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Albert Pietersma presiding

Paul E. Dion, University of Toronto
"The Greek Version of Deut. 21:1-9 and Its Variants: A Record of Early Exegesis"

Melvin K. H. Peters, Cleveland State University
"Some Observations on the Coptic Text of Genesis"

Leonard Greenspoon, Clemson University
"The Text-critical Importance of the Joshua Portion of the Samaritan Chronicle II"

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto
"Did or Didn't the Septuagint Use Kyrios?"

Business Meeting

11:50 a.m.: Called to order by the President, Albert Pietersma

1. President's Report

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

2. Recommendation of Executive Committee

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

3. Treasurer's Report (below)

Motion to accept was passed.

4. Editorial Committee

H. Orlinsky reported that four manuscripts were either accepted or in the process of acceptance:

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

Already published: David Burke, The Poetry of Baruch.

5. New Business

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

12:00 m.: Adjournment

George Howard
for the Secretary

---

**FINANCIAL REPORT**
December 18, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance on Hand, Nov. 8, 1980</th>
<th>$922.41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions 11/8/80 - 12/18/81</td>
<td>$847.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>$914.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENSES**                |                                |         |
| Bulletin 13 & 14            |                                |         |
| Duplication & Printing     | 598.16                         |         |
| Postage & Supplies         | 249.62                         | 847.78  |
| Income                     | 914.04                         |         |
| Expenses                   | 847.78                         |         |
| **NET GAIN**                | 66.26                          |         |

Balance on Hand, Nov. 8, 1980: $922.41
Net Gain to Dec. 18, 1981: 66.26

**BALANCE ON HAND, Dec. 18, 1981** $988.67

Melvin K. H. Peters
Treasurer, IOSCS

Auditors: Derwood C. Smith, Ph.D.
Nina C. Pykare, Ph.D.

Department of Religious Studies,
Cleveland State University
NEWS AND NOTES

Professor I. Seeligmann

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

Computer-Assisted Tools

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

The primary goals for this grant period are (1) morphological analysis of the entire corpus, beginning with the machine-readable text of the Rahlfs edition purchased from the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Project, but ultimately extending to the relevant textual variants as well, (2) encoding of the textual variants from the Göttingen and Cambridge editions, and (3) alignment of the parallel Greek and Hebrew texts of at least the Pentateuch, for comparative analysis.

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

New Manuscript of the Greek Deuteronomy

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

New Books by IOSCS Members

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

In a work of major importance, The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), Emanuel Tov offers a rich blend of
theory and detailed examples concerning "The Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX: Possibilities and Impossibilities" (Part I) and concerning the nature of "The Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX" (Part II). The book (343 pp.; $17) may be ordered from Simor Ltd., P. O. Box 39039, Tel Aviv, Israel 61390, or from Eisenbrauns ($18 [$16.25], see below).

Bruce M. Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography (New York and Oxford: Oxford University, 1981) presents a clear and instructive exposition of many aspects of Greek palaeography, from the origins of the Greek alphabet and the making of ancient books, to uncial and minuscule handwriting and such special features of biblical manuscripts as nomina sacra, colometry, and onomastica. Included are excellent facsimiles, almost all in actual size, of 13 MSS of the LXX and 32 of the NT. (x + 150 pp., incl. 45 pl.; $17.95 / £10.95). 

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

Honors for a Past President

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

RECORD OF WORK
PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS


Chase, M. 'Remarques et notes sur les versions grecque et ladino


Pace, S. A. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame (dir.: E. Ulrich) [in progress].


Satran, D. "The Figure of Daniel in Jewish and Christian Exegesis," Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dir.: M. E. Stone) [in progress].


REDACTION, RECENSION, AND MIDRASH IN THE BOOKS OF KINGS

Julio Trebolle
Instituto Español Biblico y Arqueológico, Jerusalem

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

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

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

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

Our study begins with the textual and literary analysis of selected passages. From these analyses a working method will be extracted which will prove to be better adapted to the textual and literary characteristics of the books of Kings. As a result, we
will see the need for a return to textual criticism and frequently to the *Urtext* as found in the text of the versions. Instead of being an arsenal for random corrections to the current Hebrew text, these versions will serve as evidence for the existence of a non-Masoretic Hebrew type of text or a pre-Masoretic recension-form of the text. For its part, textual criticism will be seen to need the literary-critical method to help it isolate merely textual phenomena such as glosses, omissions, and transpositions.

1. Jeroboam at the Assembly at Shechem:
   MT 1 Kgs 12:2 // LXX 11:43

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

The expression *wayyētēb b* appears frequently in contexts speaking of a flight into exile, forming part of a fixed narrative structure: "(...when X heard these things,) he sought to kill Y; Y was afraid, and he fled from the presence of X and settled in Z" (...*wyb*...t ḫwya *wyb*... ḫwyt ʾ...*wyb*...*wyb* Ṣmrn ...*wayyētēb b*...). The flights of Moses, Jephthah, David, Absalom, and Jeremiah are all expressed in this narrative pattern (cf. esp. Exod 2:14-15; Jer 26:21; cf. also Judg 9:21, 11:3; 1 Sam 19:2, 23:14-15, 27:1-4; 2 Sam 4:1-3, 13:37-38). This conventional expression is found in narratives from such diverse epochs as, for example, the story of the flight of Idrimi (14th century BC) and the NT flight of Joseph into Egypt. In these notices the fleeing protagonist ends up "residing in" or "settling in" a place of exile.

The text in 12:2 reproduces essential elements ("he fled...and settled in...") of that narrative sequence (above). This proves the value of the reading *wayyētēb...b* against the generally proposed correction. Furthermore, it renders impossible the proposed separation of the two verbs by consigning one to the parenthetical sentence and one to the main sentence: "When Jeroboam, son of Nebat, learned of this (for he was still in Egypt, whither he had fled from King Solomon), then Jeroboam returned from Egypt." The expression *wayyētēb b* also forms part of the inserted parenthesis. The corresponding passage in the Old Greek, located in 11:43, confirms this conclusion: here the parenthesis includes and closes after the expression "and Jeroboam settled in Egypt" (*hōs ephēgen ek prosēpou Salomon kai ektathēko en Aigyptō*). Then follows the apodosis of the main sentence: "he set out and came to his city in the land of Sareira, in the mountains of Ephraim" (*katathēnei kai erebētau eis tēn polin autou eis tēn gēn Sareira tēn en orei Ephraim*).

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

This main sentence is found outside its proper context in both the MT and the Old Greek. In the MT it interrupts the sequence between verses 1 and 3b (cf. LXX): "[v 1] Rehoboam went to Shechem, where all Israel had come to proclaim him king. [v 3b] They said to Rehoboam...." In the Old Greek it is interpolated by means of the process of *filiation* between the concluding formulas of Solomon's reign: "Solomon rested with his ancestors; he was buried in the City of David his father (LXX: When Jeroboam, son of Nebat, learned of this...). King Solomon rested..."
12:24b καὶ ἢν ἐπαιρομένος ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν 11:40 καὶ ἐξῆτε τούς ἐν Ιεροβώματι
καὶ έφοβήθη καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀπέδρα

καὶ ἀπέδρα αὐτὸς τὰς δύο πρὸς Σουσακεῖμ.
καὶ ἤν μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ έδέσμην ἐν Αλεφτῷ
καὶ έκσυνεν Ιεροβώματι

καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πράγμα
καὶ έδέσμην Ιεροβώματι ύπὸς Ναβάτ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐτε ὄντος ἐν Αλεφτῷ

ὡς ἐφυγεν ἐκ προσώπου εἰς Ἀλεφτῷ ἐξ Ἀλεφτοῦ, καὶ θῆλεν

ἐν Αλεφτῷ διὰ τῶν συναγωνιῶν... καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ἰεροβώματι εἰς Ἀλεφτοῦ, καὶ ἢλθεν εἰς γῆν Σαρειρᾶς τὴν ἐν δρεί Εβραῖμ... 24r

καὶ έδέσμην εἰς τὴν πάλιν αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν γῆν Σαρειρᾶς τὴν ἐν δρεί Εβραῖμ...

ὡς ἐφυγεν ἐκ προσώπου εἰς Ἀλεφτῷ ἐξ Ἀλεφτοῦ, καὶ θῆλεν εἰς γῆν Σαρειρᾶς τὴν ἐν δρεί Εβραῖμ... 24r

καὶ έδέσμην εἰς τὴν πάλιν αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν γῆν Σαρειρᾶς τὴν ἐν δρεί Εβραῖμ...

ὡς ἐφυγεν ἐκ προσώπου εἰς Ἀλεφτῷ ἐξ Ἀλεφτοῦ, καὶ θῆλεν εἰς γῆν Σαρειρᾶς τὴν ἐν δρεί Εβραῖμ... 24r

καὶ έδέσμην εἰς τὴν πάλιν αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν γῆν Σαρειρᾶς τὴν ἐν δρεί Εβραῖμ...
with his ancestors, and his son Rehoboam succeeded him as king. 8

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

A further confirmation is found in the text of a notice preserved in the so-called "supplement" or "midrash" of the Old Greek in 12:24c(d,f). This form of the notice represents or closely approximates the original. It even contains a formal element of the literary genre "flight notice" which is absent in MT/LXX 11:40, that is, the "fear" of the persecuted (ἐφοβέθη); ἐρχόμενος ἐκ τῆς ἐξίλουσθι...). Solomon sought to kill Jeroboam; Jeroboam was afraid and fled to Egypt where he found refuge with Shishak, and he settled there until the death of Solomon. 10 When Jeroboam learned in Egypt that Solomon had died, ... he came to... 10 All the essential elements of the "flight notice" are found here assembled in the proper order: (1) the persecution (ἐφοβέθη... ἐκ τῆς...); (2) the flight of the persecuted (ἐφοβέθη); (3) the temporary residence in exile of the persecuted person (ἐκ τῆς... ἐκ τῆς...); (4) the news of the persecutor's death (ἐφοβέθη κατὰ Λέον τοῦ ἐκ τῆς...); and (5) the return (ἐφοβέθη...).

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

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

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

II. The Accession Formula: Text and Composition

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

The stereotyped phraseology of the accession formula recurs frequently throughout the books of Kings. This therefore allows us another approach to the study of the process of the recension and composition of the books. Despite the rigidity of its formulation, the accession formula nevertheless undergoes numerous variations. As an explanation for this phenomenon Bin-Nun supposes a plurality of formulations in the original source. E. Cortese thinks rather of a redactor's literary variations upon the primitive
formula. These authors do not take into account the textual variants of the Old Greek and, in the case of Rehoboam, do not pay the least attention to the text of LXX 12:24a. 13

The accession formula is as follows: "In the year... of X, king of Israel/Judah, there became king Y, son of Z, king of Judah/Israel..." (Ιβ.ντ...L...[[ντ...]] ΜΙΚ ΙΥΒ-Α/ΥΑΕΗ ΜΙΚ...ΒΝ...Τ ΥΑΕΗ/ΥΑΕ Ζ).

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

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

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

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

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

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

...καλ ὁχοτίς οὗς ἂν ἔκακοι καὶ δύο ἐτῶν ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐνλαυτῷ ἔνα ἑβασίλευσεν ἐν ἴσχυσιν. καὶ ὄνομα τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Γοθολία θυγάτη Αχαβ βασιλείας Ἰσραὴλ. καὶ ἐπο-
The Old Greek (cf. VL) here preserves the text of Jehu's coup d'état notice integrally and in its proper place, that is, after the initial formula of Ahaziah and before the beginning of chap. 11. Also in the MT the initial sentence of the notice (8:28a) follows the initial formula of Ahaziah (8:25-27). Nevertheless, the remainder of this notice, taken from the Annals of Judah, now appears in the MT in pieces scattered throughout a prophetic narrative which comes from the Northern Kingdom and recounts the revolt of Jehu (8:28a; 9:14a.28). 17

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

One thing is clear: in order to reconstruct the history of the redaction and composition of the books it is necessary first to reestablish correctly the history of the recension of the text. The type of text on which the Old Greek is based occasionally shows knowledge of a text in which not all of the Deuteronomic additions had yet been made or in which these had been arranged according to a different compositional plan. 19 Thus, for example, the regnal formula of Rehoboam in LXX 1 Kgs 12:24a lacks the Dtr. addition found in MT/LXX 14:21-22 and ignores the anomalous formulation found in 14:21a. Again, the narratives of the consultation of Ahijah of Shiloh and of the Assembly at Shechem are presented in LXX 12:24–25 in a pre-Dtr. form. Or again, in the LXX the account of the construction of the Jerusalem temple lacks the Dtr. addition found in MT 1 Kgs 6:11-14; this addition is demarcated in the MT by means of "Viederaufnahme", where the expression "Solomon built the temple and completed it" is repeated (6:9 and 14).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG (LXXB)</th>
<th>MT/LXXB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:3-7,23</td>
<td>Dtr. comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:10-11</td>
<td>accession formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:12-13</td>
<td>epilogue formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:14-21</td>
<td>prophetic narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:22,24-25</td>
<td>notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:25+</td>
<td>epilogue formula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

III. The Construction of Solomon's Palace:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The proto-Massoretic text has transposed the ensemble formed by the two literary units 6:37-38a and 7:1-12a. The evidence for
these two transpositions is found in the discrepancies which have been left in the present text. The insertion of this block of material in a new context has caused the corruption of the form of the MT in the two verses which constitute the points of insertion and suture: 6:36 and 7:12b (LXX 6:34). The text of these verses is as follows:

LXX 6:34(6:36)

καὶ ψυχοδόμησεν

τὴν αὑλήν τὴν ἐσωτήτην

τρεῖς στίχους ἀπελεκέτησαν

καὶ στίχος κατεργασμένης κέδρου

κυκλάθειν

καὶ ψυχοδόμησε καταπέτασμα

τῆς αὐλῆς

tou αἱλαμ τοῦ οἰκοῦ (ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους)

tou κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ

MT 6:36

רברך

אשת חצרות העבריות

שלשה הפריז ברורה

дерר הפריז אברים

7:12b

רדזה לו חיות ופס❥.setString(8848)אלה והנהיגות

The two passages (LXX 6:34(6:36) and MT 7:12) use identical expressions to refer to the portico of the temple (אֹהֵל), the interior court (הֵיכָל הַחֲרוֹן), and the type of construction composing the interior and exterior court walls (אָבִּיב חֲסִינִים חֲסִינִים). This

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

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

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

(2) Furthermore, the MT form of 6:36 has lost its ending, which was in part transposed to provide 7:12b in the MT. The reference to the vestibule of the temple (אֵילות ההָבָץ) retains its original context in LXX 6:34. After the description of the אֵילות and the הָבָץ with their respective doors (6:18a-b(6:19-35)), we pass logically to the description of the third section of the temple: the αἱλαμ or vestibule framed by its bronze pillars (7:13-22). Such is the sequence in the LXX where the link between the references to the vestibule and those to its two pillars is expressed
by the common allusion to the "vestibule of the temple" in 6:34
[om MT] and 7:3[7:15] (to aílan tou oikou).

IV. The Translation Equivalent Ἴκν = ὀουκ houtōs (L' κν): Vorlage or Targum?

S. R. Driver qualified as "strange" the occasional LXX translation of the particle Ἴκν by an (interrogative?) ὀουκ houtōs, as though one were dealing with L' κν: 1 Kgs 22:19; 2 Kgs 1:4, 6, 16; 19:32; 21:12; 22:20.21 All these passages are found in the καιγε section γ6 of the Greek text of 1-2 Kings. According to L. Prijs, the "LXX" in this case employs a "targumic" interpretation of the type τῇ τίγνα, which consists in understanding a word by dividing it into two parts.

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

Thus, in 2 Kgs 1:16 the Antiochene text (boc2e2) has διά touto where we find the reviser's phrase ὀουκ houtōs in the rest of the MSS of the LXX. In two other cases, 2 Kgs 1:4, 6, the LXXL offers a double reading, the reviser's reading followed by the primitive reading: ὀουκ houtōs διά touto. In 2 Kgs 19:32 there is an omission in the LXXL, but the Armenian version attests propter hoc; the intermediate stage of this version depends upon the proto-Lucianic text and consequently attests διά touto in the OG. In two other cases, 2 Kgs 21:12 and 22:20, the LXXL now presents the reviser's translation, but again the Armenian version here joined by Lucifer (propter hoc) reflects the primitive Greek διά touto. Finally, in LXXL at 1 Kgs 22:19 the reviser's form reappears, but significantly enough Theodoret ignores it.

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

In order to obtain a more complete view of the translations of the particle Ἴκν, we need to take into account also the rendering of the expression L' κν from which the reviser's version is derived. In the only case of L' κν in a non-καιγε section (1 Sam 30:23) the OG translation for L' τὰ κάν κάν is ou poiesete houtōs. All the other cases of the reading ὀουκ houtōs (= MT L' κν) are found in the καιγε sections of the G text. This does not help to make a comparison between the possible readings of the old version and those of the proto-Theodotionic or καιγε recension found elsewhere: 2 Sam 20:21; 23:5 (καιγε oue houtōs boc2e2 VL); 2 Kgs 7:9 (τῇ houtōs boc2e2); 2 Kgs 17:9 (adikous houtōs boc2e2 VL). However, the case of 2 Sam 18:14 is in itself very eloquent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>L' κν Τύθι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXXp</td>
<td>touto εγώ arkeomai ouh houtōs mēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXL</td>
<td>διά touto εγώ arkeomai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>propter hoc quidam praeteribo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current text of the LXX offers a double reading. The first element preserves the old version, albeit in a truncated form.
without δία; the same form is attested by the Antiochene text, reflected in the Armenian version as well, presupposing the Vorlage 𐤊𐤉𐤃𐤀𐤊𐤆𐤃𐤋. The second element corresponds to the reviser's version made according to the proto-MT. 23

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

CONCLUSION: Method in Identifying the Original Text of Kings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Editors, translators, and critics of the books of Kings have had frequent recourse to the Lucianic text in the katige sections. It is all the more significant that this preference for the Lucianic text as "the better text" in these cases does not stem from a tendency favorable to it, but rather overcomes a prejudice widespread since the days of Rahlfss against the Lucianic revision and
against any possible existence of a "Lucian before Lucian." 26 Such modern authors, then, must assign a high critical value to the type of text represented by the OG and/or by the pre-Lucianic or Antiochene text. This should not remain a merely occasional recognition, confined to those passages where the MT presents an insuperable corruption or difficulty. The two types of texts must first be studied separately on their own merits. Either or both of the two text-types may sometimes reflect previous secondary redactional activity. Consequently, the analysis of the recensional history of these texts constitutes a necessary step methodologically prior to the literary analysis of the chronologically prior history of the composition and redaction of the critically-identified Urtext.
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A SHORT COMMENTARY ON SOME VERSES
OF THE OLD GREEK OF ISAIAH 23

Arie van der Kooij
University of Utrecht, Holland

I

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

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

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

Seeligmann adheres to the view that one can discover such
interpretations only "in isolated, free renderings." It is to be
asked, however, whether one has to look upon free and inter-
pretative renderings as "isolated" from their Greek context.
According to Seeligmann, one should not try "to discover logical
connections in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-
text," as K. F. Euler did with LXX Isa 53. Seeligmann studies
the LXX Isa in relation to the Hebrew Vorlage exclusively and
considers it unjustified to deal with the LXX Isa as a coherent
text with its own meaning. Euler, on the other hand, aimed at
treating LXX Isa 53 in both respects. J. M. Coste did the same
with LXX Isa 25:1-5 and reached the conclusion that the Greek
passage in those verses, while very arbitrary in relation to the
Hebrew, turns out to be a meaningful unity on its own. J. C. M.
das Neves dealt in the same way with LXX Isa 24.

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

II

23:1 (The Heading) ἤ ηγιστ ὑμών - τὸ δραμα Τύρου.

The rendering δραμα (or δρασις) for ηγιστ is characteristic
of the LXX Isa and does not occur in the LXX elsewhere in the
OT. In the LXX Isa not only the prophecy about Tyre in our
chapter but also the book as a whole (1:1, cf. MT) is called a
"vision." The rendering δραμα is thus in line with δρασις of 1:1.
23:1 Καρθάγινα θησαυρούς κατασκεύασε η θάλασσα θαλασσαίος. Εικόνα από την περιοχή της Τρίπολης: Η πόλη κατασκευάστηκε από τους Εφεσιακούς της Ρωμαϊκής θαλάσσας.

MT-LXX: 

The first thing which is striking in this verse is the rendering "Carthage" for Tarshish, as is the case throughout chap. 23 (vv 6, 10, 14). Outside this chapter, however, Tarshish has been rendered differently in the Old Greek of Isaiah: in 2:16 the words λιμάνι το θαλάσσιον (Tarshish as referring to the Mediterranean Sea) whereas the LXX offers πλοία θαρσίας for πόλις το θαλάσσιον in 60:9 and θαρσίας for πόλις in 66:19 (Tarshish in both cases understood, apparently, as the name of a [maritime] country).

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

J. Fischer has suggested that LXX Isa 23 reflects a period in which Carthage still had a dominating position in the western part of the Mediterranean Sea (between 250 and 201 B.C.). Seeligmann, on the other hand, describes the whole of our chapter in Greek as "one distressful lamentation for the destruction of the πλοία Καρθαγίνας" in the year 146 B.C.

A further analysis of the meaning of v 1 in Greek is necessary in order to answer our question and to deal with the suggestions of both Fischer and Seeligmann. "Wail, ye ships of Carthage, for x is utterly destroyed, and y no longer come from the land of the Kittim; x is led captive." Seeligmann considers "the ships" as subject of ἀπώλετο. This, however, is improbable: ἀπώλετο (singular) is in line with ἁγιασμένος (whereas ἔρχονται is in the plural), and σιχμαλάβωτος cannot refer to πλοία. Something different must be the subject of the two singular verbs; the subject of ἔρχονται, on the other hand, could be the ships.

Usually, one thinks of Tyre as the subject of ἀπώλετο. It is to be asked, however, whether the Greek of 23:1 has to be understood in the same sense as the Hebrew. This should not be decided on the basis of the meaning of the Hebrew text, as often occurs, but on the basis of the context in the Greek text of chap. 23. In this connection vv 10 and 14 are very important.

23:10 Εργάζονται οι πλοία της Καρθαγίνας: καλά πλοία οὗτοι έπεφυγεν της Καρθαγίνας και έρχονται έξω της Καρθαγίνας έπεφυγεν της Καρθαγίνας έπεφυγεν της Καρθαγίνας.
Lady of the sea? - oúkêti. πλοία: not to be related to a hypothetical ἄγνωστον (see above), but more probably to be related to πόλις (= IQIsa), interpreted as ἄγνωστον "harbor" (see below).

23:14 ἁγνωστόν - ὀλολύτετε πλοία ἔσχατος Καρχηδούνος καὶ ἄρτι ἀπώλετο τὸ ὀχύρωμα ὑμῶν.

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

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

καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται ἐκ γῆς Κιττιῶν (v 1)
καὶ γὰρ πλοία οὐκέτι ἔρχονταί ἐκ Καρχηδόνος (v 10).

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

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

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

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

There remains one question to be answered, namely, why the translator did not translate ἡπείρον. It may be assumed that this word stood in the Vorlage of the LXX Isa, because the Qumran MSS support the MT (see above). Ottley remarks: "The Heb. word may have been overlooked before ἡπείρον..." In light of the meaning of v 1 in Greek, I would suggest another and more satisfying explanation. ἡπείρον in the sense of "from being a house" would imply that Carthage (as subject of ἀπώλετο) was a "house" for the ships of Carthage. In view of the commercial practice of that time, it is, however, probable that the author of the LXX Isa interpreted a "house" for ships with their merchants as designating an organization of a state-recognized group in a foreign port,
that is to say, outside the home harbor.26 This may be the reason why the translator did not translate מים; Carthage was not a "house" for the ships of Carthage.

23:2-3 מים (Mt) - τίνι δύοιοι γεγόνασιν
οί ένοικούντες έν τῇ νήσῳ
μεταβόλοι Φοινίκης
διαπερνόντες τὴν βάλασαν
ἐν οἵτινες πολλῷ
καὶ ὁ ἡρωὴν - σπέρμα μεταβόλων
ὅτι οἱ Φοινίκης ἔφερομένου
οί μεταβόλοι τὸν ἔθνον.

MT-LXX: νησί (MT v 1fin) - τίνι: via ἄλλος; νῆσος = IsaAa, 4QisaAa.
οί - δύοιοι γεγόνασιν: via οὖς (ὑπὸ MT).
οἴ (v 2), ἡμείς and ἡμῖν (v 3): these three words have all been rendered by μεταβόλοι (the sg. understood collectively; ἡμείς interpreted as ἡμῖν via phonetic similarity of θ/δ).27 Φοινίκης - Φοινίκης: cf. διφοινίκης - Φοινίκης Deut 3:9 (and see below). ἡμείς - διαπερνόντες: the sg. ptcp. understood collectively (ὑπὸ 1QisaAa and 4QisaAa).28 There is no rendering of ἔθνος (for the Quaran readings, see below). ἐν τῇ: έν δήστε: MT (έν τῇ) = IsaAa, 1QisaB, 4QisaAa. ὃς άμετα...: the LXX offers a comparison, the MT does not; MT = IsaAa, 4QisaB. There is no rendering of ἔθνος: MT = 1QisaAa and 4QisaAa (הַמָּלָא). There is no rendering of ἡμείς: MT = 1QisaAa and 4QisaAa. The LXX reflects a sense-division in vv 2-3 different from that of the MT (with ὃς of v 1).

The structure of the Greek text is clear: it consists of a long interrogative sentence τίνι δύοιοι γεγόνασιν...σπέρμα μεταβόλων,29 and a clause with an answer ὃς άμετα... By the inhabitants "of the isle" are meant the people of Tyre. Thus, whereas in v 1 ships of Carthage (in the harbor of Tyre) are addressed, vv 2 and 3 in Greek have the inhabitants of Tyre as their subject. The text further makes clear which inhabitants of Tyre the translator has in view: the μεταβόλοι Φοινίκης. They are the important persons of vv 2-3, as is underlined by the fact that the word μεταβόλος occurs three times in these two verses. Here this Greek word is the rendering for the Hebrew יסָּהוֹ, a unique rendering of this Hebrew word in the LXX Isa (cf. only 47:15: μεταβολὴ for יסָּהוֹ) and in the LXX of the OT. The usual translation of יסָּהוֹ is ἐμπορός, ἐμπορία, ἐμπορίον, as is the case in the rest of our chapter (see v 8 and vv 17-18) and elsewhere in the rest of the LXX (see, e.g., LXX Ezek 27).

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

As a result of the rendering Φοινίκης for יסָּהוֹ the Greek of vv 2-3 presupposes that Tyre was regarded as the metropolis of Phoenicia. As we know, this was indeed the case in the Hellenistic period. In this respect as well as for the interpretation of Φοινίκης for יסָּהוֹ, the legend on Tyrian coins from the time of Antiochus IV is very significant: ἔμπορος ἐν τῷ ἔθνῳ.32 Whereas the Hebrew of vv 2-3 does not contain such a comparison, the Greek of these verses compares the retailers of Phoenicia with a harvest gathered in.33 Is this the result of a misunderstanding of the Hebrew text? Ziegler remarks in connection with the rendering ὃς (άμετα...): "Der Übersetzer kannte sich in der Konstruktion der hebr. Vorlage nicht aus, und hat frei ὃς sur Verdeutlichung eingeschoben."34 This, in my view, is an
underestimation of the translator on the one hand, and on the other too "modern" a criticism of an "ancient" translator, as far as philological principles are concerned. When one reads the Greek of vv 2-3 against the background of the contents of v 1 (see above), then the meaning of these verses becomes quite clear: the retailers in Tyre have become like a harvest gathered in, because the important trading center, Carthage, is destroyed; ships with merchants and merchandise no longer come from Carthage to Tyre, so that the retailers in Tyre, instead of crossing over the sea, have to stay at home "as a harvest gathered in." They are without employment.

In order to be able to make his translation of vv 2-3, the translator evidently dealt "freely" with the Hebrew text, as in fact is often the case in the LXX Isa. He connected לֹּהַ with לֹּהַ, read לֹּה as לֹּה (via the graphic similarity of /v/), and interpreted לֹּה via the root לֹּה. He left some minor words untranslated, and added וּכְ (see the remarks above).

There is one more important word, however, which he did not translate: צָרֵיָ֣א. According to Ottley, the LXX has "omitted it," but he offers no suggestion as to the reason for this omission. Seelig states: "LXX hat diesen Vers ganz frei wieder­gegeben und kam mit "nicht zurecht." Although it is not quite certain which reading stood in the Vorlage of the LXX Isa (דַּבָּד QIsa a, QIsa b = MT, [ יִדְבְּד 4QIsa b]), the support for the MT of QIsa b, which, unlike QIsa a, is a conservative and accurate text-type, is in favor of the reading צָרֵיָ֣א. If then we may assume that this reading was in the Vorlage of the LXX Isa, and if it was understood in the sense of "they filled you (Tyre)," one can imagine why it was left untranslated. It would mean that the retaileurs of Phoenicia "filled" Tyre. This, however, was not the case. It was not the מִבְּדָּד, but the מֵבְּדָּד ("merchants, traders"), who "filled" a city like Tyre. There is a text in one of Ezekiel's prophecies against Tyre, viz., Ezek 27:25, which confirms this: ...אָמֵר הֵן צָרֵיָ֣א שֶׁרֹּאְּתָ֥יו עַל-סְלָקָ֖ר = פָּלֹֽא, אֶֽנָּא תַּחְתֵּיָ֖ו פָּרְשֹּׁמֶֽרַת, וַֽאֲרֻמֵֽהָ֖ו... Therefore, I think, the translator could not use the Hebrew צָרֵיָ֣א in his interpretation of vv 2-3.

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

23:10a אֶֽבֶרְךְ הָֽאָרֶץ - יְרַנְּאָֽזְו אָֽשָׁנָ֖ו נְהַנְּי֑ כָּעָֽבָר.

MT-LXX: see above.

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

The rendering יְרַנְּאָֽזְו for יְצָרָה לְכַל כַּל suggests the reading יְרַנְּאָֽזְו. This is also the reading of 4QIsa a; 4QIsa b ("ענך") on the other hand, agrees with the MT. Because of the fact that the expression לֹּא זֶרֶד אֱלֹהִי is in the sense of "till the land" does not occur in biblical Hebrew (one always finds מָרַד אֱלֹהִי), the reading of the MT and of 4QIsa a must be the older and better reading. It seems more likely, therefore, to look at the rendering יְרַנְּאָֽזְו as resulting from some kind of "interpretation" of יְצָרָה (via the graphic similarity of /v/). than to assume that the Vorlage of the LXX contained the reading יְצָרָה.

This interpretation forms part of the interpretation of Isa 23 as a whole in the LXX Isa. From the fact that 4QIsa a also contains the reading יְרַנְּאָֽזְו, the question arises whether the author of this MS interpreted the text of Isa 23:10 (and of this chapter as a whole) in a similar way. This question, however, cannot be dealt with in this article, although, as I have tried to point out elsewhere, there is some evidence of fulfillment-interpretation in 4QIsa a also.
III

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

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

Our short commentary, further, may have pointed out that LXX Isa 23 is not only a translation, but also a specific interpretation of this old Hebrew oracle against Tyre. The Greek text (of some verses) of LXX Isa 23 reflects the author's belief that the "vision of Tyre" once spoken and written by the prophet Isaiah was fulfilled in his own time, when Carthage was destroyed and Tyre was confronted with the consequences of the downfall of her mighty daughter. What is said about Daniel can be said about the author of LXX Isa 23: evidently he was qualified (and authorized!) to interpret visions (see Dan 1:17).

Finally, one does not find our exegesis of these verses of LXX Isa 23 in the earliest (Christian) commentaries on the LXX Isa (of Eusebius, Jerome, and others). They connect the contents of this chapter with the siege of Tyre by King Nebuchadnezzar (cf. Ezek 26:7). One early Christian tradition, however, has interpreted LXX Isa 23, albeit in its Old Latin translation, as referring to Carthage, for two "capitula" (nos. LVIII and LIX) from the African branch of the VL read as follows: "Sermo Domini super Cartaginem (23,1), "Quod septuaginta annis esset deserta Cartago (23,14) et restitueretur." 
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Considerable experience has been gained over the past decade in the preparing of critical editions of Armenian biblical texts and associated documents. Editions of a number of texts have appeared, and the preparation of others is underway. This makes the standardization of procedures very desirable, so that future editions form a coherent corpus of critically edited biblical texts.

Type of Edition

Most of the editions published so far have been diplomatic, minor editions. They were based on a carefully selected group of manuscripts, designed both to present the most valuable text type and also to represent the range of developments of the Armenian textual tradition. The base text for the edition should be the best isolable text form. The procedures for the selection were set forth by M. E. Stone in a series of articles in the 1970s and first applied in the selection of a base manuscript for an edition of Isaiah, and then of the manuscripts to be used in an edition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The first published edition based on this procedure was that of the Testament of Joseph. The procedures established by Stone were refined and improved by Cox in the preliminary work for his edition of Deuteronomy and this refined method was applied in that edition. This method of preparation has been found suitable in the present state of scholarship, since the number of manuscripts is usually very high, and the
understanding of the version not sufficiently advanced for the preparation of full critical editions. Moreover, the present deplorable situation of editions of the Armenian Bible makes it desirable, at the present, to have reliable *editiones minores* of as many books as possible. The methodology developed by Stone and Cox is much more economical of time than the preparation of full critical editions.

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

**Format**

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

**Range of Witnesses**

On the basis of studies carried out so far, it seems very desirable to expand the range of witnesses which are consulted in the selection of text forms for inclusion in editions. This range of witnesses should include: (a) manuscripts; (b) lectionaries and other liturgical books; (c) citations, particularly patristic; and (d) other witnesses, such as commentaries, inscriptions, etc.

**Publication and Consultation**

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

**A Central List of Numbers for Designating Armenian Bibles**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Venice, San Lazzaro</td>
<td>1311 (20)</td>
<td>13 Jerusalem,</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 1925</td>
<td>21 Yerevan, Matenadaran</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yerevan, Matenadaran</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>14 Yerevan, Matenadaran</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>22 Yerevan, Matenadaran</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Venice, San Lazzaro</td>
<td>1312 (17)</td>
<td>17 Jerusalem,</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 353</td>
<td>26 Yerevan, Matenadaran</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>San Lazzaro</td>
<td>841(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>1006(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Leningrad</td>
<td>Hermitage VP-1011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Mechitarist Library</td>
<td>71(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>6230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>San Lazzaro</td>
<td>1508(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Leningrad</td>
<td>Oriental Institute B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>San Lazzaro</td>
<td>1007(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>935(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 3043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Osterr. Nationalbibl.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 2558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 2560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Vatican Armeno 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Convent of Our Lady 26(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>1507(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 1127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>San Lazzaro</td>
<td>1634(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Armenian Patriarchate 1934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>623(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>New Julfa</td>
<td>All Saviour's Vank</td>
<td>15(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>6281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>2732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Matenadaran</td>
<td>3705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

### NOTES


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

The Following Contributions are Invited:

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

2. Record of Septuagint theses and dissertations completed or in preparation.

3. Reports significant for Septuagint and cognate studies. Items of newly discovered manuscripts or of original groundbreaking research will be given primary consideration. Reports should be brief and informative and may be written in English, French, or German. Greek and Hebrew need not be transliterated.

4. Abstracts of Septuagint papers read before international, national, regional, and local academic meetings. Abstracts should be previously unpublished, not more than one page (8½" by 11"; 22 by 28 cm.), double-spaced, including the time, place, and occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by March 1 to be included in that year's Bulletin.
BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

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