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MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING
7th December, 1987--Mariott Hotel, Boston

Programme

3:45 - 5:45 Albert Pietersma presiding

Johann Cook, University of Stellenbosch, "Hellenistic Influence in the Greek of Proverbs?"

Claude Cox, McMaster University, "Terminology for Sin and Forgiveness in the Greek Translations of Job"

Bernard A. Taylor, Binghamton, NY, "The Majority Text of the Lucian Manuscripts for 1 Reigns: An Update on the Method and the Results"

Leonard Greenspoon, Clemson University, "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the President, Albert Pietersma at 5:45 p.m.

1. Minutes of the 1986 meeting in Jerusalem were read and approved.

2. The President announced that in 1989 we would meet in conjunction with the IOSOT, in Leuven, Belgium. The IOSOT meetings will convene on August 27 and last until September 1. We will meet on the preceding Friday and Saturday, August 25 and 26. Among possible topics for symposia at the 1989 gathering are (a) Qumran, the LXX and the New Testament and (b) LXX Lexicography.

3. The executive Committee proposes an expanded program for next year's meetings in Chicago. In addition to our usual morning or afternoon "open" session, we are proposing an evening plenary session on the impact and significance of D. Barthélémy's Les Devanciers d'Aquila. The year 1988 will mark the 25th anniversary of the appearance of that volume. If the plenary session is approved by the SBL Programme Committee, papers were to be solicited for a panel.
4. The Treasurer, Walter Bodine, stated that his report would appear in the upcoming volume of the Bulletin. He noted that, as a result of our raising the annual dues to $3, we are in good financial condition.

5. The Editor of the Bulletin, Melvin Peters, announced that most of the material for volume 20 is in hand. Peters urged members to provide him with information on their own research and that of others.

6. Editor of the SCS Series, Claude Cox, reported that four volumes have recently appeared: the Proceedings of the Jerusalem Meeting, and monographs by Kraft-Tov, Cox, and Peters. He also reported on projected volumes that deal with the Septuagint and with the Pseudepigrapha.

7. The general membership accepted the Executive Committee's recommendation that the positions of Secretary and Treasurer be merged into one office.

8. The following slate of officers was unanimously elected for a period of three years:
   - President: Eugene Ulrich
   - Vice President: Robert Hanhart
   - Secretary-Treasurer: Leonard Greenspoon
   - Editor of the Bulletin: Melvin Peters
   - Editor SCS Series: Claude Cox
   - Honorary President: John Wm Wevers, to join Harry M. Orlinsky
   - Immediate Past President: Albert Pietersma
   - Members at large: to be appointed by the new President at a later date.

9. A motion was passed thanking Albert Pietersma for the services he rendered as president.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Leonard Greenspoon
Secretary-Treasurer

Death of Professor Ziegler

It is with deep regret that BIOSCS notes the passing of Professor Joseph Ziegler in October of 1988. A more detailed Memoriam to this distinguished scholar will be forthcoming in the next issue of the Bulletin. It is only fortuitous, but entirely fitting, that two of the articles in the current issue deal with or make explicit reference to his work.

Note of Appreciation.

Professor Albert Pietersma served as president of IOSCS from 1981 through 1987. He ordered the business of the Organization with efficiency and skill. A motion of appreciation appears as item 9 of the current Minutes. That seems hardly a sufficient means to express the organization's gratitude to Professor Pietersma for his service. BIOSCS takes this opportunity to recognize more fully the contribution of the Immediate Past President and to wish him continued success in his research.

LXX and NT: A Review


The problem of identifying the Vorlage of the apostle Paul's frequent quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures has long challenged serious students of Paul's letters. As far back as the 1720's the Englishman William Whiston and the German Johann G. Carpzov were debating whether the Pauline citations or the Masoretic text more faithfully preserved the wording of the original Hebrew Bible. NT scholarship has long since moved beyond such apologetics to an appreciation of the rich diversity that characterizes Paul's frequent appeals to Scripture. Nevertheless, the fundamental question of the relation between Paul's citations and the known texts of the Hebrew Scriptures has yet to be satisfactorily resolved.

From the standpoint of LXX studies, of course, the more significant question is the reverse: how important are Paul's biblical citations as witnesses to the text of the Hebrew Scriptures? Numerous studies have established beyond doubt that Paul drew his quotations from Greek (not Hebrew) biblical texts that stood not far from the mainstream of our present LXX tradition. Assuming that the texts of the Pauline citations themselves could be established with reasonable certainty, one might anticipate that they would provide valuable evidence for the text of the Greek Bible in the first century CE. A brief survey of the standard printed editions of the LXX, however, would quickly dispel that notion. The classic edition of Holmes and Parsons appears to exclude the NT citations entirely from its critical apparatus. Drs. Alan Brooke and Norman McLean started out citing the evidence of the NT only when it supported known variants within the LXX manuscript tradition, but shifted to including all "definite quotations" after concluding that the original approach resulted in "a somewhat inadequate treatment of such early and important evidence." The editors of the Göttingen Septuagint have obviously struggled with the same problem.Listing Paul's quotations as evidence in certain cases and not in others, with no clear explanation for the variations in treatment. For example, Paul's use of the word ἐπισκέψατος instead of ἐκπαιδευμένου ὑπὸ θεοῦ in Gal. 3:13 is cited in full in the apparatus to Dt. 21:23, even though most New Testament scholars would see here a clear instance of Paul's molding the biblical text to fit his own theological and rhetorical purposes. The somewhat adapted citation of Dt. 29:3 in Rom. 11:8, on the other hand, is not mentioned at all in the same volume, despite the fact that at least two of its divergences from the central LXX tradition (the omission of κύριος before δέ θεός and the substitution of οἵματιν

2Many of the arguments presented below concerning Paul's reliance on written texts rather than memory can also be seen to support Paul's use of a Greek rather than a Hebrew original. A Hebrew Vorlage is generally presumed only for Rom. 11:35, 1 Cor. 3:18, 2 Cor. 8:15, and 2 Tim. 2:19, in all of which the wording appears to stand closer to the Hebrew than to any known Greek text.


4On a visit to Duke University in December 1988, Dr. John Wevers informed me that such variations in treatment as a serious weakness in the editorial technique of the Göttingen LXX would of course be short-sighted, since it is the editors' aim in such a project to bring together every piece of evidence that might possibly contribute to a proper evaluation of the text of the Old Greek Bible. What these examples do indicate, however, is the need for a better set of tools to guide LXX textual scholars in their use of the NT evidence. The biblical citations in the NT do indeed afford a valuable glimpse into the status of the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible at a relatively early and important period in their development. Their usefulness for text-criticism, however, is clouded by the effects of a relatively "loose" citation practice that runs throughout the NT documents. Whether one attributes it to carelessness, faulty memory, unconscious adaptation, or active "christianization" of the text, the fact remains that the NT authors as a whole do not appear to have been highly scrupulous about adhering to the precise wording of any known text in their frequent citations from the Hebrew Scriptures. Unfortunately, NT scholars have been relatively slow to take up the challenge of providing LXX text critics with practical guidelines for distinguishing between editorial activity and genuine textual variants within the broad corpus of NT citations. As a result, the evidence of the NT citations is generally given little weight by textual scholars as a witness to the text of the LXX.

It is therefore with gratitude that one acknowledges the publication of any work that attempts to bridge the seemingly impassable chasm that sometimes separates these two disciplines. Such a work is Dietrich Alex Koch's Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986). Though written primarily as a contribution to the broader discussion of Paul's use of the Hebrew Scriptures in explicating his Christian theology, Koch's study offers a number of observations along the way that will be of interest to LXX scholars as well.

Early in his book (pp. 48-57) Koch undertakes a careful investigation of the place of Paul's Greek Vorlage within the text-history of the LXX. In the process he moves the study of the Pauline citations a significant step forward by carrying out a separate analysis for each book cited by Paul, rather than treating the LXX as a monolithic entity in the manner of most previous Pauline scholarship. (Koch acknowledges the assistance of Robert Hanhart of the
Göttingen Septuagint project in this part of his study.) Through a careful comparison of the Pauline citations with the primary witnesses for each book of the Greek Bible, Koch is able to conclude that Paul stands closer to the tradition represented by A and Q in his citations from the book of Isaiah, whereas his quotes from the Pentateuch, while more diverse in their textual origins, appear on the whole most closely related to the tradition found in F. Quotations from the Twelve are too few and diverse to allow a clear textual orientation to emerge, but agreement seems to be greatest with the tradition represented by V. No specific profile can be identified for the multitude of Psalms citations found in Paul’s letters.

Several readings from Isaiah (8:14 in Rom. 9:33, 25:8 in 1 Cor. 15:54, 28:11ff in 1 Cor. 14:21, and 52:7 in Rom. 10:15), along with Paul’s two citations from Job (41:3 in Rom. 11:35 and 5:12-13 in 1 Cor. 3:19) and two from 3 Reigns (19:10 and 19:18 in Rom. 11:3-4) do not appear to fit within the known text-history of the LXX, and must therefore be traced to different Vorlagen. To explain these texts, some of which agree with one or another of the later “Hebraizing” recensions of the LXX, Koch posits the use of Greek texts similar to those found at Qumran, where an earlier revision of the LXX in the direction of the Hebrew text seems to be indicated (pp. 57-78). The presence of such a wide diversity of text-types within the Pauline corpus is attributed to Paul’s supposed practice of excerpting potentially useful texts from a broad range of biblical manuscripts in the course of his travels throughout the Roman Empire (pp. 80-81, 99-101, 284-5). Finally, a number of texts are identified in which divergent readings would appear to be attributable to textual developments predating Paul’s use of the text. These include the addition of μη in Gal. 4:10 in Gal. 4:30, the addition of ὅτε to Lev. 18:5 in Gal. 3:12 and Rom. 10:5, the use of δetails instead of ὅτε to Gen. 4:31 and the addition of τῶν to Dt. 27:26 in Gal. 3:10, possibly the omission of εἰδήθη in Rom. 10:8 and the substitution of εὐθύνομαι for ἐγκατέστησον in 1 Cor. 9:9, and additional variants in Rom. 9:25 (Hos. 2:25), 9:26 (Hos. 2:1), 11:9 (Ps. 68:23), and 12:20 (Prov. 25:21) (pp. 48-78 passim). Unfortunately, Koch nowhere spells out his methodology for determining which variations are Pauline and which represent the use of a different Vorlage.

Another aspect of Koch’s work that would be of interest to students of the LXX is his careful investigation of Paul’s technique of citing Scripture (pp. 92-98, 189). Here he offers what will no doubt be viewed as the definitive refutation of all “memory lapse” theories for explaining Paul’s relative “freedom” with the wording of the biblical text. Though most of his arguments are not new, the cumulative effect of Koch’s marshalling of the evidence is highly convincing. Among the observations that he puts forward are: (1) the exact agreement of fully 40% of Paul’s citations with a known text of the LXX, including numerous instances where the wording of the LXX diverges significantly from the Hebrew; (2) the close approximation of almost all the remaining texts to the wording of one or another version of the LXX, with most of the divergences attributable to the needs of the new context; (3) the general agreement between Paul and the LXX concerning the form of the divine name (βέος or κύριος) used in the various citations; and (4) the presence of different wording in two instances of parallel citations (Rom. 11:5 = Gal. 3:11, Rom. 9:33 = Rom. 10:11), which would appear to point toward intentional modification of a known biblical text. Additional evidence said to support Paul’s reliance on written texts rather than memory citation includes: (1) the presence of pre-Pauline Hebraizing text-forms in a number of Paul’s citations (see above); (2) the lack of citations in the so-called “prison epistles”, which might be traced to the inaccessibility of written texts at the time they were composed; (3) instances of apparent haplography in Paul’s reading of his Greek Vorlage (Rom. 9:27, 10:15); and (4) indications of Paul’s ongoing personal study in the text of Scripture, including the shift in his treatment of Abraham between Galatians and Romans and the careful construction of the Scriptural catena in Rom. 3:10-18.

Koch’s fundamental thesis, for which he presents a strong case, is that Paul actively and consciously modified the wording of his Vorlage where necessary to bring out what he as a Christian felt was the true meaning of the Scriptures as a witness to the coming of Christ and his gospel. In a careful examination of the individual citations (pp. 102-56), Koch identifies a number of ways in which Paul commonly modified the wording of his texts: (1) reversing the order of words (primarily for accentuation); (2) changing person, number, gender, tense, and mood (to suit a new context or to render a new sense from a verse); (3) omitting words from the text (to make it more concise, to accentuate, or to offer a new interpretation); (4) adding words to the text (relatively necessary to bring out what he as a Christian felt was the true meaning of the verse); (5) reversing the order of words (within the context); (6) changing person, number, gender, tense, and mood (to suit a new context or to render a new sense from a verse); (7) omitting words from the text (to make it more concise, to accentuate, or to offer a new interpretation); (8) adding words to the text (relatively necessary to bring out what he as a Christian felt was the true meaning of the verse).
infrequent, usually to clarify its sense).

5 (S) replacing words or phrases by new formulations (to adapt to Pauline patterns of speech, to accentuate, or to express a new interpretation);10 (6) introducing a portion of one verse into the text of another (so-called "mixed" or "confused" citations);11 and (7) combining different texts back-to-back under a single introductory formula ("combined citations").12 According to Koch's calculations, such intentional modifications can be found in fully 56% of Paul's citations (52 out of a total of 93), with over half the modified texts experiencing multiple alterations. Up to three-fourths of these modifications introduce basic changes in the "sense" of the texts so treated, with most tied directly to the function of the citation within its new context. All in all, says Koch, the evidence is overwhelming that Paul was aware of the precise wording of the Scriptural text in every case, and either retained or altered that wording depending on what he intended to signify by his use of the text (pp. 186-90).

The significance of such conclusions for the use of Paul's citations as a witness to the text of the LXX cannot be overestimated. Regardless of whether one agrees with his handling of every individual citation, Koch has made a convincing case for attributing the bulk of Paul's deviations from the central LXX textual tradition to the editorial activities of Paul himself.13 This means that text critics have generally been on the right track in downplaying the importance of Paul's divergent text-forms as a witness to the text of the Greek Bible in the first century CE. It does not mean, however, that the evidence of

9 For instance, the twofold addition of οὖς to Ps. 13:2 in Rom. 3:11, used to maintain the sense of the original in a new context, and the emphatic addition of ἐκεῖ to Dt. 32:35 in Rom. 12:19.

10 Out of the numerous examples may be noted the substitution of δεικνύομαι for διανοηθέναι in Rom. 9:9 (the original reference to the angel's "return" in Gen. 18:14 would have made no sense in the new context); the use of διαδέχομαι in place of προσφέρω in 1 Cor. 1:10 (strengthening the depiction of the divine action in Is. 29:14 and creating a better parallel with ἴδω); and the incorporation of ἀφεσις into the citation of Ps. 94:10 in 1 Cor. 3:20 in place of the more general ἀφόσιον (tying the verse more explicitly into the theme of the vanity of human wisdom that dominates 1 Cor. 1:3).

11See for example Rom. 9:9, which combines elements of Gen. 18:10 and 18:14; Rom. 9:25-27, where the καλέσαι that introduces v. 25 (citing Hos. 2:25) is derived directly from the καλοθετάω of v. 26 (citing Hos. 2:1); Rom. 9:33, which merges a phrase from Is. 8:14 into Is. 28:16; and Gal. 3:4, where Gen. 12:3 and 18:18 are conflated.

12 The classic example is Rom. 3:10-18, which combines into a single "citation" verses from Ps. 13:1-3, Ps. 5:10, Ps. 139:4, Ps. 9:28, Is. 59:7-8, and Ps. 55:2. Other examples include Rom. 11:26-7, citing Is. 59:20-21 and Is. 27:9; Rom. 11:33-6, citing Is. 40:12 and Job 41:3; and 1 Cor. 10:54-6, citing Is. 28:8 and Hos. 13:14.

Christopher D. Stanley
Duke University

the Pauline citations can now be conveniently set aside in the conduct of LXX text-criticism. While a great many of Paul's divergent readings can now be attributed with confidence to Paul's own technique of citing Scripture, there remain many others for which the origins are far from clear. Koch's seminal attempt to distinguish intentional Pauline modifications from genuine textual variants represents a major step in the right direction, but his failure to specify the grounds for his various conclusions renders their uncritical use for textual purposes suspect. More attention could also be given to evidence within the LXX tradition that might support Paul's use of a different Vorlage for at least some of his apparently divergent readings. In a number of instances Koch attributes similarities to the influence of the Pauline citations on the LXX manuscript tradition, with no attempts to justify such a conclusion.14 The existence of such evidence is noteworthy in instances where no clear Pauline motivation for the deviation can be identified, but becomes especially relevant in those "gray areas" where either a Pauline adaptation or the use of a different Vorlage could be posited (e.g., the omission of ἀφεσις in Rom. 10:6, citing Dt. 30:12, and the omission of ταῦτα and ταῦτα in Gal. 4:30, citing Gen. 21:10). Since Koch fails to offer arguments in favor of his positions on many of the more questionable Pauline deviations, it remains for subsequent investigators to sift through the evidence to isolate which are likely the result of Pauline editorial activity and which might represent genuine readings of a variant Greek text. Whether such studies will ever be carried to fruition, however, depends in part on the willingness of serious students of Paul to set aside their immediate exegetical and theological concerns in the interest of furthering the development of scholarship in a related field. Until this happens, the potential contribution of the Pauline citations to a proper evaluation of the text of the LXX will remain largely unrealized.
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BARTHELEMY AND PROTO-SEPTUAGINT STUDIES

John Wm Wevers, University of Toronto

Twenty-five years ago Doménique Barthélémy's Les Devanciers d'Aquila appeared; its subtitle (in translation) was "First full publication of the text of the Minor Prophets Fragments found in the desert of Judah, preceded by a study on the Greek translations and recensions of the Bible produced in the first century of our era under the influence of the Palestinian Rabbinate." Its impact was immediate and widespread, and today there is no reputable Septuagint scholar who has not been influenced by it.

In this study I shall reflect on two basic contributions which seem to me to have resulted from this publication. Some 20 years ago, in my review of the work in the Theologische Rundschau I said:

Apparently the most important conclusion which we can make with certainty is that our texts are part of LXX history and are not a new translation... Our text should once and for all bury Kahle's theory of 'many translations'; here is a text which is obviously Jewish and which just as obviously shows that it is a revision of the so-called 'Christian' LXX text.

What Barthélémy has shown is that we have a Jewish recension of the Old LXX text. What he presupposes is that there is a text being revised; the recension is an attempt to correct an existing translation.


2Theologische Rundschau N.F. XXXIII (1968) 67f. [The actual quote is in German and reads: "Wahrscheinlich ist die bedeutendste Schlußfolgerung, die man mit Sicherheit ziehen kann, die, dass unsere Texte ein Teil der LXX-Geschichte sind und nicht eine neue Übersetzung bieten... Unser Text sollte nun ein für allemal Kahles Theorie von den 'vielen Übersetzungen' begraben. Hier ist ein Text, der offensichtlich jüdisch ist und der ebenso offensichtlich zeigt, dass er eine Revision des so-genannten 'christlichen' LXX-Textes ist. Ed.]
I. Proto-Septuagint Studies.

This then means that proto-Septuagint studies are a valid enterprise. There was a Septuagint Pentateuch created in Egypt in the third century B.C., and the attempt to get back to the earliest possible pre-recensional form of that original text is as legitimate and as urgent as is the creation of critical editions of the N.T.

Since I have been rather preoccupied since the appearance of Barthélemy's volume with proto-Septuagint studies for the Greek Pentateuch, I might be permitted to reflect on just what that basic contribution of Barthélemy has meant methodologically for the establishment of the critical text and for the understanding of its textual history. It means that Jewish pre-Christian remains can be properly examined as part of the LXX tradition. In Kahle's fanciful reconstruction, the third century quotations from the Pentateuch by Demetrius the Hellenist as well as Aristobulus' reference to the 'law code among us . . . translated . . . before Alexander's Conquest' concern translation(s) earlier than the LXX. The fact is that if these prove anything it is that the LXX existed as early as the third century B.C.

It also means that the early Jewish Greek Biblical texts are to be taken as part of the textual history of the LXX and are important witnesses to be used for the establishment of the critical text. Two examples immediately come to mind. Manuscript 957 is a small fragment of Deuteronomy coming from the 2nd century B.C. Kahle took this Manchester Papyrus as having 'been written before the Alexandrian Committee commissioned by the Jews began its work.' By an Alexandrian Committee he means a committee in the latter part of the 2nd century B.C. which he has reconstructed for the creation of a revision which he maintains The Letter of Aristeas was written to defend, and for which there is not one scrap of evidence. These fragments were characterized by Vaccari in 1936 as being Lucianic on the basis of three readings which they supported. In actual fact, it is now fully clear that each of these three readings is a witness to the original text of Deuteronomy. Unfortunately this surprising characterization of a second century B.C. text as Lucianic, though it ought to have been severely questioned by everyone as being most unlikely, has been widely accepted and has become canonical wisdom. It is, however, quite untrue, and even a Lucianic form of the Pentateuch is itself an uncertain matter.

A second example is of much greater significance. It concerns MS 848 or Papyrus Found 266. This was copied cir. 50 B.C. and contains substantial parts of Deut. 17-33. What makes this find so sensational is that it gives us an insight into the nature of the pre-recensional text of Deuteronomy as it existed in Egypt only two centuries after it was translated and almost half a millennium before Codex Vaticanus.

Its significance lies not only in its unusual value for identifying the original text of Deuteronomy, but also in showing us what a text with non-recensional revisions actually looks like. This kind of Egyptian text is in essence worlds apart from the kind of Palestinian recensional text that Barthélemy published.

---

6Fragmentum Biblicum Seculi II ante Christum" Bib XVIII (1936) 501-504.
So one may conclude that in the Kahle vs Lagarde-Rahlfs controversy Kahle was wrong and the Lagarde school was right. Not that Lagarde's methodology for reconstructing the text history of the LXX can be accepted *holus bolus* as a blueprint for restoring the original text. His views are far too simplistic. Jerome had referred to the *trifaria varietas*, i.e. the three Christian recensions of his day: the Lucianic in Syria, the Hesychian in Egypt and the Hexaplaric in Palestine. Lagarde's plan for recovering the original LXX was first to identify these three recensional texts, and then by removing all the recensional elements to recover the pre-recensional text of the LXX.12 To this end he published in 1883 his Lucianic text13 propaedeutic to an eventual critical edition of the LXX, a text which his disciple Rahlfs called "Lagarde's biggest failure."14

My own work on the Greek Pentateuch illustrates how much more complex its text history really is. Only one of the three Christian recensions can be clearly identified, namely the hexaplaric, whereas the other two remain uncertain. On the other hand an analysis of the approximately 100 extant Greek MSS copied before Gutenberg, of papyri remains, versions and patristic quotations has yielded not only the major hexaplaric witnesses but also two sub-groups, a large Catena group which includes two sub-groups as well, and nine further distinctive textual groups or families—a total of eleven text families and four sub-groups. Of course, none of these MSS exhibits a pure text; all MSS are eclectic;15 in fact, several MSS remain which are so mixed in character as to defy classification. Nor can one say that these eleven text families are independent of each other. At the risk of gross oversimplification I would say that my overall impression might well identify larger clusters of text in the tradition; some such clustering would be attracted to the B text, the A text, the hexaplaric text, the Catena tradition and the Byzantine group.16 But except for the hexaplaric text these clusters do not on the whole show recensional traits. Furthermore, these groups may be said to have probably originated in certain geographical areas: the B text as well as the A text, in Egypt, the hexaplaric text in Palestine, and the Catena and the Byzantine texts in Byzantium.

What is clear from all this is that the text history of the Greek Pentateuch is complex and represents such a degree of eclecticism as to make a clear statement of stemmata for any group, let alone for any individual MS, quite impossible, even though it is throughout equally clear that it is all part of the textual development of a single original translation.

There is a second approach towards the critical text which is not through the text history at all but rather through the translator himself.17 The LXX is a library of materials deriving from different translators of different countries. Even the books of the Pentateuch are the products of different translators. This was already known to Zacharias Frankel in 1851,18 but the implications of that knowledge have not always been drawn by today's critics. Each translator's approach to his task must be studied through a careful analysis of his work. Is his reverence for the language of the source document so great that it

---

11Praef. in Lib. Paralip.: "totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat."
12First outlined in Symmicta II (1880), 137-148, and later in Ankündigung einer neuen ausgabe der griechischen übersetzung des alten testaments (1882) especially p. 22ff.
13Libri Paralip. (1879), in his *Studien zu der Septuaginta* (1863), in his *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben* (1863), in his first axiom of text criticism says: "die manuscrita der griechischen Übersetzung des al. sind alle entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens... p.3.
14Si. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben* (1863), in his first axiom of text criticism says: "die manuscrita der griechischen Übersetzung des al. sind alle entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens... p.3.
15With considerable hesitation I suggest the following tendencies towards clustering: for the B text A and MS 55; for the A text F, M and y; for the hexaplaric text C' and s; and the Catena text C' ± 0, with hex readings on the margin of C' and s, and the Byzantine text group d n t and to a lesser extent b. It must be emphasized that these are not to be identified as distinct textual entities but merely as textual drifts.
17Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegeten auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik, and already in his Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta which appeared ten years earlier. Cf. BIOSCS 18 (1985) 19-21.
overwhelms the demands of the target language? i.e. is the translation a literalistic word for word rendering, a noun for noun, verb for verb, preposition for preposition, kind of Greek? Or does the translator have such a fine sense of the demands of Greek style and rhetoric that the content but not the structure of the source language is expressed? One might thus contrast Numbers with Exodus, the former being far more Hebraic, and the latter much better Greek. Or for extreme cases outside the Pentateuch one might contrast Ecclesiastes in its painful Aquilanic literalness with the free paraphrase of Proverbs where even metaphors and similes are changed so as to be more attractive to a Hellenized audience.

Or to ask another question: does the translator tend to translate with stereotyped patterns as in the census reports and repeated offerings in Numbers or does he engage in variation for variety's sake as in Leviticus? What are the patterns of usage which a particular translator follows? Does he follow his Hebrew word for word, clause for clause, or is he aware of the larger context of the book and thus level out the text as is frequently the case with the Exodus translator?

Such an analysis may also involve grammatical matters. For example, the Deut translator often adapts the case of a relative pronoun by attraction to its antecedent, whereas in Numbers the grammatically correct case is insisted on. Or again did the translator prefer Hellenistic forms to Attic ones? Or individual patterns of usage may emerge. The Exodus translator renders the phrase "in the land of Egypt" inevitably by ἐν γῆ Ἀλεξάνδρει i.e. the word "Egypt" is in the dative, but the phrase "in all the land of Egypt" always appears as ἐν πάσῃ γῆ Ἀλεξάνδρει i.e. "Egypt" is in the genitive. But in Genesis the pattern is different. In the phrase "in all/whole land of Egypt" the name is in the dative three times and only once in the genitive. The phrase "in the land of Egypt" is translated as in Exodus except for one case where the genitive occurs. This is but a minor point but it is illustrative of the kind of stylistic patterns or mannerisms that occur.

It is scarcely necessary for me to belabor the point any longer. By now it is clear that one should view with scepticism if not alarm general claims concerning Septuagint usage unless they are verified by full study. Far more convincing are statements on usage or translation techniques of single translators.

To summarize what has been said thus far, the search for an original text from which extant witnesses in Greek are derivative is a valid one. But in so doing it is methodologically wrong to impose on the text history of such texts a preconceived pattern of recensional activity; the witnesses must be sorted out and allowed to speak for themselves without presuppositions, and text families must be identified on the basis of factual, textual evidence.

It is then clear that the recovery of the original, or better said, the establishment of the critical text, involves not simply an assessment of the text history but also an understanding of the mind, habits, and quirks of the translator.

II. The Recension

Meanwhile in Palestine, Seleucid interference in matters Jewish created a strong sense of nationalist fervor which focused particularly on strict adherence to the practices demanded by the Torah. The Maccabean revolt gave impetus to nationalist feeling and pride. Not that this new feeling of independence and self-sufficiency could stem the onward march of Greek as the lingua franca of the civilized world, but it could demand full observance of the law as found in the Pentateuch. Furthermore it could look askance at and make demands upon the diaspora. For the Lord roars from Zion and not from Alexandria; it was Jerusalem which he had chosen to put his name there; Israel was the land of promise, not Egypt. Is it any wonder then that questions might be raised about the origins of the Greek Pentateuch? Was it after all legitimate; did it actually render the hands unclean?

It is in this context that the raison d'etre of the Legend of Pseudo-Aristeas can best be understood. Written as most scholars agree in the latter part of the second pre-Christian century, its central story stresses the Palestinian roots of the translation, a translation made over a century beforehand but whose authenticity was only now being questioned.
Of course the story was made up out of whole cloth; of course it is not a piece of historical writing, but it did carry an important message. The sacred text had been sent by the high priest in Jerusalem; that Hebrew text was not only not an Egyptian copy, it was actually Palestinian and it was official. Furthermore the translators were not even diaspora Jews; there were six chosen from each of the twelve tribes of Israel resident in the holy land, and these 72 had been commissioned by the high priest himself. What could be more authentic than that! And that Greek translation had been rendered canonical by the Jewish community in Alexandria who not only accepted it but declared accursed anyone who might add or subtract anything from the work or effect any change in it whatsoever.\footnote{Aristeas, 3:10. Cf. also, BICS 18 (1985) 18-19.}

And the Letter was indeed successful. For over a century the Greek Pentateuch was more or less unquestioned as the canonical Greek form of the Torah. It is not an accident that the recension represented the fragments published by Barthélemy finds no parallel in the Pentateuch. In fact, even for two of the three Christian recensions I can find no convincing evidence.

Which brings me back to Barthélemy, who after all was dealing with a Jewish recension as found in the Minor Prophets fragments. And I would say that the second basic contribution which Barthélemy has made is the demonstration that R is a recension of the old Septuagint.\footnote{Op. cit., 179} What is abundantly clear from Barthélemy is just what a recension looks like. Certain clear norms for identifying a recension stand out, and it might be worthwhile to examine these in some detail.

1). It must be clear that a recension is not a new translation but a revision of an existing text. In other words the text being revised must be identifiable, must shine through. In our case it is the old Septuagint. To illustrate this let me take the first two columns which contain fragments of the text Jonah. Most words are fragmentary and so one can only consider the number of words which actually show change. And one can only count such words as being extant whose restoration is fairly certain to be correct. There are 15 verses represented in the two columns. Approximately 149 words can be read or restored with some certainty. Of these 38 show a revised text; the remainder do not. Though the proportions which these numbers suggest may not be entirely accurate since the text is fragmentary and partially restored it does reflect an overall picture of a text which has been extensively revised but at least two thirds of which has been left untouched and thus easily identified. A recension then is a revision of an existing text.

2). A second criterion for a recension is a standard used for determining what needs revision and what can be left unrevised. That norm for this text is correspondence to the Hebrew text. To illustrate this I shall again use only columns 1 and 2.

a). Such changes may involve number. In 2:4 זְקוֹן "river" is taken (correctly) as a collective by the LXX and translated by ποταμός. Our text changes this to ποταμόν. So too at 3:10 הַעֲשָׁרִים מִשְׁאָרָיו "their evil way" in referring to the Ninevites is understood by LXX as תִּתיְו אֱבִיָּיו פּוֹנֵרָיו "their evil ways." This was corrected by the revisor to the singular תִּתיְו פּוֹנֵרָיו. Or at 4:2 לֹא מִי "my word" is singular in the Hebrew, but LXX took it as של לְהָפְטֶנ קָר ו "my words" and R changed it to של לְהָפְטֶנ קָר ב.  

b). Revision may involve articulation. At 2:5 the phrase לַבָּכִי יִשְׂרָאֵל "your holy temple" is correctly rendered in LXX by, תַּחְתֶּם תְּנָכָא אֶלְמָי ה "temple" and "holy" articulated. The Hebrew phrase is of course not articulated and our scroll has תמַחְתָּם אֶלְמָי ה with both articles omitted, resulting in poor Greek though fine Hebrew.

c). Revision may simply change the word order. At 2:4 יִרְאוּ "shall surround me" is translated in LXX as "me shall they surround." The revisor has placed the pronoun me after the verb to correspond more closely to MT.

d). Should the LXX have a shorter text the reviser filled it in to correspond to the hebrew. At 2:5 the Hebrew has "I am cast out from your sight" = יִרְאוּ מִי. LXX translated the compound preposition idiomatically by εἰς, but to revise this left יִרְאוּ untranslated, so he added, εἰς αὐτὸν i.e. "from over against (your sight)." And at 3:9 MT has בָּשֵׁם "turn and
1) For the context of the story made an excellent choice in frustrated, confounded" which described Jonah's mood precisely. This, a Jewish sensibilities of his time. Rather than use Hebrew clause tetragrammaton, he has reverted to the YHWH of the original in each case and however, was far too free for the reviser who changed it to repent. The reviser supplies by adding "righteous blood." But dikaios is not quite the same as נין and R changed it to δίκαιον "innocent." At 2:6 the colorful statement "שנהל לייבבך" is literally "reeds (were) wrapped about my head" is prosaically interpreted by LXX as ἡ κεφαλή μου "my head sank down." This has been changed by R to a literal ἐλεφόθην τὴν κεφαλήν μου "reeds encircled my head." Or at 3:8 the Hebrew clause "they turned each from his way" מדרוב הוא is correctly translated by LXX as οὐκ οὐκ αὐτός "each from his way." But מדרוב to the reviser meant "man" and should be translated by ἄνγλῳ wherever it occurred and so ἄνγλῳ is substituted for οὐκ οὐκ αὐτός. Or to mention but one more, at 4:1 it is said that Jonah ἦν ὢν ὅτι became angry." The LXX with due regard for the context of the story made an excellent choice in ὅτι "he became frustrated, confounded" which described Jonah's mood precisely. This, however, was far too free for the reviser who changed it to ἔπεμψε "became angry."

f) And finally at times the reviser is impelled by his reverence for the Jewish sensibilities of his time. Rather than use κοπιῶν as the substitute for the tetragrammaton, he has reverted to the YHWH of the original in each case and that in the archaic Canaanite script. Also illustrative of this same avoidance of possible offence may well be his revision of LXX's translation of מדרוב. The Niphal of the root מדרוב occurs both at 3:9 and 10. LXX in both cases used the verb μεταρρέω "to change one's mind, to repent." Since it is God who is the subject of the verb this means that God has changed his mind. The reviser in both cases has substituted the passive of παρακαλέω "to relent."

3) A third criterion for a recension is evidence of a certain consistency in the revision. There is then a marked tendency in R to avoid polysemy in favor of a one to one correspondence. Accordingly מדרוב is rendered regularly by ἄνγλῳ even when it really means "each one"; מדרוב is rendered throughout by κατε γε; the verb מדרוב becomes ἐποτρέφω even when followed by מדרוב where ἐποτρέφω is used in the LXX. Presumably based on the Psalms our reviser renders the title נבנ currentValue of יְהֹוָה by YHWH רָם הָדָם, which incidentally always occurs articulated in spite of the lack of an article in the Hebrew original. The conjunction כֹּל which is translated in LXX by διότι is usually changed to διότι by the reviser. And the various Hebrew equivalents for "therefore," לְאַל and even לְאַל; all become δια τοῦ in the Minor Prophets fragments. Over against this LXX used δια τοῦ for לְאַל as well as one time for לְאַל which is elsewhere rendered by ἐπεκέντα τοῦ. It also used ἐπεκέντα τοῦ for διὰ τοῦ. For לְאַל LXX apparently understood the root לָל since it is translated by ἑτομαζω "be prepared." At the other end of the scale Aq reserved δια τοῦ solely for לָל.

I would like to conclude this discussion by calling attention to the terminology which Barthélemy himself used. At the beginning of this discussion I called attention to the lengthy sub-title to the book which Barthélemy used to describe exactly what his study was about. Not only was this the first full publication of the text of the Minor Prophets fragments, but it also included a study of Greek translators and recensions of the Bible produced in the first century of our era under the influence of the Palestinian Rabbinate. Unfortunately scholars who have applauded his work have paid little attention to his own description. Careful scholar that he was he referred to translations and recensions. The only context in which he used the term κατε γε recension was in describing the Vaticanus text of the הָדָם section of the Books of the Kingdoms, viz. 2 Sam 11:2 to 1 Kgs 2:11. Many texts, both recensions and translations have used κατε γε to render the Hebrew מדרוב, and it is quite legitimate to speak of a κατε γε group of texts as Barthélemy himself has done. It is, however, bizarre and misleading to speak of such materials as Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, Qoheleth, the B text of Judges, parts of the Books of the Kingdoms, the Theodotion text of Daniel, Nehemiah, the Quinta and Theodotion in general as representing a κατε γε recension. Barthélemy did not do so; even the texts which he published he never called such but always the R (for Reviser) text; in fact, in his summary chapter he refers specifically to the existence of recensions of the LXX in the group to which the recension R belongs.21 I would strongly urge

21 Ibid., p. 267
that we ban from academic usage the term κατάγε recension, reserving the term κατάγε either for the κατάγε group or simply as the common, in fact the excellent, rendering for Δ and Ε. Since Barthélemy himself refers to the source for this revisional impulse in the first century as the Palestinian Rabbinate, why not refer to this as part of the Palestinian Rabbinical tradition?

After all, the first century Rabbinic tradition in Palestine comprised more than κατάγε, more than a R recension of the Minor Prophets; it has inherited the Septuagint in all its variegated forms, and the tradition attempted in various ways to put its interpretative stamp upon them. In due course this influence became stronger and stronger, until finally the old Septuagint was no longer recognizable and it was transformed into something totally other, into an Aquila or a Symmachus. The impulse to recensional activity had so dominated the original text that it has replaced it; it has become something new, and exists independently of the LXX. All of this development is part of the Palestinian Rabbinical tradition, not just a recension, but a tradition beginning already before our era began and issuing in the barbarisms of Aquila's translation.

I. Introduction1

A synoptic comparison of the critical Hebrew and Greek texts of Isaiah 23:1-14 makes it clear that substantial similarities2 and differences3 exist between the Massoretic text and the Septuagint translation of the pericope. In this paper I attempt to account for the differences and to deal with a case of "pseudo-similarity." In such an enterprise, it is necessary to take cognizance of three factors, which are aptly summarized in a forthcoming article by Eugene Ulrich:

(i) the Hebrew Vorlage which is being translated into Greek,
(ii) the results of the transformational process by the original Greek translator, and (iii) the subsequent transmission history within the Greek manuscript tradition.4

With reference to these three categories, I proceed to examine Isaiah 23:1-14. However, it would better suit the material under discussion if I do so in an order opposite to that enumerated by Ulrich: (i) the transmission history of the Greek text, (ii) translation technique, and (iii) the Hebrew Vorlage.5

1 This paper was read at the IOSCS session of the 1988 Annual Meeting of the AAR/SDL in Chicago. I thank Dr E. Ulrich (University of Notre Dame) for his guidance in its production, and for providing access to the relevant portions of 4QIsa and 4QIsa b.
2 E.g., verses 4 and 9.
3 E.g., verses 3 and 10.
5 Ascertaining what Hebrew text the translator had before him, and how he went about translating it, are of fundamental importance in dealing with differences between a passage in the LXX and in the MT (cf. A. Aejmelaeus, "What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of
II. Transmission History of the Greek Text

It is beyond the scope of this paper to investigate extensively the transmission history of the Greek text. The point to be stressed—especially in the case of LXX Isaiah—is that modern critical editions of the Septuagint approximate, but are not necessarily identical with, the OG (Old Greek).

For example, chapter 23:12 of J. Ziegler's Göttingen text of Isaiah (as well as A. Rahlfs' earlier edition) reads: καὶ ἔφθασεν οὐδὲν μὴ προσβῇ τού ὑψώθη καὶ ὅξακαν τὴν θυγατέρα Σίδωνος καὶ καὶ ἔπεσεν εἰς Κιτήριον, οὐδὲ ἐκεῖ σοι ἀνάπαυσις ἔσται. The Göttingen edition thus accepts Σίδωνος, following almost all of the tradition going back to Origen, Lucian and B*. However, Codex Vaticanus is a witness to the hexaplaric text in the case of 8vyaTEpα. These considerations, together with superior manuscript support, indicate that the alternative reading, Σιδωνιαν, was probably contained in the OG of Isaiah (although inner-Greek corruption cannot be ruled out completely). If this be the case, then an apparent instance of similarity ("Sidon") serves as a guide to the book as a whole, not necessarily to each word and phrase of a particular pericope. With reference to the views of James Barr in particular, but also to those of Emanuel Tov, Anneli Aejmelaeus, and Arie van der Kooij, I suggest that three categories of translation may be distinguished in Isa 23:1-14: (a) Literal and semantically accurate; (b) Non-literal, but semantically adequate; (c) Non-literal and semantically inadequate.

---


7 "And they shall say: 'No longer will you continue to insult and abuse the daughter of Sidon; and if you depart to the Kittim, you will also have no rest there.'"

8 On the basis of Ω (B* L) L* 243, 456, 449* and Eusebius, Theodoret and Jerome.


10 I.e., C, S, A, Q and B*. It is interesting to note that Ziegler, when faced in v 1 with a similar choice between βυσυμυ (supported by B, Q and L) and δομας (on the basis of and C, S and A), selected δομας.

11 I will be returning to this important difference in the discussion of "tendentious exegesis" in section V below.

12 "Analysis of translation technique might indeed be called the quest for the Archimedian point, because only from this vantage point can the text-critic sit in judgement over the fidelity with which the manuscripts have preserved the original text..." (Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues, VT 35 [1985] 299).

13 P. Kyle McCarter describes LXX Isaiah as a "Very free translation, verging on paraphrase, except in chaps. 36-39, where it is relatively literal" (Textual Criticism, 90).


17 "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1Qbaṭa," BO 43 (1986) 368-69.

18 Other categories that could be considered are "free" vs. "literal," "faithful" vs. "unfaithful," and "intentional" vs. "unintentional." Since the criterion for Barr's categories is the degree of literalism "Typology," 288-89, he would classify my third category (c) as invalid or
(a) Literal and semantically accurate instances abound in LXX Isaiah 23, and are easily recognisable. For example, διαφωνειν in v 1b clearly renders דיברין;19 several other examples could be provided.

(b) Non-literal, but semantically adequate cases are numerous; for example:

VERSE
(1) To ἀποκράτα "vision" for ἡρενό "pronouncement"20
(2) διαφωνεῖν "passing over" (pl.) for ἐβαλεν (sing.)21
(3) ἐν ὑδάτι "in water" for βυζάμβιον22 μεταβολῶν (and μεταβολῶν) "merchants" for πλοῖοι<υ> and Ἰον

speculative. This type seems necessary for what Tov ("Septuagint," 810) calls "tendentious exegesis." Van der Kooij's fivefold classification is also significant, under the following headings: (a) the text of the LXX version; (b) word-word relations; (c) grammar and semantics; (d) the context of LXX Isaiah as a whole; (e) semantics

example:

and are easily recognisable. For example, διαφωνεῖν is a common instance of a "distress" type, which is not literally rendered but semantically adequate. In the case of "passing over," it is clear that the LXX is using a metaphorical translation that is not literal but adequately represents the meaning of the Hebrew term. This type of translation is common in the Septuagint as a whole, and is characteristic of LXX Isaiah.28

(5) λήπτεται αὐτῶν ὁ βύζων περί Τύρου ("Distress will seizing them concerning Tyre") adequately renders the sense of דיברין בַּלַע לָךְ ("They will be in anguish over the report about Tyre").

(7) The force of the question in the Hebrew דחיסין ("Is this") is rhetorically reinforced by the addition of ὄψιν in the OG ὄψιν ἢν ("Was this not").24

(8) The single expression ἔμπνευσιν αὐτῆς ("her merchants") renders both the Hebrew terms "merchants" and βυζάμβιον.25

(10) The Greek words καὶ γὰρ πλοία ὑπέκειται ἐρχομένος ἐκ Καρχηδόνων ("for ships no longer come out of Carthage") renders very freely the sense of the Hebrew Vorlage.26 (for the boats of Tarshish no longer have a harbour).

(11) The use of βασιλεῖα to translate βυζάμβιον (here in the plural) is common in the Septuagint as a whole, and is characteristic of LXX Isaiah.28

(13) The sense of the Hebrew בַּלָע לָךְ ("The Assyrians established [or, destined] her for desolation")29 is adequately expressed by the


In the same verse, a more speculative suggestion is that μὴ ἔμπνευσιν ἀλλ' ἡ ὁποίαν-α ("She is not inferior or without strength, is she?") renders the sense of the Hebrew term דחיסין ("who wears crowns," or "the bestower of crowns") in a very free manner. Here μὴ has the sense of the Latin non; cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar, §2651. Alternatively, the translator's Vorlage may have included a form of λατάνον to be small, few.

For discussion of the Vorlage, cf. section IV below.

The translation of πᾶν την by ἔρχομενος is dealt with in section V below.


The ἔρχομενος is the desert dweller, desert demon or wild beast. The term is frequently used to signify desolation, as in both the LXX and MT versions of this line (cf. BDB 850s; KB...
Greek καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ἡρῴαται ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ("she also has been made desolate by the Assyrians"). The Hebrew לֹא מָצָא ("As for her [watch-tower], they made it a ruin") is rendered by the Greek ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς πέντε ἕκτην (= "her wall has fallen") in a paraphrastic manner. 30

(c) The third category is non-literal and semantically inadequate. Three possible cases are evident, and will be examined further in section V below. They are:

VERSE
(2) Φείνικας "of Phoenicia" for γῆς Πορθης.
(12) Σπήλαιον for γῆς Πορθης, as already indicated in section II above.
(1, 6, 10, 14) Καρχηδόν for ψηφιακή.

IV. The Hebrew Vorlage

Although the Septuagint version of Isaiah is a free translation, this does not mean that all differences between it and the Massoretic Text are attributable to translation technique; some are better accounted for in terms of the actual Vorlage used by the translator. Admittedly, one can also speak in terms of his "mental" Vorlage — i.e., the correct text in his opinion, or even the text as he misread it — but the fact that some of the readings I shall propose are supported by Q1Qis or Q4Qis indicates that they did actually exist in ancient Hebrew scrolls and are not merely conjectures of modern scholarship. This does not imply that LXX Isaiah is dependent upon these particular scrolls, but indicates that texts slightly different from the MT were to be found in antiquity, making it reasonable to suppose that the translator made use of a text that was not identical to the MT in every respect. For example, in verse 1 מִנְּחָה ("without coming") underlies the OG καὶ οὐκ ἔχει ἵππον ("they no longer arrive"); the

30 The apparent necessity for several emendations in BHS supports the view that the MT of v 13 is corrupt; for further details regarding the Vorlage, cf. section IV below.

31 In the genitive sing. in vv 1, 10 and 14, and accusative sing. in v 6.

Massoretic forms מִנְּחָה ("without house") and מִשְׁלָחַ ("without entry") seem to be two corruptions of this word. The hiphil מִשְׁלָחַ ("[you ships] transporting") is also possible for the translator's Vorlage, but מִשְׁלָחַ is preferable because the negative force of the Greek οὐκέτα requires that מִנְּחָה be understood in the sense of separation or preclusion. 32 The differences between the translator's Vorlage and the MT are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Massoretic Text</th>
<th>Translator's Vorlage</th>
<th>Old Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(v 1) מִנְּחָה &quot;without house&quot; ofשָׁלַח &quot;without coming&quot;</td>
<td>καὶ οὐκέτα ἵππον without entry</td>
<td>θησαυροῦσας μνήμης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v 2) מִשְׁלָח לה &quot;go into exile&quot;</td>
<td>לילה &quot;to whom&quot;</td>
<td>τῶν (v 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v 5) מִשְׁלָח &quot;Be still!&quot;</td>
<td>ליבר &quot;they are like&quot;</td>
<td>άποθετον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v 7) מִשְׁלָח &quot;report&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;it will be heard&quot;</td>
<td>ἀναστήσον γένηται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v 9) מִנְּחָה &quot;whose origin&quot;</td>
<td>מִשְׁלָח &quot;before&quot;</td>
<td>πάντων η</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"pass through" + "cultivate" = ἐπέδανον
"like the Nile, o daughter" = Καίδα τῆς Νείλου μαθησάτω "for to the boats" = καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα

"his hand" = ἡ χεῖρ σου
"he shock" = ἡ παροβολήσουσα
"the LORD" = κύριος σου

"o abused (one)" = καὶ διπέτείν
"Zion" = Σιὼν

"Behold" = δεῦ
"their siege towers" = οἱ φρούριοι τῆς πόλεως
"her (watch)tower" = ηὗ τῆς πόλεως ὑποτηκή

The LXX of Isaiah 23: 1-14

With reference to the above, the Vorlage of Isaiah 23:1-14 is (tentatively) reconstructed below, but first a brief explanation is necessary. The stichoi of the pericope are presented on alternate lines. In the spaces above the Massoretic stichoi, two types of construction are to be found:

(a) Hebrew words (e.g., ליל in v 2) represent differences between the MT and the Vorlage that probably lay before the translator.

(b) The symbols < > denote letter(s) or word(s) present in the MT, but missing from the Vorlage (e.g., in the second stich of verse 2).

23:1: εἰς πόλιν
23:2: μήτε Καίδα, καὶ τῆς πόλεως

44 For ליל in the sense of "if" (= δεῦ), cf. GKC 159w and KBL 238a.

45 This would admittedly be a free rendering; τοῖχος normally translates רָד in the LXX (cf. Hauch & Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint, 2.1362-63).
Some of my retroversions (e.g., 23:2) may be considered more plausible than others (e.g., in verse 10). It is important to note, however, that several of these proposals are supported by scrolls from Qumran. For example, 1QIsa contains the transposition from the Massoretic reading "pride of all" to "all the pride" in v 9, and the form "cultivate" instead of MT "pass through" in v 10. Similarly, 4QIsa contains the infinitive "to shake" instead of MT "he shook" in v 11. This evidence indicates that at least some of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Isaiah 23:1-14 are explicable in terms of Vorlage rather than translation technique.

V. The Case for Tendentious Exegesis

It has been demonstrated so far that some of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Isaiah 23:1-14 are explicable in terms of the Vorlage, but that most are attributable to the first two categories of translation technique. Under the translation category that is of particular relevance in this paper ("non-literal and semantically inadequate"), three possible cases were identified in III above. The issue at stake is whether or not deliberate, "tendentious" exegesis has taken place on the part of the translator. In other words, has he consciously tried to contemporize the material before him by applying it to events or situations in his own time? The answer to this problem requires further examination of six verses of the pericope.

Sidon or Phoenicia?

The first possible case of tendentious exegesis is in verse 2a, where סִדְיוֹן is translated by φόντικας "of Phoenicia"; compare the following:
In view of the free nature of the translator's technique, and the absence of manuscript support, it seems obvious that no difference in Vorlage can be considered in this case. But is this an instance of non-literal and semantically inadequate (i.e., tendentious or contemporizing) translation? In a sense, the word 𝄞 is indeed being interpreted by ΨΩΣ, but only on the level of clarification: the translator is not claiming that what was once written about "Sidon" is now coming to pass concerning "Phoenicia." Instead, he loosely refers to Sidon as denoting her country, apparently for purposes of clarification or explanation to his audience. It is most reasonable, therefore, to regard the translation of .minecraftforge by ΨΩΣ as non-literal, but semantically adequate (the category under which fall most of the examples provided in section III).

Sidon or Zion?

The second candidate for tendentious exegesis is found in verse 12, where – as was previously indicated – the reading Σιδονίων is to be preferred over Σιδωνικος. It may then be argued that the translator deliberately rendered 𝄞 by Σιδονίων, making not Sidon, but Zion, the victim of oppression – in order to portray her as the object of the apparently tender attitude expressed towards Sidon in this verse. The case for interpretative exegesis seems to be supported further by a significant syntactical change, whereby ἡ πεποιθημένη ("o

abused one") is translated by καὶ δικαίωμα ("and to abuse). Instead of Sidon being oppressed herself (thus the MT), the LXX would seem to indicate that Tyre and Sidon will no longer insult and abuse the daughter of Zion – because Phoenicia's power will be broken (vv 11-14). The difference in meaning between the OG and the MT would thus lend support for a tendentious or contemporizing translation.

However, this apparently convincing example lacks a solid basis, in that it requires the translator's Vorlage to have read ἠγαθονευμένη (BHS). I have already suggested that the Vorlage probably contained ἠλέηται πιέλ "and to abuse the daughter of Zion" (= καὶ δικαίωμα τὴν θυγατέρα Σιδωνίων). At this point, even the MT would make better sense with the alternative reading, because the entire pericope is directed against Tyre and Sidon; the present Massoretic sequence seems almost sympathetic to Sidon! The alternative, as reflected in the proposed Vorlage, makes Zion the victim of Phoenician oppression. With respect to written evidence, the apparatus of the standard critical edition of the MT (BHS) gives no hint of manuscript support for the Vorlage ἠλέηται; however, BHK (Kittel) indicates that ἠλέηται is found in 14 mediaeval MSS.

It thus seems reasonable that two readings for v 12, ἠλέηται and ἠπίπτε, existed in antiquity, the first being attested by the OG and 14 MSS, and the

---

46 Cf. the comments on v 12 in section IV above.

47 Seeligmann understands the "deliberate" use of δικαίωμα "to denote the deprivation of their rights to which the Jewish people were subjected when living among hostile foreign powers" (Septuagint Version, 88).

50 In section IV above.

52 The "(virgin) daughter of Zion" also appears in a favourable light in Isa 37:22; the "(virgin) daughter of Babylon" occurs perjoratively at 47:1.

53 Although BHK still prefer the reading in MT, the fact that manuscript evidence in support of ἠλέηται is found there (and not in BHS) demonstrates the importance of not relying on only one printed Hebrew text!
second by the MT (in the form\textsuperscript{54} תִּשְׁכְּרֹע). I suggest that the original תִּשְׁכְּרֹע was later corrupted to תִּשְׁכּוּר due to the orthographic similarity between ת and ר.\textsuperscript{55} Even in this case of apparent tendentious exegesis, therefore, the differences between the MT and LXX versions of v 12 are adequately explicable in terms of the Vorlage.

**Tarshish and Carthage**

In verses 1, 6, 10 and 14, "שְׁכַרְבָּא" is rendered by קארחְדוֹון:

1. The Vision concerning Tyre

Wail, you ships of Carthage,
for [Tyre] has been laid waste,
without house or haven!
From the land of the Kittim
it is revealed to them.

6. Depart for Carthage; wail,
you who live on this island!
10. Till your land,
for no longer do ships come forth
from Carthage.
14. Wail, you ships of Carthage,
for your stronghold has been destroyed.

The case for contemporizing exegesis is supported by the fact that an interpretative translation is more likely to be found in a freely rendered text, such as LXX Isaiah, than in a strictly literal one corresponding closely to its Vorlage. Not surprisingly, several scholars\textsuperscript{61} have concluded that deliberate interpretation on the part of the translator(s) is to be found in this book of the Septuagint. In the light of the evidence so far, van der Kooij's comments on Isa 23 certainly appear to have some foundation.

\textsuperscript{54} Note both forms in 1QIsa: תִּשְׁכְּרֹע (v 4) and תִּשְׁכּוּר (v 12).


\textsuperscript{56} 1. The Oracle concerning Tyre

Wail, you ships of Tarshish,
for [Tyre] has been laid waste,
without house or haven!
From the land of the Kittim
it is revealed to them.

6. Pass over to Tarshish; wail,
you inhabitants of the coast!
10. Overflow your land
like the Nile, you daughter of Tarshish;
there is no restraint any more.
14. Wail, you ships of Tarshish,
for your stronghold is laid waste.

Following Seeligmann's earlier observations,\textsuperscript{58} Arie van der Kooij has proposed\textsuperscript{59} that the rendering of שְׁכַרְבָּא by קארחְדוֹון in Isa 23: 1-14 is a case of contemporizing exegesis in the Septuagint. According to this viewpoint, not only does the translator render the pericope into Greek, but also reinterprets the original Hebrew oracle against Tyre as being fulfilled in Hellenistic times by the destruction of Carthage in 146 BCE:

... the "vision of Tyre" once spoken and written by the prophet Isaiah was fulfilled in [the translator's] own time, when Carthage was destroyed and Tyre was confronted with the consequences of the downfall of her mighty daughter.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{58} Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 79, 90, 91.

\textsuperscript{59} Van der Kooij, "Short Commentary," 35-50.

\textsuperscript{60} Van der Kooij, "Short Commentary," 46; cf. 41. See also Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 79.

Tendentious Exegesis Reconsidered

But is this indeed a case of contemporization of an earlier prophecy, whereby the translator has deliberately used a term (Kap̱ẖ璃wv) that is neither lexically nor semantically equivalent to that in his Vorlage? There is little evidence to suggest a difference in Vorlage, and this is not an example of the first category of translation posited above. With respect to the two other categories proposed in section III, it remains to be decided whether the translation of מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע by Kap̱ẖ璃wv is: (b) non-literal, but semantically adequate; or (c) non-literal and semantically inadequate. This issue can only be decided by further investigation of the word מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע and how it is translated elsewhere in Isaiah and in the LXX as a whole.

In the Hebrew Bible, an analysis of the term yields the following data:

(1) מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע is sometimes a personal name, e.g., Tarshish the descendant of Javan (Gen 10:4; 1 Chr 1:7), and perhaps a nation named after him (Isa 66:19).

(2) מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע is often associated with the sea and ships, and the term "ship of Tarshish" can denote a type of vessel.

(3) Tarshish was a sea-port, whose status and location were uncertain in biblical times. There were probably several places of that name – notably Tartessus in Spain, a port in Sardinia, Tyrreni in Etruria (Italy), and Tarsus in Cilicia. It was towards Tarshish that Jonah fled, instead of obeying God's command to go to Nineveh (Jonah 1:1-3).

(4) מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע also denotes a precious stone, possibly a gold-coloured gem such as jasper (e.g., Exod 28:20; Ezek 28:13).

As regards the Septuagint, a careful analysis reveals that מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע is translated by the following terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἕπασος</td>
<td>19x</td>
<td>Ezek 27:25 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀσός</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>Ezek 27:12 B Q, 27:25 A Qmg, 38:13 B Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀσός</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>Ezek 38:13 B Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄριστος</td>
<td>3x</td>
<td>Ezek 27:12 B Q, 27:25 A Qmg, 38:13 B Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these renderings are clear equivalents in meaning to מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע in the Hebrew Bible. For instance, ἕπασος translates מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע as a name in Gen 10:4; 1 Chr 1:7 and Isa 66:19. Not surprisingly, the association with the sea and shipping is expressed by ὀσός in Isa 2:16 and Dan 10:5[=6]. Finally, מְשֵׁרַי סַלַע denoting a precious stone is rendered by ἄριστος ("chrysolite") in Exod 28:20 and ἄριστος ("carbuncle") in Ezek 10:9. More difficult to explain, however, is the translation by ὀσός in LXX Isaiah and by ὀσός in LXX Ezekiel.

62 The rendering ἕπασος in some versions – e.g., Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion – does not represent a difference in Vorlage, but a tendency to revise the OG to conform with the MT.

63 I.e., (a) literal and semantically accurate.


66 With the aid of Hatch & Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint.
The three cases of Kapx eléwv for ῬΩη Σάμων in Ezekiel provide an important link with the Isaiah pericope under discussion. This occurs once in an oracle against Gog (38:13) and twice in an oracle against Tyre (27:12, 25). The connection with Tyre in both LXX Isaiah and LXX Ezekiel helps justify Kapx eléwv as a non-literal, but reasonable, translation of ῬΩη Σάμων, in view of the ambiguous status and location of Tarshish. Carthage was a colony of Tyre (against which the oracles in both Isa 23 and Ezek 27 were directed); like Tarshish, the city was renowned for its harbour and ships, and it was situated in the vicinity of three traditional locations of Tarshish (Tartessus, Sardinia, and Tyrseni in Etruria), as the map below illustrates:

Carthage in Relation to Three Possible Locations of Tarshish

67 The difference between the city (Kapx eléwv) in LXX Isaiah, and its inhabitants (Kapx eléwvoi) in LXX Ezekiel, is noted, but is not pertinent to the present discussion.

68 This uncertainty is reflected by alternative MS readings for Kapx eléwv in Isaiah 23 (e.g., Χολύτατων and Χολύτατον - i.e., Chalcedon; cf. the apparatus of Ziegler’s Septuaginta). It seems to me that these variants do not stem from the OG, but reflect ongoing ambiguity regarding the exact location of Tarshish.

69 See 'Carthage' in EncAmer (1986) 5.723.

70 The map has been adapted from the Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia 5.598.

It seems impossible to say whether the rendering of "Tarshish" by "Carthage" was an educated guess on the translator's part, whether he actually believed the two locations to be identical, or whether he was equating an unknown place associated with Tyre in the Hebrew text before him with the most likely city in the given geographical area. In any event, the evidence suggests that to identify Tarshish with Carthage would have been most reasonable on his part. The use of Kapx eléwv to translate ῬΩη Σάμων is not literal and may be considered "exegetical" - but only on the level of clarification, just as ῬΩη Σάμων was rendered by φοινίκη in verse 2a.

The overall sense of the pericope lends credibility to the translation of ῬΩη Σάμων by Kapx eléwv: Tyre (against which the oracle is directed), has been destroyed (v 1), and the news of this destruction will cause anguish in Egypt (v 5). Tyre's inhabitants dwell in the island, and are told to go to Carthage (Tyre's colony) in v 6. Ships no longer come out of Carthage (v 10), because her stronghold is laid waste (v 14): i.e., since Tyre has been destroyed, Carthage can no longer conduct her trade by sea. In the light of this evidence, it seems best to regard the four instances of ῬΩη Σάμων rendered by Kapx eléwv as non-literal, but semantically adequate - the second category of translation of those proposed in section III. I thus find myself unable to accept the thesis that this is a case of actualization of prophecy or tendentious exegesis on the part of the LXX translator.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper I have suggested a methodology for explaining the differences between the Massoretic and Septuagint texts of Isaiah 23:1-14. After dealing in turn with the transmission history of the Greek text, translation technique and the question of the Hebrew Vorlage, my conclusion is that most of the differences are explicable in terms of two categories of translation
...the scholar who wishes to attribute deliberate changes, harmonizations, completion of details and new accents to the translator is under the obligation to prove his thesis with weighty arguments and also to show why the divergences cannot have originated with the Vorlage. That the translator may have manipulated his original does not mean that he necessarily did so. All that is known of the translation techniques employed in the Septuagint points firmly enough in the opposite direction.74

No major study has yet set out expressly, let alone exhaustively, to examine the question of whether the same person or group translated into Greek all twelve books of the Minor Prophets (MP). Nevertheless, contemporary scholars have generally accepted the idea that the LXX Book of the Twelve is essentially the work of one translator (Toy, 1981:48). Ziegler (1934/35), Toy (1976), and Toy and Wright (1985) have all presented evidence in support of a one-translator thesis. But at closer inspection, these studies demonstrate less than their authors intended. They suffer from a combination of generality, over limitation and unreflective methodology. In sum, scholars have assumed too easily the translational unity of LXX-MP.

This study is a preliminary attempt to reopen the question of how many people or groups are responsible for the LXX translation of the MP. It does not analyze the Book of the Twelve comprehensively; rather, it concentrates on LXX-Nahum and Joel as a test case. This thoroughgoing analysis of two books has called into question at three points the idea that one translator is responsible for LXX-MP: (1) in their attempts to support the idea of a unified Greek translation of MP, earlier studies drew examples from Nahum and Joel which are less than convincing; (2) moreover, earlier studies employed flawed logic and methodologies to establish the translational unity of MP; (3) and most importantly, the primary evidence itself from LXX-Nahum and LXX-Joel suggests that those two books at least are the products of different translators.

73 I.e., "literal and semantically accurate," and "non-literal, but semantically adequate."

In order to substantiate claims one and two, we must first review the established case for the unity of the Book of the Twelve in the LXX. The chief defender of the idea J. Ziegler, whose 1934 monograph Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch explored the question, wrote his essay in response to an earlier proposal by J. Hermann and F. Baumgartel (1923) that the LXX of the MP (and Isaiah) was the work of two translators. Ziegler’s magisterial work in Isaiah had led him to the conclusion that LXX Isaiah had but one translator, and he set out to show the same was true for the Book of the Twelve. He successfully refuted Hermann and Baumgartel by showing that the line they attempted to draw between translators was easily blurred.

Hermann and Baumgartel’s arguments were based on the false assumption that each of their alleged translators used a consistent set of Hebrew-Greek equivalences. Ziegler showed that was not the case, drawing several examples from LXX Amos where the same Hebrew word receives more than one Greek translation. Ziegler found a high degree of lexical flexibility between Hermann and Baumgartel’s hypothetical halves, as well as a preferential use of some Greek words by both supposed translators. For each of Hermann and Baumgartel’s examples, Ziegler pointed out exceptions or extenuating circumstances which invalidated the alleged patterns of usage they were supposed to illustrate. Ziegler also criticized Hermann and Baumgartel’s selections on the grounds that the words in question occurred infrequently and because the uses which they noted were often fragmentary or incorrect.

Next, Ziegler advanced three arguments to support his own contention that there had been only one translator for the Book of the Twelve. First, he noted that his single alleged translator freely established different Greek equivalences for the same Hebrew word both within and among the twelve books. For example, Ziegler noted that הָבָּה is translated as ἐ̂βάποβ in Amos 5:11, that it is omitted in 8:5, translated as ὑπομανάεις in Amos 8:6 and as εἰσίς in Joel 2:24. Ziegler argued that this great lexical flexibility was ”nicht begründet in der Verschiedenheit des Übersetzer, sondern in der Art des Übersetzers, der sich nicht an eine bestimmte Form bindet.” (1934:35: 11). Secondly, Ziegler cited forty-five examples where the supposed translator of the MP had shown a preference for a certain Greek word throughout the entire course of the Book of the Twelve. For example, Ziegler noted the word καιροσνάω which stands as the equivalent of מַעֲרָת (Mic 1:6), רָעָב (Zeph 3:6) and מַעֲרָת (Zach 11:2). Finally, Ziegler compiled a list of twenty-four Hebrew words that are rendered uniquely in LXX MP. For example, he listed the relatively rare word מַעֲרָת, which is rendered by ἀπόθεσις at each of its three appearances in MP (Mic 7:19, Jon 2:4, and Zach 10:11).

More recently, E. Tov (1976) has also argued for the unity of the Twelve in the LXX. Tov suggested that the same translator(s) were responsible for Ezekiel, Jeremiah a’ (chapters 1-28) and MP. Tov’s proposal is tentative, since he presented it in the context of a study on the Septuagint translation of Jeremiah and Baruch. The evidence Tov drew to support his ideas about the translator(s) of LXX-MP is limited to examples which surfaced in his study of LXX-Jeremiah. Nevertheless, Tov found ”striking” the similarities between Ezekiel, Jeremiah a’ and MP. To support his case, Tov collected a total of eighty-one examples of “distinctive agreements” and “rare words” shared between and among the three units. Eighteen of the distinctive agreements were between Jeremiah a’ and MP, while another eleven were shared among Jeremiah a’, Ezekiel and MP.

A new statistical study by Tov and Wright (1985) has given some empirical support to the idea that only one person or group is responsible for...
translating LXX-MP. The study surveyed a number of translation units on the basis of several quantifiable characteristics of literalness. Here is a summary of their data for Nahum and Joel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Nahum</th>
<th>Joel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נַע = ἐν</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַע = δἰ / δἰότι</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ט = στέφανος / καυτὸς</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>added prepositions</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as these four criteria are concerned, Tov and Wright argued, the translations of Nahum and Joel seem quite similar. These figures placed both books in the category which Tov and Wright described as "mixed" translations. That is to say, Tov and Wright's analysis placed both LXX-Nahum and LXX-Joel into that majority group of Septuagint translations which are neither strictly literal nor completely paraphrastic.

Taken together, these studies by Ziegler, Tov, and Tov and Wright seem to present a very persuasive case for the unity of the Minor Prophets in the Septuagint. Someone seems to have employed the same translation technique to produce the LXX version of all twelve minor prophets. But is that impression accurate? The cumulative effect of these studies is less impressive when we subject to closer scrutiny their use of examples from Nahum and Joel and the logic underlying their selection.

The most important study to date is Ziegler's, hence it is appropriate to begin our critique there. Each of Ziegler's three principal arguments in support of his one-translator thesis is open to question. Both Nahum and Joel are consistent with Ziegler's first observation that the alleged translator of LXX-MP frequently established different Greek equivalents for the same Hebrew word both within and between books. For example, in Nahum 1:4 ἡμήριον is translated first as ἁλύγνη and then seven words later as ἐξελάφον. The translator of Joel is even more flexible in this regard. The verb ἔστη is rendered by καταφαίνων (1:4, 5x), γυριζόμενον (1:19, 2:3), κατεσθένων (2:5), and ἐστιν (2:26). Examples are easily multiplied:

The question, however, is not whether Ziegler has rightly observed a phenomenon common to the collected books of LXX-MP. Rather, discussion should revolve around the issue of whether Ziegler can use lexical flexibility to support his thesis (viz., that the same translator was responsible for the whole collection). Ziegler's first argument (that variation is grounded in the art of one translator rather than the presence of many translators) proves very little in the end. Very few, if any, translation units in the LXX display absolute consistency in their renderings of the Vorlage. The same Hebrew word receives different Greek translations within and among many books of the LXX; artistry in translation is characteristic of almost every translation unit in the LXX. To contend that any two (or twelve) units of translation are closely related merely because they both (or all) had an artful translator is not a strong argument. Carried to its logical extreme, Ziegler's first line of reasoning could even be used to prove that the entire LXX was translated by the same (very artful) translator.

Ziegler's second argument involves his observation that in LXX-MP the alleged sole translator showed a preference for certain Greek words. The equivalences Ziegler noted, however, are convincing only if they meet at least

---

5In Nahum, for instance, ἄρης translates both לָבָן and מִלָּה in the same verse (1:6). The Greek θύατρον stands for both לָבָן (1:2) and מִלָּה (1:3). Examples can also be multiplied from Joel, where, for example, ἐκβάλει is the equivalent of מָלַךְ (1:11, 19, 22), ἐβέθη (2:3), and מָלַךְ (2:22).
three criteria. First, the most convincing examples would involve equivalences which are unique to the translation units under investigation. Otherwise, it would be possible to construct any number of hypothetical relationships between translation units. If close inspection can demonstrate that a preferred equivalence among the Book of the Twelve exists in a LXX translation unit beyond MP, one might argue that the alleged translator of LXX-MP was responsible for that other unit as well. Strong examples must be distinctive. Second, examples of preferred Greek equivalents are stronger if they are the only ones utilized in the book(s) under consideration. Strong examples must be consistent. Third, alleged preferences for certain Greek equivalents are most convincing when they occur with enough regularity that a pattern of usage is evident both within and outside of the translation unit(s) under investigation. Strong examples must be frequent.

Of Ziegler's examples, none of the thirteen involving Nahum and/or Joel meets this triple criterion of distinctiveness, consistency, and frequency. In all thirteen, either the evidence is too broad, the equivalences are present elsewhere, or the sample is too small. These examples illustrate the deficiencies in Ziegler's selection:

1. (Ziegler's #6) διωκεων = γίγαν Αμ 6:13(12); Χαβ 2:2; Ηαγ 1:9; also καταδιωκεων = γίγαν Joel 2:4

   Although this equivalence appears according to Ziegler's citation, it is by no means consistent within MP. The translator's alleged preference for equating διωκεων and γίγαν does not hold since διωκεων is used to translate four other words in MP (γίγαν, Εσ 6:4; 12:1; Αμ 1:11; Ναχ 1:8; γίγαν Μικ 2:10; Σορ 2:16; γίγαν Ναχ 3:2). The evidence is too broad to substantiate a specific preferred equivalence used throughout MP; the alleged translator is inconsistent.

2. (Ziegler's #11) επιφονος = ρουμιον Εσ 2:11; 2:31 (3:4); Εαβ 1:7; Ζέφ 2:11; 3:2; Μαλ 1:14; 4:5 (3:23)
   (Ziegler's #13) ελαιβιεθαν = πολλ Ναχ 1:7; Ζέφ 3:12

   The value of these examples is decreased because they identify equivalences which are not distinctive to MP. Each equivalence occurs elsewhere in LXX. επιφονος = ρουμιον in Εσ 13:6 and 1 Ερον 17:21; ελαιβιεθαν = πολλ in Prov 24:28 (30:5); and δερος, δαραντ = ρουμιον in both pentateuchal and historical texts (Gen 35:17; Ex 14:13; 20:20; 1 Κερ 17:13). Since the preference for these equivalences is not unique to MP, we can suggest that the common usages Ziegler cites result from a general convention among LXX translators--not from the distinctive preferences of an alleged sole translator of MP.

3. (Ziegler's #10) εξαλεωδαι = διν(J) Μεικ 2:12;
   = γραμ Εοι 2:5 (Piel); = εν Ναχ 3:17; = ρουμι Hab 1:8

   This example is also problematic because it presents an equivalence that is not unique to MP. In it, however, Ziegler proposed that his alleged translator betrayed a different kind of preference by using the same rare Greek word to stand for three different (also generally unusual) Hebrew words. Ziegler's citation did not include the fact that εξαλεωδαι translates a fourth word (πολυτ) which occurs outside the Book of the Twelve (Iσα 55:12).

4. (Ziegler's #31) δραμα = χωδιον Ναχ 3:16; Εαβ 1:8 (ΜΤ unclear);
   = δραμα Εοσ 5:10; Αμ 1:11; ρουμιον Hab 3:8

   The problem of frequency plagues any discussion of LXX-MP. This example demonstrates that Ziegler's evidence sometimes involves rare words whose usage patterns are difficult to evaluate. δραμα occurs
The examples Ziegler used to support his third argument (that the translator of MP established unique translations for certain Hebrew words) suffer from similar shortcomings. Ziegler's evidence is comprised of words that are quite infrequent, words that have the same equivalences outside LXX-MP, and words that have multiple equivalents within the Book of the Twelve. These examples are only illustrative:

1. \( \text{άνουσίων} = \text{יִתְנָה} \) Joel 1:5; Hab 2:7, 19
   
   This alleged unique equivalence is not very convincing because it deals with rare words and because it appears beyond the corpus of LXX-MP. The Greek word \( \text{άνουσίων} \) appears only four times in LXX, standing each time for the Hebrew \( \text{יִתְנָה} \). Thus it is difficult to establish a pattern of usage unique to the translator of MP. Moreover, the same equivalence occurs in Genesis 9:24. This evidence, by an extension of Ziegler's logic, could be used to show that the alleged sole translator of LXX-MP was responsible for LXX-Genesis as well.

2. \( \text{ἀνάρπας} = \text{יְתַרְנָה} \) Am 5:9; Nah 3:12, 14; Hab 1:10
   
   This same equivalence occurs once in Daniel and twice in Lamentations. Further, in its only other occurrence in MP (Hos 10:14), \( \text{יְתַרְנָה} \) is translated by \( \text{περιτεχνημένα} \). The equation \( \text{ἀνάρπας} = \text{יְתַרְנָה} \) is neither unique to nor consistent within LXX-MP.

3. \( \text{ἀναρπασός} = \text{יַתָּרַנְתָּ} \) Hos 2:3(5); Joel 2:20; Zeph 2:13
   
   This word pair is by no means unique to LXX-MP. \( \text{ἀναρπασός} \) stands for \( \text{יַתָּרַנְתָּ} \) frequently and consistently in LXX-Psalms, LXX-Job, and LXX-Ezekiel.

---

6. To Ziegler's credit, this preference for translating words denoting anger with the root idea of \( \text{ἀφεία} \) (instead of the more expected \( \text{ὕπαιθριος} \)) seems to be unique to LXX-MP. The translation itself is, however, rare—only four times. It brings only one-third of the Dodecapropheten into discussion. However, this translational equivalent is by no means consistent within MP. The Hebrew word \( \text{יַתָּרַנְתָּ} \) is also translated by \( \text{וסכ} \) (Hos 13:11; Zeph 1:15, 18), and \( \text{יְתַרְנָה} \) receives two other translations (\( \text{טָהָה} \) Hos 2:5; 7:1, and \( \text{טָהָהש} \) Mic 2:8; 3:3).

---

The unity of the LXX minor prophets

The fact that this equivalence occurs consistently within LXX-MP means very little if the same equivalence occurs regularly in other units which have no translational relationship.

Ziegler's thesis thus becomes more difficult to substantiate when we scrutinize his arguments concerning lexical consistency. Perhaps Ziegler was aware of such difficulties, for he concluded his article with an argument which effectively dismantles any such criticism based on lexical inconsistencies within LXX-MP. Ziegler claimed that "Wenn sich trotz dieser einheitlichen Züge eine Reihe von abweichenden Wiedergaben finden, dann gibt die Beweglichkeit des Übersetzers die Erklärung für die Verschiedenheit in der Wiedergabe." (1934/35:15-16). But if that claim is true, it becomes impossible ever to advance an argument against the unity of LXX-MP. To say that a given translation unit is consistently inconsistent is to construct a no-lose situation; one can marshal both consistent and inconsistent usage patterns in an attempt to demonstrate a relationship between what might be genuinely disparate translation units. As Ziegler stated his case, demonstrating multiple translators on the basis of word usage is a logical impossibility.

The examples which Tov drew in his 1976 study are similarly flawed. Of the fourteen "unique" equivalences he cited from Nahum and/or Joel, twelve (\# 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 18, 22, 23, 33, 61, 62, 69) provide inconclusive proof either because they appear inconsistently within MP or because they occur outside
MP/Jer a'/Ezek—sometimes with equal frequency. For example, Tov noted the translation of הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס חֶנֶּפֶחֶרֶנֶפֶכֶרֶו, which occurs over 100 times in MP (and five times in Jer a' as well). However, what Tov did not note is also important. This equivalence is not widespread in MP, it is not unique to MP, and it is not consistently used in MP. Half of the MP occurrences are in Zechariah alone. The same rendering occurs eight times in the historical books. In Zephaniah 2:9 the Greek equivalent is κυρίος τῶν δυνάμεων.8 Tov's examples are weak by his own criteria of uniqueness. The problem appears again when Tov cites the equivalence ἡμιπεϊός = μεγιστάντες (Jer 14:3; Nah 2:6; Zech 11:2). ἡμιπεϊός occurs only one other time in MP (Nah 3:18), where it received the translation δινάμωσι.

Along with problems concerning consistency and uniqueness, the issue of frequency troubles Tov's examples. Over one-third of his exemplary "unique equivalences" consist of instances in which two or more unusual Hebrew words are rendered by the same (and usually appropriate) rare Greek word. Data involving such infrequent usage is difficult to evaluate; it fails to illuminate regular patterns of usage. If a word occurs only a very few times in LXX, the possibility exists that it was employed by several different translators, each of whom made an appropriate translation based on his understanding of various obscure Hebrew Vorlagen. We can illustrate this situation with a random example. The word τραπά occurs only twice in LXX. In Daniel 3:21, it stands for בַּשָּׁבְר, "cap" (a hapax legomenon); in Ezekiel 23:15, it stands for דְּנֵה, "flowing" (eight occurrences in MT). Using Tov's logic, one might advance the highly unlikely argument that LXX-Daniel and -Ezekiel were translated by the same hand.9 Tov's examples—and the logic that impelled him to select them—lack credibility.

8In Isaiah, הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס חֶנֶּפֶחֶרֶנֶפֶכֶרֶו is consistently rendered by this phrase.

9Tov noted in his book that he failed to find any evidence which might suggest that the same person did not translate Jeremiah a', Ezekiel, and MP. Several such pieces of negative evidence surfaced in the course of this study which might refute Tov's argument from silence:

a. The word הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס is rendered δινάμωσι consistently in Joel, while its seven occurrences in Ezekiel never receive that translation.

b. The word הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס is consistently and uniquely translated by δινάμωσι in Jeremiah a' and b', in distinction from all its uses in Ezekiel and MP. (Altogether, הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס occurs ten times in MP. It receives either δινάμωσι or δινάμωσι as its translational equivalent in all those occurrences.)

c. The consistent and unique translation of הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס in MP is δινάμωσי. The phrase appears seven times in Jeremiah, translated each time by δινάμωσי. The only translation in Ezekiel (it appears five times) is כִּפּוֹס חֶנֶּפֶחֶרֶנֶפֶכֶרֶו. Compare note 9 above.

d. In contrast to the five different Hebrew words δινάס in MP, the translator of Jeremiah used δινάס only to stand for הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס in every occurrence.

Tov handily relegates to a footnote the one instance he uncovered in which LXX-Jer differed significantly from Ezekiel and MP (note 23, p. 155, concerning the absence of הָּתָּן כִּפּוֹס in LXX-Jer).
LXX-Nahum and Joel share many translational characteristics. The translation of both books adheres closely to the word order of the Masoretic Text (MT). In both books, Greek words almost always share a 1:1 correspondence with their Hebrew equivalents. Neither book is given to paraphrase. Both books show a great deal of flexibility in translating verb forms, with a tendency toward creating participial constructions. They shift number, tense, voice, and mood as context allows or demands. Both translations use a similar variety of techniques in the process of defining equivalents for unusual Hebrew words.

In Nahum 1:3 the phrase ἐρωτήσας ἥξιν ἥξιν becomes in translation καλά θυσίαν οὐκ ἰδοῦνες; in contrast, the translator of Joel renders ἔστως ἢ ἤδης as ἔχετεν ἐκπομπήν (1:7). LXX-Joel offers multiple translations for even the simplest words, most of which receive consistently the same equivalent in LXX-Nahum.

155; one possible example occurs in Nahum 1:3 where ἤξιν ("whirlwind," 2x TNK) is translated αὐτόςκελπυ ("earthquake/hurricane," cf. Deut in Nah 3:2 and Joel 2:10).

But do these similarities justify the predominant conclusion that the same person or group translated both books? That question is difficult to address since most of the similarities between Nahum and Joel are quite general. However, significant differences in translation technique suggest that LXX-Nahum and Joel came from different hands:

(1) Lexical flexibility. We have already noted that LXX-Joel exhibits greater lexical flexibility than LXX-Nahum. The translator of LXX-Joel demonstrated his ability even by the way he dealt with the repetitive Hebrew construction of the infinitive absolute. While the translator of LXX-Nahum always translated infinitive absolutes stereotypically, LXX-Joel's translator consistently introduced some variation in his equivalences. For example, in Nahum 1:3 the phrase ἐρωτήσας ἥξιν ἥξιν becomes in translation καλά θυσίαν οὐκ ἰδοῦνες; in contrast, the translator of Joel renders ἔστως ἢ ἤδης as ἔχετεν ἐκπομπήν (1:7). LXX-Joel offers multiple translations for even the simplest words, most of which receive consistently the same equivalent in LXX-Nahum.
(2) Plusses. LXX-Joel contains five times more interpretative additions than LXX-Nahum. For example, Joel 1:5 embraces two LXX additions: εἴλοιπαν αὐτῶν and εὐφροσύνην καὶ χαρά. The first appears under Origen’s obelus. The second seems to result indirectly from the mistranslation of τοῖς ἀβιβαστέοις (= εὐφροσύνην καὶ χαρά, “joy and gladness”) as the missing object of his phrase ὁ τι εὕρηται ἐκ στάματος ὠμῶν.18 Interestingly enough, the added phrase appears only a few verses later in Joel 1:16 as the object of the same verb (λαμβάνει, niphhal).

Four other plusses in Joel also reflect constructions which appear in identical contexts elsewhere within both Masoretic and Septuagintal versions of that book: πάλιστε, 2:5 (cf. 2:2); μεγάλη, 2:11 (cf. 2:31 [3:4]); δ θεος ὠμῶν, 2:12 (cf. 2:13); πάντα, 3:4:4 (cf. same verse). In contrast, this phenomenon occurs only once in Nahum (πάντα, Nah 3:10; cf. same verse [2x]).

In terms of grammatical lexemes, we may also note a difference in pronoun usage between Nahum and Joel. LXX-Joel adds eleven pronouns not found in MT (including εκ, ἀπα, ἐς, εἰς, and ἐν); LXX-Nahum adds only two.19

(3) Word Usage. This study did not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the vocabulary shared by Nahum and Joel. In at least one instance, however, the two books establish patterns of equivalences which are quite suggestive.

18In MT, מַלְוָא עַל־לִּשְׁבָעָה is the proleptic subject of the phrase מַלְוָא עַל־לִּשְׁבָעָה לְכַל עַל־לִּשְׁבָעָה (“for it is cut off from your mouth”). The translator correctly rendered that phrase into Greek as διὰ τῆς ἐξήγερσίας ἐκ στάματος ὠμῶν (“for removed from your mouth are ...”). Unfortunately, the translator understood מַלְוָא עַל־לִּשְׁבָעָה as εἰς ὀμῶν (“to the point of drunkenness”) rather than the more accurate “on account of sweet wine.” Thus, the translation lacked a description of what had been removed from the mouth of the Ninevites.

19This reckoning does not count two “added” pronouns in Nahum which result from misreadings (εκ, Nah 2:1[2]; εκ, Nah 2:3[4]) or one which is a correct interpretation of he locale (ἐκ, Nah 1:9).

Multiple words for “flying insect” appear several times each in both Nahum and Joel. LXX-Joel consistently translates πτεροῦς for πτερόν and ἀκρίας for ἀκρίνω. On the other hand, LXX-Nahum is quite inconsistent in its equivalents (ἀκρίας = ἀκρίνω, ἀκρίνω, πτερόν; πτεροῦς = ἀκρίνω).

(4) Quality of translation. If LXX-Nahum generally translates the MT with which we are familiar, its translation is vastly inferior to LXX-Joel. Nahum contains 43 misreadings (vs. 13 for Joel), 11 misunderstandings of syntactical relationships (vs. 2 for Joel), and 7 misinterpretations of Hebrew poetic parallelism (vs. 1 for Joel). These statistics take on even more meaning given the relative lengths of Nahum and Joel: Joel is nearly twice as long as Nahum.20

Translation errors in LXX-Nahum fall into several categories. Sometimes the translator confused similar-looking letters (e.g. הַדָּו for מַדָּו, 1:6). In other places, the confusion seems to be more auditory (e.g. יְדִיב for יְדִיב, 3:12). There are problems with prefixes and suffixes (e.g. לָע for לָע, 2:1[2]). The translator posits the wrong root in several places (e.g. לְכַל for לְכַל, 1:12) and fails to capture the full range of meaning for several words (e.g. לָשׁוֹן hiphil ["take hold"] = κατακρατέω ["make stronger"], 3:14). In one instance, the translator divided the text incorrectly (יְּבַע לְךָ for יְּבַע לְךָ, 1:12).21

20Of course, one might dismiss many of the difficulties outlined in this section by arguing that LXX-Nahum is simply translating a poor text, or a text which varies appreciably from MT as preserved in BHS. In that case, blame lies with the translator’s faulty and/or variant manuscript and not with his sloppy technique or poor understanding of Hebrew. Even this large number of simple misreadings is easily explained by such logic. However, the translator’s consistent misunderstanding of Hebrew syntax and poetic form—problems almost unknown in LXX-Joel—surely reflect more on the translator’s (lack) of ability rather than the state of his Vorlage.

21Here is a catalogue of translation errors in Nahum:

- graphic confusion—1:6; 1:8; 1:12; 2:3[4]; 3:17
- auditory confusion—2:1[2]; 3:12; 3:17
- root confusion—1:9; 1:12; 2:1[2]; 2:3[4]; 2:7[8]; 3:17
- faulty word division—1:2
- failure to capture semantic range—1:12; 1:14; 2:2[3]; 2:7[8] [2x]; 3:3; 3:18
The translator of Nahum frequently misunderstood the syntax of Hebrew sentences with which he was working. He ignored the basic sentence structure and thought division of the Vorlage, rearranging modifiers, shifting clauses, and confusing parts of speech. Compare Nahum 3:6, where the Hebrew verb לְשׂון becomes the Greek adverbial phrase τὰς ἐκαθορίσας σου. 22 Nahum's translator was also generally insensitive to the mechanics of Hebrew verse. He commonly ignored the parallel structure of his Vorlage, generally recasting the book as prose. That insensitivity manifests itself clearly in Nahum 2:3-4(4-5). The intricately parallel Hebrew stichs

בכום פלאודות חרב ביִם הָבֹּקָן
הָרָעָה יָדָיו

וּסְדָדָא יָדוֹ לָבָא

In a flash of fire (go) chariots on the day of their mustering,
and the horses they make tremble.
In the streets the chariots go madly;
They run about wildly in the squares.

appear in Greek as:

... εἰς πυρί, οἱ ήνεκα τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐπαραλλος αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐπηεῖες ἑκατορδιήσουνται ἐν ταὐς ὀδοῖς. Καὶ συγκυθήσουνται τὰ ἁρματα καὶ συμπλακησουνται ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις

[they have destroyed... their mighty men sporting] with fire, the reigns of their chariots on the day of preparation, and the confused horesmen in the way. And the chariots will clash together and be entangled in the broad ways.

The translator of Joel made significantly fewer mistakes in these four categories, leaving us a Greek text far more accurate than LXX-Nahum. 24

We may conclude by reviewing this study's main findings. Scholars seem to begin by assuming that one person translated the entire Book of the Twelve into Greek. They support that assumption with arguments that are flawed in logic or unsupported by textual evidence. The problematic nature of their assumption is further illustrated by a careful analysis of LXX-Nahum and Joel. This analysis reveals important differences in translational character which make it difficult for us to assume that a single translator was responsible for both books. From that point we might go on to extrapolate the existence of significant differences among the Septuagint translations of other books in the corpus of MP.

In light of these facts, the uncritical assumption of translational unity within the collection which comprises the twelve minor prophets must be rejected. The methodological grounds for making judgments about the relationships between and among the books of LXX-MP must be reassessed. More detailed study of the subject is necessary before sweeping theoretical assumptions are made. Some evidence is contradictory; perhaps a quite complicated redactional history may emerge for the Septuagint translations of the Minor Prophets. At the very least, it becomes apparent that the question of the

22 Other problem verses include Nahum 1:4, 11, 12, 15 (2:1); 2:2(3), 7(8) (2x), 10(11) (2x); 3:6.

23 Reading with LXX (οἱ ἐπηεῖες), and Samaritan Pentateuch. Graphic confusion between δ and γ during the transmission of the Hebrew text is likely.

24 For other examples of this desperate (and mistaken) attempt by the translator to make sense of his source text, see Nahum 1:15 (2:1); 2:3(4), 4(5); 3:3, 4, 9, 10.
unity of the Minor Prophets in the Septuagint is still open. To argue otherwise is to be guilty of a serious oversimplification.
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