has done greater justice to the Magical Papyri: K. Aland's *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri, I., Biblische papyri* (Berlin-New York, 1976) includes texts from the Christian amulets in the *Varia* section³. A. Biondi has attempted a textual study of these

¹ Cf. K. Preisendanz et al.- A. Henrichs (eds.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 2 vols., [Teubner], Stuttgart, 2¹⁹⁷³⁻⁷⁴ (*infra* = PGM); R.W. Daniel & F. Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum*, 2 vols. [Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Papyrologica Coloniensia, vol. XVI.1-2], Opladen, 1990-1992. English translation of the magical papyri is now available in H.D. Betz (ed.), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation. Including the Demotic Spells*, Chicago-London, 2¹⁹⁹² (*infra* = Betz). See also M. Meyer, R. Smith (eds.), *Ancient Christian Magic. Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, San Francisco, 1994. (Ch. 2, Greek Texts of Ritual Power from Christian Egypt).

² Interesting insights into the relationship between the LXX and the magical papyri are offered by T. Schermann, *Griechische Zauberpapyri und das Gemeinde- und Dankgebet im I. Klemensbriefe* [Texte und Untersuchungen, 3. Reihe, 4 Band, Heft 2b] Leipzig, 1909.

³ Another important list of the magical papyri with biblical references is found in J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et chrétiens*, Paris, 1976, NN^o 1073-1081.

quotations⁴. Unfortunately, his study is limited to the manifestly Christian amulets catalogued by Aland. A further limitation of Biondi's study is his treatment of the Bible quotations out of their context in amulets (and generally in the Magical Papyri), while his reference system makes it difficult to trace back anything to the Preisendanz edition⁵. The textual value of the amulets is in their use of direct quotations from the Greek Bible, which were believed to have protective power⁶. Other magical texts rely less on exact quoting; nevertheless the search for Septuagint textual variants could eventually profit by considering the Magical Papyri. The uncanny, heterodox nature of these texts hardly justifies their neglect by Septuagint scholars.

However what the Magical Papyri can contribute to most is our understanding of the reception of the Septuagint in late Antiquity and its diffusion in circles neither pronouncedly Christian nor Jewish. Septuagintal scholarship tends to ignore the existence of such exotic readers as the Hellenistic magicians⁷. Be they Egyptian or Greek, Jewish or Christian, these readers' attitude to the biblical text is of special interest if only by virtue of their extensive syncretism. To provide a basis for a more detailed discussion I will now present several cases of the Septuagint materials used in the Magical Papyri.

I. The first example comes from the IVth c. AD⁸ papyrus PGM, XXXVI, 295-311⁹:

⁴ A. Biondi, "Le citazioni bibliche nei papiri magici cristiani greci." *Studia Papyrologica* 20, 1981, pp.93-127.

⁵ Another flaw in the study is the use (in 1981) of the 1930s edition of PGM, ignoring the revised version by Henrichs issued in 1973-74 (see above). Also Biondi's distinction of the LXX and Theodotonic versions of Daniel seems to be rather arbitrary (pp.109, 111).

⁶ Cf. L. Robert, "Amulettes grecques", in *Journal des Savants*, 1981, pp.3-44 (on the use of the LXX see esp. pp.6-20).

⁷ Cf. an otherwise excellent survey of the Septuagint's pagan readers by G. Dorival which omits the magic papyri: G. Dorival, "La Bible des Septante chez les auteurs païens (jusqu'au Pseudo-Longin)", in *Cahiers de Biblia Patristica*, I, Paris-Strasbourg, 1987, pp.9-26.

⁸ Papyrologists date most of the magical papyri to the 3-4 c. AD. It is clear, nevertheless, that the texts we possess are but copies of writings which could be much older. Cf. K. Preisendanz, "Zur Überlieferung der griechischen Zauberpapyri", in *Miscellanea critica Teubner*, Leipzig, 1964.

'Αγωγή, ἔνπυρον ἐπὶ θεῖου ἀπύρου, οὕτως: <...> ἔστι δὲ ὁ λόγος οὗτος: ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ κατέβησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κατέστρεψαν τὴν πεντάπολιν Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορα, Ἀδαμ<ά>, Σεβουῖη καὶ Σηγῶρ. γυνὴ ἀκούσασα τῆς φωνῆς ἐγένετο ἀλατίνη στήλη. σὺ εἶ τὸ θεῖον, ὃ ἔβρεξεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον Σωδόμων καὶ Γομῶρων, Ἀδαμᾶ, Σεβουῖη καὶ Σηγῶρ. σὺ εἶ τὸ θεῖον, τὸ διακονῆσαν τῷ θεῷ -- οὕτω κάμοι διακόνησον ... κτλ.

Love spell of attraction, fire divination over unburnt brimstone, thus: <...> This is the spell: "The heavens of heavens opened, and the angels of God descended and overturned the five cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, Adama and Seboui and Segor. A woman who heard the voice became the pillar of salt. You are the brimstone which God rained down in the middle of Sodom and Gomorrah, Adama, Seboui and Segor. You are the brimstone which served God - so also serve me ... etc (E.T. by E. N. O'Neil in *Betz* with some changes).

This erotic charm has been commented on by S. Eitrem,¹⁰ who did not fail to recognize the biblical source. The Genesis verses to which this spell alludes (LXX Gen 19:23-26) have clearly influenced the language of the Magical formula:

[Gen 19.23.] ὁ ἥλιος ἐξῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ λαὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Σηγῶρ, 19.24 καὶ κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα καὶ Γομορρα θεῖον καὶ πῦρ παρὰ Κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 19.25. καὶ κατέστρεψεν τὰς πόλεις ταύτας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν περιόικον καὶ πάντα τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐκ τῆς γῆς. 19.26. καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἐγένετο στήλη ἄλος.

Words such as κατέστρεψαν and ἔβρεξεν constitute strong evidence of a link between the Magical Papyrus and the LXX text. In the following notes I will attempt to examine in greater detail the biblical background to some other expressions used in this charm.

1) ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ κατέβησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ

⁹ PGM, vol. II, p.173.

¹⁰ S. Eitrem (ed.), *Papyri Osloenses, Fasc. I, Magical Papyri*, Oslo, 1925, pp.107-110.

The fact that the angels have descended to deal with Sodom roughly corresponds to the narrative in Genesis, although the "heavens opening" are not mentioned in that context. The expression could have been derived from another description of catastrophe in Gen 7:11, *καὶ οἱ καταρράκται τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἠνεώχθησαν*, or could be related to the accounts of prophetic experience (Ez. 1:1, *καὶ ἠνοίχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ κτλ.*). On the other hand, the extensive use of this formula in the intertestamental literature and the New Testament makes one rather think of an indirect quotation influenced by such expressions as, e.g., 3 Macc 6:18, *τότε ὁ μεγαλόδοξος παντοκράτωρ καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς ἐπιφάνας τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον ἠνέωξεν τὰς οὐρανίους πύλας, ἐξ ὧν δεδοξασμένοι δύο φοβεροειδεῖς ἄγγελοι κατέβησαν*, or John 1:52 (with similar formulations in Matt 3:16 and Lk 3:21¹¹), *Ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγῆτα καὶ τοὺς ἄγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. All these passages in turn refer back to Gen 28:12, *καὶ ἰδοὺ κλίμαξ ἐστηρικμένη ἐν τῇ γῆ, ἥς ἡ κεφαλὴ ἀφικνεῖτο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνέβαινον καὶ κατέβαινον ἐπ' αὐτῆς*. Thus we see the composite origin of the wording in the magical spell.

2) *καὶ κατέστρεψαν τὴν πεντάπολιν Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορα Ἀδαμ<ᾶ>, Σεβουῖη καὶ Σηγῶρ*.

The names of the four destroyed cities are mentioned in Deut. 29:21, - *καὶ ὄψονται ταῦ πληγὰς τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης καὶ τὰς νόσους αὐτῆς, ἃς ἀπέστειλεν κύριος ἐπ' αὐτήν - 29.22. θεῖον καὶ ἄλλα κατακεκαυμένον, πᾶσα ἡ γῆ αὐτῆς οὐ σπαρήσεται οὐδὲ ἀνατελεῖ, οὐδὲ μὴ ἀναβῆ ἐπ' αὐτήν πᾶν χλωρόν, ὡσπερ κατεστράφη Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα Ἀδαμα καὶ Σεβωιμ, ἃς κατέστρεψεν κύριος ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ ...*

The denomination of Pentapolis, for the region covered in Gen. 19, emerges in Wisdom of Solomon 10:7, where Lot is described as *φυγόντα καταβάσιον πῦρ Πενταπόλεως*. The fact that the destroyed cities were indeed five (thus including Segor) was

¹¹ S. Eitrem saw here a parallel with the episode of Jesus's baptism, Matt 3:16, *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαίνον ὡσεὶ περιστέρην ...* (also Mk 1:10, Lk 3:21), *op. cit.*, p. 109.

known to Josephus, *BJ*, IV, 483-5 (cf. *AJ*, I, 203), although he also says that Segor (*Ζωῶρ*) had survived to his day (*AJ*, I, 204). In Genesis Segor (Zoar) is said to have been spared when the other cities of the plain were destroyed (Gen 19:22, 30). Its inclusion among the five is probably due to an earlier mention, in Gen 14:2, 8, of a league of five kings in which Segor took part (the others being the kings of Sodom, of Gomorrah, of Adamah and of Seboim).

3) *γυνὴ ἀκούσασα τῆς φωνῆς ἐγένετο ἀλατίνη στήλη*.

Knowing the biblical story, one is tempted to ask if οὐκ were not missing here, before ἀκούσασα. This phrase too appears to be an indirect quotation; the adjective ἀλατίνος is never used in the LXX. However, it is used of Lot's wife by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, II, 14¹²: *ὡς λίθον δεῖξας ἀλατίνην ...* The use of the verb ἀκοεῖν (and its derivatives) with the sense of "obey" is known in the LXX; in the Magical Papyri it denotes obedience to the magician's spell and is used most often in the erotic charms¹³. Some further notes of a more general nature:

1° The use of vocabulary from Genesis in references to the Sodom and Gomorrah episode is frequent in the Bible (cf. Deut. 29:22, quoted above) and emerges often in the context of a curse or menace:

Amos 4:11, *κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς, καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα, καὶ ἐγένεσθε ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός*.

Is. 1:9, *ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὁμοιωθῆμεν*,

(Cf. also Hos. 11:8 and Is. 63:19-64:1)

2° The expression οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν is, on the whole, not typical of Septuagintal idiom: it occurs once in Ps 148:3, *αἰνεῖτε αὐτόν, οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν ...*, and several times in the singular form ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in 3 Reg 8:27, 2 Chron

¹² P. T. Camelot and C. Mondésert (eds.), *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates. Stromate II* [SC, 38], Paris, 1954, p.84.

¹³ Cf. Index V, Greek Words, *sub* ἀκοεῖν & παρακούειν in R.W. Daniel & F. Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum*, vol. 2 [Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Papyrologica Coloniensis, vol. XVI.2], Opladen, 1992.

6:18, Ps 67:34 and Sir 16:18. On the other hand, the Magical Papyri do use this expression; cf. P.M. IV. 3060 (οὐρανός τῶν οὐρανῶν)¹⁴. It can be related to the expression θεός τῶν θεῶν and its various modifications, also frequently used in the papyri¹⁵. Generally speaking, the plural form of οὐρανός is rare in the LXX (it occurs in the Psalms and the Wisdom literature). It is much more frequent in the later writings, particularly in the New Testament, where ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is a key-word. Aquila also consistently uses the plural οὐρανοί¹⁶ in his version.

3° The expression ἀνά μέσον (Σωδόμων καὶ Γομωρων etc.), although here it seems out of place, is distinctly biblical. In the LXX it usually renders the Hebrew preposition ׀בּ.

4° The text seems to be many copyings away from its source in Genesis: Segor was never reported to be overturned (cf. Gen 19:20-22) and the whole issue of Lot's wife is terribly blurred. This being an erotic charm, one may suspect a conscious play on the fortunes of Lot's wife, whose disobedience got her in trouble. In that case, reference to her is crucial in the context.

5° Proximity to the NT language is seen in the opening phrase (the descending angels and the plural use of "heavens"), while the adjective ἀλατίνος is known chiefly from patristic usage. This may be conceived as an argument if not in favor of a Christian background for this document, at least of a later dating¹⁷.

II. The charm of Papyrus V, 3009-3085 (PGM, vol. I, pp.170-172) has been magisterially commented upon by A. Dieterich

¹⁴ PGM, vol. I, p.173.

¹⁵ Cf. R. Merkelbach and M. Totti, *Abraxas. Ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts*, vol. 2 [Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Papyrologica Coloniensis, vol. XVII.2.], Cologne, 1992, p.151n.466. and G. K. Beale, "The Origin of the Title 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords' in Revelation 17:14", *NTS* 31, 1985, pp.618-620.

¹⁶ Cf. J. Reider - N. Turner, *An Index to Aquila* [Sup.V.T., 12], Leiden, 1966, p.179.

¹⁷ E. R. Goodenough declares this charm to be "purely Jewish", cf. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, vol. II: *The Archeological Evidence from the Diaspora* [Bollingen Series XXXVII], New York, 1953, p.199.

and A. Deissmann¹⁸. This text betrays a high degree of awareness of the Bible stories. It has even been treated as a Greek pseudepigraphon by A.-M. Denis¹⁹. The learned notes by various scholars greatly facilitate (but by no means replace) a study of the scriptural background of this text. I will concentrate on two short passages from this papyrus.

ὀρκίζω σε τὸν ὀπτανθέντα τῷ Ὄσραήλ [sic !]²⁰ ἐν στύλῳ φωτίνῳ καὶ νεφέλῃ ἡμερινῇ καὶ ῥυσάμενον αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον ἔργου [em.: τὸν λαὸν ἐκ τοῦ] Φαραῶ καὶ ἐπενέγκαντα ἐπὶ Φαραῶ τὴν δεκάπληγον διὰ τὸ παρακούειν αὐτόν.

I adjure thee by him who appeared unto Osrael in the pillar of light and in the cloud of the day, and who delivered his word from the taskwork of Pharaoh [emendation: his people from Pharaoh] and brought upon Pharaoh the ten plagues because he heard not. (Trans. from A. Deissmann, *Light ...*, p.257²¹ with changes.)

1) ὀπτάζομαι (ὀπτάνομαι) occurs once in the LXX in a similar context: Num. 14:14, ὅστις ὀφθαλμοῖς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ὀπτάζη, κύριε, καὶ ἡ νεφέλη σου ἐφεστηκεν ἐπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης οὐ πορεύη πρότερος αὐτῶν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ἐν στύλῳ

¹⁸ Cf. A. Dieterich, *Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des Späteren Altertums* [Festschrift Hermann Usener], Leipzig, 1891 (repr. 1973), pp.138ff and A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East. The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*, [ET by L.R.M. Strachan], London-New York-Toronto, 21911, pp.251-260. Also of interest are the notes in L. Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, Budapest, 1898, pp. 112ff, and in Betz, pp.96-97.

¹⁹ Cf. *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* [Studia Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha], Leiden, 1970, pp.304-305; also in A.-M. Denis, *Concordance grecque des Pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament. Concordance, corpus des textes, indices*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987.

²⁰ Such spelling is not uncommon in the magical papyri: cf. PGM IV, 1816. A. Deissmann thought this to be a sign of the pagan origin of whoever edited this text (*op. cit.*, p.257n1). Another more weighty argument in favor of this is the ending of the charm, which says "Be pure and keep it. For the sentence is Hebrew and kept by men who are pure" (*op. cit.*, p.260 with n.3).

²¹ A photographic reproduction of the papyrus is published side by side with Deissmann's text; a superficial reading made me doubt the emendations introduced by Preisendanz and later followed in Betz's edition.

πυρός τὴν νύκτα.). Cognate verbs are used in describing the cloud epiphanies in Ex 16:10.

2) The main problem, however, is created by the terms used for the description of the pillar of light, which diverge from the LXX Exodus formulation: Ex. 13:21 has ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἠγάγει αὐτῶν, ἡμέρας μὲν ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης δειξάμενος αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδόν, τὴν δὲ νύκτα ἐν στύλῳ πυρός· (same terms in Ex 13:22). The word φωτεινός never occurs in Exodus in relation to the miraculous pillar. A cognate word is used in Ps 77:14 καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας καὶ ὅλην τὴν νύκτα ἐν φωτισμῷ πυρός. Another approximation to our papyrus formula can be found in Deut 1:33 - God showed to Israel the way ἐν πυρὶ νυκτὸς ... καὶ ἐν νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας. Thus the expression ὁ στύλος φωτεινός appears to be unprecedented in the LXX. Interestingly, we find a νεφέλη φωτεινὴ in the NT account of the transfiguration, Matt 17:5, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς. A connection between the cloud at the transfiguration and the cloud of Exodus emerges in Origen's *Commentary on St. John* 32.2²², where he speaks of Jesus's pillar of bright cloud: ὁ στύλος τῆς φωτεινῆς νεφέλης Ἰησοῦ. One can suspect that a similarly "christianized" combination is behind the στύλῳ φωτινῷ καὶ νεφέλῃ ἡμερινῇ of the magical papyrus.

3) Another argument in favor of Christian influence in this document is the the word δεκάπληγος. It does not occur in the LXX but frequently emerges in the Church Fathers' writings (see Lampe's *Dictionary, sub voce*), although we also find occurrences in Hellenistic Jewish literature (cf. *Jubilees* 48.5).

4) The appearance of λόγος where one would expect to find λαός (in the phrase ῥυσάμενον αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον ἔργου Φαραῶ) is also significant as a mark of possible Christian influence.

5) Other expressions, despite their distinctly Septuagintal flavor, are difficult to trace to any particular source:

- ῥύεσθαι is frequently used of the Exodus events, in the book itself (e.g. Ex. 14:30, καὶ ἐρρύσατο κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ

²² C. Blanc (ed.), *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean, t.V, (Livres XXXVIII et XXII). Texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes* [Sources Chrétiennes, N° 385], Paris, 1992, p.186.

ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων) and in later literature (Wis. 10:15, λαὸν ὄσιον καὶ σπέρμα ἀμειπτον ἐρρύσατο ἐξ ἔθνους θλιβόντων; see also Wis. 19:9). It is often used with the preposition ἐκ, which supports the emendation suggested by Preisendanz. The word acquires a special prominence in the Christian context by virtue of its use in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:13).

- ἔργα is often used in LXX Ex. of the labors imposed by Pharaoh, e.g. Ex 1:11,14, 2: 23, 5:4,5,9,13.

- παρακούειν is known in the Septuagint, but is never used there of the Exodus Pharaoh.

The magical text of papyrus V mentions several other important events of biblical history: the creation, the miraculous crossings of the Red Sea and the Jordan, the giants episode, and some others. Although the Bible is the ultimate source of these data, references of this kind could just as easily have drawn on any of the pseudepigraphic retellings of the biblical history or on oral tradition. Still, some passages in the charm do make one think of Septuagintal readings as their possible origin. Picking up one more line from the same text (PGM IV, 3063-65) we find:

ὀρκίζω σε τὸν περιθέντα ὄρη τῇ θαλάσῃ <ἢ> τείχος ἐξ ἄμμου, καὶ ἐπιτάξαντα αὐτῇ μὴ ὑπερβῆναι. καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ἡ ἄβυσσος· I conjure you by the one who put the mountains around the sea [or] a wall of sand and commanded the sea not to overflow. The abyss obeyed. (ET by W.C. Grese from Betz, p.97)

a) Deissmann explained ὄρη as a corruption of ὄρια, bounds,²³ mentioned in Jer 5:22, μὴ ἐμὲ οὐ φοβηθήσεσθε; λέγει κύριος, <...> τὸν τάξαντα ἄμμον ὄριον τῇ θαλάσῃ, πρόσταγμα αἰώνιον, καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήσεται αὐτό, καὶ παραχθήσεται καὶ οὐ δυνήσεται, καὶ ἠχῆσουσιν τὰ κύματα αὐτῆς καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήσεται αὐτό. Another significant parallel to our charm is found in Job 38.8-11: ἐφραξα δὲ θάλασσαν πύλαις, <...> 38.10 ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ ὄρια περιθεῖς κλείθρα καὶ πύλας· 38.11 εἶπα δὲ αὐτῇ Μέχρι τούτου ἐλεύση καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήση, ...

²³ *Op. cit.*, p.258n.15.

M. Gaster indicated the parallels between this papyrus and a passage from the book of Enoch²⁴. In fact, in 1 Enoch 69:18 we read, <<And through that oath the sea was created, and as its foundation, for the time of anger, he placed for it the sand, and it does not go beyond (it) from the creation of the world and for ever.>>²⁵

b) The interchange of ὄρη and ὄρια in our charm is not surprising; a Septuagint reader could have sensed it in many LXX passages, e.g. Ps 45:3, διὰ τοῦτο οὐ φοβηθήσομεθα ἐν τῷ ταράσσει τὴν γῆν καὶ μετατίθεσθαι ὄρη ἐν καρδίαις θαλασσῶν.

c) "καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ἡ ἄβυσσος" - the reaction of the abyss to the divine activity is frequently described in the LXX: e.g., Ps 76:16, εἰδοσάν σε ὕδατα καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν, καὶ ἐταράχθησαν ἄβυσσοι ... (cf. Sir 16:18). In the LXX the verb ἐπακουεῖν has a double connotation of hearing and responding²⁶. The papyrus formulation seems to have preserved this ambiguity.

d) It is interesting to see a fragment of what is essentially wisdom literature emerge in the context of a magical charm. Appearance of similar material in the book of Enoch is equally significant. The quotation we have dealt with, whether direct, or, more probably, from memory, demonstrates the aspects of the Bible which were relevant to at least some of its ancient readers. In this way we learn more of the Septuagint's importance as a source of cosmological knowledge.

III. The textual relationship between the Magical Papyri and the LXX that one encounters most often is a vague dependance. I think that it is important to illustrate this generic resemblance

²⁴ Cf. M. Gaster, "The Logos Ebraikos in the Magical Papyrus of Paris, and the Book of Enoch", *JRAS* 33, 1901, pp.109-117, repr. in *Ib.*, *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediaeval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology*, New York, 1971, pp.356-364.

²⁵ Quoted from M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1978, vol I, pp.163-164.

²⁶ See J. Barr, "The Meaning of ἐπακούω and Cognates in the LXX", *JTS* 31, 1980, pp.67-72.

which magical texts sometimes bear with the LXX. For example, we read in Papyrus *PGM*, V. 459-464²⁷:

ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε τὸν κτίσαντα γῆν καὶ ὅσα καὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸν στήσαντα τὴν θαλασσαν καὶ <σ>αλεύ[σαντα]²⁸ τὸν οὐρανόν, ὁ χωρίσας τὸ φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σκοτοῦς κτλ.

I call upon you who created earth and bones and all flesh and all spirit and who established the sea and shook (or: moved) the heavens, who separated the light from darkness, ... (ET by D.E. Aune in *Betz* with changes).

Invocations of this kind are quite common in the Magical Papyrus (cf. *PGM* V, 98-105, XII, 239-242, also in the *Prayer of Jacob*, *PGM*, XXII, 1-7). Although no precise citation is to be found in this passage, the reader recognizes the biblical flavor in most of the expressions used. The reference to the creation process accompanies oaths, blessings, curses, and other forms of emphatic discourse even in the biblical texts. The most striking parallel comes from the New Testament, Rev 10:6: καὶ ὤμοσεν ἐν τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται ...

We can find a similar turn of phrase already in Gen 14:19 (same in 14:22), Εὐλόγημένος Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ὑψίστῳ, ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ...

- The verb κτίζειν is also a mark of Septuagintal language²⁹:

Hos. 13:4: ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου στερεῶν οὐρανὸν καὶ κτίζων γῆν ...

²⁷ *PGM*, I, p.196. A detailed study of this text has been done by M. Philonenko, "Une prière magique au dieu créateur (*PGM* 5,459-489)", in: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles Lettres*, 1985, pp.433-52. Cf also the analysis by A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, pp. 68sq. and the commentary in Merkelbach and Totti (eds.), *Abraxas. Ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts*, vol. 2, pp.150-152.

²⁸ The reading <πασ>σαλεύ[σαντα] suggested by Preisendanz appears unsatisfying as the verb πασσαλεύω occurs in neither the LXX nor the NT, and is generally rare in the later Jewish and Christian writings. C. Wessely in his earlier edition of the papyrus read it as σαλεύων; cf. his *Griechische Zauberpapyrus von Paris und London*, Wien 1888, p.115 [139], l.476.

²⁹ Cf. M. Philonenko, *op. cit.*, p.435.

Am 4:13 – ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ στερεῶν βροντὴν καὶ κτιζῶν πνεῦμα

Although LXX Genesis never uses it as an equivalent of *קרא*, its theological significance grows in the books translated later to become the most common New Testament term for creation as well as Aquila's standard equivalent for *קרא* (cf. his version of Gen 1:1)³⁰.

- In the same way the word *σάρξ*, although abundantly used in the LXX³¹, points further towards the NT, especially to the Pauline epistles.

- The sea is often mentioned in paraphrases of the creation narrative (cf. Ps 88:13 – τὸν βορρᾶν καὶ θαλάσσης σὺ ἔκτισας ...).

It remains the object of divine preoccupation even after, and thus occurs with the verb *σαλεύω*: Pss 97:7 and 95:11, *σαλευθήτω ἡ θάλασσα καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς* [before the Lord]. A blurred reference to such passages may explain the strange formulation of the charm: the sea is fixed while the heaven is shaken. A reference to the Red Sea crossing is equally possible, although the LXX uses another verb on that occasion (Ex 14:27, cf. however, Ps 77:13, *ἔστησεν ὕδατα ὡσεὶ ἄσκον*). As for the shaken heaven, the motif is known in the LXX³², although one is tempted rather to see in this charm a vague memory of Mark 13:25, *καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται*. The same expression occurs in Mt 24:29 and Lk 21:26. We find the same image in other early Christian writings, such as 1 Clement 20:1, *οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῇ διοικήσει αὐτοῦ σαλευόμενοι ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὑποτάσσονται αὐτῷ*.

- Finally, the formula *ὁ χωρίσας τὸ φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σκότους* can be traced back to Gen 1:4, *καὶ διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους*. This expression is repeated in Gen 1:18, where the luminaries are created to *διαχωρίζειν ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους*, and in a

³⁰ Cf. W. Foerster, *κτιζῶ*, in *TWNT* and P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and their Emendation*, Cambridge, 1973, pp. 221-225.

³¹ Cf. the commentary of M. Philonenko, *op. cit.*, p. 436-437.

³² Cf. 2 Reg 22:8, *καὶ ἐταράχθη καὶ ἐσεισθη ἡ γῆ, καὶ τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συνεταράχθησαν ...*

slightly different form in Gen 1:14. M. Philonenko indicates the use of the unprefix form *ἐχώρισε* (φῶς καὶ σκότος) in Philo, *De opificio*, 33 and in *PGM*, 4, 1173³³.

By way of conclusion.

The aim of this paper has been to explore the possibilities of a link between the Magical Papyri and the Septuagint. I hope to have succeeded in showing that such a link indeed exists and is worthy of more detailed examination.

Several potential directions of further research open up at this stage. The principles of quotation might be examined and considered in relationship to other, similar treatments current in Late Antiquity. The religious syncretism reflected in the Magical Papyri makes their use of the LXX conspicuous in the context of Bible quotation in the OT Pseudepigrapha, the New Testament, and the Qumran and early Rabbinic and Christian literatures³⁴. Clarifying the mnemonic or scriptural origins of those citations may bring us closer to the authors of the magical texts.

The question arises of the possible background of the Magical Papyri: Jewish, pagan, Christian? Clearly the answer cannot be unambiguous. We have noticed the influence of New Testament idiom in almost all the passages analyzed. Such traces emerge in composite quotations, and that seems to point towards a Christian milieu. In this respect, the study of the scriptural quotations and of the language involved in them could shed some light on the magicians' cultural context. Nevertheless, the presence of Christian or intertestamental texts in the background is not decisive evidence for identifying authorship. Goodenough was right to stress that the heterodoxy of these odd documents is no argument against their Jewish

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 437.

³⁴ Several recent publications testify to the growing interest in the issue of quotation techniques; cf. various articles in M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon (eds.), *Biblical perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, XXVIII], Leiden-Boston-Köln, 1998; J. G. Campbell, *The use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*, Berlin, 1995; A. Van Den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods", *Vigiliae Christianae* 50, 1996, pp. 223-243.

origin³⁵. Although his implication that the use of semitic divine and angelic names shows the magicians' Jewish origin seems far-fetched³⁶, it is clear that the synthetic nature of these documents does not exclude some of the authors' being Jewish, or indeed Christian. An important implication of this situation is the impossibility of restricting the use of the Septuagint sources to any particular segment of the Hellenistic readership³⁷. The attitudes of this multifarious reading public to the biblical text do enrich our perception of the reception of the Septuagint in Late Antiquity.

³⁵ Cf. E. R. Goodenough, *op. cit.*, pp.107-8, 154ff.

³⁶ In Lucian's *Alexander the False Prophet*, §13 we read how the cheat Alexander simulated divine possession: ὁ δὲ φωνᾷς τινας ἀσήμους φθεγγόμενος οἷαι γένοιτο ἂν Ἑβραίων ἢ Φοινίκων, ἐξέπληττε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὐκ εἰδότας ὅ τι καὶ λέγοι . . . - Uttering a few meaningless words like Hebrew or Phoenician, he dazed the creatures, who did not know what he was saying ... (A.M. Harmon (ed.), *Lucian with an English Translation*, vol. IV [The Loeb Classical Library], 1961.). Alexander of Abonoteichus was certainly not a Jew, yet he had recourse to the Hebrew sounding *abracadabra*. It is also clear, however, that he must have gotten from somewhere the idea to use the Hebrew (or its like). This somewhere must ultimately be the practice of the Jewish magicians, such as Elymas mentioned in Acts 13:8f., or the seven sons of Scevas in Acts 19:13f.

³⁷ Another interesting witness to the spread of the LXX is the funerary curse of the rhetor Amphicles, which relies on Deut. 28; see A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, London-New York-Toronto, 1910, p.20n.1.; and a detailed discussion by L. Robert, "Malédiction funéraires grecques", in *CRAI* 1978, pp. 245-250; cf. C. Dogniez and M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie: 5, Le Deutéronome*, Paris, 1992, p.67-68. See also the quotation of Deut. 32:1-3 in Aquila's version (!) in a II-III^d c. copper amulet from Syracuse, in R. Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets. The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper and Bronze Lamellae, Part I, Published Texts of Known Provenance* [Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Papyrologica Coloniensia, vol. XXII.1], Opladen, 1994, pp.126ff. See finally C. Wessely, "On the Spread of Jewish-Christian Religious Ideas among the Egyptians," *Expositor*, 3 series, vol. IV (N^o XXI), London, 1886, p.194-204.

Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies

John William Wevers

As a farm boy in a Dutch American home living on a dairy farm almost five miles from the "Biggest little town in Wis." (Baldwin, pop. 666) the prospects for an eventual career in LXX Studies were dismal indeed. I was an unusually bright lad and overly sure of myself. I had absolutely no interest in farming, loved reading almost anything that was in print, though the books in my parental home were practically all Dutch religious literature, mainly sermonic, though a few were patriotic. But it was print, and I devoured it.

There was one teacher in the local high school, who became the first important stimulus in my life, i.e. outside of my parents. The school had been offering Latin for the last two years of schooling as an option (to Agriculture or Accounting), and I was eager to abandon Agriculture and take up Latin. To my great disappointment only two enrolled for Latin in my Junior Year, and the principal of the school dropped the option. But Abraham Lee was my savior. He knew that I had been looking forward to Latin, and suggested that, since his free period coincided with mine, he would tutor me during that time. After two or three weeks, he felt that I might like to add Greek! So I borrowed an Introductory Greek book from a local Norwegian Lutheran pastor (whose son was a classmate of mine), and I immediately fell in love with Greek. What a wonderful year that was. Abe Lee had a Masters Degree in Classics (he was probably the first such who had ever been in Baldwin), and at the end of that year he was dismissed as superfluous to the school program. I was heartbroken, but survived. After graduation I stayed home for a year since I was barely sixteen, and made ten cents an hour in house and barn painting with my bachelor Uncle Dick (who was like a second father to me). If I had a full week, I had six dollars, all of which I saved carefully. By the end of the summer of 1936, I had

earned and saved 116 dollars, and my uncle promised to lend me an extra three hundred dollars to start College (I was preparing for the ministry, the only escape from farming that I knew of), and so I started Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Mich. There I majored in Classics as far as that was possible, particularly in my first love, Greek, and then on to Calvin Seminary.

In Seminary my spiritual advisor for my senior year was Prof. Clarence Bouma, Professor of Ethics and Apologetics, who took me under his wing. By this time I was contemplating applying for a scholarship in Greek at the Univ. of Michigan. But Prof. Bouma persuaded me, in view of my love of and ability in learning languages, not to pursue that course, but to enroll at Princeton Theological Seminary in O.T. and Semitics. This, said he, would provide a much better future for someone like me. I shall always remember Prof. Bouma as having had my best interests at heart; he was a sensitive and kind person.

So off to Princeton I went with a wife and a son of six months. I had by now saved some money. My wife was a nurse, and we managed to survive on her income. Meanwhile, I studied hard and long, and two years and three months after arriving in Princeton, I had my Th.D. degree.

It was at Princeton that the third major influence in my life overtook me in the person of Henry S. Gehman, the Professor of Old Testament. He had two Doctorates, the first in Classics from Pennsylvania, and the second under James Montgomery at the Episcopal Seminary in Philadelphia. It was Montgomery who had introduced Gehman to Septuagint Studies, particularly in the secondary versions. Gehman had mastered Classical Armenian, Ethiopic, as well as Arabic, Syriac, and of course Latin. And now Gehman had someone who was willing and eager for similar work. For the first time in my life I found someone who would direct my crude talents into a worthy channel, and I loved every minute of it. This proved to be the most exciting and adventurous period of my entire life!

It was a suggestion of Montgomery that provided me with a topic for my doctoral thesis. It was "The Relation of the Hebrew Variants of the Books of Kings to the Old Greek and

the Other Greek Recensions."¹ After I had my doctorate I was offered an assistantship to Gehman as an instructor in Old Testament at the Seminary. I had taken Arabic and Arabic History at the University, and now continued with Arabic studies, which had actually become my second love.

In order to gain another perspective for Semitic studies, I also took Sanskrit and Indo-European Studies at the University; I felt that some understanding of Indo-European morphology, particularly as developed in Sanskrit, would be helpful. And these have indeed stood me in good stead. But my Semitic training also needed further stimulus, so in a second year I studied Old Babylonian, Ugaritic and Aramaic magical bowls with Cyrus Gordon at Dropsie every Monday. This was an ideal arrangement, since Gordon lived in Princeton, but taught in Philadelphia every Monday, and so took me along every week. It was a free ride all the way, and I remain in his debt to this day.

Meanwhile I had to assist Gehman in the work on his Septuagint Dictionary project. Gehman simply started with page one of Hatch-Redpath, worked through each passage, and wrote entries accordingly. After five years (1946-51) we had finished <agapao>. Of course, methodologically this was not the most efficient way to write a dictionary. He continued with this project for years after I left him for Toronto in 1951. I believe the ms containing his work is deposited in the Princeton Theological Seminary Library. During this time he was also busy with the revision of Montgomery's ICC Commentary on Kings, with which I assisted him as well. We would read the text together, and I would have to look up all the references in the library. What a job! But at least, that was finished by 1951.

Coming to Toronto was the best move I ever made. At Princeton I was really only one of "our brighter graduates," but at Toronto I could develop without outside interference. When the head of the Department, Theophile J. Meek, assigned me a lecture course on O.T. literature I asked him what approach I should take. Said he in amazement, "But it's your course!" And

¹ This appeared in digest form in "A Study in the Hebrew Variants in the Books of Kings," *ZAW* LXIV(1945-48) 46-76.

so it was; there was complete freedom of expression, something which in conservative Princeton, being ecclesiastically bound, I had not known, and it was a refreshing experience.

At Toronto I had to teach both Hebrew and Arabic. Greek was an interesting plus according to Prof. Meek; "we've never had anyone interested in the Septuagint before," said he. A new environment, new colleagues, a new country, all these meant a considerable time of adjustment. I had had a good training in Princeton University in Linguistics and I was eager to apply this to both Hebrew and Arabic. This training, particularly in Applied Linguistics, stood me in good stead when the University was suddenly flooded with Hungarian students (and professors) who had fled their country at the time of its revolt against the Soviet invaders in 1956; they desperately wanted to continue University work, but had no proficiency in English. So the University turned to the local Linguistic Society over which I presided and asked for direction. Three of us volunteered to set up some kind of training program for teaching these people English as a Second Language. That was a long tale, and resulted in our producing materials of our own. It represented a period of two to three years devoted to this project.

This was an interlude, after which I returned to my first love, Greek, and more particularly to the Septuagint.² I was particularly interested in the editing of the larger editions, the Cambridge Septuagint and the Göttingen project. I worked on two sample texts, 3 Regn. and Ezekiel, and was fascinated by the different approaches, i.e. using a diplomatic versus a critical text. I made contact with both Cambridge and Göttingen, and went to Europe for the summer of 1966. I first went to the continent, visiting Professor Ziegler in Würzburg for a few days before proceeding to Göttingen.

² See my "Proto-Septuagint Studies," *The Seed of Wisdom* (Meek Festschrift), edited by W.S. McCullough. Toronto, 1964. Pp.58-77. This was reprinted in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974. Pp.138-157.

Since I was working on another report on LXX Studies for the *Theologische Rundschau* to update an earlier review,³ I wanted to use the Göttingen library and its rich resources, and then planned to go to Britain to take part in the summer meeting of the Old Testament Society before returning to Toronto. By that time I had been offered the opportunity to edit the Genesis volume for Göttingen, and had become convinced that critical texts attempting to restore as far as possible the original text as it had been produced by the translator was the preferable way to go. Of course, as I stated quite clearly in the Genesis edition, I was under no illusions that one could fully restore such, but as in the case of the New Testament, one had to try, using all the best resources at one's disposal, and thereby come as close as humanly possible to that original text. I had accepted the Göttingen offer, and work was immediately begun on making the collation books ready for the editor. Cambridge Univ. Press, however, did want to speak to me, and the Secretary of the Syndics came to London to see me. He confessed that I was their last resort; they had hoped that I would be willing to continue the Cambridge editions, but since I was already committed to the Göttingen project, and had to refuse, they decided to abandon the project indefinitely.

I do believe that mine was a wise decision. Preparing critical editions is not a case of syncretistic adoption of readings from various mss; it is not a syncretistic text, but is a serious attempt at ridding the text of all such syncretisms, of restoring a text which ideally had no secondary readings left, an impossible but laudable goal.

I did realize that working towards a critical text of Genesis meant a total commitment to the project. It meant abandoning work on other favored projects, and spending all available time on it. I no longer did book reviews, wrote essays on linguistics or on O.T. subjects as such. I was now a Septuagint man. I immediately set to work reading the Greek text carefully and comparing it word for word with MT, studiously taking notes on anything noteworthy that occurred to

³ "Septuaginta-Forschungen," *Theol. Rundschau* XXII(1954), 85-138, 171-190; as well as my "Septuaginta-Forschungen seit 1954," *Theol. Rundschau* NF XXXIII(1968), 18-76.

me. I had to become thoroughly familiar with both the Greek and the Hebrew texts. Once I had gone through the 50 chh. of Genesis, I simply started all over again, and by the time the collation books arrived, I had gone over the texts three times. The collation books consisted of six volumes containing 1208 double pages. Each page had 33 numbered lines extending across a double page. Each line contained one word of a neutral Greek text; this was chosen on the basis of a survey of Holmes Parsons,⁴ and was written on the left-hand side of the double page. The reason for this neutral text was purely practical; the text chosen was the one which had the largest support, to which all the Greek mss earlier than Gutenberg were to be collated, in other words it was a completely neutral text. The collations covered somewhat over a hundred mss for Genesis. Outside the Psalter, the extant evidence for the Pentateuch was far and away the most extensive in the Greek Old Testament.

I felt that it was necessary immediately to make some kind of attempt at establishing the internal textual history of the book. I went through the evidence over and over again to find mss groupings. Gradually some order became evident. E.g. one group of five mss seemed to constitute a family; 19-93-108-118 and 314 consistently supported the suppletor text of Cod Vaticanus. This became my *b* group for the Pentateuch. Other groups gradually emerged as well.

I was determined not to be unduly influenced by the *trifaria varietas* of St. Jerome,⁵ but to discover relationships on my own without predisposed theories. Eventually I ended up with a hexaplaric text plus one sub group, *O* and *oI*. For the later books of the Pentateuch I split the *O* group into two, i.e. into *O* and *oII*, i.e. making three groups, *O* + *oI* + *oII*, which was a real improvement. Similarly the Catena text readily divided into three groups. Beyond that, seven different textual groups evolved. As far as Jerome's three recensions were concerned, I found no trace of the shadowy Hesychius, nor to

⁴ R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*. Oxonii, 1799. A Genesis volume appeared separately the previous year.

⁵ Praef. in Paralipp.

my surprise of a Lucianic text.⁶ The witness of the Antiochian Fathers produced no recognizable recensional text whatsoever. It had long been realized that the Lucianic text as produced by Lagarde was based on a false notion that the Lucianic mss supporting a recensional text in the Former Prophets were Lucianic throughout. Nor was there any trace of such a recensional text in the textual witnesses extant for the Pentateuch in general. The usual characteristics of the Lucianic text did not characterize any Pentateuchal texts. Even Rahlfs⁷ was misled in identifying two mss, 75 and 458, my *n* group, as Lucianic because they throughout avoided Hellenistic aorist inflections for λεγω, using only first aorist endings, i.e. Hellenistic forms such as ειπαν or ειποσαν were automatically "corrected" to ειπον; similarly, ειπα always became ειπον. This was indeed the case of the Lucianic text in the Former Prophets, but this was irrelevant for the Pentateuch. In fact, it turned out that as in the Psalter, the so-called Lucianic mss were simply Byzantine texts, and had nothing to do with Lucian, as an analysis of the text in the lectionary texts used in the Byzantine Church made clear.⁸

The problem with establishing a critical text is simply put: one can only establish the critical text if one knows the textual history thoroughly, but one can establish the textual history only insofar as it is distinct from the original text. One is forced to work within these parameters, hopefully in ever narrowing circles until one reaches some point of no return. It means learning through constant living with the text to think like the translator. How did he work, what were his prejudices, his theological stance, his view of the Biblical text? Eventually one makes tentative decisions. It's a slow process, and certainly is never fully attainable, but it remains a challenge. Like Mt. Everest, it's there, and it is mankind's aim to overcome the

⁶ "A Lucianic Recension in Genesis?," *BIOSCS* VI(1973), 22-35.

⁷ Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Gottingensis auct. Genesis. Stuttgart: Priv. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1926.

⁸ See my analysis in Chapter 11, "The Lectionary Texts," in *MSU* XI, Göttingen, 1974. Pp. 176-185.

unattainable. (It should also be noted that NT text criticism is quite unlike LXX criticism in that here one is dealing with the text of a translation.)

Once one feels comfortable about textual groupings, one can proceed to the gathering of other evidence. Of particular importance is the evidence of the papyri. This is left to the editor for obvious reasons. Its evidence is not simply a matter of reading what is there, but also of understanding the broken context. For Genesis I had 32 different papyri, a few of them without a Rahlfs number. Three of the papyri were very substantial. The Berlin Genesis, 911, from the late 3rd Century of our era contained text extending fragmentarily from ch.1 through ch.35:8. Two other large papyri were from the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin; 961 from the fourth century contained fragmentary but substantial text from chh.9 to 44, whereas 962 from the third century had such text from chh.8 through 46. The importance of these texts can hardly be overstated. The earliest papyrus for Genesis was 942, containing fragments of 7:17-20 and 38:10-12, and dated from the middle of the 1st century BCE; it is unfortunately of very little value since it is extremely fragmentary. Wherever possible one tries to find photographs, since editions of these texts should always be rechecked.

Once the Greek ms evidence has all been recorded in the collation books, one turns to the versions. The *Vetus Latina* is the oldest, and probably also the most difficult to assess. For Genesis I was fortunate in having Bonifatius Fischer's edition of the *Vetus Latina*.⁹ Fischer collated seven extant mss as well as the marginal *Vetus Latina* marginal readings of five *Vulgata* mss. Furthermore, he collated all the patristic evidence gathered by the *Vetus Latina* Institute which is housed in the Benedictine monastery at Beuron, a huge undertaking. I simply used his type groupings *holus bolus*. One could hardly improve on his enormously learned piece of work. What makes the Old Latin so difficult to use is that educated speakers of Latin treated Greek as the language of culture, and so the Fathers could easily check the LXX reading as well as that of the Old Latin

⁹ *VETUS LATINA: Die Reste der altlat. Kirchenschriftsteller. Vol.2. Genesis.* Freiburg: Herder, 1951-54.

text, often correcting the latter. E.g. Augustine only witnessed in his earliest writings to LaC, a Europeanized version of the old Latin of North Africa. But LaI was also used by Augustine, as well as LaE prior to that, i.e. the general European type text before the Itala. But Augustine also often revised LaI on the basis of the Greek, which revised text Fischer called LaA. Clearly quoting the *Vetus Latina* is fraught with danger!

Not everyone will be familiar with the languages of the versions, and in order to collate their texts one must first learn to read and understand them. For Ethiopic I was fortunate in having been taught it by Prof. Gehman during my graduate days at Princeton, but nonetheless after a twenty year interval during which I had not seriously looked at an Ethiopic text, it meant renewing my acquaintance with the language. Of course, I had the translation of Dillmann's grammar as revised by Bezold, and translated into English by James Chichon, but that is a reference grammar.¹⁰ I also had his *Lexicon*¹¹ and his *Chrestomathy* with its valuable lexicon¹² which was much easier to use than the large lexicon. Furthermore, I had Cheyne's Grammar written in French,¹³ as well as that of Praetorius written in Latin.¹⁴ The small English grammar by Mercer¹⁵ was helpful if one already knew enough of the language to correct the extremely numerous errors in the book.

¹⁰ A.Dillmann, *Ethiopic Grammar*. 2nd edition enlarged and improved by C.Bezold (1889), translated by James A.Crichon. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.

¹¹ *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae cum Indico Latino*. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970. (Reproductio phototypice editonis 1865). Pp.xxxi,1522.

¹² *Chrestomathia Aethiopica et Glossario Explanata*. Lipsiae: T.O.Weigel, 1866.

¹³ M.Chaine, *Grammaire éthiopienne*. Beyrouth, 1927.

¹⁴ F.Praetorius, *Grammatica Aethiopica cum Paradigmatibus. Literatura, Chrestomathia et Glossario. Porta Linguarum Orientalium. Pars VII.* Karlsruhe u. Leipzig: Reuther, 1886.

¹⁵ S.A.B.Mercer, *Ethiopic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1920.

So I did review the grammars, and then did what I inevitably did when I had to become familiar with a language; I took a Biblical text in the language (after all I did have Dillman's *Octateuchus*, along with an English Bible, and started by comparing Genesis 1:1 in both. When the Ethiopic looked strange I looked to see what it was supposed to say.

If one does this carefully for a few chapters, it's amazing how much of the language comes back to one. I did not use a lexicon, just the English Bible. Of course, this was not always a good rendering of the Ethiopic, but if one read five or six chapters, and then read one of the grammars again, one was ready to begin collations. For any version, I always read fairly extensively comparing the language in question and the Greek text. I did this, even when I was fully familiar with the versional language such as Syriac or Arabic. I wanted to understand how the translator approached his text before recording any variants in the collation books. If a translation is free and paraphrastic, there is little reason for recording such as textual variant. The point of collating a version was to record what one thought to be the Greek underlying the translation; only such a record was useful. Naturally I made mistakes, but this is the shortest route to get at the versional evidence.

One problem with working on the Ethiopic was that my only lexica were in Latin! The lexicon constituting almost the entire second half of the *Chrestomathy* was far more useful than the large Lexicon. Today one is blessed both with grammars and lexica in English. Lambdin's *Ethiopic Grammar* is extremely useful, and so are the lexica of Wolf Leslau, particularly his *Concise Lexicon of Geez (Classical Ethiopic)* of 1989.

My greatest difficulty was with Classical Armenian. All I had was Meillet's *Altarmenische Elementarbuch* of 1913.¹⁶ And for a lexicon Göttingen had a small dictionary in French! Nor was there much outside help in Toronto. I did have a student of Armenian descent, a Protestant clergyman who spoke Modern Armenian, though of the wrong variety. So I had to struggle

¹⁶ Indogermanische Bibliothek I,10. Heidelberg: Winter.

along. Eventually I did find a good dictionary by Bedrossian¹⁷ which covered both Classical and Modern Armenian. My first difficulty was with the miserable alphabet devised by Mesropian; some of the letters were very difficult to distinguish in my old waterlogged copy of Zohrabian's edition of the Armenian Bible of 1805 (found for me by my student who had a relative owning a bookstore in Istanbul). The edition has since been reprinted and is now readily available.¹⁸ For me Armenian was a new experience; I did not know a word (or a grapheme), so I had to start from scratch. I holed up with my Meillet (after working on the script sufficiently so that I could more or less pronounce the words printed in the cursive Armenian script) and copied all the necessary conjugations and declensions -- i.e. all those things that I had to memorize in order to make any sense out of the language. Since it was an Indo-European language it's general pattern was not all that unlike Attic Greek. These declensions and conjugations, i.e. for nouns, pronouns, and verbs, I copied out on filing cards which I carried around with me, and could review as I walked down the street or in odd moments here and there. After a week of this, I took the Zohrabian -- I could by now at least find the books of the Bible in it -- and turned to the Gospel of John and started in with the English text next to it. In this way I figured out the first verse. I had seen actual nouns and the past tense of the verb "to be." I suppose that first verse took over half an hour to figure out. I worked at this for at least two or three weeks, and by that time had read a number of chapters.

I then turned to Genesis 1:1 and compared the Armenian to the neutral text of the LXX text of the collation books. I spent another two or three weeks before I was sufficiently familiar with Armenian to trust myself to start the actual collation, this time recording the variants in the collation books. Incidentally, when I was really stuck I cheated, by seeing how the Cambridge LXX had dealt with the Armenian, but this

¹⁷ M. Bedrossian, *New Dictionary Armenian-English*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1879.

¹⁸ This is a facsimile reproduction of the 1805 Venician edition with an Introduction by C. Cox. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1984.

turned out on the whole to be unnecessary. It was exciting, but exhausting.

The other language(s) which remained unknown to me was Coptic. Again I followed more or less the same procedure. I had W. Till's *Koptische Grammatik (Saidische Dialekt)* 3rd ed.,¹⁹ as well as A. Mallon's *Grammaire copte*, 4th ed.,²⁰ which in spite of its name dealt only with the Bohairic dialect. Fortunately the extremely well organized Coptic Dictionary by Crum²¹ I had earlier acquired for my personal library. For Coptic the start was much easier, since the script gave no real problems. The uncial Greek letters were used plus a few extra for sounds not recognized by Greek. For the verbal system, which is rather difficult with its various distinct conjugations for such verbal niceties as different "futures," the extensive work by Polotsky on the Coptic verbal systems proved to be invaluable to me as well. As a linguist, I was fascinated by the morphology of Coptic, since the root of any verbal form was seldom in any doubt. The root was central and variations were either prefixed or suffixed. In any event I found the Coptic dialects most interesting, though one had to be very careful with these texts. Other dialects were extant in small fragments, but if one knew Sahidic and Bohairic these gave little trouble to the reader.

But now on to the texts which had to be collated. The Ethiopic text has its own difficulties. It was translated early, but underwent a complicated textual history. The earliest ms known is a 13th century dated ms which O. Boyd²² used as printed text, to which he collated the four mss which A. Dillmann had used in his 1853 edition. I myself also collated a 14th century ms housed in Pistoia, Italy. It often witnessed to a more reliable

¹⁹ Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1966.

²⁰ 4e edition revue par M. Malinene. Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1956.

²¹ W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939.

²² *The Octateuch in Ethiopia*. Pt. 1: Genesis. Leiden, 1968. Pt. 2: Exodus and Leviticus had appeared earlier in 1911 in the series *Bibliotheca Abessinica*.

text than Cod M which Boyd printed. It should be added that Boyd had also collated a 16th (or early 17th) ms, Cod Haverfordiensis. This text was an extensively revised one as were two of Dillmann's.

It will be clear that the collation of versions brings with it unique problems, which must be taken into consideration. In fact, this experience with versions also gave me new insight to a fundamental problem with LXX itself as over against N.T. textual criticism. It too was a translation, and as such an attempt at a critical text must take similar factors into consideration. It made me doubly aware that restoring an original text meant more than external considerations of the textual history. More was at stake than making groupings of mss, evaluating their age and importance, and choosing combinations of old uncials as the most important means of recovering the earliest form of a text. One had to learn to think like the translator, face his problems, examine favorite patterns, i.e. internal considerations as well as, and often even more important than, external ones. In other words, the fact that two or three of the oldest witnesses (uncials) support a reading is not necessarily determinative.

I also collated one Arabic ms. There were numerous Arabic translations, but the only one relevant to LXX was that used by the Melkite community, which was based on the Greek.²³ The best of the six mss extant of this translation was apparently a 13th century Paris ms. I faithfully read it, but never found it of any real value. The text was strongly influenced by the popular translation from the Hebrew by Saadia Gaon.²⁴

Of far greater importance were the Coptic versions. The oldest version is probably the Sahidic. It is extant in 21 different sources for Genesis, some of which are quite extensive. On the other hand, the Bohairic is fully extant; it is the Bible of the Coptic Church, and constituted the dialect

²³ See especially J.F. Rhodes, *The Arabic Version of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt*. Leipzig, 1921

²⁴ "The Arabic Versions of Genesis and the Septuagint," *B IOSCS* III (1970), 8-10. See also my "The Textual Affinities of the Arabic Genesis of Bib. Nat. Arab 9," *Studies on the Ancient Palestinian World* (Winnett Festschrift). Toronto, 1971. Pp.46-74

spoken in the delta. It has on the whole been neglected, since its witness was considered modern and late, whereas the Sahidic was early. But the discovery of a third century papyrus which contained Gen 1 to 4:2 in Bohairic has changed this perception; in fact, there is no good reason to consider the Bohairic inferior to the Sahidic. Other Coptic texts are very fragmentary. A few verses are extant in Achmimic, and a half verse obtains in Fayyumic. Since the Coptic is early, i.e. in the main prehexaplaric, it is an extremely important witness.

Also prehexaplaric is the Palestinian-Syriac translation. It is extant for somewhat less than a sixth of the book.²⁵ Since its text is a quite literal and early rendering of the LXX, it is also a valuable textual source.

The Old Armenian translation was probably translated from Greek texts supplied by Constantinople, thus texts largely influenced by the hexapla. It is therefore a good witness to the Origenian text, though not a slavish one. The basis for the collation was the 1805 edition of Zohrabian.

On the whole, the best witness to the hexapla text is, however, the Syrohexaplar. The main collection until recently was the *Bibliotheca Syriaca* published posthumously for De Lagarde by his student A. Rahlfs (1892). A few smaller pieces have been published since, and in 1964 A. Vööbus discovered a Syrohexaplar ms in a monastery in Tur Abdin in Turkey. A reduced facsimile was published in 1975.²⁶ Fortunately, I was supplied with an excellent photograph by W. Baars, then of Leiden, and I was able to collate it throughout. The extant text begins at 32:9, and is substantially complete for the rest of the Pentateuch. This was a major find, especially since not a scrap of the Syh text of Leviticus had been extant before this.

²⁵ Principally in F. Schulthess, *Christliche-Palästinische Fragmente aus der Omajjaden-Moschee zu Damaskus*, Berlin, 1905. See also A. S. Lewis, *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*. *Studia Sinaitica* VI. London, 1897, as well as part of ch. 2 in G. Margoliouth, *The Liturgy of the Nile*, *JRAS* 1896, pp. 677-731.

²⁶ A. Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-hexapla. A facsimile edition of a Midyat Ms. discovered in 1964*. CSCO 369. Leuven.

The versions are important witnesses in the textual history of the LXX. Many were translated before our earliest codices existed. But a caveat must be entered at this stage. The versions have also had a long and complicated history of their own, and one needs to bear this in mind. E.g. if we had had the original text of the Ethiopic, we would have had an African prehexaplaric witness to the Greek older than Cod B. But the texts we have are all late, some extensively revised under various non-LXX influences, many of which are still unidentified. In other words, one needs critical editions of the versions before their evidence can be fully trusted, and for most versions such editions are not only not extant, but are probably impossible to create, since the evidence is too meagre to make such endeavors feasible.

Probably the least satisfactory evidence which the LXX editor must collect is the Biblical quotations by the early Church Fathers. This is most frustrating! The Fathers did not have the twentieth century scholar in mind, and often, if not usually, quoted from memory. Only a few actually quoted a text accurately, i.e. a written text, as e.g. Eusebius, who witnesses to the hex text, did. But even when the Fathers quote a text, their text is probably only available in Migne's *Patrologia*, and based on faulty, popular, mss. Some of these are notoriously bad mss not only, but these volumes are throughout without indices of quotations, and one must page through thousands of pages of Migne with little to show for it. As an example of notoriously bad texts the 18 volumes of Chrysostom betray not only bad editing, but show Chrysostom at his worst as a quoter of Scripture.²⁷ For some popular Genesis texts I found as many as six or seven variations of a particular text. Surely, collecting such witnesses is a meaningless exercise.

The *d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques* which was established in Strasburg has been gradually indexing the quotations of the patristic fathers, and through the Göttingen Unternehmen which has cooperated in this enterprise, its

²⁷ Albert Pietersma was my student in those days, and he collated all the Chrysostom citations he could find. It was a tedious and time consuming task, but it was good training for textual work. We would then enter the citations together in the collation books.

indices for some of the other books of the Pentateuch were made available to me, but for Genesis this Center had not yet become operative.

Now that the evidence was all in, one could in theory begin to establish the critical text, but in practice I had already underlined some critical words and phrases which I felt confident were original, and had taken extensive notes explaining my reason for such judgments. For the basis for my critical text I xeroxed the text of Rahlfs' Handausgabe, and made my corrections on that. That is what both Ziegler and Hanhart did, and this also served me well. Ziegler had earlier strongly advised me not to change Rahlfs unless I had good reason; in other words, when in doubt I should not change the text simply to be different. This I found to be excellent advice. The text which I was creating would for many years remain the closest which serious scholarship would come to the original LXX, and I felt strongly that one should approach this task conservatively. I rejected many changes which attracted me, but when I could not make a case which fully convinced me, I invoked Ziegler's "Rule" to keep the Rahlfs text. Imagination is a fine attribute, but it must be rigidly controlled in textual work. It would be unfortunate were colleagues to find my text one that was overly imaginative, and one that had to be extensively revised.

In the course of working on the text I had written up a considerable number of studies, principally concerning the textual groups which constituted the textual history of Genesis. I analyzed each one by collecting all the readings of each group in a separate study, and characterizing each reading grammatically, thereby attempting to describe what was distinctive for each group. It was best to make these studies for the first book of the Pentateuch, since the likelihood of their extension into the following books seemed possible. And on the whole, this turned out to be the case, though numerous refinements were made later on. Particularly important were relationships among these groups, and these became part of these studies as well. Since recensional history was an important aspect of my work, I devoted time to a discussion of the Byzantine text which I was able to identify through an analysis of the lectionary texts used in the Byzantine Church. It

was clear that this text was almost word for word that represented by my group *d*, followed closely by *t*, and somewhat less closely by *n*, with group *b* even more distant. Naturally a separate study on the Critical Text was imperative. All these were part of the textual history of the text. Professor Hanhart, the Leiter of the Unternehmen, and I decided that inclusion of the Textual History in the editions was better placed in separate volumes, and so the volumes entitled *Text History of the Greek (Genesis/Textgeschichte ...)* evolved as separate volumes presented to the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen for inclusion in their *Abhandlungen*.²⁸

The pattern which was followed for the Genesis edition and its Text History was followed for subsequent volumes as well, though each volume presented its own problems. For Genesis what was unique was the lack of the text of Codex Vaticanus for most of the book; its text is extant only from the last four words of 46:28 to the end of the book.

For Deuteronomy, which was assigned to me after Genesis, the repetitive use of words, phrases, and sentences made the establishment of the critical text much more difficult.²⁹ But what made work on Deuteronomy particularly fascinating was the discovery of P.Fouad., Inv. 266, containing three "rolls" of papyri, two containing Deuteronomy text, and one a small fragment of Genesis. For Deut No. 847 was written cir 50 CE, and was very fragmentary, but no. 848, written cir 50 BCE, contained substantial fragmentary text from chh.17 to 33. Its provenance is unknown, and a facsimile edition was

²⁸ *Genesis, SEPTUAGINTA Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editit.* I. Göttingen, 1973. Pp. 502, and *Text History of the Greek Genesis, MSU XI* (= Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl. 3te Folge, Nr.81). Göttingen, 1974. Pp.250. The analysis of the Lectionary texts for Genesis is to be found in Chapter 11 entitled "The Lectionary Texts," pp.176-185.

²⁹ In my discussion of the Critical Text in the Deut. Text History, Section A (pp.86-99) a list of 56 formulaic phrases as recorded in Deuteronomy is given, a source which readers have often found useful.

published in 1980.³⁰ Fortunately, through the intervention of Ludwig Koenen, then of Cologne, and now of the Univ. of Michigan, I was given permission to work on the photographs, and Udo Quast and I spent most of one summer at the Institute studying the photos, and were in regular correspondence with Koenen, to whom I made textual suggestions, which he would then assess papyrologically. It was a most exciting summer, since this was the major oldest witness we had to the early LXX, and its text was almost 500 years older than that of Cod B. I would say that in my opinion this find was the most important discovery for LXX Studies of the century. We were actually able to suggest readings from a textual point of view which Koenen accepted as possible reconstructions. Also extant for Deut were the very fragmentary 957 papyrus from the second century BCE³¹ and the second century CE Beatty Papyrus, 963.³² The excitement caused by these papyri undoubtedly meant that not enough time was spent on the textual history.³³ That of the Genesis edition was more or less taken over for Deuteronomy, except for the establishment of a second subgroup for the *O* recension. The main hex group for Genesis was divided into *O* and *oII*. Actually the *oI* group is

³⁰ Aly, Zaki, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy*, with preface, introd., and notes by L. Koenen. Papyrologische Texte u. Abhandlungen, Bd.27. Bonn, Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1980. Pp.xiii.142; Pl.57.

³¹ Manchester, John Rylands Library, P.Gr. 458. Published by C.H. Roberts in 1936.

³² Edition: F.G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasc.V.*, London, 1935. A facsimile edition was published in Dublin in 1958.

³³ For an analysis of the textual character of 848, see ch.6, "The Text Character of 848," in my *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*, MSU XIII, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978. For a similar study, see Ch.5, "Papyrus 963," *ibid.* See also my "The Earliest Witness to the LXX Deuteronomy," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* XXXIX (1977), 240-244, as well as my "The Attitude of the Greek Translator of Deuteronomy towards his Parent Text," *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von H. Donner, R.Hanhart und R. Smend. Göttingen, 1978. Pp.498-505.

further removed from the main group than *oII*, but I did not want to change the nomenclature for the Pentateuch. The *oI* group is actually as close to the Catena text as it is to the Origenian text.

A major difference in my work on the Deut. volume from that on the Gen. one was the need to visit the Benedictine Monastery in Beuron in order to collect the patristic and ms evidence of the Old Latin at the Vetust Latina Institute housed there. The materials collected were all placed at my disposal, and in about three weeks I was able to record all the available Old Latin materials. Of course, I could hardly analyze it as Fischer had done for Genesis, but I was able to make some statements about strands of the Vetust Latina in my edition in order to create some order out of the mass of patristic evidence assembled. It is only just that I should say how helpful Fischer was to me; he gave me the benefit of his learning, and for subsequent volumes when Fischer had been transferred from Beuron, his colleagues, H.J.Frede and W.Thiele, were equally kind and helpful. I remember on one occasion I was finding the ligatures in the script of some Latin marginal notes almost impossible to decipher, and asked Walther Thiele for help. He immediately put aside whatever he was working on, and simply read all the notes to me. This scholarly friendship was characteristic of the place, and the long weekends when the Institute was closed I would spend climbing the hills surrounding the small village, near which the source of the Danube lies. The mountain trails were well marked, and one could wander about peacefully and absorb the beautiful settings, only seldom meeting a kindred soul also breathing in the pure mountain air. One could also freely attend the services in the beautiful Southern Baroque monastery church, and enjoy the music of its great organ and the plainsong sung by the monks and brothers of the Order.

With the appearance of Deuteronomium came the deserved "adiuvante U.Quast" appearing on the title page. His devotion to my work exemplified by his constancy in attendance whenever I was in Göttingen, his analysis of the Greek evidence, his proof reading, his rechecking of readings which I found uncertain, all contributed immeasurably to the correctness of the edition. My only regret is that I had not

included Detlef Fraenkel as well. The title pages should have read "adiuvantibus U.Quast et D.Fraenkel," and I owe him a public apology for not having included him. Fraenkel studied the Catena mss and their readings, as well as all marginal readings in Greek mss. Any questions I had which pertained to the second apparatus, he would study and we would discuss these at length. Though as editor I had to take final responsibility for what the volumes included, their accuracy and relevance is mainly due to the work of these two very competent textual scholars and friends.³⁴

The collation books for Numbers had been finished for some time, and had been assigned to David Gooding of Belfast. He had struggled with the collation books for some years; in fact, he had gone to Beuron and collected all the patristic evidence, but felt compelled to return the collation books to Göttingen. Belfast was in his opinion too dangerous an environment for the collation books, and he also felt that working in the versions was more than he could handle. He had spent a month with me in Toronto, and reviewed the Ethiopic evidence he had gathered from a colleague with me. It was clear that to evaluate such evidence one did have to know at least the rudiments of its linguistic code if one wanted to assess its readings textually. So he returned the volumes, and they were now assigned to me. Gooding was kind enough to send me all his Beuron notes. These were copious, and it was unnecessary for me to go to Beuron; his notes were competent -- after all, he was a Classicist, who taught in the Dept. of Classics in Belfast-- and this made my work much easier. Of course the Latin mss were readily available to me, but I was spared the inconvenience of travelling to Beuron for the patristic evidence. It might be added that the evidence of the *Vetus Latina* was much simpler than for Deut and Gen.

With Numbers, the indices from the Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristique in Strasbourg were placed at my disposal, which made the work of gathering relevant patristic

³⁴ The Deuteronomium edition appeared as Vol.III,2 in the SEPTUAGINTA series in 1977, and its accompanying *Text History*, which had been presented to the Akademie by my colleague, Robert Hanhart, as *MSU XIII* in 1978.

citations (i.e. from the Greek Fathers) a great deal easier, though most of the Fathers were only in the process of being analyzed and documented, and the paging through pages of the Fathers continued alongside the use of the indexed materials.

The Chester Beatty papyri, no. 963, was already mentioned for Deuteronomy; it also contained the text of Numbers.³⁵ But of particular interest was the assessment of the texts of the old uncials, Cod. Vaticanus and Cod. Alexandrinus, of the 4th and 5th centuries resp. A separate chapter in the *Text History of the Greek Numbers*³⁶ was devoted to their analysis. Though hexaplaric influence was present in both, it was only sporadic and scarce in B, but was a strong presence in Cod. A. This was also reflected by its place in the text contours. When A deviated from the Numbers text, it was accompanied by the textual groups in the following descending order of frequency: *ol/oil, y, s, C, b, n, t, d, z, f, O*. This contrasts with those accompanying B: These rank as *x, n, t, d, f, b, O, z, ol/oil, C, s, y*. In other words, B and A rank almost in reverse order! The *Numeri* volume and its *Text History* both appeared in 1982.³⁷ In the course of working on Numbers, a number of small studies did appear as well.³⁸

³⁵ See F. Kenyon, *op.cit.*

³⁶ *MLS XVI*, Chapter 4, "The Texts of B and A," pp.66-85.

³⁷ *Numeri, SEPTUAGINTA Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis edidit.* III, 1. Göttingen, 1982. Pp.443; *Text History of the Greek Numbers*, Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl. 3te Folge, Nr. 125. (= *MSU XVI*). Göttingen, 1982. Pp.139.

³⁸ *An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers*, ERETZ-ISRAEL; Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies, Vol. XVI: H.M. Orlinsky Volume. Jerusalem, 1982. Pp. 235*-239*; "The Textual Affinities of the Corrector(s) of B in Numbers," *Studies in Philology in Honour of Ronald James Williams: A Festschrift*, ed. by G.E. Kadish and G.E. Freeman. Toronto, 1982. Pp.139-152; and "A Study in Vatepediou 600 in Numbers," *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes a l'occasion de son 60e Anniversaire*, édite par P. Casetti, O. Keel et A. Schenker, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 38* (Fribourg/ Göttingen, 1981), 705-720.

The text of Leviticus proved to be much more interesting than I had anticipated. I found the translation to be a much better Greek than that of Numbers, and working on the collations proved a real challenge. Over against the earlier volumes, I had the newly found Tur Abdin Syrohexaplar as an exciting experience. It was unique in two respects; its text showed a somewhat different type of text than I would have expected for the Syrohexaplar. One rather naturally thinks of the Syrohexaplaric text as constituting a single type. It is supposed to represent painstakingly the kind of work that Origen himself said that he had done, viz. any text in the Greek which had no counterpart in the Hebrew was placed under an obelus (and its end marked with a metobelus), and for any text in the Hebrew which had no counterpart in the Greek, he added from the other translations, marking their onset with an asterisk, and its end with a metobelus.³⁹ But this formula does not fit the Leviticus text as neatly. E.g. the presence or absence of a pronominal suffix in Hebrew is not necessarily noted carefully in Syh. (Some of the asterisked passages are not by any means usually from Theodotion, as is true for the other books.) All that this proves is that the Syh is not the work of one man, but rather of a school of translators under the supervision of Paul of Tella. The Leviticus Syh is, nonetheless, an invaluable source for the hex text of Lev. And it was exciting to know that my analysis of the Syh was the first time that it was ever collated for its evidence of the hex text.

A second new experience for me was a visit, together with Udo Quast, to Milan to collate the manuscript of Cod F, the fabulous sixth century codex housed in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. The problem with F is that its text was often revised, both by uncial writers and later by cursive writers.

A more recent study is my "The Balaam Narrative according to the Septuagint," *Lectures et Reflectures de la Bible: Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXIV. Leuven: University Press, 1999, Pp. 133-144.

³⁹ This is found in his Commentary on Matthew 19:14ff. The *Matthäuserklärung* is volume 40 of *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*.

Collators had examined the ms first hand for the earlier books, but both Udo Quast and I felt that we should now examine the ms together. Unfortunately, shades of ink are indistinguishable in a microfilm, and only a close scrutiny of the actual ms can differentiate these. And so we spent a full week in Milan, and examined both Lev and Exodus while we were there. We saw next to nothing of the sights of Milan, but our wives accompanied us, and they would report at dinner on their sightseeing. They probably felt, with good reason so they thought, that they had the better deal of it, but our trying to interpret the intricacies of the textual history of this fascinating ms was our delight. We did conclude that trying to distinguish various uncial and cursive hands was not feasible, and so we ended up with differentiating only between uncial and cursive correctors. Of course, other matters, of *rescriptus*, of *rasurae*, etc. had to be recorded as well. For the particular problems of the Exodus tabernacle text see below.

In due course the Leviticus text and its Text History appeared in 1986,⁴⁰ and only one more book remained unedited for the Pentateuch. I had purposely left Exodus to the end, because I knew that it would take all the experience I could garner to make an intelligent job of the tabernacle accounts. I certainly did not want to emulate the Cambridge LXX which had printed the Theodotion text separately with its own apparatus. After all, the θ' text was part of the text history. I had felt that my colleague Joseph Ziegler's Job text was seriously flawed by its adoption of the ecclesiastical text, and did not conform to what I considered to be the goal of the Göttingen LXX, namely to restore to the best of one's ability the original Septuagint text. I had actually suggested to him when he handed in his ms that the θ' text be set up in a distinctive smaller type so that it would be clear at a glance that the θ' text was not part of the original text, but unfortunately he rejected this suggestion out of hand.

⁴⁰ *Leviticus, SEPTUAGINTA Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum*, II, 2. Göttingen, 1986. Pp.328, and *Text History of the Greek Leviticus*. MSU XIX (= Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen. Philol.-Hist. Kl., 3te Folge, Nr.153). Göttingen, 1986. Pp.136

It would have been overly cumbersome had I placed the Theodotion text completely in the first apparatus. The more extensive θ' additions were placed in smaller type so that one could see at a glance that this was not part of the original LXX text. A particular problem in this regard was the F^b text, which agreed much more closely with the Compl text than with θ' . I dealt with this text in some detail in the Festschrift for Frede and Thiele.⁴¹

Furthermore, I realized that the account of the building of the tabernacle in chh.36-40 was probably the most difficult textual problem in the entire canon, and that in all fairness I would have to tackle the problem of how the Greek and Hebrew texts were related.⁴² As is well-known, the Hebrew completion document is closely related to the planning document, i.e. in large part the "Exod A" text, chh.25-31, was related in the future tense, in which God gave to Moses the plans for the tabernacle, whereas the "Exod B" text, chh.35-40, related in past tense the carrying out of the orders; in other words, it repeated to a great extent the A text in past tense. But the Greek "B" text was quite different; in fact, at times its Hebrew counterpart differed considerably from that of the Hebrew of Exod A.

It certainly was the most difficult textual problem I ever faced. In fact, I spent a great deal of time in trying to understand how the "B" text came into being, made a draft of my understanding, discussed it in detail over the course of at least a full year with Detlef Fraenkel, who pointed out the weaknesses of the draft, and in due course I discarded what I had done, and started all over. Fraenkel accompanied me in my strivings every step of the way, wrote long and detailed

⁴¹ "A secondary text in Codex Ambrosianus of the Greek Exodus," *Philologia Sacra: Biblische u. patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede u. Walter Thiele zu ihrem 70ten Geburtstag*, herausg. v. R.Gryson. Bd.I. Altes u. Neues Testament. (Vetus Latina: Die Reste d. atlateinischen Bibel 24/1. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1993), 36-48.

⁴² Establishing the Greek text of Ben Sirach may well have been equally challenging. Ziegler once told me that this was the most difficult task he had ever faced.

critiques of what I had done and was doing, and though I did not agree with him on many issues, I owe much to his brilliant and at times imaginative insights to the text history of that amazingly complex translation. I dealt with this problem in my *Text History of the Greek Exodus*.⁴³ This problem was to plague me once again later on, in fact in quite recent times.⁴⁴

One problem which had long exercised me was that of the shadowy Hesychian text which according to Jerome was the recension dominant in Egypt.⁴⁵ The best representative of the Egyptian text should be that of Cyril of Alexandria, whose fifth century works *De Adoratione* and *Glaphyra* quoted extensively from the Pentateuch. But there were no critical texts of either of these, and one had to depend on the unsatisfactory texts in Migne's *Patrologia*. Unfortunately these were based on late texts, and the long excerpts from the Pentateuch were also strongly influenced by Sixtina. I had suggested for some time already at Göttingen that a collation of older Cyril mss of these two works might be a worthwhile exercise and shed some light on the "Egyptian" text. Once again Detlef Fraenkel interested himself in such a collation, and the Unternehmen purchased microfilms of a number of mss (four) as well as of some papyri from the VI and VII Centuries, thus within two centuries of the lifetime of Cyril. From these collations it appeared that the text of Cyril over against LXX agreed more frequently with Cod B than with A, in fact, the agreements with the Cod. A text are in

⁴³ Chapter VI: The Composition of Exod 35-40. MSU XXI (Göttingen, 1992), 117-146.

⁴⁴ I might add that for the past academic year one of our graduate students, Mr. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, persuaded me to offer him a reading course on the Greek Tabernacle accounts. Reading courses in the Graduate School at Toronto normally entail a large research paper with the instructor being consulted occasionally for a bit of fatherly advice. This one turned out to be a weekly session of an entire afternoon throughout the academic year, and it meant that I had to review my own work once again, though the student did the work. He hopes to turn this into a full monograph, and it should certainly advance one's insight into this major problem.

⁴⁵ *Praef ad Paralipp.*

the main popular variant texts, whereas those with B were much less so. If one excluded the popular variants as meaningless one ended up with eight agreeing with A, but 45 with B. This is hardly a surprise, since Cod B could well be Egyptian in origin; but Cyril's text remains a mixed text, and we are no closer to identifying the Hesychian recension than before this study.⁴⁶

I do believe that the Exodus volumes constitute my best work.⁴⁷ When I finished with the Exodus volumes⁴⁸ Göttingen hoped that I would take on another volume, but I was now over seventy, and the amount of work that producing another volume would require more energy and insight than my aging body would allow, and I declined. But the possibility that did excite me was a dream that I had had in my graduate days when I was working on the books of Kings, or better stated, on 3 and 4 Regnorum. I always felt that a textual commentary on the Greek O.T. would be a wonderful objective, but of course, that would presuppose critical texts. But now there were critical texts for the Pentateuch. I was freshly acquainted with the

⁴⁶ See Chapter V, "The Text of Cyril of Alexandria's *De Adoratione* and *Glaphyra*," in my *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, MSU XXI.

⁴⁷ A number of individual studies appeared in connection with my Exodus studies. These include "How the Greek Exodus Rationalized the Text," *Corolla Torontonensis: Studies in Honour of Ronald Morton Smith*, ed. by Emmet Robbins and Stella Sandahl. (Toronto: TSAR, 1994), 47-57. "The Lectionary Texts of Exodus," *Tradition of the Text: Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, edd. G.J.Norton and S.Pisano, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 109 (Freiburg Schweiz/Göttingen, 1991), 293-300. "Pre-Origen Recensional Activity in the Greek Exodus," *Studien zur Septuaginta -- Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*. Herausg. von D.Fraekel, U.Quast u. J.W.Wevers. MSU XX (= Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen. Philol.-Hist. Kl., 3te Folge, Nr.190. Göttingen, 1991), 121-139. "Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* XXI (1988), 23-34. "Theodoret's *Quaest* and the Byzantine Text," *Henoah XIII* (Maggio 1991), 29-64. "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* XVIII (1985), 16-38. "Translation and Canonicity: A Study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus," *Scripta Signa Vocis: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages in the Near East, presented to J.H. Hoppers*. Edd. H.L. Vanstiphout et al. Groningen, 1986. Pp 295-303.

⁴⁸ Both the edition and the Text History appeared in 1992.

Greek Exodus and its problems, an ideal book for precisely such a work. And I still had all my voluminous notes on the book. But not for Göttingen! Publishing such commentaries by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht would put such out of the reach of students, and I was devoted to students. I had after all spent my life in teaching students, and the thought of producing inexpensive camera ready commentaries seemed to me to be the kind of thing I could do in my seventies. By this time I had been persuaded to invest in a word processor. Colleagues had been after me for some years to use a computer, to which I regularly responded with an "I will buy a computer once I can easily compose in three scripts, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew all visible on the screen." One of my colleagues in the Department, Jack Holliday, was very knowledgeable in computers, and said "But there is such a software (I didn't even know what software meant at the time); it really is made for someone like you; in fact, it's the cadillac of word processors. It's called Nota Bene." He had installed it on a Department machine, and introduced me to it. And indeed it was true. One could switch from English to Greek to Hebrew -- it even typed Hebrew from right to left. I was hooked. This was a way of writing up a commentary in camera ready form.

And Scholars Press had been created precisely to help scholars who wrote arcane books unattractive to most publishers, to publish cheap volumes of studies.

Of course, I started with Exodus. I had no initial intention to write more than one commentary. And in imitation of Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, I called it *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. I do believe that this made a good trio of aids for Exodus: a critical edition, a Text History, and now a verse by verse commentary. And once again I had to review the tabernacle accounts. The Notes helped to clarify the situation by comparing verse by verse the A and B accounts both in the Greek and the Hebrew. One conclusion became increasingly obvious; clearly the B account had made use of the A account. What the Notes did for these difficult chapters was a detailed comparison verse by verse of the two accounts side by side. Throughout, four accounts were carefully compared, i.e. two Hebrew and two Greek ones. Any further work on this problem might well find this study a useful starting place.

The Notes are intended principally to determine what the translator thought his parent text meant. Only secondarily is reference made to the text history, which after all is the text read by later readers of the text. Only occasionally when a variant text seemed to be important and showed how the later synagogue and/or church understood the text did I take note of it, but the stress was foremost on how the translator interpreted the Hebrew text. This I considered an imperative because the first conclusion which my study of the Pentateuch reached was that the translator(s) believed the Torah to be the Word of God; it was a canonical text, and therefore their task was not merely putting a Hebrew text into the popular language, but it was a religious exercise, a holy task on which they were engaged. This involved careful study; since it was a divine word they were creating, it must have an inner consistency. In fact, this consistency pertained to the entire Pentateuch, and there is evidence in the text of influence from other books of the Torah. This conclusion, as well as those which follow, I have then taken up as presuppositions for the Notes. I have called them presuppositions, not because I started *de novo* with these notions, but as conclusions which my many years of working with the Pentateuch text had formed, and which could now be taken as normative for my treatment of Notes on the Greek text.

It also meant that the translation which they were producing was God's word as well; whether this extended beyond the Pentateuch is debatable, but the Greek Pentateuch was considered canonical and presumably was used as such by the Jewish community in Alexandria. In fact, this is clear from the pseudepigraphical Letter of Aristeas which declared that the finished product was first read to the leaders of the community, the priests and leaders, who declared that the translation was "excellent and holy" and fully "accurate." That it was canonical was emphasized by an oath formula: should anyone dare to add or change anything of that which was written he would be cursed,⁴⁹ with which one might compare the N.T. statement in Rev. 22:18-19.

⁴⁹ See 308-311.

My second presupposition has not received universal approval. I have written the Notes on the understanding that the canonical text being translated was in the main much like the Masoretic Text. I have been criticized particularly by Qumran scholars as not having taken into consideration its variant texts. This is a misunderstanding of what I have throughout tried to do, to examine all extant evidence I could find, and certainly all the Qumran texts which were at my disposal. But I refuse and continue to refuse to take a non-extant text as the presupposed parent text, except where it is completely obvious. I reject forcefully rampant retroversions, wild emendations, which have been so popular in the past two hundred or so years of Old Testament study. I remain respectful of the great scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; I believe that one can admire the astute suggestions that have been made, but they remain speculations.

This was a phase which also characterized the great Classical scholars of those times. One has but to read the Cohn and Wendland edition of Philo and to note how often the printed text represents no extant ms, but is a restoration of what the editors believed Philo to have really written. It is to the credit of Classical scholars of today that they have turned from emendation to trying to understand the text as it appears in extant mss.

Of course, I do not worship the MT text, but unless there is ms evidence, such as often appears in the Samaritan Hebrew text, or in the Pesh or the Vulg, and now in particular in the Dead Sea texts. I have taken these latter texts as they were being published in exemplary fashion in the DJD volumes with full seriousness. But just because they are old readings does not mean that they are automatically better readings; whenever the LXX appears to support a Qumran text known to me, I have cited it as the probable parent text. I rely, however, on the solid basis of given texts, not of speculative retroversions, attractive as they may be at first blush. It must be said that the MT remains a complete text and is clearly a very old text. The general picture that the Dead Sea texts display is how old the MT consonantal text was.

I have also throughout maintained that the Alexandrian translators of the Pentateuch made translations that made some

kind of sense to them. This does not mean that they never misunderstood the parent text, but what they produced always made sense. What often misleads the modern reader of the Greek text is the fact that the common pattern of rendering the Hebrew text word for word sometimes results in a Greek with a strong coloring of the original Hebrew, particularly of its syntax. When the modern reader finds the text incomprehensible, it is his or her duty to try to understand what they intended. Seeming contradictions and difficult Greek passages must be somehow seen from their point of view rather than ours. They did not intend to confuse the reader, but to inform. I would plead for humility over against this canonical text and for not judging it by modern standards of literature or logical consistency, but from their 3rd century BCE Alexandrian, Jewish, point of view. Somehow one must try to bridge the more than two millenia separating us from the translator(s), and think in the way in which they did. They shared our humanity, though not our culture, and so we must suspend our own standards of logic, consistency, and rational analysis in favor of an ancient way of viewing reality in another age.

My final conclusion/presupposition flows from what I have said in the above paragraphs. To my mind the Greek Torah is worthy of study for its own sake, not just for its translation qualities, but as a humanistic document interesting and important even without reference to its parent text. It penetrates to the heart of Alexandrian Jewry; it constitutes its faith and its essence. It is not the Targums or the Mishnah but the LXX, that is the earliest exegetical source for understanding the Pentateuch. It constitutes its earliest commentary, and I am constantly amazed at the apparent disregard by exegetical scholars of this precious source for the understanding of the Torah. The LXX is not a grab bag for emendations. It is a fault of modern scholarship that our scholarly Hebrew Bibles, the Kittel Bibles as well as BHS, are filled with footnotes ordering "lege cum Graece." As I said in my *Notes on the Greek Exodus*, "It is time to stop this nonsense, to go back to the LXX and read it for what it is, a humanistic document which should be

pondered both for its own sake and for understanding the Hebrew text."⁵⁰

I also did not try to write a commentary on the Books of the Pentateuch. There is no review of scholarship in these volumes. It was, I felt, enough of a task to try to understand simply what the first translator, the first commentator, thought the parent text meant. Some have suggested that it would have been helpful to place this in the context of modern scholarly opinion as to the meaning and origin of the Hebrew text, but that would have meant deflecting me from my set purpose, to focus on the LXX and its understanding of the Hebrew text.

This focus also meant that the text of the Later Revisers, principally of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, though very interesting, was not really my concern. I did refer to them but these references were throughout relegated to footnotes.

The first volume of Notes appeared in 1990.⁵¹ Originally I had had no intention to continue with such a commentary, but I was persuaded by colleagues that the Greek Genesis was greatly in need of a similar volume. I still had some of my notes from my work on the edition and the Text History, and used these. I suppose this reliance was unfortunate, though I did restudy the text, but some Qumran texts had been published, and these were not consulted, but for the rest I believe my Notes on the Greek Genesis to be a useful contribution as well. The same presuppositions which were basic to my notes on Exodus were also basic to the Genesis Notes. What I did add over against the first volume, was any reconsideration of the critical texts, and an Appendix was added entitled "Proposed changes in the critical text of Gen." This illustrates something I firmly believe, viz., that my texts are not the final word; the work towards recovering the autographa will never be finished, and it remains in a sense of flux, of impermanence. One uses all one's critical faculties, but it is never finished, never perfect. And to my discomfort I can illustrate this from the Appendix

⁵⁰ P. xvi.

⁵¹ *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

itself. I must not have rechecked all the entries, since four of them are in error.⁵²

I shall not bore the reader with my experiences with the remainder of the Notes on the Pentateuch. My subsequent volumes included Notes on ... Deuteronomy, Vol.39, in 1995, consisting of Pp.xxx,665; Notes ... Leviticus, Vol.42, in 1997, consisting of Pp.xxxix,319, and finally Notes ... Numbers, Vol.46, in 1998, with Pp.xlviii,653.

I have since finishing my Pentateuchal studies, completed small studies on a problem of the text of the *b* text in the last chapters of Exodus and opening four of Leviticus. I have also written up a more exact characterization of ms 106, determining approximately where in Num its loyalties shift from the *d* text to the closely related *t* text. These have not been published, but remain as practically finished studies in my computer. More recently, I have also become interested in the relation of the Lucianic text in Ezekiel to that of the hexapla. I do believe that to be worthy of study. Involved also is the possible influence of the Symmachus text on the Lucianic text. But gradually my textual work is slowing down, and domestic problems are consuming more and more of my time. But then that is not unexpected; I have reached by reason of strength fourscore years, and these have not been toil nor trouble, and for that I am grateful.

⁵² *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* appeared in 1993 as Number 35, SBLSCS Series. Pp.xxv, 881. As in the case of all five volumes of Notes these were presented to Scholars Press as camera ready copy. So all errors of proof are mine.

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*. All submissions should be made by electronic mail.

**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