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PROGRAM FOR THE IOSCS MEETING
IN DENVER, NOVEMBER 17–20, 2001

Sunday, November 18, 2001
9:00 – 11:30 a.m.
Robert A. Kraft, University of Pennsylvania, Presiding
Georg Walser, University of Lund
   Word Order and Clause Structure in the Greek Bible
Tim McLay, St. Stephen’s University
   Beyond the Use of the Septuagint in Text-Critical Research
R. Glenn Wooden, Acadia Divinity College
   The Recontextualization of Daniel 1 in the Old Greek
Benjamin G. Wright, Lehigh University
   Why a Prologue? Ben Sira’s Grandson and His Greek Translation

Joint Session:
   International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate
   Studies / Biblical Lexicography Section

Sunday, November 18, 2001
4:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.
Erik Eynikel, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Presiding
   Theme: Greek Lexicography and Language
Bernard A. Taylor, Loma Linda University
   Voice and Lexicography
Randall Buth, Jerusalem
   User Perception and Greek Lexicography
Cameron Boyd-Taylor, University of Toronto
   It’s All Greek to Me! Linguistic Register and Septuagintal Lexicography
Dirk Büchner, University of Durban-Westville

_The Translational and Grammatical Variation in LXX Leviticus in the Light of the Rest of the Pentateuch_

Hong Bom Kim, University of Sheffield

_The Interpretation of Malista in 1 Timothy 5:17_
Business Meeting

Business Meeting in Basel, August 3, 2001

Executive Committee Members Attending:


1. Minutes: Sets of minutes, including those from the business meeting in Nashville (November 2000) and subsequent e-mail meetings, were reviewed. Pietersma moved and Tov seconded their acceptance. Approved.

2. Thanks: Muraoka expressed thanks for the work of the treasurer / recording secretary.

3. IOSCS Congress Proceedings: Seppo Sipilä was nominated as editor of the Basel Congress Proceedings. He subsequently accepted the appointment. It was also agreed that, since SBL is the publisher, SBL formatting guidelines should be used in submissions to this volume.

4. Associate Treasurer: van der Kooij announced that he will discontinue collecting dues from European members once the agreement with Eisenbrauns is finalized (see following item).

5. Publication of the IOSCS Bulletin: An agreement in principle has been reached for Eisenbrauns to publish the Bulletin beginning in 2001 (volume 34), following the signing of the contract. Matters pertaining to electronic publication are still being worked out in discussions with Eisenbrauns.

6. New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) Report: Pietersma reported that the NETS Psalms fascicle was published by Oxford University Press in November 2000. An IOSCS proposal regarding the preparation of a fascicle containing the Romances (Ruth, Esther, Judith, Susannah, and Tobit) was still being considered by Oxford. This publisher, however, is only obligated by contract to produce one fascicle (Psalms) in addition to the entire NETS volume. With regard to the Septuagint commentary series, it was reported that Oxford New York is not interested in this project but that we are awaiting word from Oxford U.K. regarding its interest. If there is none from that quarter, we can go elsewhere without any difficulty, since the IOSCS holds the rights to use the NETS version in a commentary series.
7. Hexapla Project: Peter Gentry is proposing that the Hexapla Project be brought under the auspices of the IOSCS. Discussion regarding this possibility will continue.

8. Website: Jay Treat is the webmaster for the IOSCS website. This should be announced in the *Bulletin*.


10. Strasbourg Septuagint Conference: Joosten announced that a conference will be held November 8–9, 2002 in Strasbourg.


13. Thanks: Tov moved that the executive committee thank the president for his work. Approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. V. Hiebert

Recording Secretary (pro tem)
## Treasurer’s Report

### International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

**TREASURER’S REPORT**  
**U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNTS**  
**JULY 1, 2001 – JUNE 30, 2002**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/01</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>4,968.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/01</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4/01</td>
<td>Deposit: Transfer of Cdn $1400.00</td>
<td>913.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/01</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>645.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/01</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/01</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>356.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>577.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/01</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>Refund service fee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>532.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/01</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>350.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/01</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/02</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/02</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/02</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/02</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>794.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/02</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/02</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/02</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/02</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/02</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>389.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/02</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,535.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/14/01</td>
<td>Postage costs incurred by IOSCS secretary</td>
<td>113.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/01</td>
<td>Publication and mailing of <em>BIOSCS 33</em></td>
<td>2,763.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/01</td>
<td>IOSCS/IOSOT conference costs [Basel]</td>
<td>506.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/01</td>
<td>Service fee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/02</td>
<td>LXX essay prize to Jannes Smith</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4/17/02 (Reimbursement of subscription overpayment: Westminster Sem., CA) 9.00

Total 3,642.43

BALANCE 6/30/02 6,861.61

SUMMARY

BALANCE 7/1/01 4,968.84

7/1/01 – 6/30/02 Credits +5,535.20

Total 10,504.04

7/1/01 – 6/30/02 Debits –3,642.43

Total 6,861.61

6/30/02 BALANCE 6,861.61

Account No. 9550519—Farmers State Bank, Warsaw, IN

CREDITS

5/23/02 0.12
5/23/02 0.20

6/30/02 BALANCE 0.32

Respectfully submitted: Audited:
Robert J. V. Hiebert Bruce Guenther
IOSCS Treasurer Associated Canadian Theological Schools

Treasurer’s Report—Canadian Dollar Account
July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2002

Account No. 8082–010—Bank of Montreal, Mississauga, ON

BALANCE 7/1/01 1,525.81

CREDITS

7/31/01 (Deposit) 25.00
7/31/01 (Deposit) 20.00
7/31/01 (Interest) 0.03
8/31/01 (Interest) 0.01
9/28/01 (Interest) 0.01
10/16/01 (Deposit) 67.00
10/16/01 (Deposit) 27.00
10/16/01 (Deposit) 16.00
10/31/01 (Interest) 0.01
11/6/01 (Deposit) 15.73
Treasurer’s Report

11/20/01 (Deposit) 7.87
11/30/01 (Interest) 0.01
12/31/01 (Interest) 0.01
1/31/02 (Interest) 0.01
2/28/02 (Interest) 0.01
3/28/02 (Interest) 0.01
4/30/02 (Interest) 0.01
5/31/02 (Interest) 0.01
6/28/02 (Interest) 0.01

Total 178.74

CREDITS
7/5/01 (Transfer to U.S. dollar account 4507919 [= US $913.90]) 1,400.00

Total 1,400.00

BALANCE 6/30/02 304.55

SUMMARY
BALANCE 7/1/01 1,525.81
7/1/01 – 6/30/02 Credits +178.74
Total 1,704.55
1,704.55
7/1/01 – 6/30/02 Debits –1,400.00
Total 304.55
304.55
6/30/02 BALANCE 304.55

IOSCS PETTY CASH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>6/30/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted: Audited:
Robert J. V. Hiebert Bruce Guenther
IOSCS Treasurer Associated Canadian Theological Schools
NEWS AND NOTES

A New Look

It will be obvious to readers of the Bulletin that our publication has taken on a bold, new look. This is due to the transferral of the Bulletin’s publication to Eisenbrauns, Inc., a renowned publisher of biblical and ancient Near Eastern materials, located in Winona Lake, Indiana, U.S.A. We hope that our new face will encourage an even further rise in the already high quality of the Bulletin, with more submissions from senior scholars and international scholars. Subscription information may be found on the inside back cover of this issue. The new e-mail address for subscriptions is: bioscs@eisenbrauns.com.

Call for Papers

The heart of the Bulletin is the articles published in each issue. Please consider submitting, and encouraging your students to submit, articles, papers read at conferences, critical notes, and so forth. Essays read at annual meetings of the IOSCS are especially appropriate.

Books and Book Reviews

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

Essay Prize Competition

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is offering an annual prize of $250 to be awarded to an outstanding paper in the field of Septuagint Studies. This field is construed broadly, and a paper may focus on any aspect of the study of the Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures. The IOSCS wants to encourage the study of these translations by younger scholars, and eligibility is thus limited to advanced graduate students or recent Ph.D. recipients (3 years or less after receiving the degree). The papers will be judged by a committee composed of IOSCS members, and papers receiving prizes will be published in the following BIOSCS. Depending on its assessments of the papers submitted, the committee may decide not to award
the prize in any given year. The deadline for submission is August 31 of each year. Papers should be sent to Prof. Tim McLay, St. Stephen’s University, St. Stephen, NB E3L 3E2 Canada, tmclay@ssu.ca.

NETS Project Update

The New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) has recently experienced an upsurge in the submission of translations. The editors now have almost two-thirds of the translations in hand. We expect several more quite soon. NETS had made a proposal to Oxford University Press (OUP) for a volume of the biblical romances with an introduction by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. Unfortunately, OUP decided that market factors would not make such a volume feasible. OUP has, however, encouraged NETS to submit a collection of the books of the Pentateuch, which we want to send to press as soon as possible. We continue to push toward the final goal of having the entire corpus finished and off to OUP.

Several NETS translators attended a conference on the Septuagint held at Bangor Theological Seminary in early September 2002. There we had an opportunity to exchange views with German colleagues who are pursuing their own translation project. A volume of essays from the conference is in preparation and will contain contributions from Albert Pietersma (co-editor and translator of Psalms), Benjamin Wright (co-editor and translator of Psalms), Cameron Boyd-Taylor (Judith, 3 Maccabees), Robert Hiebert (Genesis), Karen Jobes (Esther), and Glenn Wooden (1 and 2 Esdras).

For NETS: Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright

New Publications in Septuagint Studies

Several new books and journals have been received or announced that will be of interest to readers of the Bulletin.

1. Frank Polak and Galen Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint. Part I: Introduction* (CATSS Basic Tools 4; Stellenbosch, 2002). Pp. xiv + 93. *Part II: The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 5; Stellenbosch, 2002). Pp. xviii + 414. These hefty (8” × 11.5”) volumes build on the database compiled by the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS) project and serve as a first step in classifying and presenting the various types of variants present in the biblical text. “Our work at the Hebrew University Bible Project made us acutely aware of the need for a comprehensive, systematic tool for putting the mass of individual variants into a whole picture” (Part I, p. vii). Part I lays out the background and methodology for the “minuses” project as a whole, while Part II comprises minute analyses of each of the “minuses” in the Septuagint version of each book of the Pentateuch in
turn, focusing for each book on (1) Words, Phrases and Clauses, (2) Syntactic and Stylistic Functions, (3) Scribe and Translator, and 4) Relationship to Other Text Forms. Needless to say, these volumes will constitute a tremendous boon for advanced scholars working on these corpora.


3. A new issue of Reseña Bíblica: Historia del texto bíblico (nº 31, otoño 2001; Editorial Verbo Divino), coordinated by Maria Victoria SPOTTORNO, is designed to provide an overview of current research on the history of the biblical text. It features five articles of interest to Septuagint scholars: (1) “El texto hebreo del Antiguo Testamento,” by Emilia FERNÁNDEZ TEJERO (pp. 5–14); (2) “La primera traducción de la Biblia,” by Natalio FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS (15–24); (3) “El texto del Nuevo Testamento,” by Maria Victoria SPOTTORNO (25–34); (4) “De Oriente a Occidente: Las versions latinas de la Biblia,” by José Manuel CAÑAS REÍLLO (35–42); and (5) “Las versiones antiguas de la Biblia,” by Maria Victoria SPOTTORNO (43–51).


Details on the contents of several of these books appear in the “Varia” section of this issue.

A New Work on Armenian Culture Features Biblical MSS

By Mayaan Jaffe. Reprinted with permission from The Jerusalem Post, December 10, 2002.

Seven kilograms of Armenian art, history, and culture lay prominently on the table at the front of the Hebrew University lecture hall. A sea of men clad in the traditional black robes and pointed hoods of the Armenian Patriarchate,
intermingled with rows of scholars in suits and ties, sat with gaping mouths, waiting for the jewel to be revealed.

After twelve years of dedicated research and hard work, the Hebrew University’s Gail Levin de Nur Professor of Religion and Armenian Studies Program director Michael E. Stone presented the Album of Armenian Paleography, a work of art and academia, for which he served as editor-in-chief.

The celebration on December 8 included lectures on the correlation between Jewish and Armenian history, and Armenian writing and art by senior university and Armenian dignitaries. But the jewel of the evening was what Prof. Malachi Beit-Arie, director of the Hebrew Paleography Project of the Israel Academy of Sciences and one of the world’s most distinguished experts on Hebrew manuscripts, called “the exquisitely designed [album], which is not only appealing to scholars, but is a deluxe coffee table book.”

The event was honored by the presence of his His Beatitude Torkom Manoogian, the 96th Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem.

His Beatitude entered deliberately with his staff and clergy just behind, like a rabbi being greeted by his Hasidim. When his grandfatherly eyes met Stone’s the two of them chuckled and embraced.

Co-edited by Prof. Dickran Kouymjian at California State University, Fresno, and Prof. Henning Lehmann of the University of Aarhus in Denmark, the Album illustrates the history of the development of Armenian writing from the earliest dated codicils of the ninth century to the cursive script of the 19th century. Its more than 200 magnificent, full-color plates of carefully selected manuscript pages are accompanied by computer-generated tables, showing the changes in the letter shapes over the centuries. In addition, each entry has a bibliography of important earlier paleographic literature on the manuscript, and comments on important features.

“I think today we are witness to the presentation of possibly [Stone’s] greatest gift to the tools of scholarship in the field, and most definitely to the particular study of Armenian paleography, of which this album is and will continue to be the cornerstone,” said visiting lecturer Dr. Sergio La Porta.

The work’s richly illustrated introductory chapters vividly trace the history of the study of Armenian script and its development.

While the Album will form an objective basis for all future studies of Armenian manuscripts and is clearly a poignant depiction of the depth and brilliance of Armenian poetry, art, and culture, its completion attests to the strong ties between Hebrew University and the Armenians in Jerusalem that Stone has aimed to cultivate over the past 30 years.
In his address, Hebrew University Rector, Prof. Haim Rabinovich, explained that Armenians have been living in Jerusalem for more than 1,000 years, and the relationship Stone has fostered since 1969 has built an unprecedented bridge between Jews and Armenians. He cited the Armenians’ fight for independence, dispersion, exile, and genocide as parallel to historical events of the Jewish people.

La Porta outlined the history of Armenian writing, explaining that it was first formulated by Saint Mesrop Mashtots to facilitate translation of the Bible. Proverbs was the first book translated.

“From the very beginning Armenians held their alphabet in great esteem. In a famous passage, Korwin [the biographer of the inventor of the Armenian alphabet] . . . compares Mesrop Mashtots to Moses, calling him a second Moses,” said La Porta.

Stone has dedicated a significant portion of his life to Armenian letters, whether they are situated on rock faces in the Sinai or in manuscripts housed in Yerevan or Jerusalem.

“If Mesrop Mashtots was a second Moses who brought the law to his people,” La Porta said, “then I feel certain in saying that in our generation Prof. Stone is a second Daniel, for he has shown us the handwriting on the wall.”

Hexapla Institute Established

A new institute for the study of the Hexapla has been established at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

Executive Board: Daniel I. Block (Southern), Peter J. Gentry (pgentry@sbts.edu) (Southern), Alison Salvesen (Oxford), Bas ter Haar Romeny (Leiden).

Advisory Board: Detlef Fraenkel (Septuaginta-Unternehmen, Göttingen), Johan Lust (Leuven; President IOSCS), Arie van der Kooij (Leiden; President IOSOT), Gerard Norton (Birmingham; initiator Hexapla Working Group).

Research Fellow: Leonard Smith.

History:

At the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, held at Oxford in 1994, all agreed that a new collection of Hexapla fragments was a desideratum. Gerard Norton reported on this Seminar and the plans made there at the 1995 IOSCS Congress,¹ and a volume comprising the papers presented at the Seminar was

published, edited by Alison Salvesen: *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments.* At the 1998 IOSCS Congress, Bas ter Haar Romeny reported on the work he and Peter Gentry had done on Genesis. Because it took some time before this paper was published, it may have seemed that the vision for a new edition of Origen’s Hexapla had died. Fortunately, the original vision of L. Greenspoon, G. Norton, and A. Salvesen is being carried forward.

The difficulties we have had over the past years were of a practical nature: those who were working on the Hexapla project had to do so in addition to other assignments. They also had to secure their own positions, and there was no institutional backing. We are grateful that the situation at this moment has very much improved, for us personally, as well as for the project. During the fall of 2000, Bas Romeny came to Southern Seminary to give some lectures on textual criticism. When the Associate Dean, Dr. Daniel Block, heard of the desire that we had to keep the Hexapla Project alive, he brought our concerns to the Dean at Southern Seminary. As a result, Peter Gentry was given a grant of about $35,000 to set up a web site there for the preliminary database. This includes about $10,000 for computer equipment and $25,000 for a research fellow with skills in computer and biblical studies to set up the web site over a five-year period, beginning this year. This research fellow has recently been appointed; his name is Leonard Smith. Peter Gentry will also have a number of Ph.D. students working on this project. Finally, the continuity of the project appears to be secure.

In July of 2001, Peter and Bas met in Leiden with Arie van der Kooij, now President of IOSOT, and Konrad Jenner of the Peshitta Institute. We were encouraged about envisioning a kind of Hexapla Institute. To give direction to the institute we would need an executive board and an advisory board. In the beginning, since funding had come from Southern Seminary, it was suggested that we have an executive board of four people, two from Southern and two from elsewhere. For Southern Seminary these are Daniel Block and Peter Gentry. Since the institute will cooperate closely with Leiden University, Bas Romeny was appointed to the board as well. The three of us were joined by


Alison Salvesen from Oxford. She was one of the initiators of the project, and Bas and Peter have kept in touch with her over the intervening years.

As an advisory board, the following have agreed to provide input: Arie van der Kooij (mentioned previously), Johan Lust (as President of IOSCS), Detlef Frankel (for the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, and also because he is a great expert in catena materials), and Gerard Norton (who was among the initiators of the Hexapla Project, and also because of his expertise and leadership in Hexapla and hexaplaric research).

Scholars who were assigned books by the original Hexapla Working Group of the Oxford Rich Seminar will be given opportunity to affirm continuing commitment to the project. The largest part of the work has yet to be assigned.

Partnership with IOSCS:

We who seek to keep the goal of “A Field for the 21st Century” believe that our aims would be best served by cooperation and partnership with The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. The mechanism for cooperation with IOSCS has been entitled The Hexapla Project. This cooperation will assist excellent scholars in joining the project. The following motion was passed following the annual meeting of the IOSCS in Toronto, 2002:

Hexapla Project Proposal:

Considering that

A Hexapla Institute was established this year (2002) at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville, Kentucky, in cooperation with the Universities of Leiden and Oxford, having as its chief aim the publication of a new edition of the fragments of Origen’s Hexapla (“A Field for the 21st Century”)

and that

the current executive board of the Institute believes it important that it operate in partnership with, and that The Hexapla Project be under the auspices of, the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

we, the undersigned,

move that the Hexapla Project be sponsored by the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies under article 21 of the IOSCS Bylaws, and that it be carried out by the Hexapla Institute on behalf of the IOSCS.
Signed

Peter J. Gentry
Bas Romeny
November 24, 2002
Toronto

The Editorial Committee overseeing the Hexapla Project and operating under IOSCS will consist of Peter Gentry, Bas Romeny, and Alison Salvesen.

We invite anyone interested in participating in the Hexapla Project to contact anyone on the Editorial Committee.
Conference on the Septuagint Held

UNIVERSITÀ CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE

Dipartimento di Scienze Religiose
SEPTUAGINTA
Libri sacri della diaspora giudaica e dei cristiani
V Giornata di studio
Dall’Egitto alla terra di Canaan: storie di eroi e di profeti
7 Maggio 2003

Milano, Largo A. Gemelli, 1
Cripta Aula Magna

ore 10,00    Saluto del Direttore del Dipartimento di Scienze Religiose
            Prof. A. Acerbi.

ore 10,15    G. Borgonovo
            Pentateuco, Tetratetueco, Esateuco; problemi di canone e di
            ermeneutica nel rapporto tra la Tôrâ e i profeti anteriori

ore 11,15    A. Rofé
            Testo ebraico e traduzione greca dei libri di Giosuè e dei
            Giudici: storia letteraria e testuale: Qumran, LXX, TM

ore 15,30    L. Troiani
            La storia della conquista della terra di Canaan nella
            tradizione storica ellenistica

ore 16,30    A. Passoni Dell’Acqua
            Il cantico di Deborah dai campi di battaglia alla sinagoga:
            problemi di traduzione di un antico brano biblico

La V Giornata di studio sulla versione dei LXX si ricollega alla precedente,
tenutasi il 10 maggio 2001, per far scorrere l’attenzione dal nucleo originario
della traduzione, il Pentateuco, ai due libri che nelle varie forme del canone
biblico si trovano in immediata successione: Giosuè e Giudici. Tali libri sono
Varia

considerati *storici* in ambito cristiano, ma *profetici* in ambito giudaico: ecco perché occorre partire da una riflessione preliminare sull’assetto e sulla concezione ermeneutica che stanno alla base di tale classificazione.

D’altro canto la traduzione greca di questi libri, da ricondurre, sembra, alla metà del II sec. a.C., pone nuovi problemi rispetto a quella del Pentateuco: è lecito supporre una tradizione non più monolitica in campo ebraico, se la tradizione greca ci appare bipartita.

I nuovi libri spostano anche l’attenzione da Mosè, a cui la tradizione giudaica attribuisce il Pentateuco, ad altri eroi ed eroine protagonisti della “conquista” della terra promessa e delle prime vicende politiche della storia dell’Israele libero. Figure che saranno poi emblematiche del passato glorioso, o letto come tale, del popolo ebraico, tanto da conferire loro lo *status* di profeti. Ecco perché sarà interessante osservare quale lettura degli avvenimenti facciano, posti a confronto, i traduttori greci e lo storico per eccellenza della storia d’Israele, Giuseppe Flavio.

L’asse si sposta dall’Egitto alla Palestina a vari livelli: *geografico*, con l’esodo dall’Egitto e l’entra alla terra di Canaan; *storico*, con il passaggio dalla schiavitù nella terra di Faraone alla libertà nella terra promessa; *istituzionale* con l’inizio della vita politica e le esigenze di un’organizzazione amministrativa; *religioso* a confronto con una concezione religiosa ed un *pantheon* diversi da quello egiziano, quali erano quelli di ambiente “fenicio” della zona siropalestinese. Infine anche *culturale*: Israele, inserito nel tessuto siropalestinese di una terra di passaggio contesa tra le grandi potenze dell’Antico Vicino Oriente è sempre stato coinvolto nelle loro vicende, gravitando ora nell’area orientale degli imperi assiro e babilonese prima e del regno seleucidico poi, ora in quella più occidentale del dominio egiziano in età faraonica e tolemaica (sotto cui si ha la versione dei LXX). Parimenti, da Alessandria d’Egitto, luogo di inizio della traduzione in greco dei libri biblici e della versione di quello dei Giudici e, forse, di Giosuè, si passa alla Palestina romana di Giuseppe.

**Old Latin Versions of the Bible (Vetus Latina)**

Beginning in the 1940s, under the direction of Dr. Bonifatius Fischer, the Vetus Latina Institut in Beuron, Germany devoted itself to producing new editions of the Old Latin (i.e., pre-Hieronymian or mainly independent of the Vulgate) Bible. These editions would replace the monumental, eighteenth-century edition of Pierre Sabatier, which had been rendered obsolete by new scholarship. Under the leadership of Fischer, Hermann Josef Frede, and now Roger Gryson, the Vetus Latina Institut has become a major force in biblical,
text-critical scholarship, although the amount of material to be covered remains daunting. Following is a synopsis of its progress to date in the areas of Jewish scriptures and apocrypha, drawn from the Institut’s 2001 prospectus.

**VETUS LATINA**

Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel
nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt
und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron

**Gliederung des Gesamtwerkes**

Textausgabe

Band
1: Verzeichnis der Sigel
2: Genesis
3: Exodus, Leviticus
4: Numeri, Deuteronomium, Josue, Judicum, Ruth
5: 1–4 Regum
6: 1–2 Paralipomenon, Esdras, Nehemias, 3–4 Esdras
7: Tobit, Judith, Esther
8: Job
9: Psalmi (5 Teilbände)
10/1: Proverbia
10/2: Ecclesiastes
10/3: Canticum Canticorum
11/1: Sapientia
11/2: Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)
12/2: Isaias 1–39
12/11: Isaias 40–66
13: Jeremias (mit Lamentationes, Baruch), Ezechiel
14: Daniel, 12 Prophetae
15: 1–2 Macchabaeorum

**Grundlagen und Quellen**

Band 1: Bonifatius Fischer, Verzeichnis der Sigel für Handschriften
and Kirchenschriftsteller (104 Seiten) *vergriffen* 1949

Band 1/1: Hermann Josef Frede, Kirchenschriftsteller, Verzeichnis und
Sigel. Repertorium scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum
saeculo nono antiquiorum siglis adpositis quae in editione
Bibliorum Sacrorum iuxta veterem latinam versionem adhibentur 4. aktualisierte Auflage (Oktavformat, 1049 Seiten, gebunden) 1995
Aktualisierungsheft 1999 – Mise à jour 1999, par Roger Gryson (Oktavformat, 136 Seiten) 1999

Band 1/2  Roger Gryson, Altlateinische Handschriften / Manuscrits vieux latins. Première partie: Mss 1–275 (d’après un manuscrit inachevé dé Hermann Josef Frede) (Oktavformat, 381 Seiten, gebunden) 1999

**ALTES TESTAMENT**

Band 2: Genesis, hrsg. von Bonifatius Fischer
1. Lfg. Einleitung und Gn 1,1–9, 14 (170 Seiten) vergriffen 1951
2. Lfg. Gn 9, 14–27,23 (160 Seiten) 1952
3. Lfg. Gn 27,23–43,22 (160 Seiten) vergriffen 1953
4. Lfg. Gn 43,22 bis Schluß; Nachträge, Register (132 Seiten) 1954

Band 6/2: Esr, wird vorbereitet von Placidus Kuhlkamp

Band 7/1: Tobit, wird vorbereitet von Jean-Marie Auwers

Band 7/2: Judith, hrsg. von Pierre-Maurice Bogaert
Fasc. 1 Introduction 2001

Band 7/3: Esther, wird vorbereitet von Jean-Claude Haelewyck

Band 10/3: Canticum Canticorum, hrsg. von Eva Schulz-Flügel
1. Lfg. Einleitung 1992
2. Lfg. Einleitung (Fortsetzung und Schluß) In Vorbereitung

Band 11/1: Sapientia Salomonis, hrsg. von Walter Thiele
1. Lfg. Einleitung 1977
2. Lfg. Einleitung (Fortsetzung) 1977
3. Lfg. Einleitung (Schluß) 1979
4. Lfg. Sap 1,1–5,3 1980
5. Lfg. Sap 5,3–8,8 1981
6. Lfg. Sap 8,8–13,1 1983
7. Lfg. Sap 13,1–18,18 1984
8. Lfg. Sap 18,18 bis Schluß; Nachträge, Register (38 Seiten) 1985

Band 11/2: Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), hrsg. von Walter Thiele
1. Lfg. Einleitung 1987
2. Lfg. Einleitung (SchluB) 1988
5. Lfg. Sir 7,30–11,35 1993

Band 12: Esaias, ed. Roger Gryson
Pars I: Introduction générale; Esaias 1,1–39,8; Appendice
Fasc. 1 Introduction et Is 1,1–22 1987
Fasc. 2 Is 1,22–5,7 1987
Fasc. 3 Is 5,8–7,14 1988
Fasc. 4 Is 7,14–10,19 1989
Fasc. 5 Is 10,20–14,13 1990
Fasc. 6 Is 14,13–22,5 1991
Fasc. 7 Is 22,5–26,20 1991
Fasc. 8 Is 26,20–30,15 1991
Fasc. 9 Is 30,15–35,5 1993
Fasc. 10 Is 35,3–39,9; Appendice: Un agraphon apparenté à Isaïe 31,9 1993

Pars II: Esaias 40,1–66,24; Conclusion: Histoire du texte; Compléments, Tables
Fasc. 1 Introduction: Les manuscrits 1993
Fasc. 2 Introduction: Les manuscrits (suite et fin); Is 40,1–41,20 1994
Fasc. 3 Is 41,21–44,4 1994
Fasc. 4 Is 44,5–46,13 1995
Fasc. 5 Is 46,13–50,3 1995
Fasc. 6 Is 50,4–53,3 1996
Fasc. 7 Is 53,3–54,17 1996
Fasc. 8 Is 54,17–58,8 1996
Fasc. 9 Is 58,8–61,10 1997
Fasc. 10 Is 61,10–65,23 1997
Fasc. 11 Is 65,23–fin; Conclusion: Histoire du texte; Compléments, Tables 1997
New Books on the Septuagint

Several significant, comprehensive new books on the Septuagint have appeared during the past year.
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La Septante en France


La Bible d’Alexandrie:

Volumes parus:


Autres publications:


Thèses soutenues:


Thèses en préparation:

BOUET, Florence. Les Cantiques des degrés de la Bible grecque des Septante (Ps 119–133); traduction et annotation, sous la direction de G. Dorival, Université d’Aix-en-Provence.

MANGIN, Dominique. Recherches sur la Septante de Job, sous la direction de G. Dorival, Université d’Aix-en-Provence.

Septuagint Studies (outside of France)


FINCKE, Andrew. (1) I am collating Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, El texto Antioqueno de la biblia griega: I 1–2 Samuel for The Samuel Scroll from Qumran: 4QSam⁴, Brill 2001, corrected and expanded version with translation and transcriptions into Hebrew computer letters of all the restorations. All the apparatus is corrected on the basis of FM-BS compared with Brooke-McLean’s critical edition and Taylor’s edition of the Lucianic text
of 1 Samuel, based on B-M. Both Taylor’s book and FM-BS came out in 1989; B-M in 1927.


YOUNGBLOOD, Kevin J. I am working on a dissertation on the translation technique of the Greek Lamentations in which I conduct a comprehensive, sy-
tematic analysis of the translator’s approach to both the lexical and structural aspects of rendering his Hebrew parent text into Greek. The results of the analysis should clarify OG Lamentations’ place in the transmission history of the Septuagint. The project is under the supervision of Peter J. Gentry for completion of the Ph.D. in Old Testament Language and Literature at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky.
In Memoriam Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen

The grand old man of Finnish Septuagint studies, Professor Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, died in Helsinki on 5th October, 2002, at the age of 85. He was born in Helsinki on 4th June, 1917.

A shadow was cast over his childhood by the stormy period of disputes and discord preceding the Finnish declaration of independence in 1917. During these tumultuous days his grandfather, Eliel Johnsson, later raised to the nobility as Soisalon-Soininen, held a prominent position as a civil servant in the Finnish Senate, then as procurator in the years 1901–5. He supported a policy of compliance with Russia, but this kind of patriotism was not readily understood by his countrymen at a time of fervent nationalism and fierce opposition toward Russia. This led to his being murdered in 1905. Following this incident the grandfather was no longer mentioned in the family. It was only in the 1980s and 1990s that Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen became reconciled to his family’s past. He carefully studied the historical documents and his grandfather’s correspondence and diaries and finally came to understand his grandfather’s policy of compliance, which was not at all shameful. It was typical of Soisalon-Soininen that he wanted to go to the roots and sources and form his own opinion. His forebears had for several generations been learned, well-educated men and women.

Soisalon-Soininen began his university education in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Helsinki, but the Winter War (1939–40) and the Continuation War (1941–44) made it difficult for him to concentrate on his studies. As it was, he took his first degree in the Faculty of Theology in 1942 and was ordained as a military chaplain.

Something happened to Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen that has happened to many theologians: the ancient languages, Hebrew and Greek, captured his interest while he was studying in the Faculty. So he decided to study classics and Semitic languages, even while at the front. In autumn 1945, he obtained his Master’s degree in the Faculty of Arts. He took his Master’s degree in theology in 1948 and obtained the licentiate degree the same year.
When it was time to find a suitable theme for a doctoral thesis, his search led him to the Septuagint. The title of his doctoral thesis was *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches*. His supervisor and examiner was Professor Gillis Gerleman of Lund. The academic disputation took place in Helsinki in 1951. His second book also dealt with translation technique: *Der Character der asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta* (1959).

In the 1950s Soisalon-Soininen established a career in marriage counseling in the Lutheran parishes of Helsinki and also taught religion and psychology in two gymnasiums in Helsinki. He himself was married and had three children. It was in the 1960s that he commenced his university career, at the lowest possible level, as a temporary assistant. But he managed to win a scholarship from the Academy of Finland as a senior researcher during 1962–64. He was then appointed Associate Professor of Biblical Exegesis at the University of Helsinki. In 1967 he was appointed Ordinary Professor of Old Testament Exegesis. He remained in this post until his retirement in 1984. Even in his later years he was an eager contributor to the new Finnish translation of the Bible. He served as a member and vice-chairman of the translation committee. His competence can be admired in the fine Finnish translations of such books as Proverbs and Job.

At the beginning of the 1960s, Soisalon-Soininen made his scholarly breakthrough with the publication of *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (1965). He was interested in the work and working methods of the Greek translators of the Old Testament and developed a methodology for the study of the Septuagint as a translation in comparison with the Hebrew Vorlage. This has become a characteristic of the “Helsinki School,” which now consists of his students over two generations, namely Raija Sollamo, Anneli Aejmelaeus, Seppo Sipilä, and Anssi Voitila. His field of study has often been called translation technique(s), and properly so, if we define translation technique as the human, intellectual process which produced the Greek translation. It does not mean a technique in the sense that the translators adopted a precise methodology or clear-cut rules for their work. Their methodology, their usual ways of translating, or their “techniques” can be detected only by comparing the final result of their work with the Hebrew Vorlage. For Soisalon-Soininen it was important to find out how the different translators translated the same Hebrew expression or the same syntactical structure. The point of departure was always the Hebrew parent text. On the other hand, he emphasized the importance of considering the Koiné background in order to enable one to evaluate whether a rendering was good Koiné Greek and what effect normal Greek practice and idiom had on different translators.
In the 1970s Soisalon-Soininen began a major project for studying the translation technique of the Greek Pentateuch. The corpus that was gathered then formed a solid basis for many later studies of the “Helsinki school.” He continued his Septuagint studies in a number of articles, the majority of which are included in the jubilee volume Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987, edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo (AASF B 237).

Soisalon-Soininen also published a number of articles and textbooks in the broader field of Old Testament studies. Of these I mention The Original Text of the Old Testament (only in Finnish: Vanhan testamentin alkuteksti, 1953), a study of the stories of the patriarchs under the title From Abraham to Joseph (only in Finnish: Aabrahamista Joosefiin, 1965), and The History of Israel (only in Finnish: Israelin kansan historia, 1969).

Soisalon-Soininen was a member of the Finnish Academy of Sciences (1972) and chairperson of the Finnish Exegetical Society from 1972 to 1980. He was made an honorary member of the same society in 1980. He was awarded an honorary doctorate by the Faculty of Arts of the University of Helsinki in 1990.

It was typical of him as a scholar that he was very international in outlook, severely critical, and extremely quality oriented. Only the best was good enough for him. He took good care of his students. His strong personality was characterized by a warm religious spirit, a capacity for heartfelt laughter, and the manners of a gentleman. He is survived by his wife, Marjatta Soisalon-Soininen.

Raija Sollamo  
University of Helsinki

[Ed.: Professor Sollamo has written a longer article on Soisalon-Soininen and “The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland”: SJOT 10 (1996) 159–68.]

For modern scholars of the Septuagint, the name John William Wevers (Emeritus Professor of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto) is synonymous with the Greek Pentateuch. He has produced critical editions of all five books in the Göttingen series (Genesis 1974, Deuteronomy 1977, Numbers 1982, Leviticus 1986, Exodus 1991), which alone would be a lifetime’s work for most scholars. Yet Wevers has been more productive still, by supplementing the edition of each Pentateuchal book with two different types of monograph: a textual history (Genesis, 1974, Exodus 1992, Leviticus 1986, Numbers 1982, Deuteronomy 1978); and a volume of critical notes (Genesis 1993, Exodus 1990, Leviticus 1997, Numbers 1998, Deuteronomy 1995). As with others in this later series, the present volume is intended to be read in conjunction with the critical edition.

The purpose of the Notes series is to provide commentaries on Wevers’s critical editions of the Greek Pentateuch, in this case Numbers. The volume opens with a helpful Introductory Statement (pp. ix–xlviii) that features the character of the Greek translation of Numbers, the character of the present volume (“my Notes . . . are not primarily intended for the professional,” p. xxv), and an extensive list of sigla. Following the Notes themselves (see below), the volume ends with an appendix that lists some 35 proposed changes in the critical Göttingen text of Greek Numbers (pp. 608–9), three grammatical indices (Greek words and phrases, Hebrew words and phrases, grammatical and textual terms, pp. 610–45), and a general index (pp. 646–53). Like its four companions, this volume contains no bibliography; Wevers never intended the series to present the state of the question, but rather to assist serious students in their comparison of the MT and LXX (p. xli).

The main body of the work is the Notes. In these 607 pages, Wevers comments on virtually every verse in Greek Numbers. Unlike the more technical
textual history series (see above), which is addressed to the Greek textual specialist, the commentary is informative and accessible to scholars and students who are not expert in Septuagint studies but have a fair knowledge of Greek and some Hebrew. Scholars who seek greater detail are at times referred by Wevers to the more specialized companion volume on textual history (for example, p. xl). On several occasions, he pays due respect to an earlier pioneer, Zacharias Frankel, whose landmark analysis of Greek Numbers as a translation of the Hebrew text was published in the mid-nineteenth century (Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegesis auf der alexandrinische Hermeneutik, Leipzig, 1851; Frankel’s treatment of Numbers is on pp. 167–200).

Wevers’s approach and underlying suppositions are especially evident in his Introductory Statement. He regards Septuagint Numbers, indeed the entire Pentateuch, as “the product of Alexandrian translators” (p. ix), but admits that this view is “hard put to the test” for Numbers. On the translator’s work and competence, Wevers judges Numbers to be “by far the weakest volume in the Greek Pentateuch” (p. ix), and more than once characterizes the translator as careless (for example, pp. x, xii). Nevertheless, he believes that the volume as a whole “shows a mind at work, making judgments at times quite astute in its approach to the task of translating holy writ” (p. xv), as opposed to Frankel’s less positive view of the translator as inconsistent and rather haphazard.

Wevers provides several definitions and helpful clarifications of the terminology that he uses in this monograph. He employs the term tradition, for example, “throughout to represent the development of the original LXX, the autographon, from its original form as reconstructed for the critical text up to its form (or forms) in the fifteenth century” (p. xxxvii). Several features that appear in the notes are summarized in a helpful manner. Two examples: the translator’s obvious prejudice against Balaam (p. xxix); and through chap. 23 in Greek Numbers, all except two instances of הוהי become “God” (p. xxix).

Two weaknesses may be observed. On a more minor level, several typing errors are evident, unfortunately sometimes in the citation of Greek and Hebrew words. Other errors are of no great import, but can give rise to confusion on the part of the reader (the sigla, for example, begin on p. xliii, not on p. xxx as given in the Table of Contents). On a more substantial level, the Introductory Statement, as well as the Notes, make it clear that Wevers almost invariably chooses readings found in the consonantal Masoretic Text over variant readings (compare p. xi). His aversion to the concept of a different Vorlage, even where such evidence is present in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the notes in BHS, or commentaries on Numbers, will be troubling to many readers.
Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers is a major contribution to our understanding of the book of Numbers in the Septuagint. It is really a commentary in its own right, and is essential reading for scholar and student alike who seek to understand better the text and message of the fourth book of the Greek Pentateuch. Although the volume is not primarily intended for experts in Septuagint and Greek studies, these scholars, too, will find this an invaluable resource and a gold mine of rich and nuanced information.

PETER W. FLINT
TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY, BRITISH COLUMBIA
Response to James Barr’s Review of
Invitation to the Septuagint

In 2000, Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva published Invitation to the Septuagint (Grand Rapids: Baker) (see our review in BIOSCS 34). James Barr wrote a lengthy review of the book, which first appeared on the Review of Biblical Literature website (http://www.bookreviews.org/) on 10/22/02. Professors Jobes and Silva have requested this opportunity to reply to Barr’s review. The reply is printed here with the permission of the editors of Review of Biblical Literature.

We are pleased that Professor Barr has given so much—and such careful—attention to our book. We are moreover very appreciative of the generous remarks, as well as constructive suggestions, found at various points in the review. It is also the case, however, that his assessment gives an inaccurate picture of the book, and readers may find a brief response helpful.

Barr’s critique focuses almost exclusively on the use of the LXX for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. While it is quite appropriate for a reviewer to select for special attention an important issue, such as this one certainly is, it is also fair to point out that the book was never intended as a manual for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible—a topic to which we devote one chapter out of fourteen (and even if we include scattered statements elsewhere, it is doubtful that more than fifty pages out of over three hundred address this issue). Our primary concern is rather to help readers understand the Greek versions in their own right. Insofar as the review does not clearly set our treatment of the MT within the context of that larger (and logically prior) aim, it runs the risk of giving a false impression not only about the book as a whole but also about what it really says regarding the value of the LXX for the Hebrew text.

In particular, Barr’s overarching evaluation that the book shows an “apparent negativity towards the LXX” (concluding section of the review) is very surprising to the authors and is not borne out by the facts. It is certainly a false evaluation if one thinks of the book in general, but even when one keeps in mind that Barr has in view the text-critical use of the LXX (and only that, we assume), it must still be said that the evidence does not support him. For example, out of twelve specific passages discussed by him, he actually agrees with our judgment in a majority of them. Indeed, only with regard to four of the variants (Gen 4:8; 1 Kgs 2:5; Isa 53:7, 8) does he find that we have rejected the LXX reading without sufficiently valid reason; moreover, it is only in the case of the two variants in Isaiah (in a passage where the Greek translator has indisputably made several mistakes) that we express any confidence about the inferiority of the LXX. Barr himself elsewhere (§6) acknowledges that at sev-
eral points we make positive statements about the text-critical value of the LXX, and in fact there are more of these in the book than the three he mentions. For example, “The primary source [for variants] consists of the ancient versions, and inasmuch as the LXX was the only translation of the whole Bible produced prior to the standardization of the pre-Masoretic text, it takes on unique importance” (Invitation, 148, emphasis added). Elsewhere (p. 152) we explicitly distance ourselves from “scholars who abandon the readings of the MT in favor of an LXX variant only as a matter of last recourse”; we add that “such an approach cannot be easily defended, and it is likely to lead us astray.” Several other statements could be adduced.

In the light of these and various other facts, one wonders what would have led Barr to assess the book as he did and to say that we have an “extremely strong preference for the MT” (§16). A possible answer arises from reading his comments on “Inspiration” (a topic to which he devotes a whole separate section, even though we mention it only in passing in a footnote). Knowing that the authors regard themselves as evangelicals (though the book nowhere says anything about that), and apparently assuming that there is a standard evangelical position on “the centrality and authority of the MT for Christianity,” Barr proceeds to attribute this position to us. His comments, however, misrepresent our view of the role of the MT in textual criticism. In truth, if any such considerations had been at play in the book, they would have run in precisely the opposite direction. While we recognize that the MT, being the only extant text of the entire Hebrew Bible, enjoys a privileged standing in some respects, it is our firm conviction that, in the attempt to make text-critical decisions, no preference should be given to any surviving textual tradition on theological or religious grounds. We do believe (along with many other scholars with differing traditions) that, for most books of the Bible, the textual form preserved in the MT is generally more reliable than that found in competing witnesses, but this is a conclusion we reach strictly on the basis of widely accepted text-critical criteria.

Among a number of Barr’s specific criticisms, at least a few should be addressed.

1. According to him (§7), the book “has one serious misstatement,” namely, our comment that the Qumran scroll A of Isaiah contains “essentially the same Hebrew text as found in Codex Leningradensis” (p. 177). He believes that “the authors must surely mean the B scroll of Isaiah.” Actually, we do mean the A scroll, and the fact that he thinks we have made a mistake may be a clue to where are our real differences lie. While it is of course true that the A scroll contains many important variants (a few of which are reflected in
the LXX), the point at issue is whether this scroll—once we set aside obvious errors by the scribe of that document, as well as orthographic/morphological variations that do not affect the sense—gives evidence of an underlying consonantal text that is essentially different from the MT. Most assuredly not. The language we use in the comment quoted above is commonplace in the literature. For example, E. Würthwein (The Text of the Old Testament, 2d ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 33) says that the scroll “essentially supports” the MT; S. Talmon (in ASTI 1 [1962]: 62), though arguing that this manuscript should be given greater weight than some scholars do, speaks of the “basic identity between MT” and the scroll; J. Hoegenhaven (in JSOT 28 [1984]: 19) uses the phrase “fundamental agreement.”

2. Particularly misguided, in our view, is Barr’s strong—indeed, drastic—rejection of the principle lectio difficilior potior (§11 of the review). This section is frankly one of the most disappointing in the review, primarily because it shows great insensitivity to the way some of our best textual critics have both articulated and applied the principle. For example, Barr comments: “In the LXX . . . there are hundreds of readings which, if they were taken seriously, would be difficult or impossible and would therefore, by the principle of difficulty, be superior to Vaticanus and to MT itself.” But who has ever argued that “impossible” readings are preferable? Moreover, Barr here ignores the extremely important qualification that the canon in question has in view readings that are superficially, not intrinsically, difficult. Barr adds that while there might be some place for this principle in monolingual textual comparisons, the situation is different in the case of a translation. But this distinction is patently invalid. A variant based on LXX evidence is worth considering only if we can offer a credible “retroversion” into Hebrew, but once we have done that, the comparison becomes monolingual: we need to decide between the Hebrew reading of the MT and the Hebrew reading of the text underlying the LXX. It should be added that Barr’s comments in this section are quite inconsistent with his own perceptive discussion in Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 266–68 (e.g., “Where it is a matter . . . of obscure words in normal contexts [i.e., in contrast to technical architectural passages, etc.] and of strange meanings for common words, there was a strong tendency towards the levelling of the vocabulary and the interpretation of that which was rare as if it was that which was more normal” [p. 268]; this fine statement undercuts Barr’s argument against the MT at Gen 4:8 in §5 of his review).

3. In §13, where Barr faults us for placing “remarkable confidence in the standard editions,” he characterizes our position as “stressing that the right
word must be there somewhere in the LXX tradition.” Both here and in the following section, he seems to imply that we say nothing about the need for conjectural emendations. Our true position (which Barr himself quotes) is that, given the numerous surviving LXX witnesses (in contrast to most Greek and Latin works), it is “likely that the original reading in any one problem passage has indeed survived somewhere” (p. 136 of our book). How our word “likely” metamorphosed into “must” is unclear, particularly when we immediately add, “But ‘likely’ is not the same as ‘certain.’” Moreover, we go on in that paragraph to commend Ziegler’s conjecture at Isa 53:2. And on p. 225 we adopt an old conjecture at Isa 53:11 not mentioned by Ziegler.

4. In the fourth paragraph of §9 of his review, Barr quotes our statement: “We should have good reason to believe that the presumed Hebrew/Aramaic reading truly existed in a manuscript and not only in the mind of the translator (whether by a mistake or by a conscious emendation)” (p. 153 of our book; Barr leaves out the parenthetical clause, which gives some indication of where one might look for the evidence). Barr goes so far as to call this principle “nonsense” because “there is no way of knowing that a reading existed in a manuscript unless we have the actual manuscript.” But we mean no more and no less than the inevitable kind of judgment that every scholar must make—as indeed Barr himself makes in the fourth paragraph of §5, where he expresses great assurance (“It is to my mind clear”) that the verb in Amos 9:12 “was written as in MT but was read [by the Gk. translator] as with a D and not a Y.”

As for Barr’s other (and milder) criticisms, some of them are certainly worth discussing—and we are genuinely grateful for the stimulus they provide—but we do not find them persuasive. In any case, we encourage readers to consult our book directly before forming their own opinion regarding our views.

Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva

I.

Die Stellungnahme des Alten Testaments zum allgemein menschlichen Problem des Bösen durch Genesis 3 ist einzigartig. Dieses Kapitel ist auch wegen der Rolle, die eine Schlange (シュニ＝オリ) einnimmt, einmalig. Erst im deuterokanonischen Buch Weisheit Salomos (2,24) wird die betreffende Schlange klar und deutlich mit Satan als einem persönlichen Wesen identifiziert. So fragt man sich nun, wie die Weisheit Salomos zu dieser Identifizierung gekommen ist.

In Jes. 27,1 wird andererseits die endzeitliche Heimsuchung von “Leviathan, der flüchtigen Schlange und Leviathan, der gewundenen Schlange, dem Drachen, der im Meer ist” durch JHWH (MT) bzw. durch das heilige Schwert Gottes (LXX) geschildert. Die Eigenart der betreffenden Jesajastelle besteht darin, daß der dort gebrauchte Wortlaut, insbesondere der zusammengesetzte Name ὑβριζόμενος ἦλεος ἡφαῖν ... ἠπάτη ... ἀριστήρα ... direkt vom Ugaritischen (KTU² 1.3 III 41–42 1.5 I 1–3 parall. 27–29: tnn ... ltn. bθη ... bθη ... bθη ... bθη ... bθη ... bθη) übernommen worden ist. Das Bestreben, den Namen möglichst buchstabengetreu wiederzugeben, kann man bei Aquila (Λευιάθαν ὁφις μοχλός. Λευιάθαν ὁφις ἔνεσκιρ(ρ)ομένος, κῆτος τὸ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ), Symmachus (Λευιάθαν ὁφις συγκλείον, Λευιάθαν ὁφις σκολός ... δράκων ὁ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ) und Theodotion (δράκων ὁφις ἰχθύρος, δράκων ὁφις σκολός ... δράκων ὁ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ) feststellen. Eine abweichende Auffassung sowie inhaltliche Erwägung des Namens seitens des Übersetzers findet ihren Niederschlag in der LXX: δράκων ὁφις φεύγων δράκων ὁφις σκολός. Der hier festgelegte Namenstypus ist im Neuen Testament u.zw. in Off. 12,9; 20,3 (τῶν δράκοντα τῶν μεγάν, τῶν ὄφιν τῶν ἄρχαιον, τῶν καλούμενον Διώβολον καί τῶν Σατανᾶ) widerzuerkennen, wo ebenfalls das endzeitliche Gericht über den Bösen, der dabei als Drache (s. Jes. 27,1 u.a.), Schlange (s. Gen. 3) und Satan (s. Hi. 1–2; Sach. 3) bezeichnet wird, angekündigt wird.

Mit Jes. 27,1 verbindet sich also ein dreifaches Problem bezogen auf seine außerbiblische Vorgeschichte, sowie auf seine alt-, zwischen- und neutestamentliche Nachgeschichte, welches bisher eher vernachlässigt wurde. Das Hauptaugenmerk meiner Untersuchung richtet sich vornehmlich auf das Alte Testament. Die außerbiblische Vorgeschichte (d.h. ugaritische Paralleletexte) sowie seine Nachgeschichte (insbesondere Septuaginta, deuterokanonische Schriften, Targum und Neues Testament) werden berücksichtigt, soweit sie für einzelne Fragen der Untersuchung von Relevanz sind.


Es ist die These dieser Studie, daß die Schlange in Jes. 27,1 mit jener in Gen. 3 als identisch anzusehen ist und den Bösen als persönliches Wesen symbolisiert. Diese Auffassung ist zwar für das Selbstbewußtsein der Alten Kirche gegeben, sie wird aber sowohl von der älteren als auch von der

II.


Die einzelnen methodischen Schritte, die den Verlauf der vergleichenden Untersuchung des Masoretischen Textes und der LXX bestimmen, entsprechen ihrem doppelten exegetischen (traditions- und theologiegeschichtlichen) Interesse.

Nach einer tiefgreifenden semantischen und pragmatischen Orientierung über den hebräischen Wortschatz und die griechischen Äquivalente, die die LXX und die anderen altgriechischen Übersetzungen des Alten Testaments bieten, wird der Versuch unternommen, die formalen und inhaltlichen Berührungen dieser Texteinheiten zueinander kritisch darzustellen, um dann Brücken für den Vergleich von Jes. 27,1 und Gen. 3 schlagen zu können.

Um einen Überblick zu gewinnen, führe ich hier die m.E. wichtigsten Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede der genannten Einheiten an:

1. Die Termini שָׂרָה—“Ωφίς, רַחֲבָּה—τὸ Πνεῦμα, שַׂטָּן—Ὁ Σατάν / Διάβολος, die charakteristischerweise determiniert auftauchen, um ein bestimmtes Subjekt zu bezeichnen, welches eine ebenso bestimmte Aufgabe zu erfüllen hat, sind in Aussagen eingebettet, die zwar klar und deutlich abgrenzbar sind, sie stehen aber zugleich in enger wechselseitiger Beziehung zu ihrem literarischen und logischen Zusammenhang.


(b) Bei I Kön. 22,19c–23 handelt es sich eigentlich um ein himmlisches Geschehen, welches das irdische entscheidend beeinträchtigt. Denn es bezieht sich auf bestimmte geschichtliche Personen (Ahab und die Pseudopropheten) und Ereignisse (Krieg gegen Syrien), die in einem bestimmten Raum und in einer bestimmten Zeit leben und geschehen. Die Umstände werden in I Kön. 22,1–19b.24–40 ausführlich beschrieben.

(c) Zwischen Urgeschichte und Vorgeschichte bzw. Patriarchenerzählungen (Westermann) steht Hi. 1,6–12; 2,1–7. Diese Texteinheit sowie die handelnden Personen haben ein eigentümliches Verhältnis zu den geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen. Im Hinblick auf die Zeit wird charakteristisch die Bestimmung "µwyh" gebraucht. Den räumlichen Rahmen bilden entweder der Himmel oder die Erde.

(d) Sach. 3,1–2 spielt sich anscheinend im Himmel ab. Sein nachdrück licher eschatologischer Charakter zeigt sich darin, daß hier die Strafe und Vernichtung des Bösen als unmittelbar bevorstehend angekündigt wird.


8. Der Mensch wird vom Bösen versucht hinsichtlich (a) des Gehorchens, (b) der Geduld und des Langmutes, (c) des Unterscheidens zwischen wahren und falschem Wort Gottes im Munde der Propheten und (d) des Glaubens an das göttliche Wort, das aus dem Mund des wahren Propheten gesprochen wird.


10. In zwei Fällen wird göttliches Strafurteil gegen den Bösen ausgesprochen; in den beiden anderen ist dies nicht deutlich, d.h. es kann nicht von vornherein ausgeschlossen werden. In Gen. 3,14f. scheint die Strafe auf dieses Dasein bezogen zu sein. In Sach. 3 aber ist es ein auf ein zukünftiges Dasein bezogenes Ereignis und dieses verbindet sich offensichtlich mit dem in Jes. 27,1 angekündigten Gericht gegen die Schlange.

III.


Jes. 27,1 nimmt aus dem Ugaritischen auf: (a) die Namen tnn . . . ltn. bṯ. . . . bṯ. ḏltn, um daraus Bezeichnungen des Bösen zu machen, und (b) die Ätiologie der Strafe nach dem weit verbreiteten jus talionis. Zugleich aber trägt es in sich alttestamentliches Erbe aus früheren Zeiten, welches nun in Verbindung zu den eschatologisch-apokalyptischen Vorstellungen gesetzt wird. Dieses Erbe wird vor allem mit den Beinamen der Schlange versinnbildlicht.

Im Hinblick auf den Ugaritischen Hintergrund von Jes. 27,1 wird folgendes festgestellt: (i) Wenn das zu beschreibende Wesen im Vordergrund der Erzählung stehen muß, dann wird im Ugaritischen der Eigename den einzelnen

Merklich verschiebt sich in MT-Jes. 27,1 der Fokus theologischer Betrachtungsweise vom Yam als Gegner Baals auf Lōtan bzw. Leviathan als widergöttliches Wesen.

Die Auffassung, daß die drei Bezeichnungen von Leviathan in Jes. 27,1 als Symbole von widergöttlichen Weltherrschern stehen, wird vom Targum vertreten. Die LXX hingegen sieht darin drei Bezeichnungen eines einzigen Wesens, welches sie mit der Schlange nach Gen. 3 identifiziert und als den Bösen betrachtet.

Bei der Auslegung von Jes. 27,1 wird naturgemäß auf die sprachlichen Besonderheiten der Septuaginta Rücksicht genommen. Es handelt sich dabei nicht um syntaktisch oder semantisch bedingte Abänderungen der Vorlage, sondern um eindeutige Nachinterpretationen. Dies läßt sich an folgenden Fällen zeigen:


Es ist aber nicht nur das Adjektiv selbst, das eine Bedeutsamkeit besitzt. Von großer Wichtigkeit sind auch die Zusammenhänge, auf die es hinweist bzw. in die es uns hineinführt.


(b) Die LXX-Wiedergabe der Termini הָנָתָן (Am. 9,3), נְיַנְיַנְי (Jes. 27,1) und דִּרְבֹּ ה (Ps. 103(104),26b) durch δρακόνων ist nicht als eine Übersetzungsvereinfachung, sondern als eine Interpretation der drei Namen anzusehen, die nicht drei verschiedene Wesen bezeichnen, sondern ein und dasselbe: den Bösen, ein Geschöpf Gottes, das an den betreffenden Stellen als Verfolger (Am. 9,3) und Verfolger u.zw. bis zu seiner totalen Vernichtung dargestellt wird (Jes. 27,1).


3. Seinem Charakter gemäß drückt das Hebräische die ideologische und theologische Zusammengehörigkeit von einzelnen Größen im allgemeinen auch dadurch aus, daß es zusammengesetzte Namen mit derselben oder vergleichbaren syntaktischen Bildung gebraucht. Die Aneinanderreihung ist keineswegs eine willkürliche, sondern findet, wie wir gesehen haben, nach einer vorgeprägten Ordnung statt. Als Beispiele seien hier folgende angeführt:

| Jes. 14,12 | ο ἐκσφόρος ο προί ἀνατέλλων |
| Ez. 29,3  | Φαραώ, τον δράκοντα τον μέγαν |
|  ליל יאיר | Τον έγκαθήμενον ἐν μέσῳ ποταμῶν αὐτοῦ |
| דאש אמלר | Τόν λέγοντα |
| ירא נאמיר עזריה | Εμοί εἰσίν οἱ ποταμοί, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐποίησα αὐτοὺς. |
Dem folgt eine sehr ausführliche Beschreibung (z.B. LXX-Dan. 7,7f):
“έχον ὠδόντας σιδηροῦς μεγάλους, ἔσθιον καὶ κοπανίζον, κύκλῳ τοῖς ποσὶ καταπατοῦν, διαφόρῳς χρώμενον παρὰ πάντα τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ θηρία: εἶχε δὲ κέρατα δέκα, καὶ βουλαὶ πολλαὶ ἐν τοῖς κέρασιν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τρία τῶν κεράτων τῶν πρώτων ἐξηράνθησαν δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἱδοὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἄσπερ ὀφθαλμοί ἀνθρώπινοι ἐν τῷ κέρατι τούτῳ καὶ στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα, καὶ ἐποίει πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς ἀγίους”. Diese ausführliche Beschreibung ist für die jüngeren Texte des Alten Testaments sehr charakteristisch. In Jes. 27,1 werden mit dem zusammengefassten Namen kurz und sehr prägnant mehrere frühere Traditionen zusammengefaßt und neu interpretiert.

Aus den Varianten und Abwandlungen des Namenstypus ist die Erkenntnis der Wandelbarkeit des Themas “des Bösen” im Alten Testament zu schließen. Daraus zeigt sich, daß das Nachdenken über “den Bösen” und “die Bösen” immer präsent ist.

IV.


Von den älteren Texten ausgehend sind folgende Darstellungsweisen des Bösen festzustellen: (a) die zoomorphe (Gen. 3:ִבַּד—“Orif”), (b) die amorphe bzw. geistige (I Kön. 22: רָעַש—Πνεῦμα Ψευδώς. Hi. 1–2, Sach. 3: שָנָה—Σατάν / Διάβολος) und (c) in den späteren Texten die theriomorphe (Jes. 27,1: רַעַש / רָעַשְתֵּא—דּוֹרִקָו). Vom Gedanken der realen Existenz des Bösen ausgehend spricht das Alte Testament in auffällender Verschiedenheit der Ausdrücke und der in ihnen zutage tretenden Anschauungen. Alle Ausdrücke sind auf diesen zentralen Punkt bezogen und von hier aus zu verstehen.
A. Retracing Thackeray’s Trail

A century ago, Henry St. John Thackeray wrote a series of articles for the *Journal of Theological Studies*. He attempted to show that the work of different translators could be identified within various books of the Greek Old Testament. The first article, perhaps the best known of the series, proposed that two portions of Jeremiah had been rendered by two different translators. In a brief paragraph, Thackeray further suggested that Jeremiah 52 was the product of yet a third hand, a suggestion which he supported with several arguments. In subsequent writings, however, he no longer defended this view. This paper endeavours to evaluate Thackeray’s initial arguments, to discover why Thackeray changed his mind, and to provide an analysis of the translation technique of Jeremiah 52.

I. Thackeray’s Initial Position

Thackeray’s article, “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah,” published in 1902/1903, was the first in a series of studies in which the author tried to

---


3. Ibid., 260.

4. A draft of this paper was presented in a graduate seminar on LXX Jeremiah at the University of Toronto. Thanks especially to Albert Pietersma, without whose constant encouragement this paper might not have been completed.
recover the translation techniques of various books of the LXX through linguistic analysis. In the first paragraph he summarized his three main conclusions.\(^5\) (1) The Greek version of Jeremiah “falls into two nearly equal portions, which have been rendered by different translators, possibly from two separate collections of prophecies.” (2) The second part of Jeremiah was translated by the same hand as the first part of Baruch. (3) The first part of Jeremiah shows “a close affinity” with the Greek version of Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, whereas Isaiah has a character of its own. (This third conclusion was developed in the subsequent articles.)

Thackeray acknowledged at the outset that to identify distinct translators within a book was no simple task. A translator did not always render a particular Hebrew word with the same Greek word, not even in the same book or the same context. Furthermore, the original text of the LXX as rendered by the first translators had been corrupted by variant readings, particularly from parallel columns of Origen’s Hexapla.\(^6\) Nevertheless, Thackeray remained confident that the work of distinct translators could be identified in the books of the LXX. In Jeremiah, he claimed, “the change in style and vocabulary takes place at a definite point in the middle of the book.”\(^7\) He then gave to the two main portions of the Greek Jeremiah labels which have endured to the present day: the first (chaps. 1–28) he named Jeremiah \(\alpha\), and the second (chaps. 29–51) Jeremiah \(\beta\). Concerning the remaining chapter, he commented: “The final chapter lii forms an appendix and the Greek is probably by a third hand (\(\gamma\)): of this I will speak later.”\(^8\)

Thackeray gave four reasons for his opinion on Jeremiah 52.\(^9\) (1) It has “the nature of an appendix,” being placed at the end of both the Hebrew and the Greek texts. (2) It is lacking in Codex 41 (9th–10th century) of Holmes and Parsons.\(^10\) (3) It contained an Attic form, \(\varphi\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\), which occurs nowhere else in the LXX. (4) The Hebrew word \(\text{יִמְגָּת} \), translated by \(\text{ιμάτιον} \) in

---

6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., 246.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., 260.
10. A. Ralhfs’ *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1914) 330–31, lists H.-P. Codex 41 among the “missing” manuscripts. Since Swete’s *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, which lists Codex 41 on p. 165, was first published only 14 years earlier, in 1900, and since Thackeray’s article on Jeremiah was published in 1902, it would be a safe bet that neither Swete nor Thackeray checked the codex itself (which indeed was probably lost before 1900) but simply referred to Holmes and Parsons (published 1798–1827).
Jeremiah β, is rendered στόλη in 52:33. He further observed that the Greek of Jeremiah 52 was not taken from that of 2 Kings (4 Kingdoms) 24–25.

The following points can be made on these four arguments. (1) Even if chapter 52 “has the nature of an appendix,” an appendix need not have been translated by a separate individual. Thackeray himself testified to the contrary when he wrote concerning Jeremiah β: “The second collection was specially connected with Baruch; it closed with the brief prophecy addressed to him, and the older portion of the book of Baruch was attached to it by way of appendix.”11 (2) Thackeray had to contend with an obstacle that has since been removed; there was not yet a fully critical edition of Jeremiah at the turn of the 20th century. The publication of Ziegler’s edition in the Göttingen series means that two of his arguments can easily be dispensed with.12 For example, the absence of Jeremiah 52 in one medieval witness can scarcely be considered original in light of the weight of evidence to the contrary. (3) Further, Ziegler regards the Attic spellings found in some of the major uncial manuscripts as secondary, reading θάλασσαν for θάλατταν (88) in 52:17, φυλάσσοντας for φυ- λάττοντα (B) in 52:24, and ἐφυλάσσοντα ἢ for ἐφυλάττετο (A 86’ Th.II 1377) in 52:31.13 (4) I will return to Thackeray’s fourth argument in my analysis of the translation technique of Jeremiah 52. There it will also become clear that he was right in observing that the Greek of Jeremiah 52 was not taken from that of 2 Kings (4 Reigns) 24–25.

II. Thackeray’s Change of Mind

A series of writings published after his initial article on Jeremiah makes it clear that Thackeray himself subsequently abandoned his position that Jeremiah 52 was translated by a third hand, though not, apparently, because he realized the above weaknesses in his arguments. His second article, “The Greek Translators of Ezekiel,” was prepared while the first was still in press. It

11. “The Greek Jeremiah,” 256. It ought further to be noted that an appendix is not necessarily a later addition, as may be demonstrated by an example from Thackeray’s own writings. His book, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins (London: Oxford University Press, 1923) contains a number of “appendices,” the second of which is a reprint of portions of a table of renderings for Jeremiah α and β from his article on Jeremiah published in JTS some 20 years previously (cf. pp. 5, 116–17). This appendix was not a later addition, being published together with the rest of the book and containing older material. Thackeray did not, in “The Greek Jeremiah,” state that Jeremiah 52 was a later addition, but he would do so in a later writing.


13. Ziegler’s “Einleitung” to Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae, 120.
begins with a summary of the first. Here Thackeray in two instances stated his views less confidently than he had done previously. One concerns the background to the division of Jeremiah: “With greater hesitation, I hazarded the conjecture that this division of the Greek book into two parts might be traceable to an older division of the Hebrew Jeremiah into two books.” The other concerns Jeremiah 52: “the final chapter, it was suggested, might possibly be the work of yet a third hand.” With regard to both cases, he expressed the tentative nature of his findings. The explanation for this, it will be seen, may be traced to new conclusions made on the basis of his studies of Ezekiel.

Thackeray discovered a threefold division in the Greek Ezekiel, which he labeled (as with Jeremiah) \( \alpha \) (chaps. 1–27), \( \beta \) (28–39), and \( \gamma \) (40–48). This did not mean, however, that these were translated by three different people. Rather, said Thackeray, “there are here, as in Jeremiah (excluding the appendix) two translators and two only . . . the hand which translated Ezek. \( \gamma \) is, in my opinion, identical with the hand which translated Ezek. \( \alpha \).”

Thackeray noted the relevance of the division of Ezekiel for the book of Jeremiah: “If we turn back again to Jeremiah, we are struck by the fact that there too the break comes nearly at the halfway point.” To illustrate his point, he performed an experiment to discover how close the divisions of Ezekiel and Jeremiah lay to the halfway point of each book:

If we take the pages of the Cambridge manual edition of the LXX and those of the R[evised] V[ersion] (minion 8vo, 1885) as a test, we get the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cambridge LXX</th>
<th>Revised Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jer. ( \alpha )</td>
<td>66 pp.</td>
<td>23 ( \frac{1}{2} ) pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. ( \beta + \gamma )</td>
<td>60”</td>
<td>21 ( \frac{1}{2} )”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez. ( \alpha )</td>
<td>58”</td>
<td>21 ( \frac{1}{2} )”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez. ( \beta + \gamma )</td>
<td>53”</td>
<td>19 ( \frac{1}{4} )”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thackeray concluded that the translators of both books were guided by the same principle in dividing the book for translating, which further suggested to him that the two translations were “parts of a common undertaking.” What is striking in the above quotation is that Thackeray combined Jeremiah \( \gamma \) with Jeremiah \( \beta \) when he reckoned the length of the second half of the book. He did

---

15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., 399.
17. Ibid., 409.
19. Ibid., 410.
so without explanation, and one can only guess at his motives, but the effect of this combination is twofold. First, his statistics for the second half of Jeremiah are slightly inflated, with the result that the degree of difference between the two parts of Jeremiah agrees slightly more closely with that of Ezekiel than it would otherwise have done. Second, the distinction of Jeremiah $\gamma$ as the work of a third hand diminishes, if it does not disappear altogether (to say nothing of the difficulty that Thackeray’s combination of Ezekiel $\beta$ and $\gamma$ poses for his argument that Ezekiel $\gamma$ was translated by the same individual that translated $\alpha$, not $\beta$). At any rate, the combination “Jer. $\beta + \gamma$” shows that Thackeray at this point still assumed that Jeremiah 52 was already a part of the book of Jeremiah at the time of translation.

As noted previously, Thackeray appeared hesitant when summarizing two conclusions from “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah.” His view that the division of the Greek Jeremiah can be traced to an older Hebrew division of the prophecies into two parts was treated at length in the first article but was characterized as a “conjecture,” “hazarded” with “greater hesitation” in the second. His hesitation, it seems, grew as a result of the second study. The first article highlighted the separateness of the two collections, Jeremiah $\alpha$ and Jeremiah $\beta$, as original to the Hebrew, which implies that the division of labor was not so much made as found by the translators. Thackeray later discovered, however, that not only was Ezekiel likewise divided between two translators, but that the two parts of Ezekiel were proportional to those of Jeremiah. This similarity between the two books implied that the division of labor for Jeremiah was not so much found as made by the translators. Hence came Thackeray’s “greater hesitation.”

Thackeray also seemed more tentative about the independent translation of Jeremiah 52 which, he said, “might possibly be the work of yet a third hand.” His study of Ezekiel suggested to Thackeray that Jeremiah had been divided for the purpose of translation. Such a suggestion would not explain why a third individual translated only the final chapter of the book. He did not again discuss the translation of this chapter in this article. He maintained, however, that it was an appendix. The change from the first study to the second, then, is that he no longer used the observation that chap. 52 had “the

---

20. In a subsequent article, “The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint mss.,” he calculated similar statistics for the corresponding Hebrew of the two parts of Greek Jeremiah, but added a footnote with regard to the second part: “Omitting chap. 52, which appears to be a later addition (see J.T.S. iv 260).”
22. Ibid., 399.
nature of an appendix” as an argument that it was translated by a third hand. That is to say, he maintained the observation, but dropped the argument.

Five years after the publication of his article on the Greek translators of Jeremiah and subsequent studies of Ezekiel and the prophetical books, Thackeray returned to the subject in an article entitled, “The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint mss.”23 While the previous articles had stated that Jeremiah and Ezekiel were divided into two parts for the purpose of translation, here Thackeray presented evidence that the bisectioning of books was an ancient practice. His evidence came not from the realm of translation but from that of transcription. He observed that uncial codices had preserved the spelling of their parent manuscripts. In uncial manuscripts containing Exodus, Leviticus, and Psalms, changes in orthography suggested to Thackeray that a second copyist had taken over from the first.24 This change took place slightly after the midpoint of the book, as did the change in translators for Jeremiah and Ezekiel.25 Thackeray believed that these uncial manuscripts had preserved the orthography of parent manuscripts which were written not on codices but on papyrus scrolls. He concluded that each scribe would have been assigned a single scroll and that a change of scribe suggested that a book was divided over two scrolls.26 Since the break in Jeremiah and Ezekiel was much more pronounced than that in Exodus, Leviticus, and Psalms, involving not merely changes in spelling but changes of style, Thackeray suggested that the practice of writing these prophetical books on two separate scrolls dated back to their original translation in the second century B.C.27

Thackeray further proposed that the practice of bisectioning was already found in the Hebrew books. Comparing the Hebrew which corresponded with the two parts of the Greek Jeremiah, he found the first to be slightly longer than the second: part 1 occupied 49 pages of “an ordinary Hebrew Bible” while part 2 occupied 43 fractions.28 With regard to part 2, Thackeray included a footnote to the effect that he did not include chap. 52, which appeared to be “a later addition,” and referred the reader to “J.T.S. iv 260”—that is, to his

24. Ibid., 88.
25. Ibid., 92.
26. Ibid., 93.
27. Ibid., 94. Perhaps a mundane observation is in place here: if, as Thackeray suggested, two translators set to work on different parts of a book, it seems obvious that each would begin to write on a fresh papyrus roll.
28. Ibid., 97.
article “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah.”

This footnote signified that Jeremiah 52 was not yet part of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah when it was divided for the purpose of translation, and that it was not rendered by one of the original translators of Jeremiah. This would mean that Jeremiah 52 did not belong to the original Greek text of Jeremiah, with the result that Thackeray no longer had to treat its translation. Though Thackeray referred in the above-mentioned footnote to p. 260 of the first article, he had in fact turned its argument around: on p. 260 his statement that Jeremiah 52 had “the nature of an appendix” functioned as a supporting argument for his view that Jeremiah 52 was the work of a third hand; here, however, his view that the final chapter was a later addition is not a supporting argument for its translation but renders the matter of its translation irrelevant. If chap. 52 in the Greek Jeremiah was a later addition, it would, of course, have been the work of another hand, but this was an issue of the later history of the Greek Jeremiah rather than of its original translation.

In 1909, Thackeray published his Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek,30 which incorporated the results of his studies to that date. The Grammar contains a number of references to Jeremiah 52. Thackeray reprinted the part of his article “The Bisection of Books” that showed that the Hebrew corresponding to part 1 of the Greek Jeremiah occupied 49 pages of “an ordinary printed Hebrew Bible” while part 2 occupied $43\frac{1}{2}$, adding in a footnote, “Excluding the last chapter which is a later addition in the Greek.”31

Thackeray also commented on the occurrence of Attic forms in Jeremiah 52: “Jer. γ is probably a later appendix to the Greek book: the occurrence of the form φυλάττειν (lxx.24B, 31A) suggests at least that this chapter has an independent history.”32 His article “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah” also refers to the occurrence of φυλάττειν in Jeremiah 52, but there the function of the reference is to support his suggestion that the final chapter was translated by a third hand,33 while in the Grammar it accompanies his view that Jeremiah 52 was a later appendix to the book; the “third hand” has disappeared.

29. Ibid., 97n.
31. Ibid., 70.
32. Ibid., 11. See p. 123, where he wrote that σσ was almost universal in the LXX, “except that φυλάττειν occurs twice in the last chapter of Jeremiah (probably a later appendix to the Greek version).”
Thackeray mentioned several other “late forms” in Jeremiah 52. He noted that in compound numerals, “the smaller number usually precedes, as in Attic, but in the later portions of the LXX, there is a marked tendency to reverse this order, and thus to bring cardinals and ordinals into line.” The footnote adds: “So regularly in . . . Jer. lii (verses 1 and 31).” On the transition from διδωμι to διδω he remarked: “. . . in the third sing. imperf. and 2 aor. middle, forms as from διδω (by an easy change of o to e) appear in late portions or texts of the LXX: imperf ἐδιδέτο Jer. lii.34 B* Ν* (the chap. is a late appendix to the Greek version).”

No less than four times, Thackeray’s Grammar calls Jeremiah 52 a later addition to the LXX. The difference, briefly stated, between his first article, “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah,” and his Grammar is this: the former called the chapter an appendix, while the latter specified that it was a later appendix. The difference between an appendix and a later appendix is that the former refers to an attached text while the latter specifies that the text was originally not attached.

Conclusion

Thackeray originally suggested that Jeremiah 52, an appendix to the book, was the work of a third translator. His evidence, however, was sparse. On the basis of his study of Ezekiel, he concluded that Jeremiah had been divided into two nearly equal parts for the purpose of translation; one part was assigned to each translator. Such a conclusion could not well explain why the final chapter alone was given to yet a third translator. Thackeray further discovered that the bisection of the Greek text stemmed from the fact that the Hebrew book was divided between two scrolls. Maintaining that the final chapter had the nature of an appendix, but unable to prove that it had been translated by a third hand, Thackeray began to insist that Jeremiah 52 was a later addition which did not yet form part of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah at the time that the book was divided for translation. Peculiarities of style formerly used as evidence of a third translator were now attributed to the lateness of the appendix. In conclusion, Thackeray abandoned his proposal that Jeremiah 52 had been translated by a third hand because it was untenable while he regarded the chapter as an appendix and because it became unnecessary when he came to regard the chapter as a later addition.

34. Thackeray, Grammar, 189n.
35. Ibid., 250.
B. The Translation Technique of LXX Jeremiah 52

The nature of the relationship of LXX Jeremiah 52 to the rest of the book can be determined only after a thorough study of its translation technique. At the outset it may be acknowledged that there is much vocabulary in the final chapter that is not found elsewhere in Jeremiah. But, as Thackeray already noted, the same may be said of its Hebrew text. Thus one cannot conclude that the translation technique of Jeremiah 52 is different from that of the rest of the book without first considering to what extent this difference may be attributed to the content of the parent text. At the Hebrew level there is yet a further dimension to be considered: large sections of Jeremiah 52 have almost exactly the same text as 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30.36 Clearly there is dependence between the two passages, though the precise nature of this dependence cannot be concluded with certainty, nor is it relevant for our purposes. The Greek translation of each differs so frequently, however, that Thackeray concluded that LXX Jeremiah 52 could not have been taken from LXX 4 Kingdoms 24–25. Nevertheless, the existence of two rather different translations for nearly identical Hebrew Vorlagen can provide us with a useful base of operations in our larger investigation. If, as Thackeray asserted but failed to demonstrate, the Greek of Jeremiah 52 does not derive from 4 Kingdoms 24–25, in what respects do the two differ in their translation technique? And similarly, if LXX Jeremiah 52 is not dependent on the Kingdoms translation, does it perhaps show more affinity with the rest of Greek Jeremiah than Thackeray allowed?37 These are the questions which inform the following analysis.


37. In the comparative analysis which follows, I have used A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979) for 4 Kingdoms, and Ziegler, Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae, for Jeremiah. Unless otherwise specified, all citations are LXX numbers.
(1) The first notable difference in the Greek is the use of the genitive absolute by the Jeremiah translator. There are a number of other instances of the genitive absolute in both Jeremiah a and b, including 19:3b; 23:27; 33:8; 35:9; 36:2; 43:23; 48:7; and 49:18. While, strictly speaking, the genitive absolute should not refer to the subject or object of the main clause, it often does in koine Greek (so in the above instances, except 35:9). Though not common in Greek Jeremiah, the genitive absolute is distributed throughout the book. The translator employs it where the Hebrew has either an asyndetic participial clause—so that he produces an asyndetic adverbial construction without recourse to subordinate conjunctions not formally present in the Hebrew (19:3b; 23:27)—or an infinitival clause (33:8; 35:9; 36:2; 43:23; 48:7; 49:18). Of the 9 instances mentioned here, only in Jer 52:1 is the participle not formally warranted by the Hebrew. But this does not suggest a different translation technique; it is simply that the genitive absolute construction requires a participle. In general, the choice of the genitive absolute is interesting in that it reveals that the translator understands the Hebrew clause as an attending circumstance; often the Hebrew can be understood that way, but it need not be.

(2) Jer 52:1 does not have ὑιός for יִשְׂרָאֵל but replaces it with a Greek idiom. Unfortunately, there are no other instances of יִשְׂרָאֵל denoting age in the book of Jeremiah. Most occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Jeremiah express either a patronymic or a nationality; these are consistently rendered by ὑιός. When the plural is used of children, it is translated τέκνα. But in 38:12 יִשְׂרָאֵלים is translated προβάτα, though בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is translated as ὑιὸς ἀνθρώπου (28:43; 30:11). Idiomatic expressions with יִשְׂרָאֵל are thus too infrequent in Jeremiah to make general remarks regarding their translation in Greek Jeremiah. According to Thackeray, “Ὅιος is used to render some idiomatic phrases with יִשְׂרָאֵל, but this Hebraism is mainly

38. A few others are ambiguous: Jer 8:18; 43:2; 48:4; 52:31. In my view, ἄναγκιστός in 43:13 is not a genitive absolute but a genitive after ἄκουω.
39. See especially Jer 19:3b.
41. Note that Ziegler reads ὑιός γυνευός in 30:11, against B, S, 130, 239, A, 106, 410, Qtxt, V, 354, 613, Aeth, and Arab, judging that ἄνθρωπος entered secondarily via Aquila and Symmachus.
confined to the literal group: the Hexateuch, Isaiah and Chronicles generally avoid it.” He also notes that “is used of age 31 times in the LXX, of which 19 are found in Kingdoms βδ (which includes 4 Kingdoms 24).

(3) LXX Jeremiah has two words for ἡνεκές, ἔτος (22 times: 1:2; 1:3; 25:1, 3, 3, 11, 12; 26:2; 28:5, 9; 35:1, 3; 36:10; 41:14, 14; 43:9; 46:1, 2; 52:1, 1, 4, 5, 31) and ἐννομάζεις (10 times: 11:23; 17:8; 23:12; 31:44; 35:16; 39:1, 1; 43:1; 51:31; 52:31), both of which occur in Jeremiah 52. The former denotes a year as a unit of time, while the latter has the connotation of a duration or period of time, sometimes with the broader meaning, “period” or “time.” Thus in LXX Jeremiah ἔτος is always used with numbers, that is, the nth year of someone’s reign or x number of years, whereas ἐννομάζεις is used for such expressions as ἐννομάζεις ἐπισκέψεως σαρκόν (11:23; 12:23:12) and ἐννομάζεις ἁβραχίας (17:8). Nevertheless, their considerable semantic overlap means that they are often used interchangeably; in Jeremiah ἐννομάζεις is also occasionally used of the nth year of someone’s reign (39:1, 1; 43:1; 51:31). This also makes it difficult to draw conclusions about translation technique from their distribution.

(4) It is of interest that Jeremiah 52 has an ordinal number for the age of the king—“It being the twenty-first year of Zedekiah”—though the Hebrew numeral is cardinal. This is the only place in Jeremiah where an ordinal translates a cardinal. But this is not as significant as it might seem, since all other occurrences of ordinal numbers in LXX Jeremiah are used for the nth year of a reign (1:3, 3; 25:1, 3; 26:2; 28:59; 35:1; 39:1, 1; 43:1; 2; 48:1; 51:31; 52:4, 31). (Note, of course, that Hebrew distinguishes cardinals and ordinals from 1 to 10, but beyond 10 the cardinal numbers are also used as ordinals.) This occurrence of the ordinal to translate a Hebrew cardinal is unique in Jeremiah, but so is the Hebrew idiom which it translates, and thus one cannot conclude that it suggests a different translation technique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 52:4</th>
<th>2 Kgs 25:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גִּבְרִי בַּשְׁנַה הַתָּשׁוֹעָה לְקֹלֵלךְ</td>
<td>גִּבְרִי בַּשְׁנַה הַתָּשׁוֹעָה לְקֹלֵלךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּאוֹרֶשׁ נֶעֶשְׂרִי בֵּשָׂמַר לְוַרֶשֶׁ</td>
<td>בֵּאוֹרֶשׁ נֶעֶשְׂרִי בֵּשָׂמַר לְוַרֶשֶׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָאַבֶּךְ וּרְבֹּרֵאֶרֶבֶ</td>
<td>יָאַבֶּךְ וּרְבֹּרֵאֶרֶבֶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָאָמַרֶךְ הֶלְיָ הָרִשְׁלֶ</td>
<td>הָאָמַרֶךְ הֶלְיָ הָרִשְׁלֶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְתִםֶנְזֶלֶתֶנֶזֶלֶ</td>
<td>נְתִםֶנְזֶלֶתֶנֶזֶלֶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Thackeray, Grammar, 41.
43. Ibid.
Though βασιλεία is used almost exclusively for θυσία in Jeremiah (1:10, 15; 15:4; 18:7; 24:9; 28:27, 59; 32:12; 34:6; 35:8; 41:17), there is a parallel instance to its use above in 1:2, where θυσία is rendered ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

(2) ἡμιφων occurs twice in Jeremiah, both times with ἐπὶ; in 27:29 it is translated παρεμβάλλω ἐπὶ “encamp against”44 (as here in 4 Kgdms 25:1), and in 52:4 περιχαράκωσαν, “to blockade, besiege,” a word that occurs only twice in the LXX, here and in Prov 4:8. One of the 2 occurrences of the simplex χαράκω also occurs in Jeremiah (39:2; the other is Isa 5:2), where it translates רָּשָׁת (Qal). The noun χαράξ, also uncommon in the LXX, is found in Jer 40:4 for מַסֵּל “siege ramp.” One can therefore reason in the following manner: (a) The rarity of this root in the LXX indicates that a translator (generally speaking) would not resort to it quickly. (b) The root is found in Jer 39:2; 40:4; and 52:4 for various Hebrew words, each time in the context of the final siege of Jerusalem. (c) That this root occurred to the translator in these 3 instances would seem to favor the view that Jeremiah 52 was translated by the same individual who translated chaps. 39 and 40. (d) The fact that 52:4 has the compound περιχαράκωμα rather than the simplex form need not be an obstacle; perhaps the compound form has a nuance better suiting the content of 52:4.

(3) The word ἡμιφων occurs 23 times in Jeremiah, rendered 3 times by ἀνοικοδομέω45 “rebuild, restore,” 19 times by οἰκοδομέω,46 and only here by περιοικοδομέω “build around, enclose.” However, περιοικοδομέω translates not merely ἡμιφων, but ὁ βωλός, a combination that occurs only here in Jeremiah. In both instances, the translator chose Greek verbs which suited the immedi-

44. Besides LXX references, LSJ also cites Polybius 1.77.6 (2d cent. b.c.) for παρεμβάλλω ἐπὶ.
ate context. The Greek is reminiscent of Ezekiel’s prophecy concerning Nebuchadnezzar’s attack on Tyre, which is translated, καὶ περιοικοδομησε κἂν ποιήσει ἐπὶ σε κύκλῳ χάρακα (Ezek 26:8).

(4) Besides here and in the parallel 4 Kingdoms passage, there are 4 occurrences of περιοικοδομή “siege-wall” in Ezekiel (4:2; 17:17; 21:27; 26:8), translated with 3 different Greek words: προμαχών “bulwark, rampart” (4:2), βελοστάσις “war engine” (17:17; 21:27), and χάραξ “barricade” (26:8). The word περιτείχος “wall” appears in 4 Kgdms 25:1, and τετραπόδος “four-foot” is used in Jeremiah 52. (Note that Ziegler differs from Rahlfs’ τετραπέδος λίθος “squared stones”; Ziegler judges that λίθος is a secondary addition which crept in from 2 Para 34:11 or 1 Macc 10:11.) The Hebrew term could include various constructions such as siege walls, encampments, engines of war like battering rams, and mobile towers. But the Greek has a different meaning; since τετραπόδος can refer to a length or area of four feet (LSJ), it seems that the translator may be referring to the size of the blockade around Jerusalem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 52:5</th>
<th>2 Kgs 25:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| θυμαράγην θύμαράγην | όλα αί την λύματα λιακά |}

(1) The phrase ἐν έκλεκτοις “among the chosen” in 10:17; ἐν τῇ περιοικῇ (19:9) “in the enclosure” (the consistent equivalent in Kingdoms); and εἰς συνοχήν “in distress” in 52:4 (as well as Mic 4:14 and Nah 3:14). This is the only occurrence of συνοχή in Jeremiah. It is possible, however, that the Vorlage read κατάταξιν “in distress,” since this similar word reflects the meaning of the Greek more closely. Note also that the two Hebrew phrases occur side by side in Deut 28:53, 55, 57, as well as in Jer 19:9 (where κατάταξιν is translated ἐν τῇ περιοικῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ πολιορκίᾳ), and that Symmachus reads ἐν πολιορκίᾳ in Jer 52:4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 52:6</th>
<th>2 Kgs 25:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| βαλτησάται βαλτησάται | ὁλα αί την λύματα λιακά |}
(1) The phrase יערברח in LXX Jer 52:6, as in 2 Kgs 25:3. Thus it is probably an explanatory addition in MT; it was already present in Origen’s Hebrew.

(2) The verb קסיה occurs 15 times in Jeremiah and is translated by a wide variety of verbs, including סטריוו (5:3; 10:4; 52:6), κρατέω (6:23; 20:7), κατακρατέω (8:5; 27:43), ὑπέρ (27:42), κατέχω (6:24), κατισχύω (8:21), ἀντιλαμβάνω (23:14), ἐπιλαμβάνω (30:14; 38:32), καταδυναστεύω (27:33), and ἐφίστημι (28:12). This variety is present even when the verb recurs in the same context (6:23, 24 and 27:33, 42, 43; 28:12), suggesting that the translator is not concerned with reflecting the lexical consistency of the Hebrew, and when the same Hebrew phrase is found in various parts of Jeremiah (6:23 and 27:42; 6:24 and 8:21), suggesting that the translator is more concerned with the immediate Hebrew context than with the way he has rendered the phrase elsewhere. Nor do the Greek renderings divide along the lines of the Hebrew theme (Piel vs. Hiphil, etc.). This variety is not surprising, given the broad usage of the Hebrew verb; all of the Greek verbs which render it fall within the semantic range of קסיה. Thus the translator simply chooses the Greek verb that best renders the Hebrew in its particular context. It is striking, however, that all 3 occurrences of סטריוו in Jeremiah translate קסיה, which it never does elsewhere in LXX.
(1) The verb בָּקַשׁ is found only twice in Jeremiah, translated ῥηγνύμι in 46:2 (as in 4 Kgdms 25:4) which also refers to the breach of Jerusalem, and by διακόπτω here.

(2) The expression οἱ ἰνησίς ἡμελευμάτων is found 8 times in MT Jeremiah, 2 of which lack an equivalent in the Greek text (46:4; 48:3). Of the remaining 6, it is never translated οἱ ἀνδρεῖς τοῦ πολέμου (as in 4 Kgdms 25:4), 4 times it is translated οἱ ἀνδρεῖς οἱ πολέμισται (28:32; 30:32; 52:1, 25), and once it is modified by διακόπτω and translated δυνατοὺς ἀνδρας ἐν πολέμῳ (48:16). The remaining instance, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν πολεμίστων in 45:4, is contested by A, 410, 613, the main Catena group, and Bohairic, which read πολεμίστων for πολέμισται (though none of the witnesses reads ἀνδρῶν here). However, the preponderance of οἱ ἀνδρεῖς οἱ πολέμισται is not specific to Jeremiah, but general in the LXX (it is even found in 4 Kgdms 21:19), while οἱ ἀνδρεῖς τοῦ πολέμου is found only in 4 Kgdms 25:4.

(3) For MT’s ἵνα ἔρχηται ἡ θεμελίωσις, the LXX has only ἐξῆλθον, suggesting a different Vorlage which had only ἔρχηται. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that the parallel passage in 4 Kingdoms had neither verb, though BHS notes that 2 Hebrew mss add ἔρχηται, and a few others add ἔρχετο, probably because the clause makes little sense without a verb.

(4) Where the Hebrew simply reads “between the two walls,” the translator of Jeremiah 52 distinguishes the two walls. The same Hebrew phrase, רָאָשָׁה מְעַבָּדָה מִשְׁפָּרָה, is also found in 39[46]:4, for which the Greek, however, is absent. In Isa 22:11 it is translated ἀνὰ μέσον τὸν δύο τείχεων. That Jer 52:7 is interpretive here rather than based on a different Vorlage is suggested by the fact that ἀνὰ μέσον is not repeated before τοῦ προτειχίσματος (cf. 7:5; Ezek 42:20). So, too, Person calls this an “exegetical translation” based on a Vorlage identical to MT, but adds:

However, the Greek of JG [LXX Jeremiah 52] has a grammatical problem. The preposition ἀνὰ μέσον, which requires the genitive, is followed by two nouns each with the genitive singular article τοῦ, but the first noun τείχους is accusative plural. This use of τείχους, which almost all extant Greek manuscripts contain, may reflect a formal equivalence to καθημένη, even within the exegetical translation. Therefore the grammatical peculiarity of the Greek may be the translator’s attempt to convey the understanding of the dual in the Hebrew.47

But here a simple mistake has led Person astray, for τείχους is the genitive singular and τείχη the accusative plural of τείχος; there is no grammatical

problem. Προτείχίσμα occurs only here in Jeremiah, and 9 times in the LXX, of which it translates בָּֽֽֽלִּֽֽֽשׁ in 2 Kgdms 20:15; 3 Kgdms 20:23; and see Ezek 42:40 and 48:15, where MT has בָּֽֽֽֽלִּֽֽֽשׁ (“common, profane”). Where προτείχισμα and τεῖχος appear in the same verse, 2 Chr 32:5 renders τεῖχος by τεῖχος and τοῦ προτείχισμα ἀλλάζοντας as το προτείχισμα καὶ τεῖχος. All of the other 9 occurrences of τεῖχος in Jeremiah translate τεῖχος (1:15, 18; 15:20; 21:4; 27:15; 28:12, 58; 30:16; 52:14). Here the Greek translator specifies that “between the two walls” refers to the area between the city wall and the second outer wall (which Hezekiah had built, 2 Chr 32:5).

Jer 52:8 2 Kgs 25:5
καὶ κατετίθησεν οὗ δύναμις τῶν ἑκάτερα ἐν τοῖς πέραιν Ἰεριχώ
καὶ κατέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πέραν Ἰεριχώ
καὶ πάντες οἱ πάρεις αὐτοῦ

diesparrhsan ap’ autou

Jer 52:8 4 Kgdms 25:5
καὶ κατέτιθησεν ἑκάτερα ἐν τοῖς πέραιν Ἰεριχώ
καὶ ἐπιστέφθη ἑκάτερα αὐτοῦ

diesparrh epanwthen autou

(1) Since for whyqdxAta, the Septuagint has αὐτὸν, and 2 Kgs 25:5 has ῥῆς, it is possible that the Vorlage for Jer 52:8 simply read ῥῆς as well, though, on the other hand, there is little need for MT to specify the referent, and it may be that the translator thought a pronoun sufficient.

(2) LXX Jeremiah 52 has κατατίθησαι, where 4 Kingdoms has the simplex διόκω, for ἴδρα. However, of the remaining 6 occurrences of the Hebrew verb, Jeremiah has the simplex form twice (17:18; 20:11) and the compound form twice (15:15; 52:8), and the 2 remaining occurrences (the only other 2 instances where ἴδρα is followed by ἴδρα) have no Greek equivalent (MT 29:18; 39:5). Further, the equation is too general in the LXX to tell us anything particular about Jeremian translation technique.

(3) In the previous verse, Ῥβαὶ is transliterated, but here the Greek has πέραν, which never otherwise translates Ῥβαὶ. The explanation is that the ι and ι were reversed in the Vorlage, since all 5 occurrences of πέραν in Jeremiah translate the root Ῥβαὶ. Note that this reversal also occurs in 2 Sam 15:28 and 17:16, where the Qere has Ῥβαὶ and the Kethib Ῥβαὶ.
(4) LXX Jeremiah 52 has καὶ πάντες οἱ παιδείς αὐτοῦ for ἀνθρώποι. The context refers to Zedekiah and his army (referred to in the previous verse as οἱ ἄννυδρεῖς οἱ πολεμίσται). It is possible that the Vorlage read ἀνθρώποι. If it read as MT, this is the only place in Jeremiah where γυναικὶ (singular) is used of Judah’s army; otherwise it is used either of the Babylonian or Egyptian army and is translated δυνάμεις (26:2; 39:2; 41:1, 7, 21; 42:11; 44:5, 7, 10, 11; 45:3; 46:1; 52:4, 8, 14). The forces of Judah which remained after the capture of Jerusalem are consistently referred to in Jeremiah by the plural γυναικὶ, which is also translated δυνάμεις (singular) (47:7, 13; 48:11, 13, 16; 49:1, 8; 50:4, 5). Perhaps the translator, thinking that Jeremiah 52:8 could not refer to the entire army of Zedekiah, interpreted it as referring to his officials.

(1) The expression παρὰ μισθωτοῖς, found 5 times in Jeremiah, 4 of which are translated into Greek, is rendered in 2 different ways in LXX Jeremiah: λαλέω πρὸς . . . μετὰ κρίσεως (1:16; 52:9) and λαλέω κρίματα πρὸς . . . (4:12; 12:1).

48. So Person’s reconstruction, Recensions, 83.
Jer 52:10
καὶ ἐσφαξέν βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος τοὺς
ψυχὰς Σεδεκίου καὶ ὀρθολογίῳ αὐτοῦ
καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀρχοντὰς Ιουδα
ἐσφαξέν ἐν Δεβλαθά

4 Kgdms 25:7
καὶ τοὺς ψυχὰς Σεδεκίου ἐσφαξέν
καὶ ὀρθολογίῳ αὐτοῦ

Jer 52:11
καὶ τοὺς ὀρθολογίῳ Σεδεκίου
ἐξετύφλωσεν καὶ ἐδήσεν αὐτῶν ἐν
πέδαις καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτῶν βασιλέως
Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Βαβυλῶνα
cαι ἐδώκεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν μύλωνος
ἔως ἡμέρας ἣς ἄπέθανεν

(1) Here the differences in the parallel Greek passages are due entirely to
the Hebrew; the elements shared in the Hebrew are identical in the Greek.

---

Jer 52:12
καὶ ἐν μηνὶ τῷ πέμπτῳ δεκάτῃ τοῦ
μήνος

2 Kgs 25:8
καὶ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ πέμπτῳ ἐβδόμη τοῦ
μήνος (αὐτοῦ ἐναυτοῦ ἐννεακατάκτας
tῷ Ναβουχοδόννοσος βασιλεί
Βαβυλῶνος)

ηλθε Ναβουζαρδαν ὁ ἀρχιμαγείρος
ἔστηκας κατὰ πρόσωπον βασιλέως
Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Ιερουσαλήμ

(1) LXX Jeremiah 52 lacks the parenthetical reference to Nebuchadnez-
zar’s reign. (Though found in a number of mss, it appears to be an Origenic
addition.) It may have been absent in the Vorlage and entered the Hebrew
from 2 Kgs 25:9.

(2) The word νῦν is only translated ἐνώπιον once (7:10), the other 3 occur-
cences of which translate ἱνώντα (7:11; 16:9; 18:4), but commonly as κατὰ
πρόσωπον (18:17, 20; 24:1; 27:8, 44; 29:20; 33:4; 37:20; 41:15, 18; 42:5, 19;
43:7, 9, 22; 44:20; 47:10; 49:2; 51:10; 52:12, 33). Thus this item does not
indicate a deviation from the translation technique in the rest of Jeremiah.
(1) 4 Kgdms 25:9 translates all 4 occurrences of τῆς κόμης by οἶκος, but Jer 52:13 renders the last 2 oἰκία. In Jeremiah, oἰκία is never used of the temple (though once of the temples of the Egyptian gods, 50:12), only rarely of the king’s house (45:7, 11—both contested), usually of the residences of the people (some 25 times), and occasionally of families (43:2; 45:7, 11) or of particular buildings (+ πότου [16:8]; + φυλακῆς [44:15]; + λάκκου [44:16]; + μύλωνος [52:11]). Other occurrences of oἰκία where οἶκος is found in the immediate context are 19:13; 22:13; 42:3 (cf. 42:2); and 45:14.

(2) If the Vorlage read as MT, this is the only instance in Jeremiah (including its occurrences in chap. 52) in which μετὰ is translated πόλις; all others are rendered Ἰερουσαλήμ.

(1) Apparently the Vorlage of 4 Kingdoms lacked the words between שָׁקַה of v. 9 and רֹקְבָּר of v. 10, for the translator perceived the latter as the subject of the former.

(2) 4 Kgdms 25:10 is thus not helpful for a discussion of translation technique. The only item of interest in Jer 52:14 is καθαρέω for ἤτα “break down.” The Hebrew verb occurs 7 times in MT Jeremiah, only 3 of which are
translated καθαρέω (38:28; 49:10; 40:4; 52:14). (The verse containing a 4th instance of קָנָה in the second half of Jeremiah, namely MT Jer 39:8, is absent in the Greek text.) Three of the 7 occurrences of קָנָה occur within a series of verbs. In all 3 cases there is a verb שָׁנָה “uproot” beside קָנָה; in 2 of these the Greek series has one verb fewer than the MT series (1:10; 18:7), and in the 3d the Greek has 3 verbs fewer than the Hebrew (38:28). The similarity of the 2 verbs placed side by side in MT may be the reason for the absence of one or the other in the Vorlage; the trick is to find out which one in each case. In 1:10, the order of the verbs in the series suggests that both קָנָה and שָׁנָה were present in the Vorlage and that the “missing” verb is instead מָרָה, which, interestingly, is rendered καθαρέω in 24:6; 38:40; 49:10; and 51:34; קָנָה, then, corresponds with κατασκάπτω. In 18:7, the 3 verbs in the Hebrew series are שָׁנָה, קָנָה, and וּבְרָא (Hiphil), while the 2 Greek verbs are ἕξαιρον and ἀπόλλυμι. Given that ἀπόλλυμι usually translates בָּרָא and that ἕξαιρον is closer in meaning to שָׁנָה than to קָנָה, it seems that the latter is the odd one out. In 38:28, MT has a series of 7 verbs (שָׁנָה, וּבְרָא, רָתָם, חָפְצָה, בַּשַּׁלָּמָה, and נָשָׁה) while Greek has only 4 (καθαρεόν, κακόν, οἰκοδομεένον, and καταφυτεύον). קָנָה and וּבְרָא seem not to be translated in the Greek, and καθαρέω could stand for either קָנָה or וּבְרָא. In sum, the equation קָנָה → καθαρέω is no surprise in Jer 52:14, because it fits the translation technique of Jeremiah.

49. Though see below.

50. Similar series are found in 1:10; 18:7, 9; 24:6; 38:28; 42:7; and 49:10.
(1) Since both vv. 15 and 16 start with תודלי in MT, one might wonder whether the omission of LXX Jer 52:15 was caused by a parablepsis.51 However, the translator does not begin v. 16 with תודלי, which presumably was absent in his text, but with the words of 15a, מראיה, which he rendered כאיו תouro̓ι of v. 15 to מראיה of v. 16, where he continued, with the result that vv. 15b–16a of the Hebrew are missing in the Greek. Rofé contends that the omission of v. 15 (as well as 27b and 28–30) is due to its absence in the Vorlage and that, though the Hebrew originally read as MT, later editors who wanted to emphasize that Zedekiah’s people were annihilated, not exiled, left these words out.52 However, if the omission is due to parablepsis by the translator, one need not posit a shorter Vorlage here, nor seek an interpretive motive for the shorter text. Hatch and Redpath (sub καταλοίπους) matches καταλοίπους with תודלי, but this is a mistake, for the addition of του λαοῦ makes it clear that מראיה is being translated. In Jeremiah, καταλοίπος is the standard translation for מראיה, but מראיה is a rare word with no usual equivalent. Περισσοῦς (4 Kgdms 25:11), on the other hand, never occurs in Jeremiah. Perhaps the translator’s choice of καταλοίπος was motivated by his choice of the cognate verb.

(2) Besides Jer 52:16 and 2 Kings 25:12, יִבְּנֵים “unpaid laborers” (Koehler-Baumgartner) occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Jer 39:10, for which there is no Greek equivalent. LXX Jeremiah 52 has γεωργοῖ, but in 4 Kgdms 25:12, γαβίν is a transliteration not of the Qere יִבְּנֵים but of the Kethib יִבְּנֵים.

(1) The תַּחַנְנִים that the Babylonians crushed were the ten bronze stands on wheels with basins for holding water which Solomon had made for the temple (1 Kings 7). Their side panels and basins had already been removed by Ahaz, presumably for tribute to Tiglath-pileser (2 Kgs 16:17). Throughout Kingdoms the word is transliterated (1 Kgdms 7:14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29; 2 Kgdms 16:17; 25:13, 16), as well as in 2 Para 4:14. On the one hand, LXX Jeremiah’s βαβσί is semantically a good translation of תַּחַנְנִים. On the other hand, the fact that βαβσί occurs together with στύλος more than 30 times in Exodus 26, 27, and 37 and Numbers 3 and 4 to refer to the bases under the pillars (στύλοι) of the tabernacle, not for תַּחַנְנִים but always for εδα, leads one to believe that the Greek Pentateuch was the source for βαβσί in Jer 52:17 and suggests that the translator was thinking not of Solomon’s stands on wheels but of pillar pedestals. Unfortunately, βαβσί occurs only here in Jeremiah, and of the other 2 occurrences of תַּחַנְנִים in Jeremiah, 34:16 (MT 27:19) lacks a Greek equivalent and 52:20 changes it to θάλασσα. (See my comments on v. 20 below.)

(2) The verb אָסַּנ occurs 27 times in MT Jeremiah, and there is no standard Greek equivalent. Its translation throughout Jeremiah gives evidence for both consistency between the two halves of the book and diversity within each half. As an example of consistency, אָסַּנ is translated λαμβάνω όνει- δίσμων in both 15:15 and 38:19. As an example of diversity in Jeremiah a,
is rendered αἰρω ὀφθαλμοὺς in 3:2 but ἀναλαμβάνω ὀφθαλμοὺς in 13:20. Translation consistency within each half tends to happen where the same Hebrew expression recurs in the immediate context, such as with αἰρω βαστάγματα in 17:21, 27 and αἰρω σημεῖον in 28:12 and 27. Though the translation of ינק by λαμβάνοις is quite common in the LXX, the distribution of this equation in both halves of Jeremiah is noteworthy (9:10, 18; 15:15; 30:29; 38:19; 52:17, 31).

(3) LXX Jeremiah 52 adds καὶ ἀπήνεγκαν without warrant in MT. Person suggests that the Vorlage was different:

JG [Jeremiah 52 Vorlage] includes the verb ἀποφέρω, thus differentiating between the taking of the bronze from the temple and the taking of the bronze to Babel. This retroversion is suggested by the use of the same root (ἀγω) in KG [4 Reigns Vorlage] 25:6 and JG 52:11 for ἀγαθοί with Βαβylon in KH [2 Kings MT] 25:6 and JH [Jeremiah MT] 52:11.53

The Greek verb in question is not (ἀπ)ἀγω, however, but ἀποφέρω, and thus Person does not have a legitimate basis for including ἀποφέρω. Ἀποφέρω occurs only here in Greek Jeremiah and may constitute an addition by the translator.

(1) Though the lists of the temple vessels are almost the same in the two MT passages, LXX Jeremiah 52 is different both from MT and from LXX 2 Kgs 25:14, and it is not easy to determine which Greek items match which Hebrew. I propose the following:

- The translator seems to have read τὴν κεφαλήν as τὰ ῥηθήνα from ר ("edge") which also better explains the Greek στεφάνη. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that τὴν is translated differently in v. 19.
• The order is different in LXX than MT: καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας; is rendered τὰς κρεάγρας; τὰς τιμηθήκτας is not found in LXX v. 18 but is transliterated in v. 19 as τὰ μασσαροθ; τὰς τιμηθήκτας is translated τὰς φιάλας but not translated in v. 19; τὰς τιμηθήκτας is not rendered in LXX v. 18 but is rendered in v. 19.

Jer 52:19

καὶ τὰ σαφφωθ καὶ τὰ μασσαροθ
καὶ τοὺς υποχυτήρας καὶ τὰς λυχνίας
καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τοὺς κυνάθους οὐ δὲν
χρυσὰ χρυσὰ καὶ οὐ ἄργυρὰ ἄργυρα
ἐλαβεν ὁ ἄρχιμάγειρος

4 Kgdms 25:15

καὶ τὰ πυρεία καὶ τὰς φιάλας
tὰς χρυσὰς καὶ τὰς ἄργυρας
ἐλαβεν ὁ ἄρχιμάγειρος

(1) The following suggestions may be made concerning the Greek text of Jer 52:19:

• The transliteration σαφφωθ suggests that the Vorlage had a feminine plural ending for the first item (cf. BHS footnote b1).
• The transliteration μασσαροθ suggests that the translator read τὰ μασσαροθ; (which is found in MT of v. 18 but not in the LXX of v. 18) instead of τὰς τιμηθήκτας.
• The next item, τὰς τιμηθήκτας, is not translated in v. 19, but it is found in v. 18, where it is translated φιάλας. Thus, either it is found only once in the Vorlage or the translator left it out here to avoid repetition.

(2) My conclusions on vv. 18–19 are: (a) that LXX lists the items in a different order than MT, (b) that LXX lists each item only once, and (c) that while it is possible that the Vorlage read differently from MT, the repetition of items might have provided the translator with a motivation for simplifying the list.

(3) Since none of the items listed in vv. 18 and 19 are found elsewhere in Jeremiah, little can be concluded about the translation technique of Jeremiah 52 in relation to the rest of the book.
Jer 52:20
καὶ οἱ στῦλοι δύο καὶ ἡ θάλασσα μία
καὶ οἱ μόσχοι δώδεκα χαλκοὶ ύποκάτω
tῆς θαλάσσης ὁ ἐποίησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
Σαλωμὼν εἰς οἶκον κυρίου
σύκ ἢν σταθμὸς τοῦ χαλκοῦ αὐτῶν

4 Kgdms 25:16
στῦλους δύο ήθάλασσα ή μία
καὶ τὰ μεγανθώ
ὁ ἐποίησεν Σαλωμὼν τῷ οἴκῳ κυρίου
σύκ ἢν σταθμὸς τοῦ χαλκοῦ πάντων τῶν
σκευῶν

(1) The translator of 4 Kgdms 25:15–16 construed καὶ as a direct object of the preceding ἡ κλὲ and thus translated it with accusative στῦλους δύο and then began a new sentence with ἡ θάλασσα. LXX Jer 52:20, on the other hand, begins with a clause-initial καὶ, though there is no waw in MT (nor in MT 2 Kgs 25:16). The translator of Jeremiah 52 (not surprisingly) also inserted καὶ before ἡ θάλασσα.

(2) The words καὶ οἱ μόσχοι δώδεκα χαλκοὶ ύποκάτω in Jer 52:20 translate a Hebrew phrase that is absent in 2 Kgs 25:16: יִשְׁרֵי-יִשְׁרֵי נְחַת אַרְשָׁר נְחַת. It is possible, though far from certain, that this phrase was originally present in 2 Kgs 25:16 but was lost through parablepsis from the letters ינ to the beginning of ינ to the letter י at the beginning of ינ, with the resultant text ינ. In any case, such a parablepsis would have taken place before Kingdoms was translated into Greek, since the Greek reflects the shorter Hebrew text.

(3) LXX Jeremiah 52 has τῆς θαλάσσης where MT has ἡ κλὲ. Since the Hebrew Bible states more than once that the 12 bronze oxen were under the sea (2 Chr 4:4; 1 Kgs 7:25 [LXX 3 Kgdms 7:13]), MT has the more difficult reading. A variety of emendations has been suggested in commentaries and in BHS to insert τίμω (or a pronoun representing it) between τῆς κλῆς and τῆς κλῆς. However, the Vorlage clearly did not have both τίμω and τῆς κλῆς. The simplest solution seems to be that the Vorlage read as MT and the translator, endeavouring to correct it, wrote τῆς θαλάσσης.

(4) For בְּכָל-חקלֵים לֵאמָל, MT Jeremiah 52 also adds the referent הֵלַּת, while MT 2 Kings 25 has only the referent and not the pronominal suffix, and LXX Jeremiah 52 has only the pronoun but not the referent. (Note the
secondary addition of πάντα τῶν σκευῶν τούτων, attested by O [asterisked] Q 86 62 Arm L’. It is possible that the Greek reflects a different Vorlage and an older Hebrew text which had only the pronominal suffix and that the referent in MT Jeremiah 52 is a later explanatory addition which, perhaps, slipped in via a marginal gloss noting the text of 2 Kings 25.

(1) LXX Jer 52:21 records the height of the temple pillar as 35 cubits but MT has 18 cubits, as do 1 Kgs 7:15 [LXX 3 Kgds 7:3] and 2 Kgs
One might argue, as Keil has done in his commentary on 1 Kgs 7:15–22, that the numeral 18 (written יָז) was confused with the numeral 35 (written הָל), but there is no proof that the numerals were so written in the Vorlage of Jeremiah 52, nor are the letters י and ה so similar as to have been easily confused. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the Chronicler’s account of the construction of Solomon’s temple gives the height of the pillars as 35 cubits (2 Chr 3:15). It is thus possible that the translator, detecting a discrepancy, chose 35 cubits as the correct figure. Further, since I proposed earlier that της θαλάσσης is a translator’s change on the basis of 1 Kgs 7:25 or 2 Chr 4:4, it now appears that 2 Chr 4:4, only 6 verses after 3:15, is the more likely candidate. Perhaps the translator’s judgment that 2 Chr 4:4 was more accurate than Jer 52:20 led him to choose the Chronicler’s 35 cubits over Jeremiah 52’s 18 cubits. A tentative hypothesis, which cannot be further explored here, is that, while the Hebrew Jeremiah 52 is based on Kings, the Greek translator double-checked its details against the parallel accounts in Chronicles and even showed preference for the latter in cases of discrepancy. It might prove interesting to study how well this hypothesis holds up for the rest of LXX Jeremiah.

(2) The word רצון occurs 3 times in Jeremiah, all in 52:22. Its 6 occurrences in 1 Kings are all translated ἐπιθέμα (7:4, 5, 6, 9); it is further transliterated χωθαρ in 4 Kgdms 25:17 and χωθαρεθ in 2 Para 4:12, 13. Jeremiah 52’s γείσος also occurs only here in Jeremiah. Thus it is a closed equation, and not productive for our study. So, too, both אֶלֶף and its translation δίκτυον occur only in Jer 52:22, 23.

(3) The word עוג also occurs only here in Jeremiah; 52:21 has υψος, but 52:23 reads τὸ μῆκος ὑπεροχή. The word ὑπεροχή “height” is otherwise found only four times in 2 Maccabees, but τὸ μῆκος “length” is common in the LXX, almost always translating רוח: it is often used of tabernacle dimensions in Exodus 25–38, for temple and palace dimensions in 1 Kings 6–7, and for temple dimensions in 2 Chronicles 3–4. Here, however, one should not suppose that the Vorlage read רוח before עוג (which would produce nonsensical Hebrew).

---

54. A comparative study of the differences between MT’s and LXX’s description of Solomon’s temple is D. W. Gooding, “Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX,” VT 17 (1967) 143–72. Gooding argues that the translator changed the dimensions of the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies in 1 Kingdoms 6 where he judged the Hebrew unclear.

but understand τὸ μῆκος as an adverb added by the translator: “and the height of the one cornice was five cubits long [or high].”

(4) To arrive at the total of 96 pomegranates (v. 23), LXX Jer 52:22 adds that the cornice had 8 pomegranates per cubit for 12 cubits. Since MT Jer 52:22 ends rather abruptly, it may well be that the Greek addition reflects its Vorlage.

(1) One notices at once that the names of the high priest and second priest are absent in LXX Jer 52:24. While it is conceivable that the translator should leave out a name or replace it with a pronoun when the reference is clear from the context, here there is no apparent warrant for such an omission. It would be better to conclude, then, that the names were absent in the Vorlage; they may well be a later addition to the Hebrew. As an interesting sidenote: though there are several Seraiahs in Jeremiah, Seraiah the high priest is mentioned only here in the Hebrew (and hence, not at all in Greek Jeremiah). Zephaniah the priest, on the other hand, is singled out in 21:1, 36[29]:25, 29, and 44[37]:3.

(2) Zephaniah is called υἱὸν τῆς δευτερόσεως in 4 Kgdms 25:18, but τὸν ἱερέα τὸν δεύτεροντα in Jer 52:24. The meaning of the Hebrew is not the second priest among a number of priests (for which one might expect ἰερεύς—see, e.g., 2 Kgs 25:17 // Jer 52:22), but a priest second in rank. Presumably the translator of the Kingdoms passage read הַלֵּאכ for הַלֵּאכ which, combined with δευτερόσεως, results in a scarcely intelligible “son of making second.” So, too, in 2 Kgs [4 Kgdms] 23:4, Hilkiah the high priest (וֹלֵיאכָּה הַלֵּאכָּה → ὁ ἱερεύς ὁ μέγας) is distinguished from ἰερεύς τῆς δευτερόσεως. The translator of Jeremiah 52, however, used the participial form of δεύτερον “to play the role of a δεύτερον” for ἰερεύς (as do 1 Para 16:5 [for the musician second in rank] and 2 Para 35:24 [for Josiah’s second chariot]). Δεύτερον occurs only here in Jeremiah; the other two instances of ἰερεύς are translated διπλοῦς.
dissovÍ (17:18), since its meaning is not “second” but “twofold” and “double,” respectively.

(3) Τὴν ὄδον seems an unlikely translation for πσ, but clearly has the support of the majority of the evidence. Lucanian τὸν οὐδόν “the threshold,” also found in Theodotion, is a much more apt translation. The only other occurrence of πσ in Jeremiah is in the same expression πσ ῥας in 42[35]:4, where both Rahlfs and Ziegler read τοῦ φυλάσσοντος Τὴν αὐλῆν, though the evidence is divided: B, S*, 130, 239, A, 106, 410, 46, as well as Coptic, Ethiopic, and Arabic support the lemma, while S*, Q, V, 26, 86, 710, 534, 538, 544, 613, the O-group, the Catena-group, and Olympiodorus read τὴν ὄδον. With regard to Jer 52:24, Ziegler concluded that τὴν ὄδον was the original reading and that the Lucianic reading was secondary, perhaps derived from Theodotion, possibly via the Hexapla. While Ziegler’s decision is methodologically sound, it does not answer one fundamental question: what could have inspired the translator to render πσ by ὄδος? Unless one postulates a Vorlage different from MT, this question remains unanswered. Οὐδός, on the other hand, presents no such difficulty, and when one considers that οὐδός and ὄδος are alternate spellings of the same word, an easy solution suggests itself: (1) the translator wrote τὸν οὐδόν; (2) at a very early stage, a well-meaning scribe “corrected” to τὴν ὄδον; (3) Theodotion’s τὸν οὐδόν easily found its way into the manuscripts, since it required only a minor change.

One cannot help but wonder whether something similar might have happened at 42:4. In 42:4, of course, one has the added difficulty that τὴν αὐλῆν is well attested. In any text-critical dilemma, one must explain the secondary appearance of the variants.

(A) If τὴν αὐλῆν is the original reading, how might one account for the appearance of τὴν ὄδον? One might point out that the latter is hexaplaric. However, since it cannot be said that it is a revision toward the Hebrew (au contraire!), the most one can say is that τὴν ὄδον was already present in Origen’s text and that Origen left it unchanged. Alternatively, one might suggest that τὴν ὄδον is a secondary intrusion from 52:24. However, it is noteworthy that τὴν αὐλῆν does not appear in the text-critical apparatus at 52:24 and thus the interference between the two texts would seem to be minimal. Finally, if τὴν αὐλῆν were the original reading in 42:4, this would be the only instance in the entire LXX where αὐλῆν translates πσ, and it is difficult to imagine why the translator would do so here, unless the Vorlage read differently from MT.

(B) If, on the other hand, τὴν ὄδον were the older of the two, how might one account for the appearance of τὴν αὐλῆν? Αὐλῆν is not an accurate translation of πσ, nor is the latter ever so rendered in the LXX. There are 19 occurrences of αὐλῆν in Jeremiah (15 of which translate all 15 occurrences of πσ). Most striking among these
is its occurrence (uncontested) only two verses prior, in 42:2, which reads: βάδισον εἰς οἶκον Ἀρχαβίν καὶ δεξιες αὐτούς εἰς οἶκον κυρίου εἰς μίαν τῶν αὐλῶν [>] καὶ ποτείες αὐτούς οἶνον. Though αὐλή is a reasonably good rendering of הַשָּׁם, there is no apparent reason for the translator to use it again at 42:4 for הַשָּׁם.

One might therefore reconstruct the transmission history of 42:4 as follows: as at 52:24, the translator wrote τὸν ὀδὸν, which was changed to τὴν ὀδὸν at an early stage. A later copyist/reviser, thinking that τὴν ὀδὸν made little sense in the context, wrote αὐλήν on the basis of 42:2. If this reconstruction is correct, it means that both occurrences of שֵׁרֶץ in Jeremiah were originally translated οἱ φυλάσσοντες τὸν ὀδὸν, in contrast with 4 Kingdoms which always reads οἱ φυλάσσοντες τὸν σταθμὸν (12:10; 22:4; 23:4; 25:18). Though this item occurs too infrequently to draw a firm conclusion, it seems to lend support to the suggestion that Jeremiah 52 was translated by the same individual who translated the second half of the book.

---

(1) Though most manuscripts read ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔλαβεν after the first occurrence of καὶ in Jer 52:25, this appears to be a hebraizing correction; B, S, 106, 410, 239, and Bohairic support the lemma. Since the verb ἔλαβεν is also
found in v. 24, it is possible that the translator decided to continue the sentence without repeating the verb and to skip the rather obvious רְשֵׁי. However, it is equally possible that רְשֵׁי was absent in the Vorlage.

(2) While 4 Kgdms 25:19 translates הָלַע לַאֹשֶׁשׁ הַמְּפֹלֶלֶתָּה as ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πολεμιστῶν, Jeremiah 52 does not formally represent the Hebrew preposition. This need not suggest that the Vorlage was different; rather, since a chief is by definition “over” his subordinates, the translator doubtless considered a preposition superfluous. The (approximately) 450 occurrences of the preposition ἐπὶ in Jeremiah are almost always rendered by a Greek preposition, usually ἐπὶ, but occasionally are not formally represented in the Greek (1:9; 5:31; 6:19; 12:9; 13:21; 18:23; 21:4; 23:34; 25:12; 28:8; 33:5; 34:8; 37:20; 39:24; 42:6; 43:32; 51:20; 52:4, 25).

(3) The discrepancy between “five” and “seven” men is not a matter of translation but of the Hebrew parent text; LXX in both passages reflects MT.

(4) The Hebrew יָשָׁשׁ מַרְאָא פֶּרְגִיטִקֶל “men of those who saw the king’s face” is different from the corresponding Greek ἄνδρας ὑνωμαστός ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ βασιλέως “renowned men in the king’s presence.” This is probably due not to a different Vorlage but to the translator, for two reasons: (a) The Hebrew expression is vague and thus lends itself to interpretation, for “those who see the king’s face” might refer to a range of categories, such as attendants (who see to his needs), bodyguards (who look out for him), devotees (who behold him), counselors, or heroes, etc. LXX eliminated the vagueness by translating “renowned men.” (b) It is difficult to account for MT if the Vorlage read as LXX. Other instances of ὑνωμαστός in the LXX translate διήθης (“men of name”: Gen 6:4; Num 16:2; 1 Chr 5:24; cf. Jer 13:11, where εἰς λαὸν ὑνωμαστόν translates λέγεται ἦν). The presence of ἐν would require the introduction of ὁ in an equivalent parent text with the further result that ἀναφέρεται. On the Greek side, though ὑνωμαστός is not a common word in the LXX, it also occurs in 13:11, though for different Hebrew, and both occurrences are nonliteral translations.

(5) Where MT has ἅρματα ἄρα, ἄρα, ἄρα, LXX reads καὶ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν δυνάμεων τῶν γραμματευόμενα τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς; ὁταν is not translated, the Greek verb is a cognate not of “host” but of “scribe,” and the direct object has been converted to an indirect object. If these differences were all due to differences in the Vorlage, the text of MT would be difficult to account for. It would seem wiser, then, to regard them as a series of adjustments made by the translator. But if his text was essentially identical to MT, how did the translator understand the Hebrew? A key question here is the grammatical
function of רָפֵר: is it part of the construct chain that follows it, or is it in apposition to it? In other words, are the רָפֵר and the אֶחָד הַנַּצֵּב the same or different individuals? The Hebrew is ambiguous. A related issue is whether the grammatical head of אֶחָד הַנַּצֵּב is רָפֵר or רַשָׁ. Here LXX’s γραμματεύοντα indicates that the translator thought that the activity of the רָפֵר was being referred to (“the recorder of the army who recorded for the people of the land”). Further, his choice of a cognate of γραμματεύς (where the Hebrew has a cognate of נֶבֶץ) suggests that he regarded the רָפֵר and the אֶחָד הַנַּצֵּב as the same person; the latter label merely qualifies the former. This might explain why the translator did not translate רַשׁ. Equating the two is also supported by other data in Jeremiah. The רָפֵר appear to be administrative officials closely associated with the king and frequently mentioned as a distinct category besides the king and his servants, the prophets, the priests, and the people of the land (1:18; 2:26; 4:9; 8:1; 17:25; 24:8; 25:1; 26:11; 36:2; 39:32; 43:24; 51:21). Among these רָפֵר, Jer 43:12 and 21 mention Elishama, the secretary (γραμματεύς > רָפֵר).

Jer 52:26
נִקְחָא אֲוֹתִים בְּנַחֲרָרָא דַּבבֶּרְשָׁ
הִלָּךְ אוֹתִים אֵלֵּי פָּכַל בְּכֵל רֵבֶּל
Jer 52:26
καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτοὺς Ναβουζαρδαν
ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος καὶ ἦγαγεν αὐτοὺς
πρὸς βασιλέα Βαβυλώνος εἰς Δεβλαθα

2 Kgs 25:20
נִקְחָא אֲוֹתִים בְּנַחֲרָרָא דַּבבֶּרְשָׁ
הִלָּךְ אוֹתִים אֵלֵּי פָּכַל רֵבֶּל
4 Kgdms 25:20
καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτοὺς Ναβουζαρδαν
ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος καὶ ἦγαγεν αὐτοὺς
πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλώνος εἰς Δεβλαθα

(1) This is the only time in Jeremiah that ἁγω translates ἔλλο (Hiphil). Most of the 14 occurrences of ἁγω translate the Hiphil of מָצַב, but other equivalents include לְכִי (11:19), הָלָל (47:1), הָלָל (48:12; 50:10), and הָלָל (52:9). Of the four other occurrences of הָלָל (Hiphil), the first (2:6) is translated καθοδήγεω (ἀνάγω is found earlier in the verse), the second is not represented in the Greek (2:17), the third is translated ἀνάγω (38:9), and the fourth (39:5) εἰσέρχομαι (involving a transformation of object to subject). This item demonstrates little more than that the translation technique of Greek Jeremiah is characterized by variety.

56. The ambiguity is reflected in the English translations: KJV reads: “the principal scribe of the host”; NIV has: “the secretary who was chief officer.” But RSV and NRSV both translate: “the secretary of the commander of the army” (emphases mine).
Jer 52:27
καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτούς βασιλεὺς Βαβυλώνος
ἐν δεξιὰ έν γῆ Εμαθ

4 Kgdms 25:21
καὶ ἐπαισέν αὐτοῦς βασιλεὺς
Βαβυλώνος καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτοῦς
ἐν δεξιά ἐν γῆ Αμαθ καὶ ἀποφίλεθη
Ἰουδαίας ἐπάνωθεν τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ

(1) 4 Kingdoms translates ἁμαρτάω (Hiphil) παίω, but Jeremiah uses πατάσσω, which is much more common in the LXX, almost always for ἁμαρτάω. In Jeremiah, πατάσσω is used exclusively for ἁμαρτάω (19 times), except in 48:4, where MT has ἁμαρτάω (Hiphil). However, the fact that there are a number of differences between LXX and MT in Jer 48:2–4 makes it possible that the Greek is nonliteral here. Though πατάσσω is the default, alternatives are also found, the most striking of which is παίω in 5:6; 14:19; and 37:14, thus in both halves of the book.57

(2) The absence of a Greek equivalent for ἁμαρτάω suggests that it was not present in the Vorlage. On the other hand, πατάσσω can refer to a fatal blow (see, e.g., Acts 7:24; 12:23), and it is thus possible that the translator considered it superfluous to add “and he killed them.” The absence of the same phrase after πατάσσω in Jer 48:2 lends credence to this possibility.

(3) The final clause of MT Jer 52:27 is absent in the Greek, as are vv. 28–30. Doubtless they were not present in the Vorlage. Bogaert and Rofé58 count vv. 15, 27b, and 28–30 as three separate omissions, deliberately suppressed in the Hebrew Vorlage. It has already been shown that the omission at v. 15 is probably due to a parablepsis on the part of the translator and thus is not grist for the mill of Bogaert and Rofé. Here it ought to be noted that it makes good sense to treat v. 27b and vv. 28–30 as a single omission (i.e., as vv. 27b–30), not merely because no text separates them, but also because v. 27b in the Hebrew may be considered a summary statement introducing vv. 28–30.59

57. Note also that Clement of Alexandria reads παίω for πατάσσω in 40:5.
(4) 4 Kgdms 25:21 is followed by five verses which have no parallel in Jeremiah 52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse in 4 Kgdms</th>
<th>Verse in Jeremiah 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:21</td>
<td>52:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נב הָגִידָם שָבֵעַ שָנָה לְגַלְתָּה יִחְיָהְךָ</td>
<td>יְהוָה שָלַשְׁסָהּ שָבֵעַ שָנָה לְגַלְתָּה יִחְיָהְךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֻּפְשֵׁרָם שָבֵעַ שָנָה לְגַלְתָּה יִחְיָהְךָ</td>
<td>בּוֹשֵׁרָם שָבֵעַ שָנָה לְגַלְתָּה יִחְיָהְךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
<td>נַשְׁאָא אֶדְרַחְתֵּךְ מַלֶּךָ בִּכְלִיתֵךְ מִלְכַּתָּה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Verse-initial רָאִים is usually translated כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ (1:3, 4, 11, 13; 13:6; 18:5; 24:4; 33:8; 35:1, 12; 36:30; 39:26; 40:1; 42:12; 43:27; 44:6, 13; 48:1, 4, 7, 13; 50:8; 52:4, 31), but occasionally כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ (13:3, 8; 41:12; 42:11; 43:9, 16, 23; 49:7; 50:1); it seems that the two Greek equivalents were interchangeable, for they are often used in close proximity with each other (witness 13:3, 6, 8; 42:11, 12; 43:23, 27).60 Both expressions are used in two ways: with a subject (always לֹאָגָהְו קָרִיםוּ [“and the word of the Lord came . . .”], except 44:13 [אֲוֹתוֹ]), or without (“and it happened that . . .”). כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ usually translates רָאִים, but sometimes רָאִים (3:9; 20:9; 31:39; 44:11), and once רָאִים רָאִים (14:1). All occurrences of כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ translate רָאִים (רָאִים in 51:22). Where clause-initial רָאִים is considered future, it is translated כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ and כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ (3:16; 4:19; 5:19; 12:15, 16; 15:2; 16:10; 17:6, 8, 24; 25:19; 27:10; 28:37, 63; 32:28; 38:28; 40:9; 49:16; never כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ), though כְּאַלְּגֶנֶךְ is otherwise used only to translate Hebrew nominal clauses—usually verbless.

---

60. The two also often contest one another in the critical apparatus; see, e.g., 13:3, 8; 41:12; 50:1.
though sometimes having הוה—or Hebrew stative verbs (εἰμί + subject complement; e.g., 2:35).

(2) 4 Kingdoms’ ἀποικεσία occurs only 8 times in the LXX (3 times in 4 Kingdoms, 4 times in Ezra 6, and once in Pss. Sol. 9:1), never in Jeremiah. ἀποικίζω is more common, found 33 times in the LXX, 10 of which are in Jeremiah, 2 of them translating תהלג (the other is 24:5). The Hebrew noun תהלג occurs 5 times in Jeremiah, twice rendered with the verb ἀποικίζω, and 3 times with the noun ἀποικία (35:4; 36:22; 47:1); the additional 10 occurrences outside Jeremiah are never translated either ἀποικίζω or ἀποικία, but most often αἰχμαλωσία. The translator’s choice of ἀποικίζω in Jer 52:31 not only reflects the prominence of this verb in Greek Jeremiah, but also stands in striking parallel with 24:5, where ἡ γῆ ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ is rendered τοῦ ἀποικισθέντος Ἰουδαία.

(3) For both instances of ἑλώτες in this verse, LXX has Ἰωάκιμ. Person suggests that the Vorlage read Ἰωάκημ, its reductor having confused Jehoiachin with Jehoiakim. Indeed, Jehoiakim is consistently represented by Ἰωάκιμ in the LXX, including the following occurrences in Jeremiah: 1:3; 22:18; 24:1; 25:1; 26:2; 33:1, 21; 42:1; 43:1, 9, 28, 30, 32; 44:1; 51:31. Jehoiakim’s son and successor, Jehoiachin, is mentioned some 10 times in Jeremiah, but with various Hebrew spellings of his name, including יְהוֹעַדְיָה, יְהוֹעַדְיָה, and יְהוֹעַדְיָה, all 3 of which are represented Ἰεχονίας (22:24, 28; 24:1; 34:20; 35:4; 36:2); Jeremiah 52 is the only chapter to give his name as Ἰεχονίας. However, the fact that the Greek reads Ἰωάκιμ need not suggest a Vorlage different from MT, for Ἰεχονίας is always rendered Ἰωάκιμ in the LXX (4 Kgms 24:6, 8, 12, 15; 25:27; Ezek 1:2), except for 2 Para 36:8 and 9, which have Ἰεχονίας.

(4) LXX Jeremiah 52 places Jehoiachin’s promotion on the “24th day of the month,” as opposed to MT Jeremiah 52’s “25th day” and 2 Kings/4 Kingdoms 25’s “27th day.” The LXX evidence for “24th” is unanimous (though there are variants in its spelling), but Aquila, Symmachus, and the Syro-hexaplar read “25th” with MT. Most likely, the reading of Greek Jeremiah is due to a difference in the Vorlage.

61. For a recent discussion of the meaning of ἀποικία in the context of hellenistic Judaism, see W. Aalders, De Septuagint: Brug tussen synagoge en kerk (Heerenveen: Groen, 1999) 27–34.


63. Cf. Stipp’s discussion (Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut, 50).
(5) The spelling ὄλαιμαφαδαχ suggests that the translator read ὄλαι μάρuéω (with ु and ṛ reversed) rather than ὄλαι μάρünde.

(6) LXX gives a nonliteral but accurate translation of μῆνα μήλων: ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ὧ ἐβασιλεύετο. Interestingly, this is the only occurrence of μήλων that is translated in Greek Jeremiah. (Two prior occurrences, in MT 10:7 and 25:14, are absent in the Old Greek.) The parallel passage in 4 Kingdoms 25 has the noun βασιλεία, but the Hebrew has the infinitive construct of μῆλε rather than μήλων. On the use of βασιλεία in Jeremiah, see my comments on 52:4, above.

(7) The translator apparently read the Kethib ἀρωκ and understood ἀρωκ not as a noun but as the Qal passive participle of ἄρα “restrain,” which also occurs at 39:2, where it is translated in exactly the same way, as φυλάσσετο. The noun ἀρωκ, on the other hand, is always rendered φιλακή (44:15, 18; 52:33). Further, in 44:4, where the Kethib has ἀρωκ βασίλεως and the Qere ἀρωκ βασίλεως, the Greek has εἰς οἶκον τῆς φιλακῆς; here it is quite conceivable that the Vorlage read the Qere or simply the segolate noun. Thus this item, too, shows that the translation technique of Jeremiah 52 is consistent with that of (the second half of) Greek Jeremiah.

(1) The word ἀγαθός is most often translated ἀγαθάκα in Jeremiah (2:7; 5:25; 6:16; 8:15; 14:11, 19; 15:11; 17:6; 18:10, 20; 21:10; 24:5, 6; 36:32; 38:12, 14; 39:39, 42; 40:9; 46:16; 49:6), but also καλός (12:6; 47:4) and χρηστός (24:2, 3, 5; 40:11; 52:32) and the verbs συμφέρω (33:14) and ἀγαθόδος (51:27). The above distribution patterns show that this item does not favor Thackeray’s view that the book was divided and translated by separate individuals; rather, it appears that the translator throughout chose the Greek equivalent whose nuance best suited the immediate context.64

64. Nor, for the same reason, does this item favor Tov’s revisor theory.
All 3 occurrences of לְמָלֵל in Jeremiah are translated ἐπάνω (42:4; 50:10; 52:32). Elsewhere this equation occurs only in Gen 22:9; Isa 14:13; and Dan LXX/θ 12:6, 7.

Thackeray uses the fact that the Hebrew word הושע is rendered στόλη in 52:33 as support for his view that the final chapter was translated by a third individual. Since στόλη occurs only here in Jeremiah, and the other 3 occurrences of הושע are all rendered ἰμάτιον (43:24; 48:5; 50:12), Thackeray’s argument appears to have some weight. However, it is not uncommon in Jeremiah that regular translation equivalents are abandoned in specific instances. In such instances, before resorting to the hypothesis of a different translator, one should check whether other factors might have motivated the translator to choose an unusual equivalent. To give an example, in Jer 28:2, καθημερίζω “despise,” which like στόλη, occurs but once in Jeremiah, translates the verb ἐριστεῖν “scatter,” which is otherwise translated twice with διασπέραω and twice with λικμᾶω. Apparently this choice was motivated by the fact that the Hebrew verb was preceded by µυρίζ; to reflect the lexical similarity of the Hebrew in the Greek, the translator rendered ἔβριστακαὶκαθημερίζοσιναὐτήν. As a second example, 8 of 9 occurrences of ἔρις are translated πλήγη (10:19; 14:17; 15:18; 19:8; 21:4; 22:3; 32:23; 34:10).
27:13; 37:12, 14, 17); the exception is 6:7, which has μάστιξ. More examples could easily be provided, but the point is that it would be difficult to use such examples as evidence of the work of different translators. Thus στολή is not able to support the weight that Thackeray attaches to it. As for 52:33, it is noteworthy that, while ιμάτιον can refer to various kinds of clothing, στολή denotes a long, flowing robe indicative of high social rank. It might seem strange, then, to read of a στολή τῆς φυλακῆς; nevertheless, στολή was the word that came to the translator’s mind as best suiting the attire of King Jehoiachin.

(3) Seldom in Jeremiah is a relative pronoun introduced where there is no ἡμέρα in the Hebrew, but there are 3 such instances in Jeremiah 52: vv. 11 (ἐος ἡμέρας ἦς ἀπέθανεν, for ἥρων ἀποθέσθαι), 33 (πᾶσας τας ἡμέρας ἦς ἐξηστήκεν, for θερηστήκειν), and 34 (ἐος ἡμέρας ἦς ἀπέθανεν, for θερηστήκειν). These 3 are similar to one another, and the Hebrew phrases which they translate are not found elsewhere in Jeremiah. Their importance lies in the fact that, while Hebrew (and English) relatives can be omitted, Greek relatives cannot, which means that if the translator chose to express an action by a verb rather than a noun, his options were limited, and Greek syntax might have obligated him to include a relative where none was present in the Hebrew. Instances of a comparable translation technique elsewhere in Jeremiah are 11:4 (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἦν ἀνήγαγον αὐτοῦ for ὅραμα Ἴσαρις ἀνέκτητα), 11:14 (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐν ὧ ἐπικαλοῦνται με, for ἵσταται ἐντυπώστατα), and 51:44 (αὐτὸς κατέτητο, for ἵσταται).
the translator’s treatment of δυτίκ, not as a noun in a bound construction but as an adverbial translated διὰ παντὸς (as it is often rendered), forces him to recast the syntax of the whole. Third, there appears to be a connection between the translation of δόρα in 52:34 and in its only other Jeremian occurrence in 47:5, where τῆς γῆς δόρα is translated καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄργι-μάγευρος δόρα. Δόρα seems to translate γῆ. While it is possible that the plural indicates that both Hebrew nouns are being represented in the single Greek word, note that both other occurrences of δόρων are also plural, even though they translate singular nouns (28:59; 40:11). In any case, it appears that the translator had some difficulty with δόρα in both passages.

(2) Ziegler’s lemma reads the form ἔδιδετο (3d sing. impf. mid. of διδόω), supported by B*, S*, A, 538, 26, 233, 544. The rest of the evidence, however, has ἔδιδοτο (3d sing. impf. mid. of διδομι). Ziegler’s apparatus also refers the reader to the Theodotionic text of Bel and the Dragon 32 and to p. 250 of Thackeray’s Grammar, where Thackeray writes:

the 3rd sing. imperf. and 2nd aor. middle forms as from διδόω (by an easy change of o to ε) appear in late portions or texts of the LXX: imperf. ἔδιδετο Jer. lii. 34 B*A (the chap. is a late appendix to the Greek version), Dan. Θ Bel 32 B* A Q. 66

In short, Ziegler appears to accept Thackeray’s suggestion that Jeremiah 52 is a “late portion” of the LXX and therefore reasons that the late form ἔδιδετο must be original. However, as this paper has attempted to demonstrate, Thackeray’s arguments to support the notion that LXX Jeremiah 52 is later than the rest of Greek Jeremiah are very weak, and the translation technique of Jeremiah 52 provides no good evidence for a distinct translator. If, in fact, LXX Jeremiah 52 is no later than the rest of the book, it may well be that the later ἔδιδετο is secondary.

(3) 4 Kgdms 25:30 reads εξ οἰκου, where MT has τῆς. Presumably the Vorlage read τῆς (as does 25:27, only three verses prior).

C. A Reevaluation of the Translation Technique of Jeremiah 52

The above analysis investigates approximately 70 items which are translated differently in Jeremiah 52 than in the parallel passage in 4 Kingdoms. The mere presence of so many discrepancies amply demonstrates that the two passages were handled by independent translators, as Thackeray already observed. 67 Not all of the differences between LXX 4 Kgdms 24:18–25:30 and

66. Thackeray, Grammar, 250.
LXX Jeremiah 52 are matters of translation technique; some are due to differences between the parent text of each. Some such differences are visible in the Masoretic Text. Others are not apparent from the Masoretic Text; in various places I have suggested that the Greek gives evidence of a Vorlage different from MT. But where the parent text of 4 Kgdms 24:18–25:30 may be judged to be the same as that of Jeremiah 52, differences between the Greek of each are probably due to the different translation practices of each translator. Therefore, items in Jeremiah 52 which are handled differently from 4 Kgdms 24:18–25:30 can provide a snapshot of the translational approach of the translator of Jeremiah 52. By analyzing how such items are handled in the rest of LXX Jeremiah, one can assess the relationship of LXX Jeremiah 52 to the rest of LXX Jeremiah.

A number of the items studied in the above analysis of Jeremiah 52 are not found in the rest of the book. In some such cases, the reason is that the Hebrew construction in question is never or rarely found elsewhere in the book, which means that no translational pattern can be established, which in turn means that such items cannot be admitted as evidence of a different translator. Examples include: בַּהֲנָה לְעָל in 52:4, בַּקַּע in 52:7, the temple vessels of 52:18–19, שֶׁנֶּה in 52:22, מְלֵתֶר in 52:31, שֶׁנֶּה in 52:33, and רָחָז in 52:34. In other cases, the Greek is an interpretive translation of the Hebrew in a specific context. Some examples are: καὶ τοῦ προτειχίσματος in 52:7, καὶ πάντες οἱ παιδεῖς αὐτοῦ in 52:8, ἄνδρας ὄνομαστοὺς ἐν προσάρτω τοῦ βασιλέως in 52:25, γραμματεύουντα in 52:25, στολὴ in 52:33, and σύνταξις in 52:34. Thus such instances do not demonstrate the work of a different translator either, though such interpretive treatment of the parent text is completely in character with the rest of LXX Jeremiah.

Other Hebrew-Greek equivalents in Jeremiah 52 are commonly attested, not only in Jeremiah but more widely in the LXX (such as שָׁהְו → ἐτος, και δυνάμει → οἱ ἀνδρεῖς οἱ πολέμισται, ἐρεῖ → καταδίωκο, τὴν ἐπίκουρον → καὶ ἐγένετο). Such items, however, are of limited value for assessing the specific relationship between LXX Jeremiah 52 and the rest of LXX Jeremiah.

Many of the items investigated above range somewhere between those never attested elsewhere in Jeremiah and those commonly found in Jeremiah and in other parts of the LXX. These have occasional parallels in the rest of Jeremiah. In some such cases, the Hebrew constructions which they translate are but seldom found in Jeremiah (βασιλεία αὐτοῦ for מֵלֶךְ in 1:2; 52:4; τὸν ὅνον for בּוּק in 42:4; 52:24; ἐπάνω for לָשׁוֹן in 42:4; 50:10; 52:32; difficulty with מְמַלְּכָּה in 47:5; 52:34). In other cases, the Hebrew expression is common enough, but is variously rendered in the Greek. Here it is good to bear in mind
what Thackeray also noted, that a translator “did not, for the most part, rigidly render each Hebrew word by a single Greek equivalent. The rendering varies in the same book and in the same context.”68 It is not difficult to demonstrate that such variety is not only present but characteristic throughout Jeremiah. Note, for example, that the verb קנס is rendered κρατεῖν in 6:23, but κατέχειν in 6:24, and καταδυναστεύω in 27:33, but ἔχειν in 27:42, κατακρατεῖν in 27:43, and ἐφίστημι in 28:12; or that ἔντι is translated οἶκος, even when it is translated οἶκος in the immediate context, in 19:13; 22:13; 42:3; 45:14; and 52:13. Examples of such variety could easily be multiplied.69 But where variety is characteristic, sameness is all the more noteworthy: thus στερεῖν for קיון in 5:3; 10:4; and 52:6 but never elsewhere in LXX; λαλεῖν πρὸς...μετὰ κρίσεως for ὁδις in 1:16 and 52:9 but never elsewhere in LXX; καθαρέειν for ἑαυτῷ in 38:28 (or for ἑαυτός), 40:4, 52:14, and for ἐστίν in 24:6, 38:28 (or for ἑαυτός), 38:40, 49:10, 51:34; πατάσσειν alone for (Hiphil) θύμων in 48:2 and 52:27; ἀποκεῖσθαι for ἀπὸ θύμων in 24:5 and 52:31; φυλάσσει for ἀλήθεια in 39:2 and 52:31; χρηστὸς for τρίτη in 24:2, 3, 5, 40:11; and 52:32. Other parallels in translation technique between Jeremiah 52 and the rest of the book are the recourse to a genitive absolute in 19:3b, 23:27, 33:8, 35:9, 36:2, 43:23, 48:7, 49:18, and 52:1; and the use of the rare root χαρακ- in 39:2, 40:4, and 52:4.

The above examples show that there are a number of significant connections between Jeremiah 52 and Jeremiah α and/or Jeremiah β.70 This has three important implications. The first is that there is no reason to believe that Jeremiah 52 was the work of a third translator, as Thackeray initially suggested. Not only are his supporting arguments very weak, but the data within Jere-

---

68. Ibid., 245. Thackeray cites Swete’s Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 317.

69. Other examples are: (1) the variety of ways in which the expression “without inhabitants” is rendered: see 6:8; 9:11; 27:3; 28:29, 37, 43, 62; 29:19; 30:11; 31:9; and 39:43; (2) ἔρχεται is rendered τόσσοι in 2:15 and 3:19 (and nowhere else in the LXX), τίθημι in 13:16, 22:6, and 27:3, and as δίδομι in 28:39 and 38:21; (3) μὴν (Hiphil) is translated καθοδηγέω in 2:6 (ἀνάγω is found earlier in the verse), ἀνάγω in 39:2, εἰςέχομαι in 39:5, and λαμβάνω in 52:32.

70. Parallels shared by Jeremiah α and β are not uncommon. Besides the examples mentioned in E. Tov, The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8 (HSM 8; Missoula, 1976), note: (1) γρηγορεῖν for προδοτήν in Jer 1:12, 5:6, and 38:28 (twice) and otherwise only in Dan 9 9:14; (2) πρόθυμον for ἐποίημα in 1:15, 19:2, 33:10, 43:10, and 50:9; (3) the only 2 occurrences of ἀμέλεκτον in the translated corpus of the LXX, in 4:17 and 38:32; (4) ἀποκίνηται for ἀνέβαι in 13:19 and 9 times in Jeremiah β; (5) κατάλειμμα for προδοτήν in 27:26 and 47:11; (5) the occurrence of βέβλητιν ἕμνε γένηται in 22:15, 33:14, 45:20, and 47:9; (6) παῖδον for ἡμείς (Hiphil) in 5:6, 14:19, and 37:14.
miah 52 do not support his suggestion. Second, the existence of such connections casts doubt on Thackeray’s modified view that Jeremiah 52 was a later addition to the Hebrew book, a translation of which was later added to the Greek.71 Thackeray points to instances of later Greek forms in Jeremiah 52, but these may well be secondary. There is no early manuscript evidence which suggests that Jeremiah 52 was ever not part of the book (Codex 41 was a solitary 9th–10th-century witness to its omission). Though Thackeray is correct in noting that its contents have “the nature of an appendix,”72 this does not in any way suggest that Jeremiah 52 had not as yet been appended when the book was translated into Greek. In any case, the translation technique does not give evidence that it was a later addition. A final implication is that the items analyzed in this paper lend no support to Thackeray’s thesis that the two halves of LXX Jeremiah give evidence for two different translators; some items in Jeremiah 52 have parallels in Jeremiah α, others in Jeremiah β, and still others in both. The existence of such parallels urges the need for a thorough reexamination of Thackeray’s theory of bisectioning,73 a reexamination which on the one hand fully accounts for items displaying continuity of translation technique, and on the other hand scrutinizes items previously associated with discontinuity of translation technique to see whether they indeed prove discontinuity or can be otherwise accounted for.

---

71. Note also Ziegler’s comment in his Einleitung to Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae: “Sehr fraglich bleibt, ob Kap. 52 wirklich nur ein späterer Nachtrag ist” (p. 128n).
72. “The Greek Jeremiah,” 260. Tov rightly noted that Thackeray was “probably more impressed by the secondary nature of ch. 52 in MT than by textual evidence relating to the LXX” (The Septuagint Translation, 79). Indeed, one of the pitfalls in Thackeray’s reasoning was his mixture of text-critical with literary-critical arguments.
73. Tov provided one such reexamination, but his treatment of chap. 52 is limited. He offers the following remark in appendix 2: “there is little positive evidence that the substratum of ch. 52 was part of the OG, and was subsequently revised by Jer-R because the Hebrew vocabulary of ch. 52 differs from that of the remainder of Jeremiah. On the other hand, the location of ch. 52 between two sections which were both revised by Jer-R (chapters 29–51 and Bar 1:1–3:8) makes it likely that it underwent the same revision” (Tov, The Septuagint Translation, 79). But this deduction arises from his thesis that there was such a reviser, rather than from the data within LXX Jeremiah 52. For a telling critique of Tov, see Stipp, Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut, especially pp. 17–19.
Transcriptions of Hebrew words into Greek, because they were unfamiliar to Greek-speaking scribes, were especially susceptible to textual corruption. It is a failing that, ironically, makes transcriptions exceptionally useful to the textual critic, for whom they serve as markers of textual groupings.¹

Its redeeming virtues notwithstanding, the textual corruption that is often associated with transcriptions complicates the determination of their original form. In this process the weighing of textual witnesses may play a lesser role than with other word types, while factors like the spelling of the word in Hebrew sources and the varieties of Greek scribal error may play a greater one.² Nevertheless, with transcriptions as with other elements of the text, translation technique is an essential consideration in the text-critical process. Without a knowledge of translation technique—or rather what we might in this context call transcription technique—a datum such as the Hebrew spelling of the word would be of little use.

¹ So, for example, M. Margolis, “The Washington MS. of Joshua,” JAOS 31 (1911) 367, who calls transcribed names in the book of Joshua “the milestones which guide the investigator in finding his way to texts held together by group affinity.”

² A. Pietersma comments that “it is doubtful that in the case of proper nouns one should be swayed by which or how many witnesses support a reading, unless it is undeniably hexaplaric. The chief focus should be on the form of the Hebrew name” (“Ra 2110,” in Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren [ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J. W. Wevers; AAWG, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 3/190; MSU, 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990] 277. J. W. Wevers states that “With transcriptions palaeographic considerations play a large role; furthermore one must decide whether the spelling of M is actually the same as of the parent text of Gen” (Text History of the Greek Genesis [MSU 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974] 213, cited hereafter as THGG).
In the present article, I will investigate aspects of transcription technique, using selected readings of the Göttingen Genesis as illustrations. Examples are taken not only from the printed Göttingen edition but also from J. W. Wevers’s proposed changes to the printed edition.³

**Terminology and Method**

Two brief notes on terminology and method will be helpful before we proceed. First, the term transcription, rather than transliteration, is used advisedly. Although the two words are at times used interchangeably, in its narrower sense transliteration is a graphic process, the replacement of one grapheme or symbol with a symbol in a different writing system. An example of a nearly pure transliteration is the Hebrew coding of the CCAT biblical texts,⁴ as in W:)ET-LOW+ for וָאוֹת ‘and Lot’ (Gen 12:5). In this example Hebrew וו̀ is represented by W regardless of whether וו̀ marks a consonant or a vowel. The principle followed in transliteration is that of one-for-one representation of symbols. Transcription, on the other hand, is a process in which symbols stand for sounds rather than for other symbols.⁵

It seems safe to say that it was primarily this latter, sound-based, process that characterized the work of the Septuagint translators.⁶ We see, for example, that the Hebrew combinations וָ and וַ are transcribed ξ rather than κσ or κς (cf. אֵלזאָ//Ikzov in Gen 25:2 and דָּרְשׁוֹן // Arfaxad in Gen 10:22, etc.). Another telling bit of evidence is the frequent disregard in transcriptions

---
⁴. Available at gopher://ccat.sas.upenn.edu. The coding scheme is that of the Michigan-Claremont BHS. Some versions of the electronic text include elements not shown above, such as morphological boundary markers. In such cases the text is of course not a pure transliteration.
⁵. This distinction between transcription and transliteration follows the usage of the International Organization for Standardization, as seen, for example (with specific reference to Hebrew), in ISO Information Centre, Information Transfer: Handbook on International Standards Governing Information Transfer (ISO Standards Handbook 1, 1977) 201.
⁶. The representation of the Hebrew tetragrammaton יהוה in some manuscripts by Greek ΠΠΠΠ, which appears somewhat similar graphically, is no exception, since it is evidently a recensional element; see A. Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram,” in De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers (ed. Claude Cox and Albert Pietersma; Mississauga, Ont.: Benben, 1984) 85–101; R. Hanhart, review of F. Dunand, Papyrus grecs bibliques, cols. 39–45 in OLZ 73 (1978) 42–23; and Henry B. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (ed. R. R. Ottley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914) 39–40 n. 4. In any event, the tetragrammaton is an exceptional case due to the taboo on pronouncing it.
for the distinction between word-final \( m \) and \( n \), as seen in many cases such as אָפְרָי // Ραφαὴν ‘Rephaim’. The fluctuation is best explained as resulting from the indistinct pronunciation of nasal consonants in word-final position.\(^7\) For if it were the symbols \( Ũ \) and \( Ū \) that the translator strove to represent, we would not see the degree of fluctuation that we do.\(^8\)

The second note concerns this paper’s notation and its implications. Where MT-LXX word pairs are adduced, two parallel lines (//) between elements of the pair indicate that the words are formally equivalent to each other, meaning that they occur in the same position in the biblical text. This is not to suggest that the MT’s word was the source of the Greek one, or that the Septuagint translators were necessarily working with a vocalization tradition or consonantal text identical to that of the Masoretes. Nor does it imply that the Hebrew language of the Septuagint translators was identical in pronunciation to the language of the Masoretes.

Nevertheless, where there were no errors in the transmission of the texts,\(^9\) the MT’s pronunciation should display a predictable relationship to Septuagint transcriptions because, to cite an axiom of historical linguistics, sound change is regular.\(^10\) It is thanks to this principle that we can compare English home and stone to German Heim and Stein and find regular, predictable phonological relationships. We do so without believing that the modern German word is the source of the English one. Similarly, we need not believe that the

---

\(^7\) It need not concern us here whether this indiscriminate pronunciation can be attributed to Hebrew or Aramaic or to pronunciation of these languages by a native speaker of Greek (a language that allows only final /\( n \)/).

Cases of \( Ũ \) \( \\textendash \) \( Ū \) in Genesis: אָפְרָי // Ραφαὴν (Gen 36:22), אֲמַנָא // Αμαν (Gen 38:21, etc.), אָמְנ // Αμα (Gen 36:24), אָרָי // Αρα (Gen 14:5), מָסֶל // Μασελ (Gen 46:21), and רָפָא // Ραφα (Gen 15:20, etc.). Cases of \( Ū \) \( \\textendash \) \( Ũ \) in Genesis: רָפָא // Ραφα (Gen 36:28), דָּרָי // דאָרָי (Gen 45:10, etc.), אָרָי // אָרָי (Gen 10:12), אָרָי // אָרָי (Gen 37:17, etc.), עָרָי // אָרָי (Gen 2:8, etc.), נָר // נָר (Gen 46:13), צָר // צָר (Gen 36:27), and מָדְי // מָדְי (Gen 25:2, etc.).

\(^8\) Of course it is possible that some \( m-n \) variants were present already in the Vorlage; but again pronunciation would be the most likely cause.

\(^9\) This would include not only copyists’ errors but also errors in vocalization of the Hebrew consonants by the translators or by the Masoretes.

\(^10\) The classical formulation of the principle, which is “sound change is regular and operates without exceptions,” has mellowed a bit with age. A recent treatment nuances it as follows: “Change in pronunciation which is not conditioned by non-phonetic factors is regular and operates without exceptions at a particular time and in a particular speech community, with possible environmental restrictions. Certain changes (including dissimilation and metathesis) are exempt from this hypothesis” (Hans H. Hock, Principles of Historical Linguistics [Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 34; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986] 35).
MT was the source of the LXX transcription in order to compare the two profitably. We need only hold that the reading tradition expressed in the MT and the Hebrew tradition underlying the LXX translators’ work developed from common origins and were modified by regular phonological processes. My intent here is not to list every assumption involved in analyzing transcriptions but simply to put to rest any notion that comparing the MT (especially its vocalization) with LXX transcriptions commits the error of equating the MT with the LXX Vorlage.

The Treatment of Morphemes

חַיַּד // יְוֹדִית (Genesis 26:34)

An obvious difficulty in this word pair is the formal correspondence ח // ν. There does not appear to be any satisfying graphic, orthographic, or phonetic explanation for the correspondence. A look at the treatment of similar names in the Septuagint points us instead in a different direction. Elsewhere in Genesis and in the Greek Pentateuch the gentilic ending ח–י is translated, not transcribed. Usually it is rendered by means of the Greek gentilic ending -ινις, or -ινίν in the accusative, its case in the present passage. This would lead us to expect an original transcription *ΙΟΥΔΙΤΙΝ. It is not difficult to imagine how this could have become ΙΟΥΔΙΝ, the Göttingen reading.

Relevant to the transformation, perhaps, is the unusual nature of the name חַיַּד, whose form is that of the gentilic that meant “Jewess.” Far from be-

11. The correspondence ח // ν would be difficult to explain by any normal graphic error. Another possibility is that an abbreviation was improperly filled out; for Hebrew see Emanuel Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 256–57, where the category of abbreviations is included with a question mark. We could also imagine fricative Heb. ח rendered by Gr. σ (no examples in the Pentateuch) or an interchange of fricative Hebrew ח with a Hebrew s-sound; compare Ashkenazi [s] for ח. The transcription *ΙΟΥΔΙΣ would then have been made accusative as ΙΟΥΔΙΝ, a possible though unusual declension.

12. In Genesis we have χανανίτις (Gen 46:10++), “of the Canaanite [woman].” Elsewhere in the Pentateuch we have ἱοραμάτιτις (Lev 24:10++), and Μακανίτιτις (and variations; Num 25:6++). These names are simply gentilics, not gentilics used as proper nouns, but the distinction would not necessarily have occasioned different treatment by the LXX translator, since gentilics were often used as proper names in Greek; for examples, see W. Pape and G. Benseler, Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (3d ed.; Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1911) xvi.

13. Disregarding its problematic appearance in connection with Esau, the name is used in the Hebrew Bible only to refer to the Jewish language. Its use to mean “Jewess” by Hellenistic times is seen in the name of the heroine of the book of Judith. There it is transcribed as one would expect: ΙΟΥΔΙΘ.
ing of Israelite stock, however, Judith was one of the Hittite wives of Esau that so upset his mother Rebekah. The semantic incongruity of a Hittite named *Ioud∂tiÍ, who moreover makes her appearance in the story precisely because she is not a Iouðtij, would have provided an incentive to reanalyze the accusative ending -τήν as an itacistic error for the article τήν. And indeed, the Göttingen text of 26:34 reads Ἰουδήν τήν θυγατέρα Βηθρ, with no article in MT corresponding to LXX τήν. The case ending ν could then have been added to *ΙΟΥΑΙΤΗΝ to yield ΙΟΥΑΙΝ ΤΗΝ, the Göttingen reading.14 Alternatively, there may have been an early parablepsis in which -TI- was omitted: *ΙΟΥΑΙΤΙΝ > ΙΟΥΑΙΝ.

Wevers also points to the meaning of the name as the reason that we do not find the expected transcription Ιουδήθ, but he suggests that the translator deliberately avoided it because of its incongruent semantics.15 Wevers’s suggestion is bolder than attributing the semantic discomfort to anonymous scribes; for in the case of the translator, we would hope to find similar examples to confirm that this behavior was within his translation repertoire.

In sum, the unprecedented and phonetically inexplicable nature of the correspondence τ // ν in conjunction with the translator’s normal mode of handling the Hebrew morpheme τ– point to a solution that is different from the one chosen in the Göttingen text. If this solution is correct, the translator has combined transcription with the translation of a suffix.

**Sounds or Phonemes?**

χΛ // Καλαχ (Genesis 10:11–12)

The reading Καλαχ for the name of the Assyrian city stands out from the majority of transcriptions because of initial χ // κ rather than χ // χ, the latter being the usual correspondence, as Wevers notes.16 In Genesis we find χ // χ in 29 different transcriptions, and χ // κ in perhaps 2.17 Simple tabulations of

14. For the case ending, see above, n. 11.
15. Wevers, Notes, 416. To clarify, Iouðθ does occur but is not the critical text.
17. The exact number depends on what we consider to be a transcription by the LXX translator, as opposed to a preexisting transcription or loanword that was used by the translator. As illustrated by the letter name κ // κάππα, the correspondence κ // κ is often found in pre-LXX loanwords and transcriptions. It is probably in this light that we should understand κ // Κίτιος (Gen 10:4) and κασμ (Gen 48:22). For the first, we have pre-LXX Κίτιος (Thucy. 1.112.3) and Κιτιος (Demosth. Or. 35.32) from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E., respectively. Sikima, a declinable Greek word, was apparently the name of Shechem after its reconstruction by the Macedonians ca. 330 B.C.E. It is distinguished by the translator of Genesis from κασμ // Συχαμ (e.g., Gen 12:6), in which we see the expected
this sort do not suffice to capture transcription technique, of course, but they
do provide a valuable point of departure.

Wevers argues that the translator employed the anomalous correspondence
κ // κ in this name in order to distinguish κ and κ, since the normal transcrip-
tion of the latter is also χ. There are indications, however, that such a con-
cern on the part of the translator is unlikely. Normally the translator uses χ to
represent both κ and κ with no apparent concern for the reader’s inability to
know which Hebrew consonant χ represents. It is not clear why the presence
of both Hebrew consonants in the same word would trigger such a concern.

Significantly, this translator is willing to ignore Hebrew letters like κ and χ
routinely and to represent all four voiceless sibilants (ζ, ζ, ξ, and ς) with σ.
One might counter that, due to the limitations of the Greek alphabet, “lapses”
of this sort are a matter of compulsion rather than willingness; but the transla-
tor could have used a system of diacritics or special spellings. In reality the
translator has preferred not to provide distinctive representations of Hebrew
phonemes or of Hebrew symbols, perhaps because the goal of approximating
the Hebrew sounds in Greek was more important or because of a desire to fol-
low Greek writing conventions. There does not appear to be any good ex-
ample of an effort on the part of the translator of Genesis (or any translator of
the Greek Pentateuch) to enable the reader to identify particular Hebrew pho-
nemes or letters, as opposed to simply approximating their sound in Greek.

Moreover, Χαλαχ, the reading of Rahlfs, enjoys rather robust textual sup-
port. The Göttingen reading Καλαχ may or may not be correct; perhaps it

transcription correspondences. Josephus knows the city of the Samaritans as Σίκιμα (e.g.,
J.W. 1.63), and Eusebius explains that biblical Σίκιμα is Sicima (On. 151.1). The other in-
stances of κ // κ are דיבק // σαβεκ (Gen 22:13) and מפריס // Καθθορειμ (Gen 10:14).

The figures cited are for both forms of MT καφ, ζ and ζ. For the sake of simplicity the
“un-dageshed” forms are generally cited herein. Whether the stop- fricative variation in the
MT has any relevance for LXX transcriptions is debatable; transcriptions in the Greek Pen-
tateuch do not show any certain indication that there were alternative stop and fricative
forms of the בטרוכנפ letters.


19. Χαλαχ is the majority reading in both verses, supported by A M and all, or all but
one, of the witnesses of d n t z. Confusion of aspirated and unaspirated consonants in the
textual tradition (see next note) would suffice to explain the small number of witnesses that
read Καλαχ. Although 911 supports the reading Καλαχ in 10:11, its editors note that the
scribe interchanges similar consonants “rather often,” including κ for χ seven times and χ
for κ six times; see H. A. Sanders and C. Schmidt, The Minor Prophets in the Freer Col-
lection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis (Univ. of Michigan Studies, Hum. Ser. 21;
New York: Macmillan, 1927) 243. In fact, Wevers illustrates χ-κ and κ-χ interchanges us-
ing examples from (inter alia) 911 and 392, the latter being another of the small number of
can be justified as the result of a dissimilation of aspirates or as a pre-LXX loanword. But the stated rationale for the reading is doubtful in light of the book’s transcription practice.

The example raises a fundamental question concerning the translator’s objectives in transcription. At the risk of oversimplifying the possibilities, is the object merely to represent the sound of the Hebrew word (a phonetic transcription), or is there an intent to communicate the Hebrew letters or phonemes involved (more along the lines of a phonemic transcription)?

**Phonetic Processes**

ברلة // בָּלַת (city name; Genesis 14:2, 8)

The basic Hebrew-Greek consonantal correspondences, such as beth-beta and gimel-gamma, are rather well known and might be thought not to occasion any difficulty, but the present case may illustrate an exception. The textual support in Gen 14:2, 8 for Göttingen בָּלַת, as opposed to Rahlfs’s reading בָּלָאכ, is anemic. Wevers explains, “Since ι is never transcribed in Gen by θ but always by zero or γ . . . the βαλακ variant cannot be original; it entered the tradition from the well-known Moabite king of that name.” The statement is not quite accurate, for in Gen 23:2 we do find בָּלַת // κ, in רבדע // אָרְבּוֹק. The same correspondence is found in רבדע // פּוֹסָק in Num 31:8.

In phonetic terms the representation of בָּלַת by κ would not be surprising, because κ is a close phonetic cousin of γ, and γ frequently represents ι. The examples suggest the existence of the phonetic process known as devoicing, by

20. The dissimilation of aspirates might be suggested by one of the other cases of ב // κ, מַסִּר // קַפְתוּרֵי. Confusion of aspirates is well attested in the later textual tradition, however (Wevers, *Genesis*, 483–84). For pre-LXX loanwords showing ב // κ, see n. 17. The case for a pre-LXX loan might be hard to make for Calah, which was eclipsed by Nineveh and subsequently abandoned in the late seventh century B.C.E.


22. Wevers had published on this matter previously. In defending the proposition that the LXX reflects the distinction between the proto-Semitic pharyngeal and velar spirants (both denoted in Hebrew by the letter π), Wevers argued that R. Růžička, who held the contrary position, frequently made the error of supposing final π to be transcribed by κappa (J. W. Wevers, “Heth in Classical Hebrew,” pp. 101–112 in *Essays on the Ancient Semitic World* [ed. J. W. Wevers and D. Redford; Toronto: Univ. of Toronto, 1970] 103). Wevers explained at least some of Růžička’s examples as cases of dittography of κ from a following και.
which a voiced consonant such as \( g \) is replaced with a voiceless counterpart such as \( k \). Devoicing is a well-attested phenomenon, occurring frequently in word-final position,\(^{23}\) as in the cases mentioned above and in three additional examples from the Göttingen Genesis: דוד // מַרְעָא (Gen 36:39), שָׁר א // סַּרְעַע (e.g., Gen 11:22), and פָּרָך // פָּרָך (e.g., Gen 10:25).\(^{24}\) Devoicing of final consonants in Hebrew has been inferred previously on the basis of Greek transcriptions\(^{25}\) and hints from the orthography of the Qumran scrolls and other Hebrew sources.\(^{26}\)

A relevant question is whether the etymology of בָּלַע gives us reason to expect a transcription of \( g \) or \( k \) rather than zero. The former transcriptions might be expected from etymological ghain, the latter one from etymological ºayin. Unfortunately the etymology of the name is unsure.\(^{27}\) In any case, the reason given for rejecting the variant בֵּלַע (that there are no cases of \( y // k \)) is inaccurate according to existing Göttingen readings and, moreover, the correspondence \( y // k \) is phonetically plausible. The stronger textual support for the \( k \) variant adds to our suspicion that this textual decision should be reevaluated.

\(^{23}\) For the general phonetic mechanism, see Hock, *Principles*, 80, 239–40.

\(^{24}\) In מַרְעָא and סַּרְעַע, the devoiced forms are also aspirated. Wevers mentions final devoicing as a factor in the textual history of Genesis, as seen, for example, in 22:22, Xάσαθ] χραστ \( d \) (Wevers *THGG*, 11). The examples cited above suggest that it was also operative much earlier, in Hebrew.

\(^{25}\) For example, G. Bergsträsser notes the devoicing of final \( b, j, \) and \( d \) based on transcriptions in the LXX and Josephus; see *Hebräische Grammatik*, part 1: Einleitung, Schrift- und Lautelehre (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1918) §61.

\(^{26}\) On מַרְעָא for מְרָא (Isa 14:20) in 1QIsa\(^{a}\) and other Hebrew examples, see E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQisa\(^{a}\]*)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974) 87, 265, 517. Devoicing is not seen in all of the LXX transcriptions in Genesis and so may have been reflected inconsistently by the translator or may have been triggered by an environmental factor. Pausal position is a likely trigger because all five words mentioned above occur in the MT with disjunctive accents. Pausal position is known to be a conditioning factor for devoicing in Arabic (H. Blanc, “The ‘Sonorous’ vs ‘Muffled’ Distinction in Old Arabic Phonology,” in *To Honor Roman Jakobson* [Janua Linguarum, Series Maior 31; The Hague: Mouton, 1967] 1.295–308; here 304 n. 30 and the references cited there) as well as other languages.

\(^{27}\) As a place-name, בָּלַע is unknown outside of Genesis 14. Many interpreters who see symbolic rather than historical names in this chapter have associated the name with the root בָּלַע – ‘swallow up’, with etymological ºayin. But the root blg also yields suitably pejorative meanings relating to slander and confusion (see *HAL*, 129). There is also some question if בָּלַע is actually a city name (as in both MT מָרָאֶל בָּלַע אֶדְדָּרָה and in the LXX) or if it was originally the name of the king of Zoar, in parallel to the information given for the other four cities. An additional question, regardless of the actual origins of the name בָּלַע, is whether the LXX translator had a reliable pronunciation tradition for it.
It is to be expected that transcription in the LXX did not operate on a simple phoneme-to-phoneme basis such that, for example, the phoneme /n/ would always be associated with /n/ (and be represented by the symbol ν). Such a representational system is generally unworkable because the phonemic systems of different languages do not correspond neatly. Instead, we would expect phonetics to play a large role, so that if /n/ were pronounced [m] due to an adjacent labial consonant, it might be transcribed with the symbol μ. Similarly, the range of representations of etymological ghain might include both κ and γ.

As the case of יָחָן illustrates, transcriptions may represent features that did not find their way into the Hebrew writing system. In addition to the well-known etymological issues surrounding י and ו, phonetic processes such as devoicing may have left traces in LXX transcriptions. Even when they have been identified, however, such processes may be difficult to distinguish from processes at work during the transmission of the Greek text.

**Representation of the Gutturals**

רַגְּרָן // Ἱσσαμ (Genesis 46:24)

It should be noted first that the Vorlage evidently read רַגְּרָן* where the MT has רַגְּרָן, as can be seen by comparing the pair רַגְּרָן // Ἱσσαμ (Exod 6:18, etc.), which occurs in Exodus and Numbers. The printed Göttingen Genesis agrees with Rahlfs in reading Ἱσσαμ with two sigmas, but Wevers subsequently expressed his preference for the reading Ἱσσαμ with one sigma. The rationale for this spelling in Genesis is apparently the same as the one given for Ἱσσαμ in *Text History of the Greek Numbers*, namely, that the Hebrew guttural ר is accounted for by the doubled alpha, leaving no reason for a geminate sigma, which could easily result from inner-Greek dittography.

Wevers’s proposed change to Ἱσσαμ would make the name’s spelling in Genesis consistent with its spelling elsewhere in the Pentateuch. There are, however, two other Pentateuchal pairs showing both vowel and consonant length in Greek opposite a Hebrew guttural, namely, שְׁנִנִּים // Σένναμ four times in Genesis (e.g., Gen 11:2) and נְגַזְּרָן // Νάγγζαρ once in Exodus and

five times in Numbers (e.g., Exod 6:23). In these names the Hebrew guttural is reflected in Greek by doubling of both the associated consonant and the adjoining vowel. If the readings \( \text{Naasswn} \) and \( \text{Sennaar} \) are correct, the phonetic rationale underlying the proposed change from \( \text{Issaar} \) to \( \text{Isaar} \) is questionable. This rationale, while logical, is in conflict with what can be observed of the transcription technique of Genesis and other books. This example, as well as the preceding one, shows the importance of a systematic and complete tabulation of transcription correspondences.

The Hebrew gutturals were probably difficult to transcribe because of the lack of Greek counterparts, the possible presence of ancillary vowel sounds to aid in articulation (cf. Masoretic furtive \( \text{patah} \), if we can trust analogy to the MT on this subject), and the often fleeting nature of the accompanying vowel sounds (the three Masoretic \( \text{hatef} \) vowels are suggestive on this point). Our expectations of consistency in transcription equivalents should probably be adjusted depending on the Hebrew element that was transcribed.

### The Form of the Hebrew

\( \text{ב} \) // \( \text{Bau} \zeta \) and \( \text{ Xperia} // \text{Ωξ} \) (Genesis 22:21)

In some instances phonetic implausibility suggests that the textual tradition is not to be trusted. In \( \text{ב} \) // \( \text{Bau} \zeta \) the MT and Septuagint differ substantially. They interpret \( \text{waw} \) differently, one as an \( u \)-vowel, and the other as the diphthong \( au \) (or vowel-plus-consonant sequence \( aw \)). More problematic is the final consonant. Greek \( \xi \) implies a Hebrew combination such as \( \text{שכ} \), as noted above.\(^{31}\) It is doubtful that any form of Hebrew would tolerate a final consonant cluster with a sound like \( \text{שכ} \) (preceded by long vowel or diphthong)\(^{32}\) and highly unlikely that such a sound would have been represented by Hebrew \( \text{t} \). Greek \( \xi \) seems unimaginable as a phonetic representation of \( \text{t} \).

Considering the problem from the Hebrew side, the expected equivalent of \( \text{t} \) is \( \zeta \), a plausible candidate for the original text.\(^{33}\) There is both means and motive for an inner-Greek change from \( \zeta \) to \( \xi \) in this word. The means is the graphic similarity of Greek \( \text{Z} \) and \( \Xi \), as seen in texts of the fourth–third centu-

---

31. Outside of the present verse, \( \xi \) occurs in transcriptions in the Pentateuch only as a representative of the consonant sequences in \( \text{ɥכ} \) (Gen 25:2) and \( \text{רפכש} \) (Gen 10:24, etc.).
32. For Tiberian phonology, see GKC §26r.
ries B.C.E. 34 The motive is the fact that ξ is acceptable as a final consonant in normal, nontranslation Greek, while ζ is not. This convention of Greek orthography would have provided a constant incentive to “correct” final ζ to ξ, while the graphic similarity of the two letters provided scribes with a reason to think that an error could have been made by an earlier scribe.

With regard to the textual support for these readings, there is admittedly widespread support for Βαυξ, while the main support for the reading Βαυζ is the cursive family δ and the Bohairic Coptic. Wevers describes δ as “quite faithful to the old text form” except where proper nouns are concerned, where “in no instance is the δ reading to be preferred.” 35 But it does not seem impossible that Bo and the generally faithful δ could have correctly preserved one proper noun (or even two).

The case of Βαυξ is complicated by the name that is associated with it in Gen 22:21, Ωξ, corresponding to MT וּש. In addition to the phonetic problems in Hebrew that are implied by final ξ, which were mentioned above, the correspondence ש // ξ, if correct, would be unique in the Pentateuch. There are some 69 transcriptions in the Pentateuch showing ש // ι and two, both doubtful and both in Genesis, having ש // ζ. 36 The case for reading Ωξ, which is supported inter alia by δ and Bo, is weaker than the case for Βαυξ, although Ωξ is preferable in terms of phonetics and transcription technique to Göttingen Ωξ. The names of these two brothers seem to have developed in tandem, and perhaps there was mutual influence even at their inception. This contextual consideration may explain an unusual case of ש // *ξ.

---

34. Examples of Gr. Ζ for Ε are ascribed to graphic error by E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1: *Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion* (2d ed.; Munich: Beck, 1953) 329. In the papyrus from Dervéni, Greece, from the later part of the fourth century B.C.E., Ζ and Ε are made alike, except that Ζ lacks a short horizontal stroke found in Ε (Richard Seider, *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri* [Stuttgart: Anton Heirsemann, 1990], III/1, 129–30). Similar letters are found in the Zenon papyri from mid-third-century Egypt. See, e.g., PCZ 59013, lines 2 (ξ) and 4 (ζ) in Seider, *Paläographie*, III/1, 177. In a more cursive script found in other Zenon papyri, the similarity of ζ and ξ can be even greater; compare ξ in Ενοκλαους of PCZ 59003, line 3 (ibid., 189) with ζ in Ζηνουνι in PCZ 59002, line 1 (ibid., 185).

35. Wevers, *THGG*, 18 and 11. Presumably the latter statement is intended to be descriptive rather than prescriptive.

36. The two are וּנ // צוגורה (Gen 13:10) and מִית // מִזַּר (Gen 36:42), but the first is likely to be pre-LXX. The transcription is evidently based on Aramaic מחי rather than on מית. While the exact form צוגורה seems not to be attested, the Madaba Map comes close with زويرا, presumably reflecting a later stage when ג was not widely pronounced. The ג reappears in medieval Arabic references to the town. For the postbiblical references, see M. C. Astour, “Zoar,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 6:1107.
A Question of Greek Declension

In Gen 29:35 Judah is introduced for the first time. The printed edition of the Göttingen Genesis reads Ιουδα (= Ra), but Wevers subsequently changed his preferred reading to Ιουδάν, citing the usual declension of the word and the need for an accusative in the context. This afterthought is open to question in light of instances in which the translator apparently introduces a proper noun that is usually declined as a simple transcription from Hebrew, and only in later references supplies Greek declensional endings. The translator’s concern in such a case would presumably be the accurate representation of the sound of the Hebrew name. Examples are the names of Esau’s wives Αδὰ and Ολιβεμα, which are undeclined when they are introduced in Gen 36:2, even though the syntax demands accusatives. The same names are declined elsewhere in Genesis. This relatively infrequent phenomenon becomes less frequent if we accept the proposed modification to the printed edition of Genesis.

Conclusions

The text-critical problems associated with transcriptions are undeniably complex, and it seems that much work remains to be done in this area. The examples cited, it should be said, are not the result of any systematic attempt to examine the Göttingen Genesis in the light of transcription technique. They were noticed in the course of other work or because they are discussed in THGG. Moreover, most pertain to the representation of the Hebrew consonants, not the vowels, where the questions tend to be more difficult.

An issue that has not received much explicit discussion is that of the method for making text-critical decisions involving transcriptions. We are able to say that the method employed in establishing the general text of the book of Genesis was a conservative one. In Wevers’s words, “consistency has in the main been avoided,” implying that as a rule the textual tradition was determinative. At times this method was used for transcriptions as well, so that we find examples like בראב // Αρβοκ, in which a consonantal correspondence runs counter to the editor’s stated expectations. As suggested above, however, in the case of transcriptions the textual tradition is particularly unre-

37. Wevers, Notes, 474, 856.
38. Αδάς is found in 36:10, 12, 16; and Ολιβεμᾶς in 36:14, 18, 41.
liable; and so there is reason to ask if transcription technique should have been given more weight in the text-critical process.

Another key area for investigation concerns the object and methods of the Septuagint translator as they pertain to that part of the text that is not translated. The distinction described above between transcription and transliteration helps to label two of the possibilities. Where the translator is concerned to represent the sound of the original, a further question, and one that has text-critical implications in the cases of Βαλάκ and Καλαχ, is what level of sound (e.g., phonetic or phonemic) is being represented.

Further study may succeed in better delineating the phonetic processes that are relevant for the translator’s work, such as possible devoicing in the case of Βαλάκ, and to distinguish them from processes operative during the transmission of the text. Other issues include the methods of treating Hebrew morphemes (Ιουδίν/Ιουδίνις) and assigning declensional endings (Ιουδα(ν)).

The discussion has included proposals for the reading of particular transcribed proper nouns. Whether or not they are judged to have merit, it is hoped that they have been useful in raising text-critical issues that need further investigation. For the writer, at least, the complexity of the cases discussed above serves as a warning against the text-critical complacency that might accompany the appearance of justly acclaimed critical editions.
Does ἀδολεσχέω Mean “To Meditate” in the LXX?
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1. The Etymology of ἀδολεσχέω; Its Meaning in Greek Literature

The verb ἀδολεσχέω comes from the noun ἀδολεσχία, which in turn comes from ἀδολέσχης.1 The noun ἀδολέσχης is formed from two roots, of which the second ("λέσχη") means "conversation."2 P. Chantraine proposes two interpretations of the root ἄδο-. (1) It comes from ἄδην ("to one’s fill, to satiety"). The word ἀδολέσχης then denotes someone who talks too much, a prater. The weakness of this interpretation is that the long a3 in ἀδολέσχης remains unexplained. (2) It comes from αὐαδό- (cf. the Attic form ἡδός—"sweet, pleasant"). The initial α is α-privativum. On this showing, ἀδολέσχης is an unpleasant talker. A third interpretation is suggested by Mpampaniotis: (3) The root is related to ἀἀδεῖν ("to bother, trouble"). The noun ἀδολέσχης then describes a person who bothers others with his talk. Thus, the original meaning of the word ἀδολέσχης consists of two semantic components: (1) "to talk" and (2) a negative estimation of the person who talks. Theophrastus (Characters III 1–2) defines ἀδολεσχία and ἀδολέσχης as follows:

ἡ δὲ ἀδολεσχία ἐστὶ μὲν διήγησις λόγων μακρὸν καὶ ἀπροβολεύτων, οὗ δὲ ἀδολέσχης τοιοῦτος ἐστιν, οἷος ἂν μὴ γινώσκει τούτῳ παρακαθέζομενος πλησιὸν πρῶτον μὲν τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς εἰπεῖν ἐγκώμιον, εἴτε ὁ τῆς νυκτὸς εἰδὲν ἐνύπνιον τούτῳ διηγήσασθαι εἴθη ἢν εἶχεν ἐπὶ τῷ δείπνῳ τὰ καθ’ ἐκαστα διεξελθεῖν.

---

2. Ibid., 21.
Idle chatter is engaging in prolonged and aimless talk. The idle chatterer is the sort who sits right down beside someone he does not know, and starts out by speaking in praise of his own wife; then he recounts the dream he had the night before; then he relates the details of what he had for dinner.  

LSJ ascribes two major meanings to ἄδολεσχία: (1) prater, idle talker; talker, babbler; (2) (in good sense) subtle reasoner. The word ἄδολεσχία, according to LSJ, has three meanings: (1) prating, garrulity; (2) keenness, subtlety; and (3) conversation, talk (with two references to the LXX). The contexts in which ἄδολεσχία and ἄδολεσχα presumably occur without a negative connotation are few. LSJ refers to Cratylus 401b for ἄδολεσχία (2) and to Phaedrus 269e for ἄδολεσχα (2). However, in these texts Socrates uses words with the root ἄδολεςχ- in order to hint at the popular opinion held in regard to philosophers; namely, they are nothing but idle talkers.

For the verb ἄδολεσχέω LSJ lists three meanings: (1) to talk idly, prate; (2) to talk; (3) to meditate. The evidence that LSJ adduces in support of meanings (2) and (3) comes exclusively from the LXX. Meaning (1) is well attested in Greek literature. It is actually the only meaning of ἄδολεσχέω known to Hesychius, who explains the verb as φλυαρέω and μακρολογέω.

2. The Aim of This Paper

In the present paper I propose studying the use of the verb ἄδολεσχέω (and partially of the noun ἄδολεσχα) in the LXX. As is well known, the LXX uses certain words with meanings not attested for these words in the Classical and Hellenistic sources or only sparsely attested in the newly found papyri. The LXX usage may be either a reliable guide to the (Hellenistic) Greek usage that only accidentally is not reflected in the original Greek writings accessible to us, or it may be a deviation from the Greek norm, the result of a certain handling of the Hebrew (or Aramaic) text by the translator. The aim of this article is to establish whether it is correct to ascribe the meanings “to talk” and “to meditate” to the Greek verb. I attempt to ascertain whether the peculiarities of the LXX usage should be explained as idiosyncratic translation phenomena or as a genuine witness to Hellenistic Greek usage.


6. Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon (ed. M. Schmidt; Ienae, 1858, V. I.) 47. Cf. also P. Glare (Revised Supplement to LSJ [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996] 7), who interprets ἄδολεσχία as “talk, chatter” and dispenses with the other meanings given by LSJ.
3. The Meaning of ἀδολεσχέω in Genesis 24:63

The first occurrence of ἀδολεσχέω in the LXX and the only one in the Pentateuch is in Gen 24:63. The Hebrew text reads:

The verb ἀδολεσχέω is a biblical hapax legomenon whose meaning is unclear. The versions witness to a variety of interpretations. The LXX offers ἀδολεσχέω, the Vulgate has ad meditandum, the Peshitta uses lamhallāku (“to walk about”), and the Targum—λαλάκα (“to pray”). The opinion of modern scholars is not unanimous either. 7 HAL considers the meaning “to walk, wander” the most probable, especially since in Gen 24:65 Isaac is called “the one walking in the field” (הללך). The Greek rendering ἀδολεσχέω is puzzling, since its meaning does not correspond exactly to any of the proposed meanings of the Hebrew original. It is possible that the translator chose to use a rare Greek word to render the Hebrew hapax, whose meaning was unknown to him. However, it is more likely that the translator actually read הַשָּׁן in his Vorlage.8 The verb ἀδολεσχέω is used nine times in the Psalms, and it always translates

7. HAL refers to T. Nöldeke, who suggested that the first letter be read as פ (פָּשָׂע) and interpreted the word as a verb of motion (sich ergehen), based on the Arabic parallel saha (سَهَأ), which means “to make a pilgrimage, to wander.” H.-P. Müller (“Die Hebräische Wurzel sjh,” VT 19 [1969] 361–71, here p. 368) considers Nöldeke’s suggestion plausible. Some scholars have tried to use the Qumran Manual of Discipline (1QS) 7:15 as the key to understanding j'Wc in Gen 24:63. However, the Qumran text is ambiguous. P. Wernberg-Moller (“A Note on lasuahu basadeh in Gen 24:63,” VT 7 [1957] 414–16) understands it in context as “to stretch out (the left hand) in order to recline,” reading the verb with the initial פ. He contends that his interpretation corresponds to the normal meaning of פָּשָׂע: “to sink down.” To interpret Gen 24:63, he extends the semantic chain as follows: “to sink down”—“to bend down”—“to prostrate oneself.” Thus, Isaac went out in the evening to lie down in the field. G. R. Driver (“Problems of Interpretation in the Pentateuch” [Mélanges Bibliques; Travaux de l’Institut Catholique de Paris 4; Redigés en l’honneur de André Robert; Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1957] 66–76, here pp. 66–68) relates פָּשָׂע to the noun הַשָּׁן (“hole”) and understands the verb in the Genesis text as “to dig out a hole for purposes of excretion.” Driver holds that this meaning of הַשָּׁן fits the context of the Qumran text as well. Still other scholars relate פָּשָׂע to הַשָּׁן and understand it as a verb of speech (e.g., J. Levy, referred to by Müller in “Die Hebräische Wurzel,” 361). BDB tentatively suggests that perhaps פָּשָׂע (“to walk, wander”) is to be read instead of פָּשָׂע.

8. J. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 374 regards הַשָּׁן as a pseudovariant. Müller, “Die Hebräische Wurzel,” 368 rejects the possibility that הַשָּׁן is original. However, he considers only the meaning “to lament” for הַשָּׁן, which obviously does not fit the context. But the idea of “meditation” in the field is not totally out of place and could therefore be ascribed to the writer. Driver, “Problems,” 66–67, however, finds this idea contrary to normal practices in the ancient Near East.
Furthermore, ἄδολεσχία, used five times outside the Pentateuch, always translates the cognate noun ḫṣ. This usage certainly relies on the text of Gen 24:63 as its model. If the translator of Psalms was the first to use a word from the root ἄδολεσχ-, for ḫṣ consistently (which is likely), he must have compared the Greek and the Hebrew texts of Genesis, which were available to him, and he must have read ḫṣ in his Hebrew text of Gen 24:63 (as did Jerome, Aquila, and Symmachus). If the translator of Genesis, like his successors, read ḫṣ in Gen 24:63, how did he understand the Hebrew word and what did he intend with ἄδολεσχῶ?

HAL lists the following meanings of ḫṣ:

1. Loud, emotionally laden speech
   a. praising
   b. lamenting
   c. taunting, mocking
   d. instructing, teaching

2. to meditate, with thanks and praise

Meanings (a), (b), (c), and (d) are contextual. To simplify the matter, ḫṣ is used as a verb of speaking (1) or as a verb of thinking (2). LSJ, GELS, and La Bible d’Alexandrie understand ἄδολεσχῶ in Gen 24:63 as a verb of thinking, presumably corresponding to meaning (2) of ḫṣ, given in HAL. The Greek text reads: καὶ ἔξηλθεν Ἰσαὰκ ἄδολεσχήσας εἰς τὸ πεδίον τὸ πρὸς δεήλης, which is translated in La Bible d’Alexandrie as Et Isaak sortit pour méditer dans la plaine vers le soir. M. Harl postulates a semantic development of the word ἄδολεσχῶ that took place before the translation of the Pentateuch but was not reflected in the original Greek writings. According to Harl, ἄδολεσχῶ developed the meaning “to meditate” on the basis of the root λεσχ- (“conversation”). It seems unnecessary to postulate a semantic development that took place before the Pentateuch translation.

---

9. This shows to what extent the Hebrew Pentateuch was familiar to at least some later translators.

10. Outside the Psalter, ἄδολεσχία renders the noun ḫṣ three times in the books of Kingdoms. The translators of these books probably knew the Greek Psalter in addition to the Greek Pentateuch and so could draw from both sources. Furthermore, the corresponding Greek verb is used twice in Sirach.

11. Scholars are divided on the issue of the original meaning of the verb. HAL and TWAT (7.758) follow Müller’s view (“Die Hebräische Wurzel,” 361–371), which regards “sound-production” as the original meaning. Among the opponents of this view, HAL lists A. Deissler, G. Gerleman, J. Pedersen, and H. J. Franken, who regard the original denotation of ḫṣ as some kind of mental activity. However, there is no agreement among these scholars regarding the precise nature of the activity denoted by ḫṣ.


13. Ibid., 205.
evolution of ἀδολεσχέω, however, since the word can be interpreted in Gen 24:63 as a verb of speaking—that is, more in line with classical usage. On the one hand, Aquila and Symmachus understood ἔψει in Gen 24:63 as a verb of speaking. Aquila translates it ὀμιλέω, while Symmachus uses λαλέω. The LXX translator probably understood ἔψει in a similar way. Furthermore, several Jewish and Christian writers during the first through fourth centuries understood ἀδολεσχέω in Gen 24:63 (and in some other biblical passages) as a verb of speaking. Thus, Philo of Alexandria refers to Gen 24:63 in Det. 30 and explains why Isaac went out into the field:

ἀμιλλησάμενος δὲ οὐδενί, . . . μόνον δὲ ιδιάσαι βουλόμενος καὶ ἰδιολογήσασθαι τῷ θεῷ

He (Isaac) is not going to compete with anyone; he only wants to be alone with God and to converse with him in private.

Undoubtedly, Philo intends the words ἰδιολογήσασθαι τῷ θεῷ as an interpretation of ἀδολεσχέω. In Legat. 3.43 Philo uses ἀδολεσχέω with the dative θεῷ:

καὶ ἦς τῆς ψυχῆς χαρὰ Ισαὰκ ὅταν ἀδολεσχῆ καὶ ἰδιάζη θεῷ ἐξέρχεται ἀπολείπον ἐαυτὸν καὶ τὸν ἰδίον νοῦν

And when Isaac, the joy of the soul, talks with God and is alone with him, he goes out, leaving behind his own mind and himself.

In his commentary on the book of Genesis, Origen provides an allegorical interpretation of Gen 24:63 (In Genesim 94–95):

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ισαὰκ ἀδολεσχήσαι εἰς τὸ πεδίον τὸ πρὸς δείλης. Ἐξελθεῖν δὲι τῶν γῆν τὸν μέλλοντα περὶ τῶν θείων ὀμιλεῖν, ὅπερ ἀδολεσχῆσαι νῦν ὄνομασεν. Ὅδε πρόσκειται δὲ τίνι, εἰκότως, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ἀνθρώπων ἢ τοιαύτῃ ὁμιλίᾳ γίνεται ἀλλ’ ἦτοι πρὸς θεόν ἢ αὐτοῦ τινὸς πρὸς ἐαυτὸν

And Isaac went out onto the plain in the evening to talk. It is necessary that he who wants to converse—this is what he means by ἀδολεσχήσαι—about the divine things should leave behind the earthly. It does not say with whom (he talks), which is proper, since he converses not with men, but with God or with himself.

One should note three things in connection with this comment by Origen. First, he understands ἀδολεσχέω as a verb of speaking; he explains it with ὀμιλέω. Second, he seems to concede that the usage is not normal. His remark, “this is what he means by ἀδολεσχήσαι,” is probably occasioned by the stylistic awkwardness of the LXX. Third, he recognizes that the text is not quite clear and needs exegesis. This he readily provides, indicating that Isaac converses with God or with himself.
In his commentary on the book of Psalms (Selecta in Psalmos), Origen explains ἀδολεσχέω in Ps 118:23 by using the words λαλέω and φθέγγομαι:

Καὶ γὰρ ἐκάθεσαν ἀρχόντες, καὶ κατ’ ἐμοὶ κατελάλουν. οὐ δὲ δούλος σου ἠδολέσχει ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασι σου. οὕτως συνέρχονται κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου σκοπούντες πῶς ἐπιβουλεύσωσιν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς οὐ παύεται λαλῶν ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασιν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπινον φθέγγεται

“And the rulers sat down and spoke against me. But your servant talked about your righteous statutes.” In this way, those who seek to lay snares for the righteous come together against him, but he speaks unceasingly of the righteous statutes of God. And it is not human things that he utters.

Although the context suggests that ἀδολεσχέω in Ps 118:23 has the meaning “to meditate,” it is noteworthy that Origen understands it differently, more in line with normal Greek usage.14 The difference is that Origen interprets ἀδολεσχέω in a neutral sense, without the usual negative component of the verb’s meaning.

Commenting on Psalm 76, Eusebius writes:

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠδολέσχησα, φησί, καὶ ὀλγηγυψήχησα: ἀνθ’ οὐ ὁ Σύμμαχος ἥρμηνευσε, διελάλουν ἐν ἐμαυτῷ καὶ ἐλεπιθύμουσ᾽. Ὄτι μὲν φησί ἐμαυτῷ διελάλουν, ἐλεπιθύμουσαν καὶ ὁτε ἠδολέσχουν παρ’ ἐμαυτῷ, τηνικαῦτα ὀλγηγυψήχῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου

But he says: “I talked and I lost heart.” This Symmachus interprets as follows: “I spoke to myself and my spirit failed.” So he says: “I spoke to myself, my spirit failed. And when I talked to myself, then my spirit failed.”

One of the reasons that Eusebius turns to Symmachus is that ἀδολεσχέω in the context (as in Gen 24:63) requires an object, indicating with whom the psalmist is speaking (see also Origen on Gen 24:63). The translation of Symmachus makes it clear that a conversation with oneself is meant. One should note that for Eusebius the expressions ἐμαυτῷ διελάλουν and ἠδολέσχουν παρ’ ἐμαυτῷ are synonymous.

Although the above-mentioned writers interpret ἀδολεσχέω as “to speak, to talk, to converse,” the word was not normally used with this neutral meaning. The necessity to interpret the biblical texts in a meaningful way leads Philo and the Christian exegetes to a linguistically strained usage. Most contexts in

14. Such examples should restrain the lexicographer from hasty assertions that a Hebrew meaning is imparted to the Greek word. One can presume that in most cases the Greek-speaking readers of the LXX would not have recourse to the Hebrew original to understand the biblical text. It is only natural that they would try to interpret the Greek text in itself, and as a result approximate the meanings of the words in the Bible to those in their own usage. For reservations regarding the ascription of the Hebrew meanings to the Greek words, see E. Tov, “Three Dimensions of LXX Words,” RB 83 (1976) 529–44.
which ἀδολεσχέω appears in the LXX demand that the negative semantic component of the word be eliminated. Moreover, the verb is sometimes used in connection with the psalmist’s devotion to God’s law. We have to acknowledge that with regard to the word’s connotations there is no continuity between Classical/Hellenistic and biblical usage. The change was introduced by the translator of Genesis, who then influenced subsequent translators. If we accept that the translator of Genesis understood ἀδολεσχέω as “to converse,” the question arises whether this meaning fits the context. The sense of the text is certainly clearer if we translate ἀδολεσχέω as “to meditate” (as does M. Harl). However, the ancient translators of the biblical text perceived it differently from modern readers. We look for a clear, unambiguous text; they often chose to leave it obscure. The most popular modern theory of translation is that of dynamic equivalence; the ancients translated word for word. As S. P. Brock has pointed out, the roles of the translator (interpres) and the interpreter (expositor) in antiquity were generally distinguished. The translator did not normally go out of his way to provide an interpretation for obscure passages; this was the task of the interpreter. Thus, although the text does not explicitly say with whom Isaac conversed on the plain, neither the translator nor the Alexandrian exegetes found it overly problematic.

4. The Words ἀδολεσχία and ἀδολεσχέω in the Psalms

The first occurrence of the root ḫ־ן in the Psalms is in Ps 55:3. According to HAL, the meaning of the prepositional phrase ḫ־ן ב־ן in this verse is “in my lament.” The word occurs with the same meaning in 64:2, 102:1, and 142:3. The translator was not aware of this meaning. As he encountered the root ḫ־ן for the first time, he translated it ἀδολεσχία, a cognate of the verb ἀδολεσχέω, which was used for ḫ־ן by the translator of Genesis. In its Greek context the word ἀδολεσχία refers to the psalmist’s prayer and can mean either “idle talk” (a self-abasing description of one’s prayer) or simply “talk.” In four other passages in which the noun ḫ־ן occurs, the translator abandons the equivalent ἀδολεσχία (possibly because of its negative overtones). In three of the four passages he explicates ḫ־ן as prayer:
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An interesting case is presented by Ps 118:85a, which reads:

διηγήσαντό μοι παράνομοι ἀδολεσχίας

The wicked have told me idle speeches. 17

The Hebrew text of Ps 119:85a is quite different:

The wicked have dug out holes for me.

The translator obviously read the last word as ἀδολεσχίας (plural of ἀδολεσχία—“meditation, instruction,” a derivative of the verb ἀδολεσχία). Guided by the meaning of the verb ἀδολεσχία, he understood the noun as “speeches.” Since he rendered the Hebrew with the natural equivalent, ἀδολεσχία, the Greek word could then be taken as a description of the sinners’ idle talk. More problematic is the use of διηγέομαι for ἀρκ. 18 GELS suggests (with a question mark) the retroversion ἁρκ. However, even if ἁρκ could be misread as ἁρκ, the semantic difference between ἁρκ and διηγέομαι is too big to make the retroversion plausible. 19 I would suggest a translation-technical solution to the problem. It is difficult to say whether the translator understood his text as having little sense or as being metaphorical. 20 In any case he found it necessary to make the meaning of the text more perspicuous. Thus he translated the verb meaning “to dig” with a verb meaning “to tell,” which fit the context. 21 It is probable that the word ἄρκη suggested to the translator the use of διηγέομαι, since this Greek verb

17. Euthymius Zigaben, a Byzantine commentator, explains ἀδολεσχίας in this verse as φλυαρίας δομάτων, λημνόσιας (PG 128.1157). Here, as in other places, Zigaben gives the opinions of the well-known Church Fathers (St. Basil the Great, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Athanasius the Great, and others) without naming them.

18. The translator knows the meaning of the Hebrew verb. Cf. Ps 7:16; 21[22]:7; 93[94]:13; 56[57]:7.

19. The word ἁρκ means “to call, proclaim, read,” while διηγέομαι has the meaning “to tell, narrate.” Most important is the fact that ἁρκ is never translated διηγέομαι in the Psalms. The Hebrew verb occurs 55 times. The translator uses two main equivalents: ἐπικαλέομαι (“to call upon”) 28 times and κράζω (“to cry unto”) 22 times. Besides these two words, καλέω (“to call”) occurs 3 times and προσκαλέομαι (“to call to”) one time. In one instance there is no verb in the Greek text corresponding to the Hebrew ἁρκ.

20. The latter possibility is not unlikely, in view of Prov 16:27, where the phrase ὁ διώκειν ἄρκην (the one digging out evil”) is used.

21. A. Aejemelaeus has drawn my attention to Jer 18:20, 22, where the MT reads ὁ διώκειν τὴν ἀρκήν (in 18:22, so Q; K ἁρκην). The LXX translator read ἡ ἀρκή both times and understood
has already been used twice (54:17; 55:18; 104:2) in the previous psalms as an equivalent for "יהוה". The third appearance of "דְּתַנְנָּה" for "יהוה" in the Psalms is at 144:5. The choice of Greek equivalents for the Hebrew noun "יהוה" shows that the translator understood it to denote speech. This fact makes it likely that the verb "יהוה" was understood by the translator as a verb of speaking, and therefore "ἀδολεσχέω" also should denote not “meditation” but “speech.”

At the first occurrence of the verb "יהוה" in the Psalms (55:18), the translator understands it as a verb of speech and renders it by "διηγόμαι". At 68:13 he uses the word "ἀδολεσχέω", probably in its normal meaning “to prate”:

κατ’ ἑμῶν ἡδολέσχουν ὁμιλήσαντες, καὶ οἱ πίνοντες τὸν οἶνον

Those who sit at the gate talked idly against me and those who drink wine sang against me.

In Psalm 77, "יהוה" appears three times (vv. 4, 7, 13) and can be interpreted as “to meditate.” In all of these instances the LXX uses "ἀδολεσχέω". How are we to evaluate it? It is precarious to maintain that the translator intends the meaning “to meditate” and consciously fills the Greek word with the Hebrew meaning. It is safer to say that the translator stereotypically uses the previously chosen equivalent in a context that demands a different Greek word. In other words, the use of "ἀδολεσχέω" in Psalm 76 tells us more about the factors in the translation process than about the semantics of the Greek word.

22. This is the first occurrence of the verb "ἀδολεσχέω" in the Psalms. The Slavonic Version here uses the word meaning “to mock,” which actually suits the translation of the Hebrew text better than that of the LXX. In any case, here the Slavonic translator rendered "ἀδολεσχέω" contextually. However, he completely disregarded the context in other cases, in that he used the same word meaning “to mock” to translate "ἀδολεσχέω" in all of its other occurrences. This is an example of how the literal and the free approaches may be combined within one book. Such a combination is evidenced in the Greek Psalter as well.

23. HAL (3.1320) understands "יהוה" in vv. 4 and 7 as “lamenting,” and in v. 13 as “to meditate.” KJV translates "יהוה" as "meditate" in the first two verses and as “to talk” in the third. The revised Luther’s Translation understands "יהוה" as a verb of speaking in v. 7, and as a verb of thinking in the other two verses. According to the Elberfelderübersetzung, "יהוה" means “to meditate, ponder” in all three occurrences.

24. The translator here probably did not ask himself: “What would "ἀδολεσχέω" mean in these verses?” On the other hand, he seems to have been concerned with the meaning of the Greek equivalent in 118:148 and 142:5, where he abandoned the standard rendering "ἀδολεσχέω" in favor of "μελέταω", which corresponds to the meaning “to meditate” of the Hebrew "יהוה". The choice of "μελέταω" instead of "ἀδολεσχέω" shows that the translator did not regard the latter word as an adequate vehicle for the idea of meditation.
However, it is not to be excluded that the translator understood ἄδολεσχέω as “to speak” and used ἄδολεσχέω with the same meaning. It is hard to be more precise about the translator’s intentions in this case. As far as the possible interpretations of the Greek text itself are concerned, there are two. The first is represented by Eusebius, quoted above, who is constrained by the normal Greek usage to understand ἄδολεσχέω as a verb of speech, but who adds (relying on Symmachus) the interpretative παρ’ ἐμαυτῷ, so that the Greek text is understood to mean something like “speaking with oneself,” which is not far from the idea of “meditation.”

The other approach does not seek to interpret the word in line with its normal usage. It starts with the question: “What meaning best fits this particular context?” In Psalms 76 and 118 ἄδολεσχέω makes more sense when it is understood as “to meditate” rather than “to prate” or even “to speak.” In 76:4 it is parallel to μιμήσκομαι; in 76:13 to μελετάω. In Psalm 118 ἄδολεσχέω appears five times (vv. 15, 23, 27, 48, 78), and it stands in parallelism with the verbs κατανοέω, μελετάω, and συνετίζω. The translator uses ἄδολεσχέω in the phrases that resemble those with the verb μελετάω:

118:15 (cf. v. 78): ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς σου ἄδολεσχήσω 26
118:47: ἐμελέτων ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς σου
118:23 (cf. v. 48): ἡδολέσχει ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν σου
118:16 (cf. v. 117): ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν σου μελετήσω

Naturally, some readers of the LXX concluded that ἄδολεσχέω has a “biblical” meaning that is different from its normal meaning. Thus, the Lexicon of Suida explains the words ἄδολεσχία and ἄδολεσχέω as follows: ἄκαρία, φλυαρία, συνέχεια. ἄδολεσχία δὲ παρὰ τῇ Γραφῇ ἡ συνεχής μελέτη, καὶ ἄδολεσχήσω ἀντί τοῦ διηνήκος μελετήσω. 27 The meaning of ἄδολεσχέω is explained in Zigaben’s commentary several times, for example: τὸ τῆς ἄδολεσχίας ὄνομα, κυρίως μὲν, ἐπὶ τῆς φλυαρίας τάττεται. Λαμβάνει δὲ τὸ τοῦ πολλάκις ὁ προφήτης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς συνεχοῦς ἐμμελετήσως, ὡς τὸ καὶ ἡδολέσχουν ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασι σου, τούτου, ἐμελέτων ἐν τῷ νόμῳ σου . . . Λαμβάνεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ θέαν μετεωρισμοῦ, ὡς τὸ ἐξήλθεν Ἡσαΐας ἄδολεσχήσω εἰς τὸ πεδίον, τὸ πρὸς δείλησι. 28

25. Compare Jerome’s use of the verb loquor for πρὸς in Ps 77:7, 119:27, 48, 78 (according to the modern dictionaries, πρὸς in these contexts has the meaning “to meditate”). Other Latin renderings of πρὸς are eloquor (55:18) and meditor (77:13; 119:15, 23, 148; 143:5).
26. The use of the preposition ἐν with the verb ἄδολεσχέω to indicate the object of meditation is Hebraistic.
27. Suida, 106.
28. PG 128.573.
The English translation of the LXX Psalms by A. Pietersma also stands in this tradition. The words ἀδολεσχέω and ἀδολεσχία are normally rendered “to ponder” and “pondering.” The three exceptions are Ps 76:7 (“to commune [with one’s heart]”), 68:13 (“to gossip”), and 118:85 (“tales”). “Communing with one’s heart” is very close to the idea of meditation. The only two verses in which the idea of “speaking” is clearly expressed are thus Ps 68:13 and 118:85. As shown above, the context in both verses disallows the understanding of ἀδολεσχέω and ἀδολεσχία as words of “thinking.”

To sum up, the meaning of ἀδολεσχέω in the LXX can be discussed on two levels. As far as the intentions of the translators are concerned, one can hardly say that they used ἀδολεσχέω with the meaning “to meditate.” This meaning is not attested for ἀδολεσχέω in the Greek literature, nor is it easy to perceive why the translators would want to impart the meaning of the Hebrew יָש to the Greek verb. One can probably say that, when ἀδολεσχέω translates יָש with the meaning “to meditate,” the semantics of the Greek word was not the translator’s concern (unless he understood יָש as a verb of speaking, contrary to the modern Hebraists). In these instances he was simply using a standard equivalent for the verb יָש. On the other hand, there is evidence that the translator of Psalms understood יָש (at least in some contexts) as a verb of speaking. The second level on which the semantics of ἀδολεσχέω can be discussed is that of the later reception of the LXX. The nature of some contexts in which ἀδολεσχέω appears enables an interpretation of the verb as “to meditate.” Moreover, this meaning actually fits the context better.
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Any attempt to restore the original text of the Septuagint is an impossible task. The most one can hope for is that, with the aid of extant manuscripts, one may perhaps come close to it. The significant opus by the Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen¹ has presented an eclectic edition of most books of the Old Testament, which brings scholars closer to the original form of the Septuagint and allows biblical scholars to advance and perfect their research. Through projects of this sort, the scholar may now employ such statements as “LXX reads so and so,” “LXX interprets so and so,” “LXX omits/adds/harmonizes,” and so on, even without adding reservations in the form of references to manuscripts, unless there are significant differences between recensions. Every once in a while there are some pleasant surprises when new material is discovered (e.g., the Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever and other Greek fragments²). As in all science, we are coming closer and closer to the accurate item. Certainly, however, not all scholars will agree with each decision made by the editors of the Greek volumes of the Bible as to what the main text of the edition should be.

Another significant point should be considered: There is a span of hundreds of years between the transcriptions of the extant manuscripts which supposedly represent the “Old Greek” and the original translations. Consequently,


². The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever [DJD VII, 1990] appears, however, to be a Kaige-Theodotion recension and in this capacity is even less useful than later extant textual witnesses to the original text of the LXX.
one does not know exactly what happened during those hundreds of years. Without doubt, all known types of textual developments that have occurred during later periods—when there are already a number of manuscripts containing many variant readings stemming from the processes of transcription and typical *Schreibfehler*—occurred earlier as well. Accordingly, there is room for scholars to suggest differing reconstructions of the Greek text, including conjectures that are not based on extant manuscripts. These suggestions should be weighed judiciously, and in appropriate cases should be incorporated or appended to these editions, so that readers of these volumes will have the opportunity to evaluate them.

In this paper, I would like to offer some comments on certain verses in the Septuagint version of Genesis and raise a number of textual hypotheses.

1. Gen 6:7, MT: יִתְמוּנ יַעֲקֹב; G, in Rahlfs’ and the Göttingen editions: ἐθυμοθεῖν (“I became angry”). This reading is accepted without reservation by various commentaries and modern translations of the Septuagint.³ The idea that one would not attribute regret to God is comprehensible. However, in v. 6, the same Hebrew expression יִתְמוּנ הַרְעָה was rendered differently, ἐνεθυμοθεῖν (“took to heart”), which is no less proper, although it is closer to the Hebrew. There is no apparent reason for the change in the rendering. Some witnesses have ἐνεθυμοθεῖν in v. 7 as well. Accordingly, I think that this reading should be preferred. Note the similarity of the two Greek words.

2. Gen 9:5, MT: יִתְמוּנ יַעֲקֹב (וּנְכַר בִּלְדֵי יִתְמוּנ יִתְמוּנ אֲדָלְפֹּה). This phrase is not entirely clear. In Sam (and similarly in Pesh): καὶ ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου αδελφοῦ, literally, “from the hand of a man a brother.” The words ἀνθρώπος and ἀδελφός are genitive, and they are bound to “the hand.” As often, ἀδελφός is not followed by a possessive pronoun. We shall consider what G read, how it interpreted the Hebrew text, and how the readers were supposed to understand the biblical phrase.

Some explanations may be proposed:

a. The words יִתְמוּנ אֲדָלְפֹּה appeared superfluous to the translator, and consequently were omitted.⁴ However, this is not the usual practice of the translator of Genesis, nor do these words seem superfluous.

---

b. The translator simplified the odd phrase of MT. The Greek is to be taken as “[a] brother man,” and *adelphou* should be understood as an attribute of *anthrōpos*. Nonetheless, is this what the translator really meant?

c. This is a literal translation of a shorter Hebrew text that read (*מד כל persone אדום*). Such a Hebrew phrase is in fact impossible.

d. The word *anthrōpos* is a stereotypical rendition of *אדום*, but likewise it is often used for *איש* (*Aish*). Therefore, it might reflect (*מד איש persone אדום*). Therefore, it may reflect a shorter Hebrew text.

e. The Hebrew Vorlage was similar to MT, but something happened at a later stage. It is possible that both Hebrew words, *אדום* and *איש*, were rendered *anthrōpos*, thus: *kai ek cheiros anthropou, ek cheiros anthropou adelphou*, and that what we have now is a result of haplography.

As for the verse in MT, it should probably be divided thus: *מד כל persone אדום*.

3. At Gen 25:13, MT reads *מדלתל מתמב*. In G: *κατ’ onoma tōn geneōn*. The term *תמדלת* is normally rendered *genesis* (or *geneseis*, in the plural), as in v. 12; *genea* is very unusual; this is the common rendering of *דר*. I suspect that *geneōn* in our reference is a corruption of *geneseōn* (as in the 11th-century ms 426) or a similar word (another explanation is offered by Wevers, *Notes*, 384–85).

4. The next case refers to Symmachus. At Gen 19:12, for *אלה* there is a corrupted passage of Symmachus: *horasai*, which is emended in the Göttingen edition (as well as in Wevers, *Notes*, ad loc.) to *hora ei*, which may roughly be interpreted as “see if.” This is not of much use, and copyists probably exchanged the word *idou*, which is employed as a stereotypical equivalent of *ראה*, but literally means “see!” “hold!” with a cognate word *hora*. I suspect, however, that the corrupted passage emerges from *ara ei*; compare 18:3, where *.ENTERO* is rendered *ei ara* in G.

There are also passages which seem to be additions and should be ascribed to a later hand.

---

5. Harl, *La Genèse*, 140; Wevers, *Notes on Greek Genesis*, 115. In a private letter, Hanna Kahana suggested that the Greek reader would understand the Greek phrase and these two genitives, not according to the word order that follows the Hebrew but, rather, as “of a brother of a man,” a fellow.

6. The next verse in G, 9:6, is no less difficult. Were it an exegetical translation, it could have been better formulated. The Vorlage of G probably read *שָׁמַפֶּר דָּמוֹ לַאֲדֹם בְּ(-) דָּמוֹ לַשֶּפֶר*. Note the four repetitions of *דָּמוֹ* in MT.
5. Gen 30:13, after the words “and she named him Asher” (G = MT): some mss (among them 911, a papyrus dated to the third century C.E.) and secondary text-witnesses add here (ho estin) ploutos, “richness,” which would explain the name, albeit erroneously, probably confusing the root דַּשָּׁר with דַּשָּׁר. This is appropriately presented in the apparatus to the Göttingen edition. However, there is a similar case, v. 18, where after “she named him Issachar” G adds: ho estin misthos, “which means wage”; in this case both editions of the Septuagint, that of Rahlfs and that of Göttingen, include these additional words in the main text. Undeniably, this addition in v. 18 appears in almost all manuscripts (in all the important ones) whereas in the former verse the textual evidence is meager. In many passages in the Book of Genesis, the narrative presents an explanation for the choice of a name while in the Greek there is no connection between the name and the derivation offered. The translator, however, did not supply any additional explanation for the sake of his Greek readers (unlike Josephus, who always does) and leaves the issue unclear. The above-mentioned instances are the only two where in Septuagintal manuscripts there is a supplement clarifying the meaning of the name. However, in the Book of Jubilees, which often shows affinity with G, these explanatory passages are missing. This leads one to conclude that these supplements in G derive from an early Greek gloss and are not part of the Septuagint.

6. Gen. 31:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>רָאָה</td>
<td>kai ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְהַעֲבָדֵים</td>
<td>tous tragous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חֲלִילָה</td>
<td>kai tous krious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְלִזְאָא</td>
<td>anabainontas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>epi ta probata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kai tas aigas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


“The he-goats and the rams were mounting the sheep and the she-goats.” However, in the OT עִים and is always a part of the עִים. It seems, therefore, that the additional words in G emerged within the Greek tradition and were not an integral part of the “Old Greek.”

7. Philo (Somn. 2.35; Migr. 95) explains the name Asher as “happy,” but clearly also refers to the word ploutos.
9. Philo (Somn. 2.33–36) adds an explanation to the names of all the tribes.
Since *probata* usually renders both the Hebrew words כבשים and זאן, the original G probably only had the term *probata* as a rendition of זאן, but it was misunderstood as referring to “sheep” only, and the word *aigai* “she-goats” was added (see, e.g., 30:32, 33). As a result, also a second male group, *krioi* “rams,” had to be added as against the two female species. Zacharias Frankel suggests that *krioi* stemmed from an erroneous doublet, µylyah + µylw[h. 10 He does not explain where the *aigai* came from.

7. Gen 45:21, MT: *harp*; G + *tou basileōs*. This addition is strange. In MT there is only “pharaoh” (without any attribute), “Pharaoh, the king of Egypt,” or only “the king of Egypt”; never “Pharaoh the king.”

8. Gen 50:12, MT: וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל יֵלֵךְ וַיְבָרַךְ וַיִּמָּת הוֹוָּאָב וַיַּמְבִלֶּהוּ מַהֲרִי. The latter passage has no point since Jacob was not buried “there” but in the “double cave” near Hebron (v. 13). It is apparently taken from the next verse, where it is in place. 12 This passage, in fact, is missing in some Greek manuscripts (mainly Hexaplaric) and in the Syrohexapla it is marked with an asterisk in some editions or marked with Hexaplaric signs of “added.”

9. The following reference is adduced here with hesitation. For MT לְנִש in Gen 45:10 and 46:34, G has Gesem Arabias. The exchange of *n/m* is common; see, for example, מַדְיָא, G: Madiam. This addition of Arabia appears in these two references (and only in these two) in almost all the mss. It seems, however, to be an old scholion, under the influence of the name גְּאֶשֶם הָהָרֵךְ, Neh 6:1ff., 13 and should therefore appear only in the apparatus and not in the main text. 14 Note, however, that the name Arabia is used by Herodotus, Pliny, and Ptolemy the Geographer for an administrative district in Lower Egypt, and in some old sources one finds in the same region a place-name generally deciphered Gsm.t. This may possibly be related to the rendition of G, but it is unsure. 15 The Greek

---

11. The words “as he had told them” are missing in ms B and therefore some editions, including Rahlfs, omit these words. I do not see any relationship between addition/omission of these two passages.
12. See, for example, V. P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 18–50* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, 1995) ad loc.
13. Wevers, *Notes*, 761, claims that there is no connection to this name, since the Greek text there (2 Esd 16:1) has τὸ Γέσαμ τὸ Αράβι. This argument is valid only if we assume that the translator of the Book of Genesis read the Book of Esdras in Greek.
14. The identification of לְנִש in Gen 46:28 with Hērōōn-polis will be discussed elsewhere. For the present, see Frankel, *Palästinischen Exegete*, 19 note i.
translator often uses “modern” names such as Mesopotamia, Syria, and Aigyptos, as well as Heliou-polis and Hērōōn-polis, and one would expect a “modern” name for ינש, too. Thus, the expression Gesem Arabias may be an authentic rendition of the Hebrew text.

A similar problem is found in Exod 1:11, where G adds Ōn, a third treasure city in Egypt, to the two found in the Hebrew text, and supplements it by adding: “which is Hēliou-Polis” (see Gen 45:50; 46:20; and cf. Isa 19:18, which appears in 1Q Isa as ציר החוב = “City of Sun,” also witnessed in some versions). Whereas the name Ōn may reflect a Hebrew Vorlage ינש, the words “which is Hēliou-Polis” seem to be a later gloss. Had the “modern” name been introduced as a translation, as is done often, it would have replaced the Hebrew name and not been added as an explanation; see the cases mentioned above. If we are correct, the words “which is Hēliou-Polis” should not be printed in the main text of G but only noted in the apparatus.

These notes may perhaps contribute to the endeavor of the Göttingen Edition to get closer to the most ancient form of the Old Greek Version.